# Emergency Regulation Agency Background Document 

| Agency name | State Water Control Board |
| ---: | :--- |
| Virginia Administrative Code <br> (VAC) citation | 9 VAC 25-260-185 |
| Regulation title | Water Quality Standards |
| Action title | Amending the Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria to include 2007, 2008 <br> and 2010 Chesapeake Bay criteria assessment protocols addenda. |
| Date this document prepared | November 10, 2010 |

This information is required for executive branch review and the Virginia Registrar of Regulations, pursuant to the Virginia Administrative Process Act (APA), Executive Orders 14 (2010) and 58 (1999), and the Virginia Register Form, Style, and Procedure Manual.

## Preamble

The APA (Code of Virginia § 2.2-4011) states that (i) regulations that an agency finds are necessitated by an emergency situation may be adopted by an agency upon consultation with the Attorney General, which approval shall be granted only after the agency has submitted a request stating in writing the nature of the emergency, and the necessity for such action shall be at the sole discretion of the Governor and (ii) agencies may also adopt emergency regulations in situations in which Virginia statutory law or the appropriation act or federal law or federal regulation requires that a regulation be effective in 280 days or less from its enactment, and the regulation is not exempt under the provisions of subdivision 44 of § 2.2-4006.

1) Please explain why this is an "emergency situation" as described above.
2) Summarize the key provisions of the new regulation or substantive changes to an existing regulation.

The timing of an ongoing rulemaking process to amend the Water Quality Standards Regulation (9VAC25-260185) to include the October 2007, September 2008 and May 2010 Chesapeake Bay Criteria Assessment Protocols addenda may not be completed in time to ensure the incorporation of the recently published protocols by the December 31, 2010 deadline. The protocols are being used by the U.S. EPA to develop the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the Bay and its tidal rivers. TMDLs must be developed in accordance with approved water quality standards and it is necessary for the VA standards to refer to each of the addenda published by EPA.

## Legal basis

Other than the emergency authority described above, please identify the state and/or federal legal authority to promulgate this proposed regulation, including: 1) the most relevant law and/or regulation, including Code of Virginia citation and General Assembly chapter number(s), if applicable, and 2) the promulgating entity, i.e., agency, board, or person. Describe the legal authority and the extent to which the authority is mandatory or discretionary. Please include a citation to the emergeny language.

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.

## Substance

Please detail any changes that are proposed. Please outline new substantive provisions, all substantive changes to existing sections, or both where appropriate. Set forth the specific reasons the agency has determined that the proposed regulatory action is essential to protect the health, safety, or welfare of Virginians.

| Current section number | Current requirement |  |  | Proposed change and rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9 \text { VAC } \\ & 25-260- \end{aligned}$$185$ | A. Dissolved oxygen. |  |  | Amending section 9VAC25-260185 D.3. to include references to Chesapeake Bay Criteria Assessment Protocols Addenda 2007 (CBP/TRS 288/07, EPA 903-R-07-005), 2008 (CBP/TRS 29008, EPA 903-R-08-001, and 2010 (CBP/TRS 301-10, EPA 903-R-10002). <br> These recently published protocols are being used by EPA to develop the Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Bay and its tidal rivers. TMDLs must be developed in accordance with approved water quality |
|  | Designated Use | Criteria Concentration/ Duration | Temporal Application |  |
|  | Migratory fish spawning and nursery | 7-day mean $\geq 6 \mathrm{mg} / 1$ (tidal habitats with 0-0.5 ppt salinity) | February 1 - May 31 |  |
|  |  | Instantaneous minimum $\geq 5$ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |  |  |
|  | Open water ${ }^{1}$ | 30 day mean $\geq 5.5 \mathrm{mg} / l$ (tidal habitats with $0-0.5 \mathrm{ppt}$ salinity) | year-round ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  |  | 30 day mean $\geq 5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ (tidal habitats with $>0.5 \mathrm{ppt}$ salinity) |  |  |
|  |  | 7 day mean $\geq 4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |  |  |



|  | PMKTF | 187 | 13\% | 468 | April 1 October 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PMKOH | - | - | - | - |
|  | YRKMH | 239 | 22\% | 598 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | YRKPH | 2,793 | 22\% | 6,982 | March 1 - <br> November 30 |
|  | MOBPH | 15,901 | 22\% | 33,990 | March 1 - <br> November 30 |
|  | JMSTF2 | 200 | 13\% | 500 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | JMSTF1 | 1000 | 13\% | 2500 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | APPTF | 379 | 13\% | 948 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | JMSOH | 15 | 13\% | 38 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | CHKOH | 535 | 13\% | 1,338 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | JMSMH | 200 | 22\% | 500 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | JMSPH | 300 | 22\% | 750 | March 1 - <br> November 30 |
|  | WBEMH | - | - | - | - |
|  | SBEMH | - | - | - | - |
|  | EBEMH | - | - | - | - |
|  | ELIPH | - | - | - | - |
|  | LYNPH | 107 | 22\% | 268 | March 1 - <br> November 30 |
|  | POCOH | - | - | - | - |
|  | POCMH | 4,066 | 22\% | 9,368 | April 1 October 31 |
|  | TANMH | 13,579 | 22\% | 22,064 | April 1 October 31 |

${ }^{1}$ The assessment period for SAV and water clarity acres shall be the single best year in the most recent three consecutive years. When three consecutive years of data are not available, a minimum of three years within the data assessment window.
${ }^{2}$ Percent Light through Water $=100 \mathrm{e}^{(- \text {- dz })}$ where $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{d}}$ is water column light attenuation coefficient and can be measured directly or converted from a measured secchi depth where $K_{d}=1.45 /$ secchi depth. $Z=$ depth at location of measurement of $K_{d}$.
C. Chlorophyll a.

| Designated Use | Chlorophyll a Narrative Criterion | Temporal <br> Application |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Open Water | Concentrations of chlorophyll a in free- <br> floating microscopic aquatic plants <br> (algae) shall not exceed levels that result <br> in undesirable or nuisance aquatic plant <br> life, or render tidal waters unsuitable for <br> the propagation and growth of a <br> balanced, indigenous population of <br> aquatic life or otherwise result in | March 1- <br> September 30 |


| e  <br>  con <br> low  <br> in  <br>  d <br>  or <br>  con | ecologically undesirable water quality conditions such as reduced water clarity, low dissolved oxygen, food supply imbalances, proliferation of species deemed potentially harmful to aquatic life or humans or aesthetically objectionable conditions. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *See 9VAC25-260-310 special standard bb for numerical chlorophyll criteria for the tidal James River. <br> D. Implementation. <br> 1. Chesapeake Bay program segmentation scheme as described in Chesapeake Bay Program, 2004 Chesapeake Bay Program Analytical Segmentation Scheme-Revisions, Decisions and Rationales: 1983-2003, CBP/TRS 268/04, EPA 903-R-04-008, Chesapeake Bay Program, Annapolis, Maryland, and the Chesapeake Bay Program published 2005 addendum (CBP/TRS 278-06; EPA 903-R-05-004) is listed below and shall be used as the spatial assessment unit to determine attainment of the criteria in this section for each designated use. |  |  |  |  |
| Chesapeake Bay Segment Description | Segment Name ${ }^{1}$ | Chesapeake Bay Segment Description | Segment Name ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| Lower Central Chesapeake Bay | CB5MH | Mobjack Bay | MOBPH |  |
| Western Lower Chesapeake Bay | CB6PH | Upper Tidal Fresh James River | JMSTF2 |  |
| Eastern Lower Chesapeake Bay | CB7PH | Lower Tidal Fresh James River | JMSTF1 |  |
| Mouth of the Chesapeake Bay | CB8PH | Appomattox River | APPTF |  |
| Upper Potomac River | POTTF | Middle James River | JMSOH |  |
| Middle Potomac River | POTOH | Chickahominy River | CHKOH |  |
| Lower Potomac River | POTMH | Lower James River | JMSMH |  |
| Upper Rappahannock River | RPPTF | Mouth of the James River | JMSPH |  |
| Middle Rapphannock River | RPPOH | Western Branch Elizabeth River | WBEMH |  |
| Lower Rapphannock River | RPPMH | Southern Branch Elizabeth River | SBEMH |  |
| Corrotoman River | CRRMH | Eastern Branch Elizabeth River | EBEMH |  |
| Piankatank River | PIAMH | Lafayette River | LAFMH |  |
| Upper Mattaponi River | MPNTF | Mouth of the Elizabeth River | ELIPH |  |
| Lower Mattaponi River | MPNOH | Lynnhaven River | LYNPH |  |
| Upper Pamunkey River | PMKTF | Middle Pocomoke River | POCOH |  |
| Lower Pamunkey River | PMKOH | Lower Pocomoke River | POCMH |  |
| Middle York River | YRKMH | Tangier Sound | TANMH |  |



In addition, the Documents Incorporated By Reference section of 9VAC25-260 is being amended to reflect the additional addenda that is being inserted into 9VAC25-260-185 D $3 .\{2007$ (CBP/TRS 288/07, EPA 903-R-07005), 2008 (CBP/TRS 290-08, EPA 903-R-08-001, and 2010 (CBP/TRS 301-10, EPA 903-R-10-002)).

These recently published protocols are being used by EPA to develop the Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Bay and its tidal rivers. TMDLs must be developed in accordance with approved water quality standards and it is necessary for the VA standards to refer to each of the addenda published by EPA.

## Alternatives

Please describe all viable alternatives to the proposed regulatory action that have been considered to meet the essential purpose of the action.

The primary alternative considered to date was to leave the regulation unchanged. This was not the alternative chosen because the updated assessment protocols were developed by EPA through a collaborative process within the Federal-Interstate Chesapeake Bay Program. These recently published protocols are being used by EPA to develop the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the Bay and its tidal rivers. TMDLs must be developed in accordance with approved water quality standards. Therefore it is necessary for the Virginia standards to refer to each of the addenda published by EPA.

## Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Please describe the agency's analysis of alternative regulatory methods, consistent with health, safety, environmental, and economic welfare, that will accomplish the objectives of applicable law while minimizing the adverse impact on small business. Alternative regulatory methods include, at a minimum: 1) the establishment of less stringent compliance or reporting requirements; 2) the establishment of less stringent schedules or deadlines for compliance or reporting requirements; 3) the consolidation or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements; 4) the establishment of performance standards for small businesses to replace design or operational standards required in the proposed regulation; and 5) the exemption of small businesses from all or any part of the requirements contained in the proposed regulation.

Analysis not performed as no small businesses are affected and assessment protocols do not have a direct effect on compliance or reporting schedules and/or requirements.

## Family impact

Please assess the impact of the emergency regulatory action on the institution of the family and family stability including to what extent the regulatory action will: 1) strengthen or erode the authority and rights of parents in the education, nurturing, and supervision of their children; 2) encourage or discourage economic self-sufficiency, self-pride, and the assumption of responsibility for oneself, one's spouse, and one's children and/or elderly parents; 3) strengthen or erode the marital commitment; and 4) increase or decrease disposable family income.

The development of water quality standards is for the protection of public health and safety, which has only an indirect impact on families.

