
From: Trevena, Suzanne <Trevena.suzanne@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2026 7:33 AM
Subject: FW: Decision Requested: CWGT Workgroup Structure

Good morning Fed Family,

The Clean Water Goal Team (CWGT) is seeking a decision on proposed structure of workgroups. **I need your feedback by 2 PM, Tuesday May 26.** I am off on May 27, so I want to make sure I weigh in on behalf of the feds on time. I am asking if you are OK with the proposed organizational chart, with one change noted in the email below regarding the PPAT's location in the chart.

- 1) Are folks comfortable with the proposed changes related to the CWGT (See Proposed Org Chart)? The Federal Facilities Workgroup was put back into the org chart to allow some for more time to see if this stays as a workgroup or if this group gets merged with the watershed technical workgroup. I believe this will be discussed at the June Fed Facilities workgroup (FFWG). Support for this org chart means to keep the FFWG for now, but there will be discussions about the future of that group in the coming weeks (but this decision keeps the FFWG for now).
- 2) There is a proposal that the Plastics Pollution Action Team (PPAT) - to be renamed to a workgroup (Plastics Pollution Workgroup PPoW). The PPoW will remain as a separate team, but proposed that it will not be housed under the toxics workgroup. Currently the PPAT/PPoW is a direct report to the Management Board, which goes away this July. A proposed modification to the org chart would assign the workgroup directly under the CWGT. One of the reasons to include the PPAT/PPoW at a higher level in the org structure are that the Toxics and Emerging Contaminants (TEC)'s outcome is limited to information sharing and the PPAT/PPoW collects primary data, develops monitoring strategies, performs laboratory work, develops risk assessments, etc. The proposed organization chart does have other technical workgroups that fall directly under the CWGT. Being a workgroup under the CWGT allows better opportunities inform partners about microplastics in the Bay and is a more efficient way to communicate information to decision-makers.

The language in the revised Bay Agreement for the CWGT states: [Clean water is the foundation of healthy fisheries, habitats, farmlands and communities across the watershed. However, excess nitrogen, phosphorus, sediment and toxic contaminants can degrade our waterways, harm wildlife and pose risks to human health. Changes in the landscape and environmental conditions may exacerbate these impacts. Chesapeake Bay Program partners use a variety of tools to reduce excess nitrogen, phosphorus and sediment, address toxic contaminants and monitor progress toward achieving water quality standards. These actions support sustainable economies that depend on a healthy Bay and watershed.](#)

Where the Toxics and Emerging Contaminants Outcome states: [Promote information sharing between researchers, program managers and policymakers on the lessons learned, best practices and most up-to-date science, policy and communications around the toxic contaminants impacting the Chesapeake Bay watershed.](#)

Given those various reasons, I think it makes sense that the PPAT/PPoW would be placed in the org chart under the CWGT.

Please let me know if you are OK with the proposed org chart that includes keeping the federal facilities workgroup until further discussion can occur, and a modification that the PPAT/PPoW be housed directly under the CWGT and not be lumped under the TEC based upon the PPAT's current role/function.

Thank you and I hope you all have a wonderful holiday weekend.
Suzanne

As always, please let me know if I need to add/remove any folks from this email group.

From: Baldwin, Petra <Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2026 1:26 PM
Subject: Decision Requested: CWGT Workgroup Structure

Good afternoon CWGT voting members,

Thank you for your continued feedback, input and discussion on the proposed CWGT Workgroup Structure. Following the [May 18th CWGT meeting](#), we have updated the structure strawman and included additional explanation of groups' roles, as requested.

We are seeking a **decision by email** from voting members on recommending the proposed CWGT Structure to the Management Board. Please send your consensus vote and any associated comments to Petra (Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov) by **Wednesday, May 27th at 12pm**.

- All materials for the decision are attached to this email including: (1) CWGT Structure Strawman, (2) Description of Groups, (3) List of Voting Members and (4) Consensus Continuum Graphic
- The consensus continuum follows a 1-5 scale: Stop = 1, Hold = 2, Stand Aside = 3, Agree with Reservations = 4, and Endorse = 5. If you are a stop or hold, please provide what your concerns are and what steps can be taken to get you to a 3 or above.
- If we do not hear from you by May 27th, your vote will be treated as a 3, similar to a stand aside.
- A recap email with these materials and more details on the May 18th meeting will be sent to the full listserv.

If you have any questions or further comments, please reach out to Lee, Greg, Petra and Caroline.

Best,
Petra

[Petra Baldwin](#)
Environmental Management Staffer, Chesapeake Research Consortium
Water Quality Goal Implementation Team
Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Baldwin.Petra@epa.gov
Alternate email: baldwinp@chesapeake.org