CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team Toxic Contaminants Workgroup Meeting Agenda

Date: Wednesday November 13th, 2019

Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Location: Conference Call, Room 305 at CBPO **Call-in:** 1-929-205-6099; **Code:** 217 196 432 **Zoom Link:** https://zoom.us/j/217196432

Calendar Page: <u>Link</u>.



Agenda Item and Desired Outcome	Time	Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items
 Introductions and Announcements Approval of the October meeting minutes – Scott Phillips PCB Consortium exploratory team formation – Greg Allen Federal Remediation Technologies Roundtable (FRTR) is scheduled for today, November 13, 2019. Meeting topic: Synthesizing Evolving Conceptual Site Models (CSMs) with Applicable Remediation Technologies. Updates from November 6th Habitat GIT presentation on microplastics STAC report: "Microplastics in the Chesapeake Bay and its Watershed: State of the Knowledge, Data Gaps and Relationship to Management Goals." MSN article: "Toxic PCBs linger in schools; EPA, lawmakers fail to act." "Millions of fluorescent light ballasts containing PCBs probably remain in schools and day care centers across the U.S. four decades after the chemicals were banned over concerns that they could cause cancer and other illnesses. Many older buildings also have caulk, ceiling tiles, floor adhesives and paint made with PCBs, which sometimes have been found at levels far higher than allowed by law." 	1:00	 TCW members will send their comments / edits for the draft STAC report on Toxic Contaminants in Agriculture and Urban Settings to Scott Phillips (swphillips@usgs.gov). Scott Phillips will present the Final STAC report to the TCW at the November meeting.
2. Voluntary Phase-Out of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in Current Use in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed—Jeff Cantin, ERG	1:15	Presentation and <u>report</u> . TCW strategy and workplan.
3. Overview of STAC Microplastics Report – Bob Murphy, Tetra Tech	2:15	TCW <u>strategy and workplan</u>.Presentation
4. Wrap Up and Adjourn	2:50	Next meeting: December 11 th , 2019 from 1- 3 PM

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Decision: the TCW approved the October meeting minutes.

Action: TCW members should email Hilary (<u>swartwood.hilary@epa.gov</u>) or Greg (<u>allen.greg@epa.gov</u>) if interested in participating in the PCB exploratory team.

Meeting Minutes

1. Introductions and Announcements

- a. NOAA Webinar on Lee Blaney's recent research: Occurrence of antibiotics, estrogenic hormones, and UV-filters in water, sediment, and oyster tissue from the Chesapeake Bay.
 - i. When: November 20th from 12-1 PM
 - ii. Registration link: https://www.star.nesdis.noaa.gov/star/OneNOAASeminars ListOnly.php#TopExp30424:
- b. **Decision:** TCW approved meeting minutes for October.
- c. PCB Consortium: calling for volunteers for the PCB Consortium exploratory team. This team would look at the feasibility of putting together this consortium. People who have agreed to assist in the beginning: Len Schugam and Mark Richards.
 - i. **Action:** TCW members should email Hilary (<u>swartwood.hilary@epa.gov</u>) or Greg (<u>allen.greg@epa.gov</u>) if interested in participating in the PCB exploratory team.

2. Voluntary PCBs Presentation – Jeff Cantin, ERG

- a. Summary:
 - i. Project Goals: a) identify and quantify current and future sources of PCBS in the CBW. Triggered most of the fish consumption advisories etc. This study focused mostly on PCBs in electrical equipment. Utilities are under no obligation to locate, remove, or monitor PCB equipment and doing so is labor and resource intensive. ERG built a model to extrapolate population factoring in annual removal and failure...Created an inventory to determine sources of PCBs (ex. fluorescent lamp ballasts, paints and pigments, electrical equipment, caulks, and sealants). Looked at existing voluntary initiatives focused on PCBs (ex. Minnesota, Washington State PCB Chemical Action Plan, Great Lakes Binational Strategy for PCB Risk Management, Spokane River Regional Toxics Task Force). Options for PCB voluntary initiatives: legacy sources, electrical equipment owners, FLBs, public agency procurement of outdoor paint. Voluntary Partnership Structure: partners- sign partnership agreement and commit to undertaking a discrete set of activities, develop outreach campaign tools and materials (LOE = level of effort)
 - ii. What have we learned from the report and what does that mean about what we do next?
 - 1. Bring this to the MB and present what we learned and what this means for the CBP etc.
- b. Questions/Discussion:
 - i. Doug Austin, CBPO: Let's say we find or segregate out FLBs, there are certain requirements for disposables, do you know if there is a way to keep PCBs segregated from the environment once they are disposed?
 - ii. Jeff Cantin, ERG: I believe PCBS would have to be disposed in a toxic landfill and the closet one is in Canada. There is also a problem with shipping PCBs.

- iii. Ian Hartwell, NOAA: What kind of magnitude of PCBs are recycled through sludge from Wastewater
- iv. Jeff Cantin, ERG: I'm not an expert or aware of this issue,
- v. Greg Allen, EPA: What we are talking about here is source sector PCBs- trying to keep these out of wastewater to begin with.
- vi. Mark Richards, VA DEQ: This was eye opening to me- I 've never seen anything that suggests that PCBs exist in electrical equipment and it definitely will get me to look at this issue differently.
- vii. Greg Allen, EPA: I think one of the key findings is the FLBs in schools and other facilities. Schools get complicated because they don't have the money and they are dealing with other issues like asbestos and mold. But in the Bay area we have a program for Cleaner, Greener, Schools so there may be an opportunity to get something going around ballasts around this program.
- viii. Mark Richards, VA DEQ: I am missing the piece of how FLBs are linked to Water Quality.
- ix. Jeff Cantin: One of the risks would be during a renovation and does the contractor have the knowledge to deal with FLBs etc. and there would be a path to water through runoff from there.

3. Overview of STAC Microplastics Report- Bob Murphy, Tetra Tech

- a. Summary:
 - i. Plastics are a global problem. Since 1950 the amount of plastic waste generated has increased exponentially and we are now just starting to understand the effects this has on our environment. In particular, microplastics are of great concern (microplastics- small plastic fragments, fibers or granules ranging in size from 0.1 mm to 10 mm). There are 2 types of microplastics: 1. Primary Microplastics: manufactured products used in facial cleansers and cosmetics, as vectors for drugs, as air-blasting media for removing rust, and virgin plastic production pellets. 2. Secondary Microplastics: piece of plastic that have broken off larger plastic objects through physical, biological, or chemical processes. In 2019, the Australian Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization estimated that by 2050 95% of all seabird species will ingest some from of plastic. The WEF projected that there will be more plastic than fish in the ocean by 2050. The Chesapeake Bay already has evidence of plastic pollution, specifically in SAV beds. In order to address this rising concern, the STAC held a workshop to discuss the state of the knowledge, data gaps, and relationship to management. The following recommendations were made:
 - 1. The CBP should create a cross-GIT Plastic Pollution Action Team to address the growing threat of plastic pollution to the bay and watershed.
 - 2. The Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting Team should incorporate development of ERAs of microplastics into the CBP strategic science and research framework, with the development of the ERAs focused on assessment of microplastic pollution on multiple living resource endpoints.
 - 3. STAC or an appointed ad hoc technical team should undertake a technical review of terminology used in microplastic research, specifically size classification, and concentration units, and recommend uniform terminology for the CBP partners to utilize in monitoring and studies focused on plastic pollution in the bay and watershed.
 - 4. The CBP should develop a source reduction strategy to assess and address plastic pollution emanating from point sources, non-point sources, and human behavior.

5. The CBP should direct the Plastic Pollution Action Team and STAR Team to collaborate on utilizing the existing bay and watershed monitoring networks to monitor for microplastic pollution.

b. Questions/Discussion:

- i. Scott Phillips: what would be the charge of the Pollution Action Team?
- ii. The most efficient use of such a team would be to direct the development of a risk assessment or source reduction strategy
- iii. Greg Allen: I think if an action team comes together, the question is whether recommendation #4 as listed, until you know the effects its hard to put it in a relevant context against the other things. Really should emphasize the fish microplastic problem at the MB meeting.
- iv. Marel King: What would a source reduction strategy entail / what would it include?
- v. Bob Murphy: some of the things discussed were producers, plastics in general (that's the source reduction), Hampton road sanitation- very common in biosolids- that's a vector that has possibilities.
- vi. Greg Allen: I think we would be willing to be partners with another group to examine the science. It would be hard right now to take on the reduction strategy. Is Healthy Watersheds GIT going to stay involved?
- vii. Bob Murphy: Yes and no- it's a capacity issue. This issue is really across all workgroups and GITs so it's more who wants to take it on.

Call Participants

Scott Phillips, USGS
Emily Majcher, USGS
Ian Hartwell, NOAA
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
Scott Glaberman, GMU
Marel King, CBC
Jeff Cantin, ERG
Bob Murphy, TetraTech
Doug Austin, EPA
Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Amy Williams, PA DEP
Tom Parham, MDNR
Ruth Cassilly, UMD