The following text will be added to the Executive Summary and Section 6.5 of the expert panel report.

Additions to Executive Summary

Phasing in the ESC Panel Recommendations

The WTWG and USWG jointly decided to phase in the panel recommendations in order to address several Chesapeake Bay modeling and monitoring issues, and in particular, the planned improvements to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model (CBWM) from version 5.3.2 to version 6.0, which are expected to be completed by 2017. The phasing of the new removal rates are explained in Table E-2 below.

Table E-2: Sediment and Nutrient Removal Rates for Construction Sites with Erosion and Sediment Control Practices (%)

Practice Type	Sediment		Nitrogen		Phosphorus	
	Phase 5.3.2	Phase 6	Phase 5.3.2	Phase 6	Phase 5.3.2	Phase 6
Level 1 ESC	40	74/0*	25	0 **	40	0 **
Level 2 ESC	65	85/42*	25	0 **	40	0 **
Level 3 ESC	77	90/58*	25	0 **	40	0 **

**The reductions are listed for two possible base conditions. The first is a reduction from a construction site without ESC practices, while the second is a reduction from a construction site with Level 1 ESC practices. The ultimate Phase 6 loading rates will be selected by the Modeling Workgroup and will be subject to Water Quality GIT approval.*

*** The expert panel proposed that the zero removal rate be applied to the current nutrient loading rates for construction land in Phase 6 of the CBWM unless new monitoring data acquired between now and then provides strong evidence that the target nutrient loads from construction sites with Level 2 or Level 3 ESC practices should be increased or decreased. The ultimate Phase 6 loading rates will be selected by the Modeling Workgroup and will be subject to Water Quality GIT approval.*

The Panel found that the "No BMP" nutrient loading rates in the current Phase 5.3.2 CBWM of 26.4 lbs/ac/yr for TN and 8.8 lbs/ac/yr for TP were within the range of nutrient loading totals expected from construction sites under present day Level 2 ESC controls. The Panel also recommended 12 tons/ac/yr as the sediment target if a No BMP scenario must be used in Phase 6 and 3.1 tons/ac/yr as the sediment target for the Level 1 ESC conditions that they recommended to be applied historically to the period 1985 -2005. The Modeling Workgroup will determine the initial load assumptions for calibration of the Phase 6 CBWM based on the best available literature in addition to water quality monitoring-based information. Multiple lines of evidence are used to arrive at these initial loading values. Literature summaries are highly valued in this process and the expert panel's synthesis of the literature and its analysis of nutrient pathways will carry significant weight. The initial loading values may be further modified by calibration to observed water quality data as part of the calibration process.

In addition, the WTWG agreed that construction sites with a qualifying urban nutrient management (UNM) plan would be eligible for a nutrient reduction credit, as defined by the UNM expert panel.

Executive Summary, page 5

Added Text for Future Modeling Considerations:
After review of the expert panel's report, the WTWG and Water Quality GIT recommended the Modeling Workgroup further analyze nutrient loadings from construction acres before assigning target loading rates for the Phase 6 CBWM. The panel's analysis should be considered in the review of the available literature for nutrient loadings from construction sites.

Addition to Section 6.5, page 39

Current Text:
"Consequently, the Panel elected to assign a zero N and P removal rate for all four levels of ESC practice, and rely instead on the current CBWM target nutrient loads of 26.4 lbs N/acre/year and 8.8 lbs P/acre/year as our best understanding of the probable nutrient load generated for construction sites with ESC practices."

Added Text:
After review of the expert panel's report, the WTWG and Water Quality GIT recommended the Modeling Workgroup further analyze nutrient loadings from construction acres before assigning target loading rates for the Phase 6 CBWM. The panel's analysis should be considered in the review of the available literature for nutrient loadings from construction sites.