

PBT Reduction Strategy Team Conference Call Summary
January 19, 2005, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm Central Time

41 conference lines participated in the call.

Introduction – Review the Agenda

Gary Gulezian opened the call with a brief welcome and a review of the agenda. Gary also summarized the call between the Executive Committee and all the Strategy Team leads. These calls should be a good forum to address overlaps and develop a consistent approach amongst the strategy teams.

The first face-to-face meeting of the Executive Committee and the Strategy Teams will be held on February 22 and 23 at Maumee State Park in Toledo, Ohio. Maumee State Park is approximately a 1-hour drive from the Detroit Metro Airport. Toledo can also be reached by the regional Amtrak service. For those that cannot attend the face-to-face meeting, a conference call-in number will be established. More details to follow. The face-to-face meeting will be used to engage a systematic discussion of a preliminary draft of the PBT Strategy that covers the organizing concepts. That draft will be available prior to the face-to-face meeting.

Carri Lohse-Hanson asked about document version control. Ted Smith said that the documents sent out on 1/11/2005 and those sent out on 1/18/2005 are the same. No comments have been incorporated yet. When the comments are incorporated into a revised version, the document will be named V3, and so on.

PBT Team Webpage

Ted Smith briefed provided an update on the webpage for the PBT Reduction Strategy Team. The Great Lakes Commission has kindly offered their expertise and help to create webpages for the 8 Strategy Teams. The PBT Reduction Strategy Team website can be found at:

<http://www.glin.net/pbtstrategyteam/index.php>

The webpage is still a work in progress; however, the following features should be added in the next week or so: (1) interactive use; (2) ability to sign up to a Strategy Team or specific sub-teams; and (3) ability to submit comments online. Please feel free to browse the draft webpage and provide any comments or suggestions.

Review Process for writing PBT Reduction Strategy

Ted Smith provided an overview of the planned process for drafting the PBT Strategy. There will be only one core drafting team rather than separate drafting teams for each sub-topic. The core drafting team will have a broad representation of all the sub-topics and will rely on the expertise and comments of the entire Strategy Team. So far the following 11 people have agreed to be on the drafting team: Tim Brown, Joe DePinto, David De Vault, Deb Jacobson, Jon Dettling, Susan Boehme, Dale Phenicie, Laura Rauwerda, Matt Hudson, Sue Brauer, and Zoe Lipman/Mike Murray. The core drafting

team will be in place by February 2, 2005. If you are interested in participating on the core drafting team, then please volunteer by email Ted Smith (smith.edwin@epa.gov). The core drafting team will have conference call every other week on Tuesdays at 1am central time, using the same call in number and code as the full PBT Team calls.

The problem statement, goals and objectives will be rough drafted and available prior to the next conference call. It was suggested that the 4-5 page PBT Strategy categorize substances into the following: (1) active priority pollutants; (2) banned pesticides; and (3) emerging chemicals of concern.

George Cooper also suggested that the team define the scope of the PBT Strategy sooner rather than later. Gary responded that he hoped to arrive at a consensus on the scope by or at the face-to-face meeting.

Discuss inventory of current PBT reduction activities

Ted Smith provided a short overview of the PBT Reduction activities matrix. The matrix is intended to be a broad meta-database that will be used to identify the status quo, and inform the program gap analysis. The matrix is broken down into categories based on the organizing concepts. The matrix will be used to draft sections 3 and 4 of the PBT Strategy report. Although Ted has received some comments on the matrix, he encouraged others to review and provide comments.

Matrix Comments

Rob Simon asked why the matrix classifies some pollutants as specific compounds and others as groups of chemicals. Ted responded that the PBT Strategy report will use broader classifications (see above) and the classifications were arranged to provide a finer assessment for the gap analysis. Gary responded that we willing to accept and incorporate any comments.

Mike Murray suggested that a 4th category be added under Chemical Screening Programs. The category could be named “Potential to Threat Health” to address high use (or volume) chemicals.

Carri Lohse-Hanson commented that the matrix appeared to include a lot more research, monitoring, and screening activities than PBT reduction activities. Carri suggested that LaMPs, RAPs, and the GLBTS be added as separate categories. Carri also commented that the team will have to address the cross-listing of sediments and non-points sources with their respective strategy teams. Carri also the team should also consider how this approach correlates to SOLEC (and LaMP) Indicators for the environment and for releases.

David De Vault commented on the need to consider or define spatial perspectives (i.e. near shore versus open water, tributary watershed versus lake watershed, etc.). Gary G. views the Regional Collaboration efforts from a Great Lakes perspective where we can deal with whatever problems at whatever scale.

Sue Brauer suggested that we utilize the matrix developed for the Lake Michigan LaMP as an example.

PBT Team Comments on Draft Documents

- Joy Marburger suggested that the EPA PBT Strategy be added to the list of websites and documents because it would provide a good model for this PBT Strategy Report.
- Fish advisories have a disproportionate impact on Tribes.
- The document and website list needs to be easier to navigate – possibly with subcategories and short descriptions.
- The team needs to emphasize where we need to go rather than focus on where we are (i.e. the first 3 sections of the report should be very short).
- It was suggested that section 3 of the organizing concepts should group together monitoring, research, and screening to smooth out the section.
- The CEPA program in Canada has a systematic risk assessment element that should be considered.
- The report should focus on a 5-year to a 10-year horizon as opposed to a longer timeframe (i.e. decades).
- Laura Rauwerda suggested that the voluntary programs matrix be expanded with an eye to the future (e.g. alternative reduction strategies).
- Mike Murray suggested that in the goals sections we need to reference the Virtual Elimination language included in the GLBTS and the GLWQA.
- Sue Brauer suggested that we include the 14 Beneficial Use Impairments in the goals section.
- Jim Zorn commented that we needed to remember that the meta-inventory is what it is. For example, a box marked with partial “P” will not tell us the extent of the problem.
- Jim Zorn also emphasized the need for tribal input.

Other Business

Ted will set up a conference call of the writing team next Tuesday (January 25).

Ted will also set up a conference call of the entire strategy team in 2 weeks time.

The website should be fully functional soon.