

Perhaps work to provide information concerning toxics that can be shared on the county websites and conservation district websites

Local Leadership Collaboration

How can the TCW and LLWG work together to support local governments?

Communication with the public is one of the hardest things to do with regard to toxic contaminant issues/concerns. Helping to facilitate those conversations could prove useful.

Using existing partnerships that have active Local government participation such as Baltimore Urban Waters, Anacostia Urban Waters Federal Partnership

Support desktop source analysis by locals

(follow up on tool - previously identified)

Promote local TC data collection sharing that can provide value at a broader, watershed scale

Amend the story map to include ARPs?

Identify existing TMDLs and ARPs that address PCBs

Share existing and/or creating new PFAS dashboards for sharing data

Provide technical assistance for local water quality monitoring efforts to support assessment and TMDL implementation.

Promote source water data sharing that includes toxic contaminants (could include in the data call for Ches Data effort)

2025-2026 Strategies Big Picture Thoughts

Lots of momentum on an occurrence study on 6PPDQ in the watershed.

PFAS Data - status, concentrations in the watershed, available for use so that Q can be explored/answered at various scales

Articulation of the process of consideration of new issues and then into a process of the TCW

Perhaps a process for other groups with technical questions around TC to engage with appropriate technical staff

