



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Street address: 1111 E. Main Street, Suite 1400, Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mailing address: P.O. Box 1105, Richmond, Virginia 23218

Matthew J. Strickler
Secretary of Natural Resources

David K. Paylor
Director

(804) 698-4000
1-800-592-5482

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Water Control Board Members

FROM: Jutta Schneider
Director, Water Planning Division

SUBJECT: Final Adoption of Water Quality Standards Regulation Amendments (9VAC25-260): Numeric Chlorophyll-a Criteria for the Tidal James River and their Assessment Methodology

DATE: May 16, 2019

Executive Summary

Staff will ask the Board to adopt final amendments to the Water Quality Standards Regulation (9 VAC25-260-310 (bb)), regarding the numeric chlorophyll-*a* criteria applicable to the tidal James River. The final amendments are the outcome of the Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) seven-year-long effort to update the regulation with best available science, evaluating the protectiveness of the current criteria and determining if revisions were appropriate, as well as modifying the methods used to assess criteria attainment. In addition, an enhanced water quality model was developed to simulate chlorophyll-*a* concentrations in response to varying levels of point source nutrient reduction. Modeling scenarios have been run and results have been presented to communicate the potential economic implications of the proposed amendments. The final amendments take into consideration the recommendations of a scientific advisory panel (SAP) and a regulatory advisory panel (RAP). Membership lists of the SAP and RAP are provided in Attachment 1.

Background

Low dissolved oxygen (DO) is a problem found in much of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. Excessive nitrogen and phosphorus pollution are well-established causes of algal blooms, which can then lead to low DO. In 1999, EPA identified most of the waters of the Bay as impaired due to inadequate DO for aquatic life. This action spurred efforts to manage nutrient loads throughout the entire Bay watershed. The tidal James River poses a challenge since its physical characteristics make it resistant to low DO, yet it has experienced frequent and intense

algal blooms that are occasionally comprised of potentially toxic phytoplankton. During development of the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), EPA urged Virginia to adopt chlorophyll-*a* criteria for the tidal James River so that nutrient loads in the James basin could be managed in a similar fashion as loads in other Bay tributary basins. Chlorophyll-*a* is the primary pigment of phytoplankton and is thus highly correlated with both phytoplankton biomass and nutrient levels. DEQ developed James River chlorophyll-*a* criteria in collaboration with the EPA-Chesapeake Bay Program Office and the Board adopted these criteria in 2005. Along with Bay-wide DO criteria and water clarity acreage goals for underwater grasses, the James River chlorophyll-*a* criteria were used as endpoints in EPA's Chesapeake Bay TMDL, which was finalized in December 2010. However, under the TMDL the annual nitrogen and phosphorus loads allocated to the James River were much more stringent than the loads used to test attainability of the chlorophyll-*a* criteria adopted in 2005, due to the use of a revised water quality modeling framework by EPA. For this reason it was decided to conduct a comprehensive study of the criteria to determine what chlorophyll-*a* levels were protective of the aquatic life use, before pursuing a nutrient control plan for the basin that would add an estimated \$0.5 to 1.0 billion dollars to the cost of compliance.

The 2011 General Assembly authorized DEQ to use up to \$3 million from the Water Quality Improvement Fund (WQIF) to conduct the James River Chlorophyll-*a* Study. The primary purpose of the James River Chlorophyll-*a* Study was to verify whether the potential impact on permitted dischargers was justified by assessing the scientific defensibility of the criteria and their assessment methodology and developing alternatives if deemed necessary. DEQ's intention to review the regulation for this purpose was announced in a Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) published September 12, 2011. The Governor's counselor approved a waiver (signed 3/29/2011) from the standard regulatory process to provide time to conduct a thorough study of the regulation. Through the WQIF allocation, DEQ funded a number of scientific research projects to fill in knowledge gaps pertaining to estuarine nutrient dynamics, spatial and temporal distributions of James River chlorophyll-*a*, phytoplankton composition and dynamics, and harmful algal bloom toxicity. Another critical component of the study was the development of a water quality model specific to the James River, so that the full implications of the existing regulation and any amendments to it could be communicated to stakeholders. DEQ also convened a scientific advisory panel (SAP, see Attachment 1)) comprised of university, private sector, and state/federal government scientists and experts to review this research and provide recommendations regarding the technical aspects of the criteria and assessment methodology. The regulatory advisory panel (RAP, see Attachment 1) formed for this regulatory action reviewed the SAP's recommendations and provided their own input on the criteria amendments. The RAP has also reviewed draft proposals presented by DEQ staff. DEQ staff has reasonably considered all the recommendations of the SAP and the RAP when developing the proposed amendments. EPA-Chesapeake Bay Program Office staff participated on both panels and engaged its Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee and Bay partner jurisdictions to provide additional input in the review process.

Summary of Final Regulation Presented for Adoption

The James River Chlorophyll-*a* Study revealed some substantial weaknesses in both the existing criteria and assessment methodology. First, the existing criteria were developed from datasets that were relatively limited in scope and that were drawn from areas of the Chesapeake Bay that may not be representative of the James River. In contrast, the proposed amendments provide criteria that were developed from larger, more refined datasets almost entirely developed within the tidal James. Secondly, while the existing criteria were developed to promote a balanced phytoplankton assemblage that is relatively free from harmful taxa, the absence of clear relationships between chlorophyll-*a* and phytoplankton composition necessitated some subjective decision-making in the selection of thresholds. In contrast, toxicity tests and robust statistical models were used to objectively inform all aspects of the proposed criteria. Furthermore, both physicochemical factors (dissolved oxygen, water clarity, and pH) and phytoplankton metrics were considered in the development of the proposed criteria, as opposed to just phytoplankton metrics. Thirdly, the study found that the existing criteria must be assessed as geometric means (as directed by implementation guidance referenced in subsection D of 9 VAC 25-260-185) even though they were developed as arithmetic means. Research conducted by EPA-Chesapeake Bay Program Office in 2010 determined that the geometric mean is the more appropriate statistic for characterizing James River chlorophyll-*a* central tendency. The proposed seasonal mean criteria were developed with this understanding. Finally, the existing assessment methodology and the rules used to delineate allowable exceedance frequency, described in references cited in subsection D of 9 VAC 25-260-185, were developed separately from the existing criteria and were found to be ill-suited for a parameter like chlorophyll-*a*, which can vary considerably in space and time even under ideal conditions. The mismatch between these elements and the existing criteria likely accounts for some of the stringency of the nutrient load reductions determined under the Bay TMDL by EPA to be necessary for criteria attainment. Another factor was that the modeling framework used at the time had limitations in its ability to accurately predict chlorophyll-*a* concentrations resulting from simulated nutrient reduction scenarios. An enhanced model is now being used in the analysis with improved calibration and validity. The proposed amendments provide a procedure for analyzing data that is tailored to James River chlorophyll-*a* and is fully consistent with the way data were analyzed in the development of the proposed criteria. The proposed amendments stipulate allowable exceedance frequencies that are also consistent with the design of the proposed criteria.

9 VAC 25-260-310 (bb) provides the criteria for site-specific chlorophyll-*a* levels in the tidal James River (excluding tributaries) and contains a table listing two seasonal mean criteria (spring and summer) for each of the five James River segments (delineated by salinity regime), for a total of ten paired sets of criteria. The final regulation would amend each of the listed values, with eight values being lowered and two values being raised. Compliance with the seasonal mean criteria is achieved if no more than two exceedances are observed in a six year assessment period. Additionally, the final regulation would insert another table of short-duration criteria that apply only during the summer. A James River segment would not be allowed to exceed these criteria more than 10% of the time. Compliance with the new criteria is expected to minimize short-term effects of harmful algal blooms to aquatic life. The final

regulation would also delete the reference to subsection D of 9VAC25-260-185. Lastly, the final regulation would insert new language stipulating the following:

- Seasonal mean criteria should be calculated as geometric means.
- The allowable exceedance frequency and length of assessment period over which criteria should be evaluated, along with the duration of those criteria.
- The manner in which chlorophyll-*a* data should be aggregated and how two of the segments should be subdivided for the purposes of data aggregation.
- A reference to the EPA technical document that provides the boundaries of the James River segments.
- Assessment guidance will be developed to address the appropriate assessment category if consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment.

The complete text of the final amendments to the James River chlorophyll-*a* criteria and assessment methodology are presented in Attachment 2.

Public Comment and DEQ Response

The Board's authorization to hold a public hearing and receive public comments on the proposal was received at their September 20, 2018 meeting. Notice of Public Comment on the proposed criteria amendments was issued January 21, 2019, and the public review period ran from January 21, 2019 to March 22, 2019. A public hearing was held on February 26, 2019. There were 19 attendees at the public hearing and 7 persons provided oral comment. Written public comments were received from: EPA; two environmental organizations; 124 citizens; Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies; Virginia Manufacturers Association; three industrial owners; nine local governments; and, four Water and Sewer Authorities on the proposed changes to the water quality standards regulation. A summary of comments received and DEQ's response is presented below. DEQ made one change in the proposal to address comments received by adding the following text in section 9VAC25-260-310 (bb), preceding the numeric seasonal mean criteria table:

Should consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment after the effective date of these chlorophyll-*a* criteria, the Department will examine additional lines of evidence including, but not limited to, the occurrence of harmful algal blooms, physicochemical monitoring and phytoplankton datasets, and fish kill reports in the evaluation of the appropriate assessment category for the water body segment. The Department will develop guidance for inclusion in the Water Quality Assessment Guidance Manual to address evaluating the appropriate assessment category when consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur. The Department will determine if additional monitoring for harmful algal blooms is warranted.

Commenter:

U.S Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

EPA Comment 1: A reference to the conceptual model developed by Hagy et al. (2008) would provide additional conceptual rigor, since VADEQ utilizes a couple of the approaches presented in that model.

DEQ Response: VADEQ agrees with this suggestion and has incorporated this reference in its technical support document, which can be found on the DEQ website:

https://www.deq.virginia.gov/Portals/0/DEQ/Water/WaterQualityStandards/James%20River%20Chl%20A%20Study/Rulemaking_materials/James_R_Chlorophyll_TSD_DEC2018.pdf?ver=2019-03-13-140711-020.

EPA Comment 2: There are inconsistencies in the log-transformation of data in empirical relationships. Log-transforming pH is questionable, since pH is logarithmic.

DEQ Response: Given the importance of the empirical models, model variables were transformed to maximize model fit. This required log-transforming both variables for some models, while the fit of other models was better when only one variable was transformed. VADEQ agrees that it is questionable to log-transform pH. However, redeveloping the pH- chlorophyll-*a* models using only a log-transformed independent variable (chlorophyll) results in predictions that are very similar to those generated by the original models.

EPA Comment 3: The temporal expression of the DO water quality standard is a 30-day mean, but the DO variable in the DO- chlorophyll-*a* empirical relationships is expressed as a summer mean. These different temporal scales need to be reconciled. Additionally, by averaging summer DO measurements, physiologically significant observations in the data could be masked.

DEQ Response: VADEQ agrees that its treatment of DO could be enhanced, especially given the diversity of available datasets. Monthly mid-channel grab samples were used to relate chlorophyll-*a* and DO because such data form the basis of the biennial assessment of the 30-day DO mean criterion. However, it actually makes more sense to use the continuous monitoring (ConMon) data for this purpose, since this information enables the calculation of robust 30-day means. Monthly data were averaged across each summer-year because other researchers (Harding et al., 2014 and Sutula et al., 2017) have had success finding a relationship between chlorophyll-*a* and DO when they are averaged over long periods (seasons). However, VADEQ agrees that presenting plots of chlorophyll-*a* and DO at different temporal scales would be equally informative, as it would support VADEQ's assertion that the relationship between James River chlorophyll-*a* and low DO cannot be substantiated with the available data. The technical support document has been revised to incorporate EPA's recommendations.

EPA Comment 4: A prediction interval (the upper prediction limit) would be the more appropriate approach for deriving a baseline criterion.

DEQ Response: VADEQ agrees with EPA that an upper prediction limit (rather than upper confidence limit) is a superior way of pinpointing a seasonal chlorophyll-*a* mean threshold that distinguishes “normal” from “extreme”, since the upper prediction limit (UPL) takes into account measurement uncertainty. The table below compares the baseline criteria derived from the upper confidence limit of the mean (UCL) with those derived from the UPL. While the UPL is a statistically valid way of selecting criteria developed to protect baseline conditions, for the following reasons VADEQ has decided to continue to use the UCL to inform the criteria for those segment-seasons without documented harmful chlorophyll-related effects:

- Criteria derived from the UPL would be substantially greater in magnitude than those derived from the UCL. The baseline criteria are developed to mitigate any unknown or poorly understood harmful effects that could occur by allowing phytoplankton biomass to increase above current levels. UPL-derived criteria would not provide this protection as well as UCL-derived ones would, given the former’s greater magnitude. Long-term compliance with UCL-derived criteria would prevent upward trends in chlorophyll-*a* concentrations in the segments that would be regulated by those criteria. UPL-derived criteria would only prevent extreme upward shifts in chlorophyll-*a* concentrations and would thus allow degradation in the segments regulated by them.
- By definition, values greater than the UPL are expected to occur very rarely. In contrast, while values greater than the UCL would be unusually high, such values are still expected to occur occasionally. For example, the upper 95% confidence limit of the spring mean estimates for JMSMH is 7 µg/l, a value that was exceeded twice over the 2005-2015 period (in 2005 and 2013). In contrast, the upper 95% prediction limit for JMSMH spring means—10 µg/l—was not exceeded in any spring season over the 2005-2015 period. Thus, two exceedances of UCL-derived criteria over six years would not be incompatible with the normal variability of chlorophyll. But two exceedances of the UPL over six years would be a considerable departure from “normal”.

Segment-Season	UCL*	U95%PL
JMSTFU spring	8	10
JMSTFL spring	10	13
JMSOH spring	13	20
JMSOH summer	11	15
JMSMH spring	7	9
JMSMH summer	7	10
JMSPH spring	8	11

* U99%CL for TF and OH segments, U95%CL for JMSMH and JMSPH

EPA Comment 5: It is not clear from the descriptions in the technical support document whether VADEQ accounted for differences in scale between the Continuous Monitoring (ConMon) data and the Dataflow data.

DEQ Response: The different high-frequency monitoring datasets (ConMon and Dataflow) were used for different purposes. ConMon datasets were used to develop empirical relationships and to characterize baseline temporal variability in those segments that were *not* monitored with weekly Dataflow (the tidal fresh and oligohaline segments). In JMSMH and JMSPH, weekly Dataflow datasets were used to estimate baseline central tendency and temporal variability. ConMon datasets in those segments were only used to determine the frequency of pH exceedances and were not combined with other datasets. While VADEQ does agree that spatial and temporal scales are important considerations, VADEQ believes that it treated the different high-frequency datasets properly.

EPA Comment 6: The proposed chlorophyll-a criteria index period for assessment needs to be clarified.

DEQ Response: VADEQ intends to use a static index period for determining compliance with the proposed criteria for 305(b)/303(d) purposes. That is to say, the proposed criteria would be assessed for the same six-year assessment window that VADEQ uses to determine aquatic life use support for the majority of the state’s waters.

The proposed frequency statement for the seasonal mean criteria will be modified to read as follows: “The following site-specific seasonal mean criteria should not be exceeded in the specified tidal James River segment more than twice in six years.”

Commenters:

Chesapeake Bay Foundation, James River Association, and 124 Citizens

Comment: VADEQ should revise the assessment methodology to prohibit consecutive seasonal mean exceedances due to remaining knowledge gaps regarding the effects of algal blooms and because allowing consecutive exceedances is not consistent with the EPA-recommended allowable exceedance frequency for most water quality standards.

DEQ Response: VADEQ appreciates the concerns expressed over unknown impacts stemming from algae in the James River and how those effects may manifest if exceedances occur in back-to-back years. VADEQ does prohibit closely spaced exceedances of toxic pollutants in accordance with EPA’s recommended frequency statement, “No more than one exceedance every three years”.¹ When this frequency rule is successfully implemented

¹ United States Environmental Protection Agency. 1985. Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, MN, Narragansett, RI, Corvallis, OR. PB85-227049.

through pollution control measures, exceedances should occur no frequently than once every three years, on average. However, this recommendation pertains to substances that always cause aquatic life mortality at high concentrations. It is reasonable to expect the effect of high exposure events to compound the closer they occur in time when mortality is always an outcome of such events. Toxic substances also tend not to naturally occur at a concentration relevant to regulatory standards. However, chlorophyll-*a* is a non-toxic substance that naturally occurs in all waterbodies in appreciable amounts. VADEQ believes a less stringent allowable frequency is justified on this basis. The following arguments add further support to the position that VADEQ’s frequency statements for the proposed criteria are sufficiently protective of aquatic life:

1. The proposed allowable frequencies of both sets of criteria (seasonal mean and short-duration) are consistent with EPA recommendations for the kind of effects the criteria are developed to protect aquatic life from. EPA’s “one exceedance in three years” recommendation applies to toxic substances which comprise the overwhelming majority of the Commonwealth’s regulated pollutants. It does not apply to conventional pollutants/parameters which are evaluated based on this requirement. VADEQ believes that chlorophyll, as an indicator parameter, is much more like a conventional parameter (e.g., dissolved oxygen or pH) than a toxic substance. The frequency statements for the seasonal mean and short-duration chlorophyll-*a* criteria are compatible with EPA’s recommended exceedance frequency for conventional pollutants² and the EPA-approved “two exceedances in three years” rule used for Chesapeake Bay water clarity restoration goals.
2. Chlorophyll-*a* concentrations are influenced by a number of non-nutrient, non-anthropogenic variables (e.g., flow, light availability, temperature, tides, wind, and grazing rates). Marginal exceedances of the seasonal mean criteria are expected to occasionally occur simply due to natural variability. The spacing of these exceedances is expected to occasionally cluster in time (e.g., two back-to-back years) but would not necessarily be indicative of harmful water quality conditions.
3. In segments where harmful algal blooms have been documented, the seasonal mean criteria would work in tandem with the proposed short-duration criteria. Compliance with the latter would place a constraint on the upper limit of summer mean concentrations, since these criteria are designed to minimize the frequency of the very high chlorophyll-*a* concentrations one would expect to see during harmful algal blooms. The goal of the amended water quality criteria for chlorophyll-*a* is for “high risk” seasonal chlorophyll-*a* concentrations—those most likely to be driven by severe HABs—

² United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2002. Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology—A Compendium of Best Practices. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington D.C. July 2002.

to occur no more frequently than once every six years. VADEQ believes long-term compliance with the seasonal mean and short-duration criteria will achieve this goal.

Commenters: Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies, Virginia Manufacturers Association, AdvanSix, DuPont Spruance, WestRock, and Town of Buena Vista, Hanover County, City of Richmond, Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, South Central Wastewater Authority, County of Henrico, Dinwiddie County Water Authority, City of Lynchburg, Campbell County, Chesterfield County, Town of Amherst, City of Hopewell, Hampton Roads Sanitation District

Comment: The proposed summer mean criteria for the two tidal fresh segments should be increased from 21 µg/l to 23 µg/l (JMSTFU) and from 24 µg/l to 25 µg/l (JMSTFL) because the proposed values are based on a very limited dataset that is not representative of the tidal fresh segments in their entirety. Additionally, the short-duration criteria should not be adopted since they are “late additions” to the proposal and because the “patchiness” and non-toxicity of chlorophyll-*a* makes these criteria questionable.

DEQ Response: Attachment 3 provides a presentation and discussion of analyses that challenge the commenters’ assertions that (1) the dataset that VADEQ used to generate the summertime tidal fresh chlorophyll-pH empirical relationship is not spatially representative and (2) a more accurate relationship can be constructed from more recent data using a different modeling technique. The analyses show that even if VADEQ were to accept the second assertion, no adjustments would need to be made to the currently proposed criteria.

The seasonal mean criteria are developed to protect aquatic life from the short-term and long-term harmful effects caused by phytoplankton. Because these criteria were derived using conservative assumptions regarding spatial and temporal variability of James River chlorophyll-*a* expression, VADEQ expects that these criteria will be protective of aquatic life the majority of the time. However, when these assumptions are not met (i.e., when spatial and/or temporal chlorophyll-*a* variability is unusually high), it is possible for a segment to demonstrate compliance with its seasonal mean criteria despite experiencing numerous HAB events. The short-duration criteria help to ensure that the frequency of potentially harmful high exposure events is minimized. The short-duration criteria also constrain the duration of potentially harmful algal blooms much more effectively than the seasonal mean criteria do. For instance, in the absence of the short-duration criteria, very intense, month-long *Microcystis* blooms would be permitted every year in JMSTFL. The short-duration criterion for JMSTFL would limit such blooms to once every six years.

It is also important to note that the efficacy of the seasonal mean criteria is highly dependent on the robustness of the assessment dataset. According to the power analysis performed by VADEQ, an average of 20 stations is needed in each James River segment to generate a highly accurate estimate of spatial chlorophyll-*a* central tendency most of the time, and these stations would have to be sampled twice weekly to generate a highly

accurate estimate of seasonal chlorophyll-a central tendency. VADEQ is currently unable to support such a monitoring program and it is unlikely it ever will. The relatively high sampling error rates expected from a conventional monitoring program (2-3 stations sampled monthly) necessitates a “stop-gap” to minimize the likelihood of false negatives, i.e., an assessment decision that a segment meets a criterion when it actually fails it. The short-duration criteria provide this function, since they approximate instantaneous criteria the smaller the assessment dataset becomes.

Attorney General’s Certification

The amendments will be forwarded to the Office of the Attorney General for certification of the Board’s authority to adopt them. The amendments will be presented for adoption "contingent upon Attorney General Office statutory authority" if certification is not received by the June Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Board adopt the final amendments to the Water Quality Standards Regulation 9 VAC25-260-310 (bb), as presented.

PRESENTER CONTACT INFORMATION:

Presenter Name: John Kennedy and Tish Robertson

Presenter Office: Water Quality Standards

Telephone: 804-698-4312 (JK); 804-698-4309 (TR)

E-mail: john.kennedy@deq.virginia.gov; tish.robertson@deq.virginia.gov

Attachment 1: List of SAP and RAP memberships

Attachment 2: Proposed amendments to **9 VAC 25-260-310 (bb)**

Attachment 3: Response to technical memorandum cited by VAMWA to recommend upwards adjustments to the proposed tidal fresh summer mean criteria.

Attachment 4: Town Hall document

ATTACHMENT 1

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERSHIP

<p>Clifton Bell Associate Hydrologist Brown and Caldwell 310 Bendix Rd Virginia Beach, VA 23452 (757) 518-2456 CBell@brwncald.com</p>	<p>Brian Benham Associate Professor and Extension Specialist Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA 24061 (540) 231-5705 benham@vt.edu</p>
<p>Claire Buchanan Director for Aquatic Habitats Interstate Commission of the Potomac River Basin 30 West Gude Drive, Suite 450 Rockville, MD 20850 (901) 984-1908 ext.112 CBuchanan@icprb.org</p>	<p>Paul Bukaveckas Associate Professor, Center for Environmental Studies Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA 23284 (804)828-0161 pabukaveckas@vcu.edu</p>
<p>Todd Egerton Marine Scientist Supervisor 830 Southampton Ave, Suite 3100 Norfolk, VA 23510 (757)683-8461 todd.egerton@vdh.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Greg Garman Director, VCU Rice Rivers Center Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, VA 23284 (804)828-0161 ggarman@vcu.edu</p>
<p>Will Hunley Environmental Scientist Hampton Roads Sanitation District 1434 Air Rail Ave Virginia Beach, VA 23455 (757)460-4252 whunley@hrsd.com</p>	<p>Kenneth Moore Professor Virginia Institute of Marine Science 1375 Greate Rd Gloucester Point, VA 23062 (804)684-7384 moore@vims.edu</p>
<p>Margaret Mulholland Old Dominion University 1 Old Dominion University Norfolk, VA 23529 (757)683-3972 mmulholl@odu.edu</p>	<p>Kimberly Reece Professor Virginia Institute of Marine Science 1375 Greate Rd Gloucester Point, VA 23062 (804) 684-7407 kreece@vims.edu</p>
<p>Peter Tango Chesapeake Bay Monitoring Coordinator Chesapeake Bay Program Office 410 Severn Ave, Suite 109 Annapolis, MD 21403 (443)510-0486 pitango@usgs.gov</p>	<p>Harry Wang Professor Virginia Institute of Marine Science 1375 Greate Rd Gloucester Point, VA 23062 (804)684-7215 wang@vims.edu</p>

REGULATORY ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERSHIP

<p>Ernie Aschenbach Biologist, Env. Services Section VA Department of Game and Inland Fisheries 7870 Villa Park Drive, Suite 400 Henrico, VA 23228 (804) 367-2733 Ernie.Aschenbach@dgif.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Cheryl Atkinson Water Quality Standards Coordinator EPA-Region III (3WP11) 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029 (215) 814-3392 atkinson.cheryl@epa.gov</p>
<p>Richard Batiuk (upon retirement, replaced by Lucinda Power) Associate Director for Science Chesapeake Bay Program Office 410 Severn Ave, Suite 109 Annapolis, MD 21403 (410) 267-5722 power.lucinda@epa.gov</p>	<p>Patrick Bradley Water Quality Manager City of Richmond Department of Public Utilities 900 E. Broad St., Rm. 115 Richmond, VA 23219 (904) 646-7608 Patrick.Bradley@richmondgov.com</p>
<p>Jamie Brunkow Lower James Riverkeeper, James River Association 4833 Old Main St. Richmond, VA 23231 (757) 634-4541 jbrunkow@jrava.org</p>	<p>Jerry Byerly, Director Hopewell Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility 231 Hummel Ross Rd Hopewell, VA 23860 (804)541-2214 ext. 204 jbyerly@hopewellva.gov</p>
<p>Darryl Glover Director, Div. of Soil & Water Conservation VA Department of Conservation and Recreation 600 E. Main St., 24th floor Richmond, VA 23219-2094 (904) 786-7119 darryl.glover@dcr.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Dickie Thompson, Deputy Director Hopewell Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility 231 Hummel Ross Rd Hopewell, VA 23860 (804) 541-2214 ext. 208 rthompson@hopewellva.gov</p>
<p>Robert Greenlee Eastern Regional Fisheries Mgr. VA Department of Game and Inland Fisheries 3801 John Tyler Memorial Hwy Charles City, VA 23030 (804) 829-6715 greenlee@dgif.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Jamie Heisig-Mitchell Chief of Technical Services Hampton Roads Sanitation District P.O. Box 5911 Virginia Beach, VA 23471-0911 (757) 460-4220 jmitchell@hrsd.com</p>
<p>Ted Henifin, President, VA Assoc. of Municipal Wastewater Agencies General Manager Hampton Roads Sanitation District P.O. Box 51 Richmond, VA 23218 (757) 460-4242 thenifin@hrsd.com</p>	<p>Andrew Parker, VA Manufacturers Association Health, Safety, and Environmental Leader AdvanSix 905 East Randolph Rd. Hopewell, VA 23860-2413 (804) 541-5734 Andrew.Parker2@honeyswell.com</p>
<p>James Pletl, Director, Water Quality Dept. Hampton Roads Sanitation District 1434 Air Rail Ave Virginia Beach, VA 23430 (757) 460-4246 jpletl@hrsd.com</p>	<p>Chris Pomeroy President, AquaLaw (VAMWA legal counsel) 6 South 5th Street Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 716-9021, ext. 202 Chris@AquaLaw.com</p>
<p>Oula Shehab-Dandan, Environmental Consultant Dominion Resources Inc. 5000 Dominion Blvd. Glen Allen, VA 23060 (804) 273-2697 oula.k.shehab-dandan@dom.com</p>	<p>Margaret Smigo, Program Coordinator Virginia Department of Health/Waterborne Hazards Control 109 Governor St. Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 864-8128 margaret.smigo@vdh.virginia.gov</p>
<p>Keith Skiles, Director Virginia Department of Health-Division of Shellfish Sanitation 109 Governor St. Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 864-7477 keith.skiles@vdh.virginia.gov</p>	<p>Robert Steidel Deputy Chief Administrative Officer for Operations City of Richmond Department of Public Utilities 900 E. Broad St., Rm. 115 Richmond, VA 23219 (904) 646-1378 Robert.Steidel@richmondgov.com</p>

Memo to the State Water Control Board – WQ Standards Amendments

Jutta Schneider

Page 14 of 38

<p>Ellen Snyder, Virginia Manufacturers Association Environmental Engineer Altria Group, Inc. 6601 W. Broad St. Richmond, VA 23230 Ellen.Pafford.Snyder@altria.com</p>	<p>Barry Suits, President Virginia American Water 22223 Duke St. Alexandria, VA 22314 (703) 706-3864 Barry.suits@amwater.com</p>
<p>Joseph Wood, PhD Virginia Staff Scientist, Chesapeake Bay Foundation 1108 E. Main St., Suite 1600 Richmond, VA 23219-3539 (804) 780-1392, ext. 3130 jwood@cbf.org</p>	

ATTACHMENT 2

Part VII

Special Standards and Scenic Rivers Listings

9VAC25-260-310. Special standards and requirements.

The special standards are shown in small letters to correspond to lettering in the basin tables. The special standards are as follows:

a. Shellfish waters. In all open ocean or estuarine waters capable of propagating shellfish or in specific areas where public or leased private shellfish beds are present, including those waters on which condemnation classifications are established by the Virginia Department of Health, the following criteria for fecal coliform bacteria will apply:

The geometric mean fecal coliform value for a sampling station shall not exceed an MPN (most probable number) or MF (membrane filtration using mTEC culture media) of 14 per 100 milliliters (ml) of sample and the estimated 90th percentile shall not exceed an MPN of 43 per 100 ml for a 5-tube decimal dilution test or an MPN of 49 per 100 ml for a 3-tube decimal dilution test or MF test of 31 CFU (colony forming units) per 100 ml.

The shellfish area is not to be so contaminated by radionuclides, pesticides, herbicides, or fecal material that the consumption of shellfish might be hazardous.

b. Policy for the Potomac Embayments. At its meeting on September 12, 1996, the board adopted a policy (9VAC25-415. Policy for the Potomac Embayments) to control point source discharges of conventional pollutants into the Virginia embayment waters of the Potomac River, and their tributaries, from the fall line at Chain Bridge in Arlington County to the Route 301 bridge in King George County. The policy sets effluent limits for BOD₅, total suspended solids, phosphorus, and ammonia, to protect the water quality of these high profile waterbodies.

c. Canceled.

d. Canceled.

e. Canceled.

f. Canceled.

g. Occoquan watershed policy. At its meeting on July 26, 1971 (Minute 10), the board adopted a comprehensive pollution abatement and water quality management policy for the Occoquan watershed. The policy set stringent treatment and discharge requirements in order to improve and protect water quality, particularly since the waters are an important water supply for Northern Virginia. Following a public hearing on November 20, 1980, the board, at its December 10-12, 1980 meeting, adopted as of February 1, 1981, revisions to this policy (Minute 20). These revisions became effective March 4, 1981. Additional amendments were made following a public hearing on August 22, 1990, and adopted by the board at its September 24, 1990, meeting (Minute 24) and became effective on December 5, 1990. Copies are available upon request from the Department of Environmental Quality.

h. Canceled.

i. Canceled.

j. Canceled.

k. Canceled.

l. Canceled.

m. The following effluent limitations apply to wastewater treatment facilities treating an organic nutrient source in the entire Chickahominy watershed above Walker's Dam (this excludes discharges consisting solely of stormwater):

CONSTITUENT	CONCENTRATION
1. Biochemical oxygen demand 5-day	6 mg/l monthly average, with not more than 5% of individual samples to exceed 8 mg/l.
2. Settleable solids	Not to exceed 0.1 ml/l monthly average.
3. Suspended solids	5.0 mg/l monthly average, with not more than 5% of individual samples to exceed 7.5 mg/l.
4. Ammonia nitrogen	Not to exceed 2.0 mg/l monthly average as N.
5. Total phosphorus	Not to exceed 0.10 mg/l monthly average for all discharges with the exception of Tyson Foods, Inc., which shall meet 0.30 mg/l monthly average and 0.50 mg/l daily maximum.
6. Other physical and chemical constituents	Other physical or chemical constituents not specifically mentioned will be covered by additional specifications as conditions detrimental to the stream arise. The specific mention of items 1 through 5 does not necessarily mean that the addition of other physical or chemical constituents will be condoned.

n. No sewage discharges, regardless of degree of treatment, should be allowed into the James River between Boshier and Williams Island Dams.

o. The concentration and total amount of impurities in Tuckahoe Creek and its tributaries of sewage origin shall be limited to those amounts from sewage, industrial wastes, and other wastes ~~which~~ that are now present in the stream from natural sources and from existing discharges in the watershed.

p. Canceled.

q. Canceled.

r. Canceled.

s. Canceled.

t. Canceled.

u. Maximum temperature for the New River Basin from the Virginia-West Virginia state line upstream to the Giles-Montgomery County line:

The maximum temperature shall be 27°C (81°F) unless caused by natural conditions; the maximum rise above natural temperatures shall not exceed 2.8°C (5°F).

This maximum temperature limit of 81°F was established in the 1970 water quality standards amendments so that Virginia temperature criteria for the New River would be consistent with those of West Virginia, since the stream flows into that state.

v. The maximum temperature of the New River and its tributaries (except trout waters) from the Montgomery-Giles County line upstream to the Virginia-North Carolina state line shall be 29°C (84°F).

w. Canceled.

x. Clinch River from the confluence of Dumps Creek at river mile 268 at Carbo downstream to river mile 255.4. The special water quality criteria for copper (measured as total recoverable) in this section of the Clinch River are 12.4 µg/l for protection from chronic effects and 19.5 µg/l for protection from acute effects. These site-specific criteria are needed to provide protection to several endangered species of freshwater mussels.

y. Tidal freshwater Potomac River and tidal tributaries that enter the tidal freshwater Potomac River from Cockpit Point (below Occoquan Bay) to the fall line at Chain Bridge. During November 1 through February 14 of each year the 30-day average concentration of total ammonia nitrogen (in mg N/L) shall not exceed, more than once every three years on the average, the following chronic ammonia criterion:

$$\left(\frac{0.0577}{1 + 10^{7.688-\text{pH}}} + \frac{2.487}{1 + 10^{\text{pH}-7.688}} \right) \times 1.45(10^{0.028(25-\text{MAX})})$$

MAX = temperature in °C or 7, whichever is greater.

The default design flow for calculating steady state wasteload allocations for this chronic ammonia criterion is the 30Q10, unless statistically valid methods are employed which demonstrate compliance with the duration and return frequency of this water quality criterion.

z. A site specific dissolved copper aquatic life criterion of 16.3 µg/l for protection from acute effects and 10.5 µg/l for protection from chronic effects applies in the following area:

Little Creek to the Route 60 (Shore Drive) bridge including Little Channel, Desert Cove, Fishermans Cove, and Little Creek Cove.

Hampton Roads Harbor including the waters within the boundary lines formed by I-664 (Monitor-Merrimac Memorial Bridge Tunnel) and I-64 (Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel), Willoughby Bay, and the Elizabeth River and its tidal tributaries.

This criterion reflects the acute and chronic copper aquatic life criterion for saltwater in 9VAC25-260-140 B X a water effect ratio. The water effect ratio was derived in accordance with 9VAC25-260-140 F.

aa. The following site-specific dissolved oxygen criteria apply to the tidal Mattaponi and Pamunkey Rivers and their tidal tributaries because of seasonal lower dissolved oxygen concentration due to the natural oxygen depleting processes present in the extensive surrounding tidal wetlands. These criteria apply June 1 through September 30 to Chesapeake Bay segments MPNTF, MPNOH, PMKTF, PMKOH and are implemented in accordance with subsection D of 9VAC25-260-185. These criteria supersede the open water criteria listed in subsection A of 9VAC25-260-185.

Designated use	Criteria Concentration/Duration	Temporal Application
Open water	30 day mean ≥ 4.0 mg/l	June 1 - September 30
	Instantaneous minimum ≥ 3.2 mg/l at temperatures <29°C	
	Instantaneous minimum ≥ 4.3 mg/l at temperatures ≥ 29°C	

A site-specific pH criterion of 5.0-8.0 applies to the tidal freshwater Mattaponi Chesapeake Bay segment MPNTF to reflect natural conditions.

bb. The following site-specific seasonal mean criteria should not be exceeded in the specified tidal James River segment more than twice [over in] six [consecutive spring or summer seasons years] . [Should consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment after the effective date of these chlorophyll a criteria, the Department will examine additional lines of evidence including, but not limited to, the occurrence of harmful algae blooms, physicochemical monitoring and phytoplankton datasets, and fish kill reports in the evaluation of the appropriate assessment category for the water body segment. The Department will develop guidance for inclusion in the Water Quality Assessment Guidance Manual to address evaluating the appropriate assessment category when consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur. The Department will determine if additional monitoring for harmful algal blooms is warranted] .

<u>Designated Use</u>	<u>Chlorophyll a μ/l</u>	<u>Chesapeake Bay Program Segment</u>	<u>Temporal Application</u>
<u>Open water</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>JMSTF2</u>	<u>March 1 - May 31</u> <u>(spring)</u>
	<u>10</u>	<u>JMSTF1</u>	
	<u>13</u>	<u>JMSOH</u>	
	<u>7</u>	<u>JMSMH</u>	
	<u>8</u>	<u>JMSPH</u>	
	<u>21</u>	<u>JMSTF2</u>	<u>July 1 - September 30</u> <u>(summer)</u>
	<u>24</u>	<u>JMSTF1</u>	
	<u>11</u>	<u>JMSOH</u>	
	<u>7</u>	<u>JMSMH</u>	
	<u>7</u>	<u>JMSPH</u>	

The following site-specific chlorophyll a concentrations at the specified duration should not [be exceeded occur] more than 10% of the time over six [consecutive] summer seasons in the specified area of the tidal James River. These criteria protect against aquatic life effects due to harmful algal blooms. Such effects have not been documented in the upper portion of JMSTF2 or in JMSOH.

<u>Chlorophyll a μg/l</u>	<u>Chesapeake Bay Program Segment</u>	<u>Spatial Application</u>	<u>Duration</u>
<u>--</u>	<u>JMSTF2</u>	<u>Upstream boundary of JMSTF2 to river mile 95</u>	<u>--</u>
<u>52</u>	<u>JMSTF2</u>	<u>River mile 95 to downstream boundary of JMSTF2</u>	<u>1-month median</u>
<u>52</u>	<u>JMSTF1</u>	<u>Upstream boundary of JMSTF1 to river mile 67</u>	<u>1-month median</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>JMSTF1</u>	<u>River mile 67 to downstream boundary of JMSTF1</u>	<u>1-month median</u>

=	<u>JMSOH</u>	<u>Entire segment</u>	=
<u>59</u>	<u>JMSMH</u>	<u>Entire segment</u>	<u>1-day median</u>
<u>20</u>	<u>JMSPH</u>	<u>Entire segment</u>	<u>1-day median</u>

(1) The following site-specific numerical chlorophyll a criteria apply March 1 through May 31 and July 1 through September 30 as seasonal means to the tidal James River segments (excludes tributaries) segments JMSTF2, JMSTF1, JMSOH, JMSMH, and JMSPH and are implemented in accordance with subsection D of 9VAC25-260-185, the boundaries of which are described in EPA 903-R-05-004.

Designated Use	Chlorophyll a $\mu\text{g/l}$	Chesapeake Bay Program Segment	Temporal Application
Open water	10	JMSTF2	March 1 – May 31
	15	JMSTF1	
	15	JMSOH	
	12	JMSMH	
	12	JMSPH	
	15	JMSTF2	July 1 – September 30
	23	JMSTF1	
	22	JMSOH	
	10	JMSMH	
	10	JMSPH	

(2) For segments JMSOH, JMSMH, and JMSPH, the median of same-day samples collected one meter or less in a segment should be calculated to represent the chlorophyll a expression of a segment over that day, and the median of same-month chlorophyll a values should be calculated to represent the chlorophyll a expression of a segment over that month. The seasonal geometric mean shall be calculated from the monthly chlorophyll a values for a segment.

(3) For segment JMSTF2, chlorophyll a data collected in the "upper zone" (from the upstream boundary at the fall line to approximately river mile 95 (N37° 23' 15.27" / W77° 18' 45.05" to N37° 23' 19.31" / W77° 18' 54.03")) should be pooled, in the manner described in subdivision bb (2) of this section, separately from chlorophyll a data collected in the "lower zone" (from river mile 95 to the downstream boundary of JMSTF2). The seasonal geometric mean for each of these zones should be calculated from their respective monthly chlorophyll a values. To calculate the seasonal segment-wide geometric mean, an area-weighted average of the zonal geometric means should be calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Upper Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.41 + \text{Lower Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.59$$

(4) For segment JMSTF1, chlorophyll a data collected in the "upper zone" (from the upstream boundary of JMSTF1 to approximately river mile 67 (N37° 17' 46.21" / W77° 7' 9.55" to N37° 18' 58.94" / W77° 6' 57.14")) should be pooled, in the manner described in subdivision bb (2) of this section, separately from chlorophyll a data collected in the "lower zone" (between river mile 67 to the downstream boundary of JMSTF1). The

seasonal geometric mean for each of these zones should be calculated from their respective monthly chlorophyll a values. To calculate the seasonal segment-wide geometric mean, an area-weighted average of the zonal geometric means should be calculated using the following equation:

Upper Zone Geometric Mean x 0.49 + Lower Zone Geometric Mean x 0.51

cc. For Mountain Lake in Giles County, chlorophyll a shall not exceed 6 µg/L at a depth of six meters and orthophosphate-P shall not exceed 8 µg/L at a depth of one meter or less.

dd. For Lake Drummond, located within the boundaries of Chesapeake and Suffolk in the Great Dismal Swamp, chlorophyll a shall not exceed 35 µg/L and total phosphorus shall not exceed 40 µg/L at a depth of one meter or less.

ee. Maximum temperature for these seasonally stockable trout waters is 26°C and applies May 1 through October 31.

ff. Maximum temperature for these seasonally stockable trout waters is 28°C and applies May 1 through October 31.

gg. Little Calfpasture River from the Goshen Dam to 0.76 miles above its confluence with the Calfpasture River has a stream condition index (A Stream Condition Index for Virginia Non-Coastal Streams, September 2003, Tetra Tech, Inc.) of at least 20.5 to protect the subcategory of aquatic life that exists in this river section as a result of the hydrologic modification. From 0.76 miles to 0.02 miles above its confluence with the Calfpasture River, aquatic life conditions are expected to gradually recover and meet the general aquatic life uses at 0.02 miles above its confluence with the Calfpasture River.

hh. Maximum temperature for these seasonally stockable trout waters is 31°C and applies May 1 through October 31.

Statutory Authority

§ 62.1-44.15 of the Code of Virginia; Clean Water Act (33 USC § 1251 et seq.); 40 CFR Part 131.

Historical Notes

Derived from VR680-21-07.1, eff. May 20, 1992; amended July 1, 1992; amended, Virginia Register Volume 13, Issue 12, eff. April 2, 1997; Volume 14, Issue 4, eff. December 10, 1997; Volume 19, Issue 23, eff. August 27, 2003; Volume 20, Issue 9, eff. February 12, 2004; Volume 22, Issue 11, eff. January 12, 2006; Volume 24, Issue 4, eff. August 14, 2007; Volume 26, Issue 12, eff. February 1, 2010; Volume 32, Issue 26, eff. June 27, 2017.

ATTACHMENT 3

Response to Technical Memorandum Cited by VAMWA to Recommend Upwards Adjustments to the Proposed Tidal Fresh Summer Mean Criteria

Subject: Response to Technical Memo “Comparison of pH and Chlorophyll-*a* at the Rice Center Pier and Other Stations”

Date: May 6, 2019

From: Tish Robertson

Introduction

The primary driver for the proposed chlorophyll-*a* criteria in the two tidal fresh segments in the James River is protection against elevated pH (DEQ, 2018), a stressor observed at a high frequency by the continuous monitor deployed by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) from 2006 to 2008 at the Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Rice Rivers Center Pier (hereafter referred to as the “Rice Pier”). At the Spring 2017 James River Chlorophyll-*a* Regulatory Advisory Panel (RAP) meeting, Clifton Bell from Brown & Caldwell asserted that the statistical relationship derived from chlorophyll and pH samples taken from the Rice Pier is different from the relationships derived from samples collected at other locations nearby. He contended that this difference is sufficient enough to warrant a “correction” to the relationship used for estimating effect thresholds and ultimately the proposed tidal fresh criteria. By using Bell’s “corrected” relationship, the proposed summer criterion would be raised from 21 µg/l to 23 µg/l for JMSTFU and from 24 µg/l to 25 µg/l for JMSTFL. In response to Bell’s presentation, Tish Robertson (DEQ) presented analyses that support DEQ’s assumption that water quality at the Rice Pier is adequately representative of the surrounding area.

On October 31, 2017, Bell submitted a technical memorandum to DEQ that expands on the work he presented at the Spring 2017 RAP meeting. This memo is also enclosed with VAMWA’s comment letter to DEQ dated March 22, 2019. Bell’s position can be distilled into two separate assertions: 1) pH is biased high at the Rice Pier compared to the pH observed in the adjacent mid-channel—a bias consistently high enough to warrant a 0.08 standard unit subtraction to the chlorophyll-pH relationship used to develop effect thresholds, and 2) the model used by DEQ to develop effect thresholds (simple linear regression) produces pH predictions that are biased high at high chlorophyll-*a* concentrations, therefore warranting a more accurate model that implicates a higher effect threshold than the one used to develop the proposed criteria. To make both cases, Bell makes inferences based on statistical analyses of the 2006-2016 continuous data collected at the Rice Pier. During the 2006-2008 period, VIMS managed the continuous monitoring station under contract with DEQ. The generated data were used by DEQ to develop the proposed criteria for the tidal fresh segments. VCU managed

the continuous monitoring station after 2008. DEQ declined to use the VCU-managed continuous data for developing the chlorophyll-pH relationship due to their questionable quality³. The continuous data used in Bell’s analyses were submitted to Robertson along with his memorandum. A brief critique of Bell’s assertions is presented below.

Assertion 1#: Higher pH at Rice Pier compared to the surrounding habitat

Bell presents a statistical comparison of chlorophyll-*a* and pH sampled by DEQ staff visiting mid-channel stations to observations recorded by the Rice Pier continuous monitor over the 2006-2016 period. Bell asserts statistical comparisons of station datasets support a finding that water quality at the Rice Pier is different from water quality at other stations. The following describes some weaknesses to this argument:

1. It is unclear whether the continuous data used in this analysis are raw fluorescence values or estimates of extracted chlorophyll-*a* derived from a calibration model. Since the mid-channel samples collected by DEQ were extracted chlorophyll, the Rice continuous data should be calibrated to ensure an “apples to apples” comparison. If these data were not properly calibrated, then any differences in chlorophyll-*a* concentration between Rice and mid-channel data might be due to mismatched parameters rather than site differences. DEQ used standardized parameters (extracted chlorophyll-*a* compared to extracted chlorophyll) in the comparison of station samples (see slide 6 of the PowerPoint presentation entitled [“Representativeness of pH and Chlorophyll at Rice Center Pier”](#), which was presented at the Spring 2017 RAP meeting).
2. Bell compares data collected by different data collectors (DEQ, VIMS, and VCU), so any differences may be due to different instrumentation, sampling techniques, and/or calibration. Only VIMS data were used in DEQ’s comparison of station samples (slides 5 and 6 of the aforementioned PowerPoint presentation).
3. Bell does pairwise comparisons of station datasets. However, an assertion that the Rice Pier habitat is different from the “rest of the tidal fresh” necessitates evidence that Rice Pier samples are sufficiently different from the *set* of samples collected from the “rest of the tidal fresh”. DEQ did not find that there was enough statistical certainty to reject the hypothesis that the Rice samples are similar to samples from the closest mid-channel stations to the Rice Pier when the station datasets are compared collectively (slides 5 and 6 of the aforementioned PowerPoint presentation).

³ The questionable quality of the VCU continuous data is acknowledged by Bell. While VIMS includes QA/QC flags with its datasets, VCU does not provide such metadata. Bell describes how the data were “cleaned” prior to being analyzed. However, it is important to note that the continuous data that Bell submitted to DEQ did not include observations that DEQ has deemed valid (for instance, the majority of observations taken during July 2007) and some VIMS observations were deemed valid despite having QA/QC flags that indicate they should not be used due to probe malfunction.

4. Bell's pairwise comparisons indicate that the Rice Pier pH is statistically different (with 95% confidence) from pH measured at the mid-channel stations TF5.2A, TF5.3, and TF5.6. While not exactly corroborated by DEQ's analysis (slide 5 of the aforementioned PowerPoint presentation), this finding is not unexpected given that DEQ has already acknowledged these stations are located in habitats that differ from the one represented by the Rice Pier. These three stations are located in habitats with lower chlorophyll-*a* concentrations (and thus less intense algal photosynthesis) than the habitat represented by the Rice Pier. DEQ assumes that the stations TF5.5 and TF5.5A are located in the same habitat as the Rice Pier, and Bell finds that the pH samples taken at these stations are statistically different from the Rice Pier samples at the 90% confidence level. However, DEQ used a 95% confidence level for the majority of the decision points underlying the proposed criteria. The only exception is the 99% level chosen for the estimation of baseline central tendencies for the tidal fresh and oligohaline segments. DEQ is able to justify the use of a less conventional confidence level by citing the fact that baseline datasets were generated from different data sources and data types. There is no justification with comparable defensibility for using a lower confidence level, especially in a case involving uncontrolled confounders and questionable data integrity.
5. Bell compares the chlorophyll-pH relationship derived from Rice continuous data to the relationships derived from DEQ samples taken from the mid-channel stations and finds that the mid-channel relationships are different from the Rice relationship. However, the difference is only significant at the 90% confidence level. Moreover, even if this difference is considered significant, the cause of the difference cannot be attributed solely on habitat effects given the aforementioned confounding variables (i.e., dissimilar parameters, instrumentation, and data collectors). Admittedly, DEQ's comparison of relationship (slide 8 of the aforementioned PowerPoint presentation) was also complicated by mixed data sources (in this case, VIMS versus DEQ). However, DEQ found there was not enough evidence to reject the hypothesis that the Rice relationship is similar to the relationship derived from samples at the closest mid-channel station.

Assertion 2#: Alternative model produces better predictions of pH

Bell uses the 2006-2016 continuous dataset to simulate the relationship between chlorophyll-*a* and pH. He finds that these data generate a simple linear regression model that is similar to the model that DEQ used to develop the proposed tidal fresh criteria. However, Bell asserts this model overestimates pH at high chlorophyll-*a* concentrations. A locally weighted scatterplot smooth (LOWESS) regression model that Bell fits to the same data predicts a higher effect threshold than the simple linear regression model does (55 µg/l versus 50 µg/l). Bell asserts that because the LOWESS model generates more accurate predictions than the other model, the higher effect threshold is the more preferable of the two. The following issues were found with this analysis:

1. It is unclear whether Bell’s relationship is based on raw fluorescence (reported directly from the continuous monitor) or extracted chlorophyll-a equivalents as predicted from a calibration model. The chlorophyll-a data that were enclosed with his technical memorandum (hereafter referred to as the “Bell dataset”) were fluorescence values. The relationship used by DEQ to develop the proposed criteria was not based on raw fluorescence, but rather on estimates of extracted chlorophyll. To facilitate the consideration of Bell’s recommendation, the Bell dataset was “corrected” using the annualized correction factors developed by HRSD/VAMWA for the James River Chlorophyll-a Study and then aggregated into daily chlorophyll-a medians and daily 90th percentile pH values (Figure 1). The resulting scatterplot is not the same as the scatterplot that Bell presents in his technical memorandum and thus the resulting empirical models are different from his. Because observations that are known to be suspect are present in the Bell dataset and observations that VIMS and DEQ have deemed valid are missing for unknown reasons (see Footnote 1), the validity of any model derived from this dataset is questionable.
2. Bell does not provide measures of fit so that his simple linear regression and LOWESS models can be objectively compared. To verify his assertion that the LOWESS curve produces better predictions, LOWESS and simple linear regression models were fit to the corrected Bell dataset. The LOWESS curve does indeed fit better in terms of root mean square error (RMSE). The RMSE for the LOWESS model is 0.44 versus 0.46 standard unit for the simple linear regression model. However, the effect threshold predicted by both models is the same (47 $\mu\text{g/l}$). This is lower than the effect threshold used by DEQ to develop the proposed tidal fresh criteria.




Figure 1. Scatterplot of pH (daily 90th percentile) and chlorophyll-*a* concentration (daily median) calculated from the Bell dataset, fit with a LOWESS model (blue) and simple linear regression model (yellow). Red line indicates pH = 9.1. Vertical line indicates the effect threshold. Bandwidth = 0.3126708

- If the Bell dataset is to be considered valid, then its use should not just be restricted to developing an effect threshold for elevated pH. DEQ used the 2006-2008 continuous data not only for this purpose, but also to quantify temporal variability in the stretch of the tidal fresh between river miles 67 and 95. Using this dataset, DEQ estimated the upper 95% confidence limit of the summertime average chlorophyll-a standard deviation (log-normal) to be 0.396182296 µg/l. The corresponding estimate produced from the Bell dataset is 0.347734817509471 µg/l (see Table 1). Using this estimate of variability and the effect threshold of 47 µg/l, the proposed criteria for the tidal fresh segments would remain unchanged.

Year	Criteria Development Dataset	Bell Dataset
2006	0.389447572	0.462046075
2007	0.307853703	0.305545355
2008	0.244400857	0.196826473
2009	—	0.199938688
2010	—	0.239356215
2011	—	0.367498736
2012	—	0.33692055
2013	—	0.165795743
2014	—	—
2015	—	—
2016	—	0.295249743
mean	0.313900711	0.285464175
U95%CL	0.396182296	0.347734818

Table 1. Estimates of summer standard deviation (log-normal) derived from the Rice Pier continuous data.⁴

Despite the aforementioned concerns with the quality of the Bell dataset, Bell’s suggestion to use LOWESS regression for the tidal fresh chlorophyll-pH relationship may be worth considering. A LOWESS curve was fit through the chlorophyll-pH dataset used by DEQ to develop the proposed tidal fresh criteria (using a simple linear regression model), as shown in Figures 2A and 2B. The LOWESS model predicts an effect threshold of 61 µg/l, which if

⁴ According to Bell, the majority of the summer data points collected in 2014 were not retained by VCU due to quality issues. Bell declined to use the 2015 data due to a high number of suspicious observations.

accepted by DEQ would adjust the proposed tidal fresh summer criteria to the same ones recommended by Bell (23 $\mu\text{g}/\text{l}$ for JMSTFU and 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{l}$ for JMSTFL).




Figure 2. Scatterplot of pH (daily 90th percentile) and chlorophyll-*a* concentration (daily median) from 2006-2008 continuous data taken from the Rice Pier, fit with A) a simple linear regression model (RMSE= 0.37) and B) a LOWESS model (RMSE = 0.35). Red line indicates pH = 9.1. Vertical line indicates the effect threshold. Bandwidth = 0.9076968

On the basis of RMSE, LOWESS regression models were found to be marginally better than all the simple linear regression models that were used by DEQ to estimate other effect thresholds. However, in almost every case the LOWESS model predictions would not result in changes to the proposed criteria. The exception is the effect threshold for microcystin for the tidal fresh. The simple linear regression model predicts an effect threshold of 53 $\mu\text{g}/\text{l}$ (Figure

3A). The LOWESS model fit through the same data predicts 48 $\mu\text{g/l}$ (Figure 3B), which would then shift the proposed summer criteria for the tidal fresh back to the originally recommended numbers (21 $\mu\text{g/l}$ for JMSTFL and 24 $\mu\text{g/l}$ for JMSTFL).




Figure 3. Scatterplot of microcystin and chlorophyll-a concentrations taken at TF5.5A. A) The simple linear regression model (RMSE = 0.71 $\mu\text{g/l}$) used to develop the effect threshold (chlorophyll=53 $\mu\text{g/l}$) underpinning the currently proposed criteria. B) The LOWESS model (RMSE = 0.68), which predicts the effect threshold (chlorophyll=48 $\mu\text{g/l}$). Red line indicates microcystin concentration = 1 $\mu\text{g/l}$. Bandwidth = 0.7260913

There are strengths and weaknesses to all modeling approaches, and LOWESS is no exception (see the discussion provided by Basu et al., 2015). While LOWESS regression has an advantage over parametric methods like simple linear regression in that it does not presume that data fit any particular distribution, it does require an analyst to specify a smoothing parameter (bandwidth) and the degree of local polynomial. Usually these parameters are chosen based on visual interpretation, but for the models presented here, a computer software program (the R-statistical software package fANCOVA) was used to select parameters on the basis of generalized cross-validation. Another weakness is that LOWESS regression is more “data hungry” than simple linear regression. The datasets shown here are quite modest in size compared to the datasets that are usually explored using LOWESS regression. Finally, relationships discerned using simple linear regression can be more thoroughly compared to each other and can be replicated and scrutinized without the underlying dataset. This is not the case for LOWESS regression. Given these weaknesses and the marginal differences in the goodness-of-fit between the two types of models, DEQ has sufficient cause to continue using the effect thresholds derived from simple linear regression models.

Conclusions

While larger datasets are always more preferable than smaller ones, the breadth of the Rice Pier continuous dataset poses a special challenge. The 2006-2008 continuous dataset, which DEQ used to develop the proposed tidal fresh criteria, was screened by VIMS before it was analyzed by DEQ. Its high quality is evidenced by its accompanying QA/QC flags. The post-2008 continuous data collected at the Rice Pier lack these measures, and this is a very important shortcoming given that unsupervised continuous monitoring is so error-prone. An analyst should not be responsible for ensuring data quality. Thus, DEQ will continue to disregard the post-2008 Rice Pier continuous dataset for the purposes of criteria development until VCU implements a more rigorous QA/QC process for its continuous monitoring program. However, regardless of whether these data are considered valid or not, Clifton Bell's assertion that there are localized effects on pH at the Rice Pier cannot be substantiated statistically.

Bell's recommendation to consider an alternative model (LOWESS) to simulate the tidal fresh summer chlorophyll-pH relationship is well-taken, though. If LOWESS regression is used solely for this purpose, DEQ would have sound justification for adopting the alternative criteria Bell recommends. But the desire for methodological consistency compels the use of LOWESS regression to pinpoint the effect thresholds for all the other metrics examined in the tidal fresh James. Using a LOWESS model to simulate the relationship of the tidal fresh chlorophyll-*a* and microcystin relationship confirms the protectiveness of criteria originally proposed by DEQ. While LOWESS regression is a defensible modeling approach, DEQ believes that simple linear regression is more appropriate given the modest size of the monitoring datasets. For these reasons, no changes will be made to the proposed criteria for the tidal fresh James segments.

References

- Basu, K., M.C. Mariani, L. Serpa and R. Sinha (2015) Evaluation of interpolants in their ability to fit seismometric time series. *Mathematic s* 3: 666-689.
- Bell, C. (2017) Comparison of pH and chlorophyll-*a* at the Rice Center Pier and other stations. Technical memorandum submitted to DEQ on October 31, 2017. 14 pg.
- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (2018) Recommended numeric chlorophyll-*a* criteria for the James River estuary. 65 pg.

ATTACHMENT 4



townhall.virginia.gov

Final Regulation Agency Background Document

Agency name	State Water Control Board
Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) citation(s)	9 VAC 25-260-310
Regulation title(s)	Water Quality Standards
Action title	Amendments to the tidal James River special standard for chlorophyll-a
Date this document prepared	May 16, 2019

This information is required for executive branch review and the Virginia Registrar of Regulations, pursuant to the Virginia Administrative Process Act (APA), Executive Order 14 (as amended, July 16, 2018), the Regulations for Filing and Publishing Agency Regulations (1 VAC7-10), and the *Virginia Register Form, Style, and Procedure Manual for Publication of Virginia Regulations*.

Brief Summary

Please provide a brief summary (preferably no more than 2 or 3 paragraphs) of this regulatory change (i.e., new regulation, amendments to an existing regulation, or repeal of an existing regulation). Alert the reader to all substantive matters. If applicable, generally describe the existing regulation.

The proposed amendments include modified and new site-specific chlorophyll-a criteria applicable to the tidal James River. Chlorophyll-a criteria enable watershed management of nitrogen and phosphorus, nutrients which drive algal blooms in the tidal James River. The proposed amendments are the result of a comprehensive scientific study overseen by DEQ that focused on chlorophyll-a dynamics and linkages to aquatic life effects in the James River. Among the most notable changes to the regulation are modified seasonal mean criteria (eight proposed criteria are lower than the existing criteria and two proposed criteria are higher) and new short-duration criteria that protect aquatic life from the effects of toxic algae. Additionally, new language describing how data should be analyzed and the allowable exceedance frequencies for both sets of criteria will be inserted into the regulation.

Acronyms and Definitions

Please define all acronyms used in the Agency Background Document. Also, please define any technical terms that are used in the document that are not also defined in the "Definition" section of the regulations.

Define acronyms and terms, if used. Otherwise, delete this section.

Statement of Final Agency Action

Please provide a statement of the final action taken by the agency including: 1) the date the action was taken; 2) the name of the agency taking the action; and 3) the title of the regulation.

DEQ = Department of Environmental Quality
EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency

Legal Basis

Please identify (1) the agency or other promulgating entity, and (2) the state and/or federal legal authority for the regulatory change, including the most relevant citations to the Code of Virginia or Acts of Assembly chapter number(s), if applicable. Your citation must include a specific provision, if any, authorizing the promulgating entity to regulate this specific subject or program, as well as a reference to the agency or promulgating entity's overall regulatory authority.

Section 62.1-44.15(3a) of the Code of Virginia, as amended, mandates and authorizes the State Water Control Board to establish water quality standards and policies for any State waters consistent with the purpose and general policy of the State Water Control Law, and to modify, amend or cancel any such standards or policies established. The federal Clean Water Act at 303(c) mandates the State Water Control Board to review and, as appropriate, modify and adopt water quality standards. The promulgating entity is the State Water Control Board.

The corresponding federal water quality standards regulation at 40 CFR 131.6 describes the minimum requirements for water quality standards. The minimum requirements are use designations, water quality criteria to protect the designated uses and an antidegradation policy. All of the citations mentioned describe mandates for water quality standards.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Water Quality Standards regulation (40 CFR 131.11) is the regulatory basis for the EPA requiring the states to establish water quality criteria to protect designated uses and the criteria are used to assess whether or not a waterbody is meeting those uses.

Purpose

Please explain the need for the regulatory change, including a description of: (1) the rationale or justification, (2) the specific reasons the regulatory change is essential to protect the health, safety or welfare of citizens, and (3) the goals of the regulatory change and the problems it's intended to solve.

The amendments to the special standards and requirements section (9 VAC 25-260-310) of the Virginia Water Quality Standards Regulation reflects new understanding resulting from a seven-year-long study aimed at updating the chlorophyll-*a* criteria for the tidal James River with best available science. Chlorophyll-*a* criteria, which enable the regulatory management of nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), were adopted for the tidal James River in 2005. The scientific basis of the existing James River chlorophyll-*a* criteria was questioned in response to the stringent nutrient load reductions determined by the EPA to be necessary for attainment of these criteria, as a component of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.

The study of the existing regulation revealed some substantial weaknesses. First, the existing chlorophyll-*a* criteria were developed from datasets that were relatively limited in scope and were drawn from areas of the Chesapeake Bay that may not be representative of the James River. Secondly, while the existing criteria were developed to promote a balanced phytoplankton assemblage that is relatively free from harmful taxa, the absence of clear relationships between chlorophyll-*a* and phytoplankton composition necessitated some subjective decision-making in the selection of thresholds. Also, physicochemical effects stemming from algal blooms, like poor water clarity and high pH, were not considered when the existing criteria were developed. Thirdly, the study found that the existing criteria must be assessed as geometric means (as directed by implementation guidance specified in subsection D of 9 VAC 25-260-185) even though they were developed as arithmetic means. Research conducted by the EPA-Chesapeake Bay Program Office in 2010 determined that the geometric mean is the more appropriate statistic for characterizing James River chlorophyll-*a* central tendency. Finally, the existing assessment methodology and the rules used to delineate allowable exceedance frequency, both described in references cited in subsection D of 9 VAC 25-260-185, were developed separately from the existing

criteria and were found to be ill-suited for a parameter like chlorophyll-*a*, which can vary considerably in space and time even under ideal conditions. The mismatch between these elements and the existing criteria likely accounts for some of the stringency of the nutrient load reductions determined by EPA under the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) to be necessary for criteria attainment. Another factor was the modeling framework used at the time had limitations in its ability to accurately predict chlorophyll-*a* concentrations resulting from simulated nutrient reduction scenarios. An enhanced model is now being used in the analysis with improved calibration and validity.

The amendments to the regulation address the above weaknesses. DEQ staff have concluded that implementation of the amendments will benefit the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the Commonwealth by protecting the water quality and living resources of the tidal James River from the effects of excessive nutrients and the resulting elevated chlorophyll-*a* levels.

Substance

Please briefly identify and explain the new substantive provisions, the substantive changes to existing sections, or both. A more detailed discussion is provided in the “Detail of Changes” section below.

9 VAC 25-260-310 (bb) provides the criteria for site-specific chlorophyll-*a* levels in the tidal James River (excluding tributaries) and contains a table listing two seasonal mean criteria (spring and summer) for each of the five James River segments (delineated by salinity regime), for a total of ten paired sets of criteria. The amendments lower eight of these values and raise two of them. Compliance with these revised criteria is expected to minimize both long-term and short-term effects on aquatic life. Additionally, a new table of criteria that apply only during the summer is inserted. Compliance with these new criteria is expected to minimize short-term effects on aquatic life stemming from potentially toxic harmful algal blooms. Finally, the amendments remove the reference to subsection D of 9 VAC25-260-185 and inserts new language stipulating that: 1) seasonal means should be calculated as geometric means; 2) the allowable exceedance frequencies of both sets of criteria and the length of the assessment period over which they should be evaluated; 3) the manner in which chlorophyll-*a* data should be aggregated and how segments should be subdivided for the purposes of data aggregation; 4) the reference to the EPA technical document that provides the boundaries of the James River segments, and 5) assessment guidance will be developed to address the appropriate assessment category if consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment.

Issues

Please identify the issues associated with the regulatory change, including: 1) the primary advantages and disadvantages to the public, such as individual private citizens or businesses, of implementing the new or amended provisions; 2) the primary advantages and disadvantages to the agency or the Commonwealth; and 3) other pertinent matters of interest to the regulated community, government officials, and the public. If there are no disadvantages to the public or the Commonwealth, include a specific statement to that effect.

There are a number of advantages that result from the amendments. First, DEQ will be able to better detect potentially harmful changes to the tidal James River stemming from excessive nitrogen and phosphorus loads that may affect the aquatic life designated use. DEQ will also be able to produce more confident assessments so that the public can be properly informed about the status of water quality in the tidal James River. Additionally, the amendments strengthen the technical defensibility of the regulation so that the regulated community and resource managers can better understand the benefits expected to be gained with regulatory compliance. More defensible permit limits and non-point source management plans will result from the adoption of these amendments. A final benefit is that the costs needed to attain the amended criteria may be less than what attainment of the existing criteria has been estimated to cost.

There is no disadvantage to the agency or the Commonwealth that will result from the adoption of this final regulation.

Requirements More Restrictive than Federal

Please list all changes to the information reported on the Agency Background Document submitted for the previous stage regarding any requirement of the regulatory change which is more restrictive than applicable federal requirements. If there are no changes to previously-reported information, include a specific statement to that effect.

The amendments do not exceed applicable federal minimum requirements.

Agencies, Localities, and Other Entities Particularly Affected

Please list all changes to the information reported on the Agency Background Document submitted for the previous stage regarding any other state agencies, localities, or other entities that are particularly affected by the regulatory change. If there are no changes to previously-reported information, include a specific statement to that effect.

Other State Agencies Particularly Affected:

No state agencies are known to be particularly affected.

Localities Particularly Affected:

The 38 counties and 17 cities that will be particularly affected all drain into the James River: Counties: Albemarle, Alleghany, Amelia, Amherst, Appomattox, Augusta, Bath, Bedford, Botetourt, Buckingham, Campbell, Charles City, Chesterfield, Craig, Cumberland, Dinwiddie, Fluvanna, Giles, Goochland, Greene, Hanover, Henrico, Highland, Isle of Wight, James City, Louisa, Montgomery, Nelson, New Kent, Nottoway, Orange, Powhatan, Prince Edward, Prince George, Roanoke, Rockbridge, Surry, and York; Cities: Buena Vista, Charlottesville, Chesapeake, Colonial Heights, Covington, Hampton, Hopewell, Lexington, Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, Petersburg, Portsmouth, Richmond, Suffolk, Williamsburg, and Virginia Beach.

Other Entities Particularly Affected:

No other entities are known to be particularly affected.

Public Comment

Please summarize all comments received during the public comment period following the publication of the previous stage, and provide the agency response. Ensure to include all comments submitted: including those received on Town Hall, in a public hearing, or submitted directly to the agency or board. If no comment was received, enter a specific statement to that effect.

See Attachments 1 and 2.

Detail of Changes Made Since the Previous Stage

Please list all changes that made to the text since the previous stage was published in the Virginia Register of Regulations and the rationale for the changes. Explain the new requirements and what they mean rather than merely quoting the text of the regulation.

**Please put an asterisk next to any substantive changes.*

Current chapter-section number	New chapter-section number, if applicable	New requirement from previous stage	Updated new requirement since previous stage	Change, intent, rationale, and likely impact of updated requirements
9VAC 25-260-310		<p>The following statement has been added: “Should consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment after the effective date of these chlorophyll-a criteria, the Department will examine additional lines of evidence including, but not limited to, the occurrence of harmful algal blooms, physicochemical monitoring and phytoplankton datasets, and fish kill reports in the evaluation of the appropriate assessment category for the water body segment. The Department will develop guidance for inclusion in the Water Quality Assessment Guidance Manual to address evaluating the appropriate assessment category when consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion occur. The Department will determine if additional monitoring for harmful algal blooms is warranted.”</p>		<p>The change does not alter the proposed criteria but it does give the Department the flexibility to review additional lines of evidence in determining the appropriate water quality assessment category when consecutive exceedances of a seasonal mean criterion occur in a water body segment.</p>

Current chapter-section number	New chapter-section number, if applicable	New requirement from previous stage	Updated new requirement since previous stage	Change, intent, rationale, and likely impact of updated requirements
9VAC 25-260-310			The statement reading, “The following site-specific seasonal mean criteria should not be exceeded in the specified tidal James River segment more than twice over six consecutive spring or summer seasons” has been modified thusly: “The following site-specific seasonal mean criteria should not be exceeded in the specified tidal James River segment more than twice in six years.”	Comments from EPA suggested that the use of the “consecutive” is unnecessary and potentially confusing. The change does not impact the updated requirements.
9VAC 25-260-310			The statement reading, “The following site-specific chlorophyll a concentrations at the specified duration should not occur more than 10% of the time over six consecutive summer seasons in the specified area of the tidal James River” has been modified thusly: “The following site-specific chlorophyll a concentrations at the specified duration should not be exceeded more than 10% of the time over six summer seasons.”	Comments from EPA suggested that the use of the “consecutive” is unnecessary and potentially confusing. The insertion of the phrase “should not be exceeded” provides much needed clarity. These changes do not impact the updated requirements.

Detail of All Changes Proposed in this Regulatory Action

*Please list all changes proposed in this action and the rationale for the changes. Explain the new requirements and what they mean rather than merely quoting the text of the regulation. *Please put an asterisk next to any substantive changes.*

[For changes to existing regulation(s), please use the following chart otherwise delete:]

Current section number	New section number, if applicable	Current requirement	Change, intent, rationale, and likely impact of new requirements
9VAC 25-260-310		Site-specific chlorophyll criteria expressed as seasonal means and a reference to subsection D of 9VAC25-260-180 for implementation guidance.	The reference to subsection D of 9 VAC25-260-180 is removed and a reference to the EPA document that describes the Chesapeake Bay segment boundaries is added. Language has been added stipulating how chlorophyll-a data should be aggregated in time and space. Seasonal mean criteria have been modified, with eight being in lower in magnitude and two being higher in magnitude. New table of criteria has been inserted that apply only during summer. The allowable exceedance frequencies and assessment periods for both sets of criteria are provided, with a statement that additional lines of evidence may be evaluated when consecutive exceedances occur.