CBP Goal Implementation Team

Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2017
Time: 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Calendar Page: http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/25154/

Chesapeake Bay Program
A Watershed Partnership

Summary of Actions and Decisions:

Action: The toxics and climate adaptation workshop will proceed with a focus on PCB TMDLs and mapping vulnerabilities in the watershed. Michelle will send out a link to a poll for preferred workshop dates; those interested in participating in the workshop are encouraged to fill out the poll.

Action: Jurisdictions should solicit comments from their health and environmental agencies relevant to fish consumption advisories and submit feedback on the draft infographic by Friday, July 14.

Action: Greg Allen will try to write a paragraph on each of these proposed ideas and have TCW weigh in on the usefulness of ideas. We will also keep soliciting ideas via email from the workgroup through June and July.

Welcome, Introductions and Announcements:

- Baltimore Urban Waters Partnership workshop on toxics—Bob Shedlock at USGS is point of contact. Looking for local gov'ts to participate. Len Schugam will talk about the TMDL process and monitoring, Greg will give an overview of TCW strategy and workplan, other agenda topics—Aug 3rd, USGS office in Baltimore
    - Greg and Michelle will send out details soon about the workshop
- WWTP/PCB project underway, complete workplan available on today's calendar page. We will have a draft completed project to send around for review in late summer, early fall.
- EJ Screen Tool, focused on Chesapeake Bay. Presentation and demo will be at July conference call.
- Scott Phillips: Endocrine disrupting compound project with USGS— we are finalizing current project and ramping up for next year.

Workshop Planning Update: Anna Hamilton, Tetra Tech; Zoe Johnson, NOAA

Anna Hamilton will provide updates regarding the upcoming workshop on climate change and toxic contaminants adaptive management approaches.

- Climate adaptation workshop intro was previously covered at March TCW meeting.
- Working on determining a workshop date and getting projects to discuss at the workshop.
    - 2 sets of potential dates: July 17-19, July 31, or Aug 1-2.
- Zoe Johnson: We might be interested in coordinating with the USGS workshop to make sure folks who want to attend both can.

- Anna Hamilton had questions about what activities are conducive to case studies for incorporating climate change considerations. Three levels we are looking at: outcome level, workplan level, specific actions level.
    - Workshop has also been done with Black Duck and SAV and Wetlands groups in fall 2016. (see March TCW calendar page for workshop summaries)
- Greg Allen: Current focus of the workgroup has two outcomes: prevention of pollution and policy implementation, science and research outcome aimed at addressing gaps in knowledge. PP: regulatory, voluntary, education and awareness, science and research. Most of emphasis is on regulatory, through impairments and CWA framework with TMDLs. We are mapping, and creating indicators to assess level of impairments against issued TMDLs. We are also developing guidance documents for PMPs and trackdown guidance studies. We also look at how permits are aligning with WLAs for PCBs in the watershed. We aren't doing very much on the voluntary part of the strategy, as we don't have a lot of resources to do that. We have a fish consumption advisory awareness project that hits the education part.
- Anna Hamilton asked regarding the statuses of workplans and what we are currently doing to move the PCB reduction objective forward. What is particularly active?
    - Greg Allen noted that jurisdictions are best situated to respond to those, within the framework of local TMDLs
- Len Schugam: Many jurisdictions have submitted plans under MS4 permits but have not begun to start work yet. One of our goals of the August workshop will be to address efforts to implement plans. If we are seeing increases in precipitation with climate change for example, that will lead to more overflows and exceeding capacity of WWTPs, and that can be big for toxics released within WW under the WLA.
    - Anna Hamilton: Would that be a good case study to look at?
    - Len Schugam: We have WLAs associated with PCBs, and in some cases point sources have been targeted for reductions under that. The secondary benefits of structural BMPs will be impacted by climate change as well, and those have some secondary removal of toxics, so that could be an impact.
- Anna Hamilton: SW BMPs are being implemented by local jurisdictions. How are you connected with that kind of project? How do you determine where there are PCB hotspots for example to know where to focus future efforts for BMP implementation? IS there a way to ID hotspots and incorporate those into TMDLs and implementation efforts?
    - Greg Allen: There are hotspots. For example, an exhaustive study in the Anacostia is finishing up. There has also been some work characterizing sediment contamination. We don't really take a lead on tracking itself, we are more in a coordinating role, to help all jurisdictions be more effective at what they are doing.
- Anna Hamilton: Aside from structural stormwater BMPs, are there other projects that are applied to implement TMDLs?
    - Mark Richards: For stormwater related implementation for outfalls for point sources, we do trackdown first, once we find that a WLA is exceeded. When we find out where the exceeded contamination is coming from, then we would ask that facility to implement some type of cleanup to bring their discharges within the TMDL's WLA. That's applicable on the tidal James, although there's not a TMDL there yet.
    - Greg: climate change-related impacts fall in two categories:

        - Effectiveness of management practices like BMPs and maybe atmospheric changes to PCB flux. Those are policy and prevention issues.
        - Science: There are a lot of knowledge gaps about risk to natural resources in the Bay from all kinds of toxics—pesticides, metals, PCBs, EDCs, etc. That's a really important question that needs to be asked.
- Anna Hamilton: Have you considered climate change already in how you have framed the science work?
    - Greg Allen: Not that I'm aware of, and the work on EDCs have not been incorporated with Climate change.
    - Scott Phillips: Following Hurricane Sandy, some work was done to identify risk of flooding or storm surges to superfund and hazardous sites, which might be a place to start.
    - Mark Richards: Has anyone done research on where new hotspots might be exposed due to flooding or climate change factors in the Bay watershed?
    - Greg Allen: We could overlay some data layers with projected flooding and SLR maps over superfund, hazardous sites. That might be a future project that could come out of this workshop.
    - Zoe Johnson: We certainly have access to those vulnerability maps. That is an example of something that could be added to the workplan.
    - George Onyullo: Going back to TMDLs, which are the main area of focus right now: if you take the TMDL process and go through each individual step in creating and implementing the TMDL and pull in climate change. How those BMPs are equipped to deal with each individual pollutant, and how do you incorporate climate considerations? This goes back to the Co-benefits scoring project.
        - Anna Hamilton: So we could pull up an example implementation plan and look at structural BMPs and climate change.
        - Zoe Johnson: We do have a climate change and water quality BMPs STAC workshop this fall, so we want to make sure we're not duplicating efforts.
    - Greg Allen: With the Co-benefits project, wherever there is a sediment efficiency, there is usually effectiveness for toxics removal. We have other actions specific to PCBs, like upland sediment remediation—lots of good work done by DRBC. Those are also definitely important for reducing toxics.
    - Zoe Johnson: So we can pick a list of WQ BMPs that have high scores for toxics, and also toxic-specific implementation practices, and we will do the exhaustive BMP list in the fall with the climate change/BMP effectiveness workshop.
    - Greg Allen: I think TCW will be very interested in that workshop.
- Anna Hamilton: So we have the mapping focus and the TMDL focus for the workshop.
- Greg Allen: Yes, we are focusing on that. The science is also important but it's too much to do for this context. At this point we just want to know where the risks are and where we can prevent them.

Action: The toxics and climate adaptation workshop will proceed with a focus on PCB TMDLs and mapping vulnerabilities in the watershed. Michelle will send out a link to a poll for preferred workshop dates; those interested in participating in the workshop are encouraged to fill out the poll.

Fish Consumption Advisory Draft Outreach Graphics: The workgroup will review the draft artwork, and provide comments. Members are asked to share these materials with their fish consumption advisory program leads in their jurisdictions and solicit feedback.

- Reggie Parrish: We have an advisory committee which made a lot of these initial decisions and requests for considerations. Made up of federal folks, local government reps, DWG and TCW folks—we are due to have another meeting of this advisory committee to get feedback on the draft.
- Greg Allen: Right, so we are due to bring this infographic back to that advisory group to get their feedback as well. We want something that the Bay Program partners think is useful and important for communicating FCAs and promoting healthy fish consumption habits in their communities.
- George Onyullo: If someone has a comment on the graphic, when should those be submitted?
    - Greg Allen: We'll talk about that and how much time you'll need to share within your agencies and FCA leads. We think at least a couple weeks, if not 3 or 4 to get some thorough vetting on this.
- Greg Allen: The red dots are supposed to indicate pollution that originates in the city in the background and is in the unhealthy fish, and we have some questions about the particular fish the angler is holding up.
- Darius Stanton: The first original draft was just this scene in the first block, and we decided that showing the whole sequence of steps is important.
- Ian Hartwell: In the states, do you get information on the spot on exactly which fish are good to eat, and do people really get the exact species on the spot where you can do what the man is doing in the first panel?
- John Schneider: The DE fishing guide has all kinds of information available on what is safe to eat and such.
- Greg Allen: We did do a literature search on which communication method was best, and a simple infographic came out of that as the best way to do this. We just wanted to indicate that there are better fish and worse fish, and that in general fish are healthy and you should make safe choices.
- George Onyullo: in the first panel, choosing fish is the most elaborate process of all these actions, you don't eyeball them and just decide. Maybe we should show the angler looking up the type of fish and having that inform his decision. I think additional work need to be done to communicate how you should work your way through the choices to make a selection.
- Greg: So we need to suggest somehow that there's specific knowledge to be gained for the angler to make the right choice.
- Greg Allen: In the second panel, we thought it was important to show the angler sharing the fish with his family and the importance of accepting the fish that store less pollution. In the bottom panel, we thought the man should be wearing the same shirt throughout, for consistency. At the very bottom, there is a place for individual states/agencies to link to their specific information.
- Mark Richards: In the "Prepare" slide: our health department suggested not frying the fish, so we want to make sure that the fish is not indicated to be fried. The other comment was in regard to mercury contamination—cutting fat only applies to PCBs. I don't know if there is a safe preparation technique for mercury.

    - Greg Allen: I'm not sure where we can include a negative here, with the directive not to fry, but we'll look at that.
    - Ian Hartwell: I also know that you're not supposed to keep the oil from frying either, you're supposed to throw it out.
        - Greg Allen: So maybe we should add that you should dispose of the oil after cooking.
- John Schneider: I would propose that the next draft should also be translated into Spanish as well.
    - Greg Allen: I would see if we should translate into any other languages as well. We did try to keep the language simple so that it could easily be translated into different languages.
- Greg Allen: So some folks have started to vet this, and we want to know how much time you need to get this to your health and environmental agencies and collect comments. Particularly DC, MD, DE, VA.
- Len Schugam asked about Maryland jurisdictional reps on the steering committee.
    - Greg Allen: No, I don't think we have any Maryland reps on the steering committee for this.
- Thomas Barron agreed, Len agreed, George has already started with comments from the DC rep on the steering committee forthcoming.
- George Onyullo: An early July timeline should work for DC.
    - Greg Allen: So let's say Friday, July 14 for comments on the infographic.
- John Schneider had a question about the ultimate use of the graphic.
    - Reggie Parrish: The DWG is very interested in this, and our stakeholders are very interested in the public health communication aspects of fish advisories. We will be working with NGOs and community groups that we count as our stakeholders, for a start.
    - John Schneider: It's a hard dance, as many of our subsistence anglers rely on this for a source of protein and we don't want to tell them that they can't eat fish anymore. So it's hard to communicate this with folks you can't relate to very well.
    - Greg Allen: A home run would be a way that jurisdictions could integrate this into their existing advisory programs, otherwise we would distribute posters, signs, ads, etc. But that's very general at this point and up for discussion.
- George Onyullo: Related to the utility of the graphic—this is something that should invite you to find out more about the fish you are relating with. It gives you an overview and you can then use referenced resources to follow up.
    - Greg Allen: This is an on-ramp to getting the level of detail you need to make a smart decision.
- Greg Allen: This is going to require at least one more revision, maybe more. We will ask for any written comments you and your teams want to share.

Action: Jurisdictions should solicit comments from their health and environmental agencies relevant to fish consumption advisories and submit feedback on the draft infographic by Friday, July 14.

Goal Team Funding needs: The workgroup will discuss priorities for goal team funding projects and review the timeline for submitting proposals.

- Greg Allen: We have the full amount of funding, and each goal team and STAR submits 3 priority projects. We are under WQGIT so we will be under the WQGIT goal team funding. Detailed guidance will go out next week or so. Most projects top out at 60-70K for budget so that all the projects can be funded. We have some ongoing projects—ex PMP and trackdown, but Michelle and Greg are working on that and it may not be a fit for a contractor.
- We may want to look at our workplan to get inspiration from project ideas, meetings over the last year or so. We are calling on WG members to think about this, and if we ID a project we have to get a proposal to the WQGIT by mid-July.
- Fred Pinkney: Could the voluntary programs be revisited with the GIT funding projects?
    - Greg Allen: We had thought that EPA would be releasing a regulation that would make phase-out mandatory, and so we had let go of the voluntary. The regulation turned out to be much more limited than expected, so we might need to revisit the voluntary side. How would we use Goal Team funding to do that?
    - Fred Pinkney: Maybe we could review approaches used nationwide, get some case study results, maybe look at a Businesses for the Bay-type awards system or something. Find out what's worked and maybe an implementation plan to do that? A small project, maybe 10-20K.
- Len Schugam: A field study on removal efficiency of PCBs from structural BMPs? That could build on the literature review done for the co-benefits project. Maybe a pilot class of BMPs like wet ponds. Look at influent, effluent, etc.
    - George Onyullo: A lot of those studies tend to be site-specific, so scalability might be an issue.
- Len Schugam: We could also do a pilot source-trackdown study in an area we know has hotspots.
    - Greg Allen: We need to have the whole logic together on that to argue our case.
- Greg Allen: We also have some gaps in pre/post ENR in other jurisdictions that aren't addressed with the current project underway.

Action: Greg Allen will try to write a paragraph on each of these proposed ideas and have TCW weigh in on the usefulness of ideas. We will also keep soliciting ideas via email from the workgroup through June and July.

Next Conference Call:

- Proposing new date for July 20th for July conference call.
- July agenda items:
    - Demo/presentation on EJ Screen Tool
    - Presentation on historical trends of PCB in fish tissue

Call Participants:

Greg Allen, EPA CBPO

Scott Phillips, USGS
Michelle Williams, CRC
George Onyullo, DOEE
Ian Hartwell, EPA
Fred Pinkney, FWS
Anna Hamilton, Tetra Tech
Zoe Johnson, NOAA
Julia Abolafia, UMD intern
Greg Krasnoff, UMD intern
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Len Schugam, MDE
John Schneider, DNREC
Thomas Barron, PA DEP
Kate Creef, EPA
Darius Stanton, CRC
Amy Williams, PA DEP
Reggie Parrish, EPA CBPO