AGENDA Chesapeake Bay WQS AD HOC Committee February 24, 2004

Welcome/Introductions

Update From Last Meeting (DO Issues)

DEQ/EPA update on Maryland Bay WQS process

EPA clarification on 30-day open water criteria application for migratory use

EPA to address CBF comments on migratory use boundaries and seasonal application and VAMWA comment on no citations of impacts to ELS of fish to short term exposures less than 4.0. Other D.O. criteria issues (4.0 vs. 3.2 instantaneous in lower Bay)

DEQ and VAMWA update on local impacts to permittees on new migratory dissolved oxygen criteria (i.e. BOD limits)

EPA to address VAMWA comments on deep water boundaries in CB6 and Elizabeth River tributary deep water/channel uses

Findings from EPA/DEQ on naturally low DO in Mattaponi/Pamunkey

EPA input on application of uses and criteria in small tidal creeks and embayments

Findings from DEQ/EPA on attainment and measuring of instantaneous/7-day mean/30-day means

Other input/concerns from group on DO criteria and their related uses (migratory, open, deep water and deep channel)

LUNCH (provided)

Water Clarity Criteria and Shallow Water (SAV) Uses

Overview Water Clarity Criteria and Shallow Water Uses (DEO/EPA)

Discussion of numerical criteria for shallow water

Is the seasonal application (April 1 - October 31) appropriate? Should a numerical water clarity criteria (PLW, secchi depth) or SAV acreage as a biological criterion be considered? If so, should restoration goal acreage be used? Should SAV acreage be proposed by region (VA Bay), CBP segment, watershed, other?

Should a water clarity criterion in combination with SAV acreage biological criterion be considered? How should this be assessed?

Are the use of 'application depths' (including minimum of .5 meter maximum of 2 meters) appropriate for defining shallow water use boundaries?

Are the 'no grow zones' appropriate? What about no grow zones in turbidity maximum zones (e.g. York)?