

Nutrient TAG Meeting

December 10, 2013

Ohio EPA Groveport Field Office

Attendance

Member/Alternates – Elizabeth Toot-Levy, Adam Sackenheim (A), Adrienne Nemura, Gary Sheely (A), John Lyons, Ron Wyss, Guy Jamesson, Dale Kocarek (A), Larry Antosch, Jack Irvin (A), Rob Reash, Tom Menke (A), Anthony Sasson, Doug Busdeker, Michael Brom (A), Kristen Kubitzka, Chris Henney (A)

Observers – Mark Wilson, Brian Johnson, Chris Morgan, Bill Hall, Mark Smith, Kevin Elder, Todd Colquitt

Via conference phone – Angela Carbonell, Heather Raymond (OEPA-DDGW), Steve Haughey, John Meyer

Ohio EPA – Dan Dudley, Jeff DeShon, Bob Miltner, Chris Skalski, Dale White, Gary Stulhfauth, Eric Nygaard, Melinda Harris

Handouts

- Agenda, Comparison of State Nutrient standards for Streams by Anthony Sasson, Compilation of questions based upon ESO comments Group A, Biocriteria table 7-15 of OAC 3745-1-07, Ohio Stream Surveys – TIC Principles and Scoring presentation slides

Started meeting at 1:00 pm. Quick around the room introductions – members/alternates first and then observers and phone.

Review Agenda and Initial Question/Task List

- Agenda – no changes suggested by the group.
- Minutes from November 19, 2013 meeting – no changes other than those submitted by Adrienne. Will post as final on web.
- Task list/issues – grouped questions based on ESO comments into A, B & C – look at Group A during discussion today. Group offered no feedback on outline. There was general agreement to use this as the master list of issues and check off issues when the matter is discussed/resolved (with understanding that additional topics might be added). All ESO comments – are they available on the web? [The comments are available at: http://epa.ohio.gov/Portals/35/wqs/nutrient_tag/Nutrients_ESO_Comments_2013_complete.pdf]
- Future meeting dates – Dan said our marching orders are to have a draft set of rules ready for interested party review and group dissolved in first half of 2015. Monthly meetings – whole or half day – maybe 10 to 4 or 9 to 3? Maybe have longer meetings based on agenda. Will keep

options open but respect driving times. Question about other water quality standards packages – various packages on hold. Planning to look at nutrients in relation to existing rules or revised rules should rule changes move forward within the next year.

- Next meeting date – January
 1. Set meetings for second Thursday of the month – next meeting January 9, 2014
- Went over follow up list for meeting 1
 1. Other state nutrient WQS (discussed during meeting 2)
 2. Details of stream survey assessment, details of TIC development (discussed during meeting 2)
 3. Relationship of TIC & landscape BMPs
 4. Stream habitat management
 5. Inland lake nutrient WQS
 6. Lake Erie nutrient WQS – IJC Annex 4
 7. Gulf hypoxia task force

Added during meeting 2:

 8. Impairment of public water supply use
 9. Agency provides responses to Group A – C questions where possible

Presentation by Dan and Bob

Part 1 – Basics of Survey Program

- Covers both point and nonpoint sources – slide 4
- Question about loading estimates and how we use third party data
- Need further discussion on 303(d) reporting categories later

Break

Part 2 - TIC principles and operational issues

Identify next steps, work assignments

- Answers to the compilation of ESO questions groups A, B & C – several members suggested the Agency respond to these
 - Elizabeth said she would look at what has been answered already and what the Agency needs to answer

Parking Lot

- How do loading estimates compare Ohio EPA sentinel sites vs Heidelberg daily data (Does Ohio EPA sampling intensity adequately collect data to provide good loading/modeling estimates compared to Heidelberg data collection?)
- Protect & restore notion – “threatened”. What is the frequency of encountering fully attaining biology along with tripping the TIC? U.S. EPA required us to head off something becoming a problem before it becomes a problem – threatened becomes a category 5. Further discussion – look at adaptive management, “one-off” events/anomalies
- What if N & P listed as secondary cause of ALU impairment? Is this where STE might be used?
- Discussion over updating biocriteria values in rules (re-calibration of reference site data) – would make things more stringent – issue of moving the goal post to be considered.
- What happens if ALU is impaired but results on other TIC parameters show no nutrients
- Where do we plan to take TIC measurements – how to deal with tiny streams?
- Question about critical condition and when biocriteria apply
- Need discussion on limiting nutrient determination and the TIC
- How to give credit for improving water quality where past evaluations resulted in non-attainment, now 1 or 2 metrics meet. Could there be more levels of refinement?
- In a TMDL, why not model D.O. and chlorophyll a to determine WQBELs for phosphorus and nitrogen instead of the new target values TP and DIN [Apply and model the D.O. and chl a numbers found in TIC metrics]

Anthony’s work – Comparison of State Nutrient Standards for Streams

Used U.S. EPA’s compilation as starting point – 2012/2013 information. Did not have time to look at Illinois. Cannot summarize what states are doing in a table – so many factors going on. Wis & Minn most advanced, southern portions similar to Ohio geology – few if any consider habitat. Maine has biocriteria generally comparable to Ohio – has independent application. Maine’s rules are not final.

Numbers for algae or D.O. – some are really small ranges – Minn – not looking at the same algae type.
Not a straight forward apples to apples comparison between states.

Meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.