

Report Revision Issues for Discussion at the July 9, 2009 INC Public Teleconference

May Action Item Gaps

	Who identified	Issue/Action item	
1)	Russ	Beth was going to send Arvin and me some info on Published CMAQ runs -	Russ -- will call Beth
2)		Mellilo comment: P31, L32 – would it be possible to add a column to indicate primary sources of this information - Beth will provide information	
3)		McIsaac comment Page 69, Figure 14: I think it is dangerous to presume a trend from two data points (the 1985 and 2005 maps). I have looked at the full series of maps available on the web, and I agree that there probably is a real trend, but I think it would be better to present and analyze the annual time series, as was done for nitrate. Action item: Beth will Insert table showing time series and include contemporary figure showing spatial pattern, provide to Arvin and Russ	

DFO concerns about clarity, communication, and logic with June 22, 2009 INC draft report

1)	p. 96	Finding and recommendation 14 seem to be in the wrong place -- they relate to water programs broadly, not section 2.4.3.4	AN: Suggestion, move it before section 2.4.3.3 -- it seems out of place in 2.4.3.4 Paul Stacey: Please respond
2)	p.97-98	<p>Recommendation 98 not clear and potentially problematic</p> <p>Finding 1 Meeting Nr management goals for estuaries, when a balance should be struck between economic, societal and environmental needs, under current federal law seems unlikely. Enforceable authorities over nonpoint source, stormwater, air (in terms of critical loads), and land use are not adequate to support necessary Nr controls. Funding programs are presently inadequate to meet existing pollution control needs. Furthermore, new technologies and management approaches are required to meet ambitious Nr control needs aimed at restoring national water quality.</p> <p>Recommendation 15. INC recommends that EPA reevaluate water quality management approaches to ensure Nr management goals are attainable, enforceable, and affordable and that monitoring and research are adequate to problem definition and resolution, particularly</p>	<p>AN: Language on page 97, lines 4-5 indicates that targets exceed nitrogen goals. Finding and recommendation 15 either are very general or seem to call for reductions in current targets. Is that what the INC wants?</p> <p>Paul Stacey: Please respond</p>

		in the development of nitrogen removal technologies. This may require changes in the way EPA sets water quality criteria and some compromises in ecosystem goals to accommodate human uses of the air, land and water.	
3)	p. 98	Major point of text box 3 not clear	AN: what is the take away message about how well TMDLs work? It shows how a TMDL is being used in a place, but so what"? Paul Stacey: Please respond
4)	p. 99	Finding and recommendation 16 relates to monitoring generally, not water quality monitoring in particular and is not supported by text in 2.4.3.6. Suggestion: move it to section on monitoring more generally	AN: Suggestion -- a new section on monitoring generally could be created (i.e., 2.4.4 b used to flesh out Overarching recommendation C Paul Stacey and INC: Please respond
5)	p. 151	No discussion of rationale for target recommendation 4 -- how was target set?	Paul: Please respond