



Review of Key Decisions and Next Steps

WQGIT September 29th & 30th, 2009 Meeting

Critical Period

- WQGIT unanimous **approval of 93-95 critical period** for assessing compliance with WQ standards
- Caveats:
 - Must clearly **communicate** the scientific reasons for this choice to PSC
 - Will include in TMDL **documentation** and likely write a white paper on critical period

Base Year and WWTP Flow

- **WQGIT majority approval for using 2010 land use and WWTP design flow**
- **Caveats:**
 - **NY presented a dissenting opinion** because this choice disadvantages jurisdictions who have not grown, which is a major cause of the degradation of the Bay
 - **Include in TMDL documentation** the reasons for 2010 land use and WWTP design flow

Draft Basinwide Nutrient Targets

- WQGIT unanimous **approval to present 200 million lbs N and 15 million lbs P** as the draft basinwide nutrient targets to the PSC
- Caveats
 - The **model run**, using option 3 (slide 9), of this scenario must show that this level achieves water quality standards
 - The following must be clearly **explained** to the PSC and the public:
 - This number is preliminary and will likely change
 - **Reasons this number increased** from phase 5.1 estimate of 175,14.1
 - The technical enhancements and further analyses that may cause this **number to change in the future**
 - This number is good enough to **begin the WIP development**

Why did the basinwide target load increase to 200 million pounds TN and 15 million pounds TP from 175 million pounds TN and 14.1 million pounds TP?

- An appropriate change in the critical period from '96-'98 to '93-'95 to better approximate a 1 in 10 year return frequency.
- New refined biological reference curves.

Why will the basinwide target load change in the future and in which direction will that change likely be?

- Phase 5.3 and WQSTM model calibrations (potentially decrease target load)
- Filter feeders (potentially increase target load)
- Local water quality (potentially increase target load)
- Air deposition load allocation (potentially increase target load)
- Deposition to coastal ocean (potentially increase target load)
- SAV/clarity water quality standard (potentially decrease target load)
- James and DC chlorophyll water quality standard (potentially decrease target load)

EPIL and TS Scenarios

- WQGIT majority **approval of using TS run as a reference point** in communicating the draft basinwide target loads to the PSC and future WQGIT communications
 - VA DCR presented a dissenting opinion due to no time to review the runs, could be misleading, and prefers state version of EPIL be used
 - Must clearly **communicate** why these loads have changed and that states may no longer be comfortable with their TS. This reference does not mean that states want to use their TS for their WIP
 - CBPO will share Tributary Strategy Scenario input deck with jurisdictions
- Reasons for Decreased TS Loads
 - 10 millions lbs lower from **calibration**
 - Guess of 5 millions lbs for **atmospheric deposition**
 - Fertilizer and manure application rates
 - Landuse crop and animal projections
- Jurisdictions want **priority on developing 2008** scenarios as a reference point for the PSC, possibly followed by EPIL after the PSC
 - CBPO will share 2008 Scenario input deck with jurisdictions

Draft Target Load Distribution Methodology

- If a state chooses that they want to shift target loadings among major basins within their state, that **exchanged target load** is permissible if modeling shows WQS are achieved in tidal segments and locally
- Will develop ratios for shifting target loads among basins within a state

Draft Target Load Distribution Methodology

- Present options 1 and 3 to the PSC
 - Option 1
 - TN WWTP 4.5-8 & other straight w/ 20% slope
 - TP WWTP .22-.53 & other straight w/ 20% slope
 - Option 3
 - TN: WWTP 4.5-8 hockey stick, other straight 20% slope
 - TP: WWTP .22-.53 hockey stick, other straight 20% slope
- Phase 5.2 model runs of Tributary Strategy loads and 2008 status scenarios as **reference points**

WIP Guidance

- 5 out of 7 jurisdictions preferred having a state defined, rather than EPA defined, interim target load
- Jurisdictions expressed that existing and 2008 scenario outputs would be helpful in WIP development
- Comments on WIP Guidance are due to Katherine by Monday 10/5