



Toxic Contaminants Workgroup

October 14th Conference Call

October 14, 2015

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

I. Welcome, Introductions, Announcements

Greg Allen, EPA

- GIT Funding Proposals Update
 - Two GIT funding proposals were submitted. The proposal for developing guidance for track down studies did not succeed in getting funding. The proposal for improving communication on fish consumption advisories, in conjunction with Diversity Action Team, did received funding for \$50,000.
- Presentation on PAHs and coal-tar-based sealcoat (Barbara Mahler, USGS)
 - <http://nctc.fws.gov/topic/online-training/webinars/conservation-science.html>

II. Elizabeth River Project Case Study

- Joe Rieger, Elizabeth River Project, provided an overview of some of the work conducted to address toxic contaminants in the Elizabeth River.
- Joe asked that the TCW keep the Elizabeth River Project in mind since they may have some information to contribute to the fish consumption advisory project.
- Were you able to monitor residual PAHs below your cap to see if it is degrading in the anoxic conditions?
 - Rieger: Cap fitness was based on two types of residual. We have a few areas where breakthrough is occurring. Phase 1 cap has held up very well, phase 2 cap is seeing some breakthrough that we are monitoring and are prepared to adaptively manage. We haven't seen the material degrading under the cap, it is there to stay, but it is just isolated from the biota.
- Allen: Are PAHs being redeposited right over top of the cap from new sources?
 - Rieger: We have seen some areas with elevated PAHs, there is some fine organic material on top of the cap. The question is how much is coming through the cap versus being deposited on top of the cap directly. We think there is some of that going on, but we don't know how much.
- Dev Murali (DOEE): what was total depth you dredges from?
- Rieger: Phase 1 we dredged 12 inches, and backfilled with sand. Depth of the water was about 5 feet. In phase 2 we dredged anywhere from 8ft to 1ft and the depth of the water was 1ft to 30 ft. Phase 1 cap was sand with oyster reef on top and/or marsh on top. In phase 2, we mixed inorganic material with organic carbon. Recommend you get in touch with Dr. Mike Unger at VIMS. He is looking for new projects and partnerships and is interested in growing this technology.
- How much did it cost and how was it funded?

- Rieger: We set up an end loop fee fund. The Money Point cleanup took about \$5 million.

III. Policy and Prevention Workplan Development

Greg Allen, EPA

- Greg presented an initial draft of the Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention Workplan. TCW members helped address gaps in the workplan and to provide additional feedback. The majority of edits to the workplan were made live during the meeting.
- In Management Approach 1, Key Action 6, remove the Pennsylvania and Virginia item. Those can be the information that help to inform the issue paper discussed in the third performance target. Add additional components about: methods used, where monitoring is done, characteristics of discharges that are evaluated and where the info get compiled, as information that would be included in the issue paper.
- ACTION: Reach out to Dianne McNally and EPA WPD for information on key action 12.
- ACTION: Jackie Lendrum (EPA LCD) will follow up about TSCA rule-making in terms of voluntary action on transformer program in terms of status and timeline.
- ACTION: David will reissue the revised workplan drafts for review and comment by end of next week.
- ACTION: David will distribute the Diversity Action Team GIT funding proposal for quick comment by COB Friday, October 16.

IV. Research Workplan Development

Scott Phillips, USGS

- Scott presented an initial draft of the Toxic Contaminants Research Workplan. TCW members helped address gaps in the workplan and to provide additional feedback. The majority of edits to the workplan were made live during the meeting.
- Research wp: KA 3.
- Ian Hartwell (NOAA): We can work with you on the language for Management Approach 1, key action 3. Databases are on the web as well as the reports. They are doing some work this year on transplanted animals. Don't know if results are back yet. Dennis Eppity is lead investigator. I will discuss with Dennis.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): Expand on the contaminants and effects being mentioned in the key actions. Explain that it is multiple contaminants.
- ACTION: Confirm with Maryland that they are undertaking the actions listed in in key action 5.
- Vicki Blazer (USGS): Bullhead tumor work should also be included. Fred Pinkney can provide that.
- ACTION: Perform a crosswalk between the workplan and the research gaps identified in the Management Strategies.
- ACTION: Scott will work with Kelly Smalling on getting dates for the actions listed in management approach 3.

- ACTION: Clarify how algal toxins are linked and relevant to the toxic contaminants research strategy.
- ACTION: Clarify the intent of the key action item on considering development of a PCB mass-balance model.

V. Wrap-up and Next Steps

Greg Allen, EPA and Scott Phillips, USGS

Schedule of Remaining 2015 TCW Meetings:

November 10 – rescheduled from November 11 due to Veterans Day

December 9