

# Toxic Contaminants Workgroup - Indicator Discussion

## March 11, 2026

### Tracking Information Sharing

Do we need/want to quantitatively track information sharing as a measure of progress? If so, how could we best do that?

Annual symposium that has one day focused on current research and one day focused on management strategies. Allows for a way to annually track what's new w/out info overload at monthly or quarterly meetings. (This isn't Whitney, it's KC at HRPDC)

Whitney

Attendance at the group's meetings esp. for the presentation focused meetings. If there are people attending it means research is being disseminated.

I agree with attendance, but perhaps rather than raw number of attendees, number of unique institutions represented at meetings. Also, I think KC's idea for a symposium is great! - Sushanth

### The Current TCPP Indicator

What do you find valuable in it? What are its limitations? Should we continue it? If so, any modifications?

one challenge/issue with the indicator is that it synthesizes disparate approaches as if they are the same or without qualifying the differences (e.g., showing VA mainstem impaired while MD mainstem is not) EM-

Valuable in that it is quantitative. Agree with the other comments around the fact that just focusing on % impaired segments may obscure other forms of progress. It's also important to note that different forms of impairments can have different impacts - ie if there is a PCB vs PFAS impairment. The indicator should emphasize areas where progress is possible fastest (ie if there is a persistent pollutant in a segment that is unlikely to ever be fully remediated, that should count less in the indicator) - Sushanth

increased analysis results in increased impairments (eg PFAS) and may benefit from a percent monitoring vs. impaired. EM

The 80% impaired, masks the work that done, ie PCB delistings not captured in a single statistic. The bar charts do better to show the work and changes over time.

It's good as a kind of report card, but the indicator does nothing to advance restoration/implementation plans to remove impairments. For me, that's the major limitation.

This could also go under tracking/info sharing, but a reporting of implemented policies that address these contaminants would be helpful.

MKing

### Other Tools To Consider

Do you reference or utilize the PCB and Mercury Geonarratives? Would similar ones for other priority contaminants be valuable? Do you have ideas for new tools, indicators, resources, etc.?

Much of the clean up needs to happen at the local level through state-coordinated efforts. Not sure a CBP hosted geonarrative will help unless it really digs into how it's being managed locally. If geonarratives stay, I would love to see a focus on different management strategies and approaches. Most know where their TMDLs or pending ones are, but tools to address them would be more valuable.

Whitney

I have regularly referenced them in papers and reports for PCBs to show magnitude of the problem, but same issues with the different methods are in the geonarratives EM

To the extent that our tools/narratives can serve as a nexus or clearinghouse for multi/cross jurisdictional issues, I think they are useful. Since the CBP's value is going above and beyond what any one state can do. - Sushanth

### Tony's Thoughts

Considerations re: 92 CBPSEGs / Spatial Resolution of Indicator:

- connecting Local stakeholders to information challenging at 92-CBPSEG scale
- localized impairments/waterbodies vs. entire CBPSEG?
- % of segments with impairments vs. % surface area impaired?
- emphasis on actionable information?

Need Consistent Methods/Definition of "Impairment"

- can TCW clarify or re-categorize existing definitions?
- can TCW use available information to create a synthetic indicator that is homogeneous across jurisdictions?

Re: Connecting Practitioners with Needed Information

- Add links by watershed/CBPSEG to pertinent jurisdictional policies/regulations/points of contact?
- Clearinghouse for easy discovery of all information on Toxics/TMDLs in Bay watershed?
  - For use by other CBP WGs as well as public
  - Need to outline contents
  - Integrate/link to non-indicators such as Geonarratives?

Role of TCW re: mitigation strategies in new paradigm

- pre-2025 TCPP Outcome explicitly included identification/evaluation of mitigation options
- should post-2025 TCW include mitigation options at some level in targets/indicators?; if so, how?
  - I think it entirely prudent for TCW to aggregate and share state of the science on mitigation efficacy, but how to do so using existing/readily-available information?
  - What report/mechanism/staff at jurisdiction level can provide ready access to this information?
    - Anecdotal vs. scientific evaluation of options...