



Chesapeake Bay Program

Science. Restoration. Partnership.

Toxic Contaminants Workgroup

Wednesday, May 13th, 2026

1:00 – 2:00 PM

[Visit the meeting webpage for meeting materials and additional information.](#)

Purpose: This is the monthly meeting of the Chesapeake Bay Program's Toxic Contaminants Workgroup (TCW), which focused on planning and discussions for CBP Management Strategy development.

Minutes

I. Welcome and Announcements

Lead: Keith Bollt, TCW Coordinator

Keith gave an overview of today's agenda and shared announcements, including:

- CWGT is holding a two-day, hybrid meeting in Baltimore, MD on [June 22-23](#). Day 2 will focus on Goal Team Operations and Management Strategies, which may be of interest to TCW members. If you are interested in attending (in-person or virtually), **please complete this [RSVP form](#) by Friday, May 29.**
- TCW will move forward with confirmations of three at-large member nominees upon guidance from the CWGT, likely at the June TCW meeting. Note there is still an additional vacant Co-Chair position as well, which we welcome nominations for at any time.

Decisions:

1. TCW members approved the [April 2026 TCW Meeting Minutes](#).

II. Management Strategy Template Overview

Lead: Petra Baldwin, TCW Staffer

Petra gave an overview of the timeline and components for the new Management Strategy and outlined initial work that TCW can begin to consider for the Toxic and Emerging Contaminants Outcome section of the CWGT's Management Strategy.

Materials: [Presentation](#), [Management Strategy Template](#), [Workplan Template](#)

Discussion:

- Emily Majcher, USGS (in chat): I noticed that PPAT met recently. Clarification - is PPAT remaining an action team or is it folding into TEC MS?

- Petra Baldwin, TCW Staffer, responded that the CWGT is working towards a proposed workgroup structure and will be finalizing that at their May 18th meeting. The current structure strawman has PPAT continuing and potentially becoming a workgroup that reports to the CWGT.
- Kelly Somers, PPAT Coordinator, added that no decision has been made yet, but they are working through leadership to lay out their options. As of now, PPAT is moving forward still under that original management board charge that was directed a few years ago, and that is where their focus remains. They are happy to weigh in on management strategy development and contribute and report out on any actions, since plastics was specifically called out in the new outcome.

III. Discussion: TCW Management Strategy Development

Lead: Keith Bollt, TCW Coordinator

TCW members engaged in brainstorming and discussion on challenges to consider in the situation analysis for the TEC Outcome section of the CWGT Management Strategy.

Actions:

1. If you are interested in being involved in drafting of the Toxic and Emerging Contaminants subsection of the CWGT Management Strategy, **please reach out to Tony, Keith and Petra by Friday, May 22**, if possible. We plan to meet as a small group between TCW meetings. If you do not have the capacity to participate at this level, we hope you can share ideas and feedback at our workgroup meetings and via email.
2. TCW leadership will develop an initial list of challenges/situational analysis; short-, mid- and long-term priorities; and potentially management approaches for the Toxic and Emerging Contaminants Outcome to share with CWGT leadership per their request for discussion at the CWGT June meeting. These will be shared at the June 10th TCW meeting.

Discussion:

- Petra Baldwin shared some challenges identified in the two previous toxic contaminants outcomes' Management Strategy documents (Factors Influencing Success and Gaps) that may still be relevant, including resource constraints, need for synthesis of information, lack of knowledge on emerging contaminants, and a need for greater understanding of co-benefits with nutrient and sediment BMPs.
- John Cargill, DNREC, shared that a large challenge to TCW is a lack of understanding of direction of where we're being asked to go, given that the outcome is so broad. One thing that may be relevant for multiple contaminants is a focus on source identification
 - Keith responded that the lack of specificity is also an opportunity for us to self-define what challenges we want to focus on.
 - Emily Majcher, USGS, added that the broad scope is daunting, and there are also so many things to focus on so it's hard to narrow down. Identifying ways to think broadly about how tasks or efforts within the workgroup can help everyone across different jurisdictions would be helpful. Source identification, including jurisdictions sharing guidance from their PCB source track down studies, is one example of this.

- Kelly Somers, PPAT Coordinator, shared that a challenge is how we reduce the amount and effects of toxic contaminants by sharing information and understanding impact. Conducting risk assessments, like PPAT is doing, could demonstrate effects of toxicity. Kelly also suggested developing a system to stay up-to-date on relevant research happening and papers published, coalescing them, sharing out best practices and communications from that research, and bringing the right researchers to this group to share that information.
- Marel King, CBC shared that it would be helpful to have a synthesis or matrix of what is known for different contaminants to collect the state of the science and state of policy in one place. That might help us to ask the right questions of the folks we want to bring in about particular contaminants and move it from one level to the next.
 - Emily Majcher responded that this was compiled through a funded project in 2012 - [Toxic Contaminants in the Chesapeake Bay and its Watershed](#) - which is outdated and does not address PFAS. TCW recommended at the beginning of the Beyond 2025 process that an updated version should be made.
 - Keith responded that an update could be doable, but agreed it is a big task.
- Emily Majcher (in chat): PPAT is a great example of how outside partnership resources have been secured to answer outstanding questions at the watershed-wide scale.
 - Kelly Somers (in chat): Thanks Emily! We have some great team who is engaged and motivated on the subject matter!
- John Cargill noted Delaware has worked well to break down silos between divisions and sections within their state agency, which could be a potential challenge being faced by other jurisdictions. Lack of communication amongst programs within each jurisdiction can be a big problem and is potentially something TCW can help address by identifying what those silos are and having people in TCW go back to their jurisdiction to try to connect across divisions.
 - Keith responded that the spotlight of the Bay Program on whatever topics happens to be discussed can also serve as an opportunity to convene folks who work on those topics.
 - John noted this is something that can be a help across the entire watershed and is not specific to any contaminant.

IV. **Wrap-Up & Adjourn**

Lead: Petra Baldwin, TCW Staffer

Next Meeting: [June 10, 2026](#)

Attendees:

Keith Bollt, EPA CBPO (TCW Coordinator)
 Petra Baldwin, CRC (TCW Staffer)
 John Cargill, DNREC
 Sakinat Ahmad, DNREC
 Josh Lookenbill, PADEP
 Nick Murray, WVDEP
 Cassie Davis, NYSDEC

Maggie Woodward, CBC
 Marel King, CBC
 Sushanth Gupta, MWCOG
 Katie Davis, EPA
 Emily Majcher, USGS
 Sam Miller, USGS
 Erin Sonnenburg, CRC
 Kelly Somers, EPA R3

Suzanne Trevena, EPA R3
 John Healey, EPA
 Tom Parham, MD DNR
 Anthony Cario, VADEQ
 Chris Peot, DC Water
 Abdolhossain Liaghat, PADEP
 Michelle Ashworth, AquaLaw