CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM
WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
May 24th, 2010 Conference Call

MINUTES

Developing the Bay TMDL Tracking and Accounting System (BayTAS) – Pravin Rana

- Need to determine who will be in charge of this through 2025
- States may be asked to participate on the Integrated Project Team; representatives should be familiar with TMDLs and BMP reporting
- EPA is required to have an operational system by the end of this year; interpreted that it does not need to be fully complete, but must be operational and will refine in 2011
- Next update will include an explanation of how this will fit into existing reporting systems
- Indus Corp and TetraTech involved in development
- Upland states will likely not be treated any differently than tidal states. This system is also to track 2-year milestones. Allocation will be at major basin scale based on the detail in the state WIPs.

Moving Toward Final 2010 Nutrient and Sediment Targets – Lewis Linker, Bob Koroncai

- John Schneider, DE DNREC: how can a state can go beyond the E3 scenario?
    - Lewis Linker, EPA, explained that there are ways to adjust standards if the loads are beyond achievability.

Slide 5 – scenarios use a 15:1 N:P ratio for 190-170 scenarios as discussed on May 10th, 2010
Slide 7 – scenarios will be done with problem segments at E3 and 1/3 and 2/3 of the way between E3 and All Forest; these scenarios will be done as time allows
Slide 8, 9, 10 – Do not yet have local loads by basin for the new scenarios
Slide 22 - Decision has not yet been made on critical period for chlorophyll-a
Slide 23 – E3 likely necessary in James River

- DC Potomac and James Tidal Fresh percent attainment do not track with nutrient reductions due to an interaction between the limiting nutrients. This needs to be considered in further detail after the target loads are settled.
- Attempting to get target loads by the end of May, will then work on DO and chlorophyll issues
- Will redo the TN, TP trade-off to allow state partners to exchange reductions
- The one percent rule, which is still pending approval, was applied in the presentation

Nonattainment Diagnostics – Jeni Keisman

- 1% rule not applied in this presentation
- Defined problem segments as not attaining at 170 TN

Slide 4 – highlighted cells are used to determine response to load reduction
Slide 6 – graphs represent relationship between DO levels at calibration and E3. Should not have the same DO levels - more improvement at lower loads

- Based on superficial analysis, monitoring versus calibration data show that these segments are not well calibrated. We have concerns about using this model on a very small scale, but

it shows the general response to reductions. Range of DO responses over simulated time used rather than daily estimate. Need a range in monitoring data to show proper response.

- Resolution of small segments taking Water Quality Sediment Transport Model (WQSTM) to the limit, but other lines of evidence show that while the model is simulating non-attainment an argument could be made that they should be in attainment at these loads.
- Looking at nearby segments because WQSTM doesn't necessarily do a good job in these single cells. We have higher confidence that it is showing how nearby, deeper waters are responding and guessing that the local segments require the same level of reduction as nearby segments. Last week we used spreadsheet tool to identify that local regions are the primary influence on these segments for the most part.
- We would not consider further global reduction for attainment in areas that are not influenced by the main bay.
- TMDLs can and do go beyond "E3." Cannot ignore non-attainment in TMDL regulation, which specifies using margin of safety for uncertainty. Using other lines of evidence than the model, we could argue that segments are attaining and the TMDL will be written to that effect.

Slide 14 – July versus June 94 had better calibration; June has poor regression. Assume that at global reductions this segment would be in attainment

Slide 15 – some months get good response, others don't

PARTICIPANTS

Katherine Antos, Coordinator	EPA CBPO	antos.katherine@epa.gov
Clifton Bell	Malcolm Pirnie	cbell@pirnie.com
Karl Berger	MWCOG	kberger@mwcog.org
Steve Bieber	MWCOG	sbieber@mwcog.org
Karl Blankenship	Bay Journal	bayjournal@earthlink.net
Pat Buckley	PA DEP	pbuckley@state.pa.us
Collin Burrell	DDOE	collin.burrell@dc.gov
Arthur Butt	VA DEQ	ajbutt@deq.virginia.gov
Monir Chowdhury	DDOE	monir.chowdhury@dc.gov
Lee Currey	MDE	lcurrey@mde.state.md.us
Chris Day	EPA R3	day.christopher@epa.gov
Ron Entringer	NY DEC	raentrin@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Kelly Gable	EPA R3	gable.kelly@epa.gov
Dave Hansen, Chair	U. of Delaware	djhansen@udel.edu
Dave Heicher	SRBC	dheicher@srbc.net
Scott Hinz	LimnoTech	shinz@limno.com
Will Hunley	HRSD	whunley@hrsd.com
Bill Keeling	VA DCR	william.keeling@dcr.virginia.gov
Bob Koroncai, Chair	EPA R3	koroncai.robert@epa.gov
Marya Levelev	MDE	mlevelev@mde.state.md.us
Bruce Michael	MD DNR	bmichael@dnr.state.md.us
Dave Montali	WV DEP	david.a.montali@wv.gov
Russell Morgan	NRCS	russell.morgan@de.usda.gov
Andrew Parker	TetraTech	andrew.parker@tetratech.com
Russ Perkinson	VA DCR	russ.perkinson@dcr.virginia.gov
Jim Pletl	HRSD	jpletl@hrsd.dst.va.us
Chris Pomeroy	AquaLaw	chris@aqualaw.com
Pravin Rana	EPA HQ	rana.pravin@epa.gov
Ed Reilley	NY DEC	exreilly@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Aaron Ristow	USC NY	aaron.ristow@cortlandswcd.org
John Schneider	DE DNREC	john.schneider@state.de.us
Mohsin Siddique	DC WASA	mohsin_siddique@dcwasa.com
Helen Stewart	MD DNR	hstewart@dnr.state.md.us
Rachel Streusand	CRC/CBP	rstreusa@chesapeakebay.net
Tom Thornton	MDE	tthornton@mde.state.md.us
Sean Zhang	Carroll Engineering	seanxzhang@yahoo.com