

CBP Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Toxic Contaminants Workgroup
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 9, 2020

Time: 1:00 - 3:00 PM

Location: Conference Call (remote only)

Calendar Page: [Link](#).



| Agenda Item and Desired Outcome | Time | Background Docs, Notes, and Action Items |
|--|------|---|
| 1. Introductions and Announcements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The Intercept</i> published an article titled “Toxic PFAS Chemicals Discovered in Hundreds of Products”, which is an overview of an article in the Journal of Environmental Science: Processes and Impacts. Download the original article here. The <i>American Fisheries Society</i> published an article titled “Anglers’ Views on Using Signs to Communicate Fish Consumption Advisories”. Bay Journal recently published articles of interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forever Chemicals Found in the Chesapeake Seafood and Maryland Drinking Water New Recipe: Fish consumption advisory substitutes safety for scare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBP Communication Team also posted video to TCW homepage | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete the toxic contaminant indicator Update the PCB Story Map Final SRS Materials |
| 2. Mercury Monitoring Network – Collin Eagle-Smith and Scott Phillips, USGS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of draft story map for mercury fisheries – Collin Eagle- Smith, USGS (15 min.) Considerations for developing a Mercury Monitoring Network for the Bay Watershed – Collin Eagle- Smith, USGS (15 min.) Discussion by TCW on options for Mercury Monitoring Network – Scott Phillips, USGS (15 min.) | 1:20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation |
| 3. Toxic Contaminant SRS Updates and Final Logic and Action Plan Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy and Prevention Outcome – Greg Allen, EPA (30 min.) Research Outcome – Scott Phillips and Emily Majcher, USGS (15 min.) | 2:00 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management Strategies Logic and Action Plans (LAPs) |
| 4. Potential STAC Proposals – TCW leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) is accepting proposals for STAC-sponsored workshops for the STAC fiscal year 2021 budget cycle. All draft proposals are due to STAC Coordinator, Annabelle Harvey (harveya@chesapeake.org) by COB February 16, 2021. Workshops convened by May 2022. | 2:45 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RFP found on STAC website here. |

| | | |
|------------------------|------|---|
| | | |
| 5. Wrap Up and Adjourn | 3:00 | • Next meeting: January 13, 2020 |

Summary of Actions and Decisions

Action: TCW will have the PFAS STAC proposal idea on their January agenda to assess if this would be feasible.

Action: Collin Eagle- Smith will start flushing out a decision matrix that can help choose a path forward for the Mercury Monitoring Network.

Action: TCW will follow- up on the Mercury Monitoring Network discussion at their January meeting.

1. Introductions and Announcements

- **Tom Parham:** contracting some work on the West Coast. Found that salmon are impacted by chemicals found in tire particles.
- **Greg Allen:** the authors had a very strong conclusion that a compound in tires turns into something else in sunlight and very harmful to young salmon. I have often wondered for a long time what happens to the used tire bits and their effects on the environment. Definitely something to keep an eye on. Would be interesting to know if that compound is on any monitoring lists. Thanks for sharing Tom. Maybe we can bring this back to the workgroup as a presentation at some point.
- **Emily Majcher:** CWEA just reported PFAS in the tire materials.
- **Dave Whitall:** Zinc from tire wear particles is also a problem.

2. Mercury Monitoring Network

- **Considerations for Monitoring Network Discussion:**
 - i. **Scott Phillips:** Is it okay if we provide yours's and James' email and share that with everyone.
 - ii. **Collin Eagle- Smith:** yes, and we can turn this into a pdf/ ppt and although it won't be interactive it will at least have the moving parts.
 - iii. **Mark Richards:** this is great information. Right now, we are trying to put together our priority list for the next TMDL cycle. One of the big components is generating more information on mercury and this is really interesting and could help guide our discussion.
 - iv. **Collin Eagle- Smith:** definitely can share the story map since it's already published. We can share this PowerPoint as well and to continue this conversation.
 - v. **Greg Allen:** I am blown away by this product. This is one of the most innovative pieces of science communication I have seen in a while. This takes the story map to a whole new level. I would like to talk about how we could drop PCBs into that same format and create something similar. I like the way that it presents data in a way that is useful.
 - vi. **Collin Eagle- Smith:** aside from difference in data structure, it is relatively straight forward. In terms of overall structure, I don't think it would be a super heavy lift to get
 - vii. **James Willacker:** data structure is really the major hurdle. But now that we have people use to making these and really it comes down to getting the data organized so that it's basically a drop in. I also would like to mention that the paper has a lot of the management considerations in it. It is in a giant multi-page table, but it might be a good springboard to start conversations.
 - viii. **Emily Majcher:** For the PCB Data, USGS has compiled a lot of the state PCB location data. I think the biggest hurdle is that Mercury is one constituent, whereas there are 209 PCBs, so all that data would have to be normalized first.

- ix. *Collin Eagle- Smith*: One thing we found, is that the data structure that makes sense for the story map doesn't make sense for a normal data structure.
- x. *Len Schugam*: Have you looked at doing any temporal analysis of this?
- xi. *Collin Eagle- Smith*: we have looked at that pretty extensively for the paper. The density of the data etc. wasn't there. The temporal data was going to be spread out and we couldn't present it with any confidence.
- xii. *Fred Pinkney*: I was thinking when you show the maps of exceedances it would be good to show the thresholds as well.
- xiii. *James Willacker*: that is something that we are still working out why it isn't doing that, and we plan to have something like that.
- xiv. **Link to paper**: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-020-02193-5>
- **TCW Monitoring Discussion:**
 - i. *Options could include:*
 - 1. Develop some focused common objectives and how existing monitoring can be utilized to meet them.
 - 2. First option plus identify additional objectives (and gaps) that would benefit from additional monitoring.
 - 3. Second option plus develop funding recommendations to address gaps.
 - ii. No one was opposed to pursuing an options approach.
 - iii. **Discussion:**
 - 1. *Collin Eagle- Smith*: We would be happy to start to flush out a decision matrix that can help choose the path we want to go with.
 - 2. *Scott Phillips*: That would be really beneficial, thanks Collin.
- **Action:** Collin Eagle- Smith will start flushing out a decision matrix that can help choose a path forward for the Mercury Monitoring Network,
- **Action:** TCW will follow- up on the Mercury Monitoring Network discussion at their January meeting.

3. TC SRS Updates and Final LAPs

- **Policy and Prevention:**
 - i. MS was put out for comment and that period has not ended yet. Still working on completing revisions to LAP. Everything for the MB meeting should be posted by January 7th for their first meeting of 2021.
- **Research:**
 - i. No comments of significance for strategy or LAP and the science needs were brought into Research as planned.
 - ii. Final review for fatal flaws: all feedback is due by December 21st.
 - iii. *Fred Pinkney*: I was out of the loop in terms of what media we are looking at- is all media? Are we concerned with extent and magnitude or are we linked to specific human and fish concerns?
 - iv. *Scott Phillips*: the way we tried to limit the scope is to focus on the ecosystem effects. We were not going to take on drinking water.
 - v. *Fred Pinkney*: what about the fish tissue component?
 - vi. *Scott Phillips*: I think that would be an important part- if you are going to sample what do you need to consider for fish and other species. If that's not a worthwhile undertaking?
 - vii. *Fred Pinkney*: it seems like STAC would be a good approach if we can focus in and get good results.
 - viii. *Scott Phillips*: maybe members can start jotting some ideas and we can discuss at the next meeting.
 - ix. *Fred Pinkney*: yeah, I could try to draft something before the meeting.
 - x. *Greg Allen*: it seems like it is a good fit for STAC. For them to play a role where we get together on data etc. it would be useful of other programs. I think it's a good fit, but it would come down to horsepower.

- xi. **Action:** TCW will have the PFAS STAC proposal idea on their January agenda to assess if this would be feasible.

4. Potential STAC Proposals

- Discussed up above in the Research section. The best STAC proposal would be around PFAS.

Call Participants

Hilary Swartwood, CRC
Greg Allen, EPA
Scott Phillips, USGS
Emily Majcher, USGS
Doug Austin, EPA
Collin Eagle- Smith, USGS
Dave Whittall, NOAA
Fred Pinkney, FWS
Kelly Smalling, USGS
John Cargill, DNREC
Len Schugam, MDE
Marel King, CBC
Mark Richards, VA DEQ
James Willacker, USGS
Vicki Blazer, USGS
Tom Parham, MDE
Cindy Driscoll, MDE

Affiliation?

Chico Macron,