

TSCA/iPCB Workgroup Meeting Summary
March 4, 2020

TSCA Members in Attendance:

Joel Breems (Avista)
Jeff Donovan (City of Spokane)
Lauren Heine (NW Green Chemistry)
Doug Krapas (IEP)
Doug McClanahan (WA DOT)
Anna Montgomery (NWGC)
Cheryl Niemi (Ecology), Partial
Michael Ober (TDSC)
Mike Peterson (The Lands Council)
Elsa Pond (WA DOT)
Karl Rains (Ecology), Partial
Jay West (American Chemistry Council)

TSCA Members not in Attendance:

Tom Agnew (Liberty Lake SWD)
Adriane Borgias (Ecology)
Ben Carleton (IEP))
David Darling (ACA)
Lucy Edmondson (EPA)
Ben Floyd (White Bluffs Consulting)
Lara Floyd (White Bluffs Consulting)
Doug Greenlund (City of Spokane)
Michelle Mullin (EPA)
Amelia Nestler (NGC)
Cadie Olson (City of Spokane)
Amanda Parrish (the Lands Council)
Dean Weaver (WA DOT)
Tammie Williams (WA DOT)
Lisa Dally Wilson (Dally Environmental)

Agenda Items Discussed:

General:

1. Road Paint Whitepaper:

- a. Anna provided an update on the progress of this work contracted to NWGC by the SRRTTF:
 - i. NWGC resolved the contract concerns with ACE and is proceeding with work.
 - ii. NWGC is shooting to have a draft for TSCA Workgroup member review by the end on this week (March 6, 2020). **Action NWGC**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- b. The SRRTTF at the December meeting approved NWGC's proposal (\$2,460) to develop a "technical case study" whitepaper building on the work of journalist Sonja Elmquist.
- c. NWGC was in not in attendance of this TSCA/iPCB Workgroup meeting to provide an update on their progress. Doug K. followed up with Anna for an update. NWGC intends to conduct interviews in the next couple weeks and will be drafting the whitepaper shortly thereafter with a draft likely in February for TSCA Workgroup member review. NWGC expects about 2 months to complete the work, depending upon SRRTTF review and approval process.
- d. Doug K. had suggested that David Darling from ACA, Elsa Pond from DOT and someone from DES be interviewed in addition to himself, as all were key players.
- e. The group reviewed a prior action item related to the road paint project effort that was the follow-up evaluation of the specification change with municipalities using these "non-diarylide" paints:

- i. David Darling suggested evaluating impacts from the supply side due to the China pigment supply concerns (plant explosion), available manufacturers/products, and any DES related purchasing issues.
 - ii. Elsa believes that it is still too premature as DOT and DES are still evaluating the supply chain concerns, availability of manufacturers/products, and effectiveness of the allowance in the purchasing process.
 - iii. Doug M. reported that the DOT has been using these products for some time and have 5 to 10 pigments to choose from. They have not experienced any problems with drying time, durability and other performance related parameters.
 - iv. Based on the above, the group decided to table this action and bring up for reconsideration in 2021.
2. **OECD** (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development):
 - a. Jay West was in attendance at the meeting and stated that the OECD is scratching their heads on next steps due to the diversity in the various case studies that were presented.
 - b. The TSCA/iPCB Workgroup agreed to table this project with Doug & Lauren continuing to follow-up with the OECD on any next steps. **Action Lauren H. & Doug K.**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- c. Doug provided a summary of the presentation delivered by Doug and Lauren Heine to the OECD in Paris, France on Monday, February 3rd, 2020. A complete summary was provided in the February meeting minutes, along with the OECD Agenda and the PowerPoint presentation.
 - d. The SRRTTF approved sponsorship of OECD application at the December meeting. Mike P. expressed a concern with the risk assessment of lower level congeners discussed in the application. Doug K. stated that the SRRTTF would be permitted additional information if the case study is accepted by OECD and that would be the appropriate time for the SRRTTF to suggest any revisions.
 - e. Doug K. and Lauren Heine are scheduled to present the case study to the OECD at a workshop in Paris, France on Monday, February 3. The presentation is due to OECD no later than Friday, January 24. A draft of the presentation will be provided for SRRTTF approval at the phone-con meeting on January 22. (**Action Doug K & NWGC – Done**)
3. **Update on PCB EPA Method 1668 study of TiO₂:** Michael Ober provided an update on the status of the study.
 - a. Jay West submitted the draft QAPP for review by the TSCA Work Group members on February 24th with a request that comments be received by COB March 4 as track changes to the Word documents.
 - b. Jeff reviewed the QAPP and asked if it was applicable to the TiO₂ specifically used in products and not the products themselves. Jay confirmed that the QAPP applies only to the testing of TiO₂ and not any associated products that they may be used in.
 - c. Considering no comments were received by the TSCA workgroup, the draft QAPP will now be submitted to the SRRTTF for review with comments to be received by COB

March 18th and approval at the SRRTTF meeting on the March 25th. **Action Jay W. & Doug K.**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- d. “Environmental Standards Inc.” (<https://www.envstd.com/>), selected as the 3rd party to develop the QAPP and perform data analysis for the TDSC is in the process of finalizing the QAPP. Michael expects a draft of the QAPP to be completed in February of 2020 for TDSC membership review and approval. Due to anti-trust concerns this is going to be a back and forth process with no firm timeline for completion.
 - e. They would like to begin sampling in the 1st quarter of 2020, so the SRRTTF will need to expedite approval.
 - f. As previously discussed, there were now only be three (3) categories of TiO₂ samples based on highest volumes of use, greatest nexus to the Spokane River and produced by Chloride process:
 1. Paints and Coatings
 2. Plastics
 3. Paper and Paperboard Packaging
4. **PCB's in products data base updates:**
- a. Mike P. has not yet heard back from Lisa Rodenburg regarding the request that Rutgers University host the data base and will send another note. **Action Mike P.**
 - b. Mike P. suggested contacting local universities, such as Kyle Shimabuku of Gonzaga University’s Civil Engineering Department as they may be better suited since this is a local focus. **Action Mike P.**
 - c. Lauren also has contacts at Gonzaga and suggested that this may be a good fit for their Engineering Design Projects and will follow-up. **Action Lauren H.**
 - d. The discussion on the CompTox workshops sponsored by EPA & Ecology will be tabled until the next TSCA/iPCB workgroup meeting in April since no representatives from either agency were on the call. **Action Doug K. to include w/April 2020 agenda**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- e. Mike P. contacted Lisa Rodenburg after the holidays regarding Rutgers hosting the data base. Lisa said to be patient as she is still waiting to hear back from the Rutgers decision makers.
- f. Cheryl stated that she uses the CompTox data base to evaluate toxics in products.
- g. The group has expressed some concerns over the user friendliness of the CompTox data base and its suitability for our intended use.
- h. Both EPA and Ecology are sponsoring workshops in February regarding use of the CompTox data base. Karl, Jeff, Doug, Elsa, Cheryl, Lauren and Mike P. plan to attend.
- i. Michelle suggested submitting any questions we have ahead of the workshop.

5. EPA research opportunities:

- a. **iPCB Key words for Scholarly Articles:** Michelle stated during our February, 2020 call that EPA is resource limited and is focused on higher priority projects such as site clean-ups and iPCB product testing (see below Children's Product Testing), so this particular project has been assigned a lower priority and is currently on the back burner. **Action Michelle M. to provide occasional updates**
- b. **Children's Product Testing:**
 - i. Michelle stated during our February, 2020 call that this remains a work in progress, as EPA attempts to understand the variability of the results and other environmental influences (air emissions, dust adsorption, etc.). **Action Michelle M. to provide occasional updates**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- ii. EPA recently completed a pilot project testing children's products using Method 1668.
 - iii. EPA found a difference between the results of their study of similar products to that conducted by Ecology, and even variability amongst the same products (i.e.: yellow glitter foam sheets).
 - iv. PCB-11 was the most prevalent congener detected.
 - v. EPA is using a different lab (ORD) and extraction methods than that used by Ecology.
 - vi. Michelle was not sure what if any blank correction methods were being used, but will find out for our next meeting. **Action Michelle M. (also, when is report expected?)**
- c. **NTP risk study of various Congeners and Aroclors:** NTP is evaluating toxicity of PCB congeners 11, 95, 126, 153 and Aroclors 1016 and 1254. **Action EPA to provide occasional updates**

6. iPCB Workshop:

- a. During our February, 2020 meeting David Darling had suggested projects to evaluate PCB-11 in comparison to other dioxin-like congeners and provided the following for consideration: evaluate rates of degradation, bioaccumulation potential, explore methods to handle PCB-11 differently. David was not available for our March, 2020 meeting, so this discussion will be tabled until the April meeting. **Action David D. and Doug K. to include w/April 2020 agenda**
- b. Anna provided an update on NWGC's progress to carry-on the efforts from the workshop under a Bullitt Foundation grant:
 - i. The March meetings will be the last under the Bullit Foundation grant
 - ii. NWGC will seek other funding options to continue this work
 - iii. Expect to get summaries to each of the three workgroups out next week

- c. With the Bullitt Foundation funding running out at the end of the 1st quarter, robust discussion and strategic planning is needed to carry on the energy created by the iPCB workshop. **Action Doug K. to include w/April 2020 agenda**
- d. Anna suggested following up with Ken Zarker regarding Ecology's Toxics Group on PCBs to see if there may be any opportunities/synergies to carry on this work. **Action Anna M.**
- e. Mike P. in regards to the advocacy piece, stated that The Lands Council is putting together a National outreach campaign to expand knowledge on the iPCB issue, reaching out to other State agencies and will be attending the River Rally conference in San Antonio in May. Mike also stated that they implement this effort regardless of their success in obtaining the Columbia River Toxics Grant. **Action Mike P. for updates**

Historical Notes for this Project:

- f. Discussion ensued regarding the ongoing NWGC webinar efforts under the Bullitt Foundation grant.
- g. The NWGC advocacy groups were reported to be poorly attended, so TSCA Workgroup members were encouraged to join one of the groups to carry on the work of the iPCB workshop
- h. The following TSCA Workgroup members present for this meeting were attending the following
 - i. Government/Regulatory – Elsa, Karl & Cheryl
 - ii. Technical Considerations – Jeff
 - iii. Policy/Advocacy – Doug (Mike P. stated he will join this group)
- i. The benefit of consolidating into one group versus three was discussed to improve attendance, minimize the number of meetings and diversify the brainstorming talent. After much debate, it was agreed that separate groups addressing each of these very diverse topics was more prudent at this time.
- j. Also suggestions to better define the purpose, goals and outcomes of each NWGC workgroup would be beneficial to provide better definition and guidance.
- k. There has been some confusion as to the difference between the Government/Regulatory and Policy/Advocacy workgroups. Doug K. explained that the Policy/Advocacy was not government related policy, but Corporate policy, so the suggestion was made to define as Corporate policy/Advocacy to better define.
- l. As a follow-up to the workshop, NWGC is conducting webinars to further develop the three main categories of interest:
 - i. Government/Regulatory – two meetings held in November with good attendance.
 - ii. Technical Considerations – one meeting in November with good attendance
 - iii. Policy/Advocacy – one meeting in November with poor attendance
- m. Review of key points from the work groups:
 - i. A lot of questions remain around key issues such as toxicity of iPCBs.
 - ii. A lot of emphasis on Brands impacting the decision makers.

- iii. The Sustainable Packaging Coalition (SPC) was absent from our iPCB workshop due to a conflicting conference, but is having another conference in late March in Austin, TX which may serve as a good opportunity to present on the iPCB concern.
 - iv. SPC members are not aware of the iPCB concern.
 - v. Questions that Brands should be asking of suppliers and policies that they could implement.
- n. Karl questioned the funding sources of NWGC's continuing work and its applicability to SRRTTF guidelines for reporting. Anna confirmed that funding did not include SRRTTF funds for this ongoing work, and was using Bullitt foundation funding that will continue through March of 2020. The Bullitt foundation will be closing its doors thereafter, so there may be some Ecology PPG funding to continue this work.
 - o. We need to encourage SRRTTF members to participate in this ongoing NWGC work to further advance the efforts from the iPCB workshop.

7. **Funding/EPA OPPT Grant:**

- a. Based on recent information regarding the EPA OPPT grant, nonprofit organizations (such as NWGC, The Lands council, ACE) can apply under the Source Reduction Assistance Program but cannot apply for the Pollution Prevention Grant Program.
- b. Only a public university (i.e.: Rutgers) may apply and the application would have to go through the applicable EPA region
- c. Based on the above and the limited time line for gaining SRRTTF approval, the collective decision by the TSCA/iPCB workgroup was not to pursue this particular grant.

Historical Notes for this Project:

- d. Mike P. asked if anyone knew about the status of the Columbia River Toxics Grant that the Lands Council submitted an application. Karl stated that EPA received 24 applications that are currently under review. EPA expects to award the successful grants in June/July 2020.
- e. Karl mentioned that Adriane believes that the SRRTTF is well positioned for these types of grants due to our cross boundary watershed and diversity of interests.
- f. Karl stated that we need to define projects with scopes of work so packages are ready to go upon notice of grant opportunities.
- g. Lisa stated that the TTWG should develop a full list of projects for this purpose, but the funding workgroup should develop a boiler plate grant proposal.
- h. Ben suggested that the TTWG and Funding Workgroups develop a coordinated strategy and might consider using current funding to support this effort. Karl will put this request onto the Funding workgroup agenda for discussion and bring recommendations to SRRTTF for consideration. **Action Lisa & Karl**

8. **Other:**

- a. None