

May 20, 2004

Andrew Fisk
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
#17 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0017

SUBJECT: Notification of Approval of Pleasant (Mud) Pond TMDL

Dear Mr. Fisk:

Thank you for Maine's submittal of the Pleasant (Mud) Pond Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for total phosphorus. This waterbody is included on Maine's 2002 303(d) list and was moved up as a priority for TMDL development from past listings due to the high level of stakeholder interest in this particular lake. The purpose of the TMDL is to address algae blooms due to excessive nutrient loading from nonpoint source pollution.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) hereby approves Maine's May 10, 2004 Pleasant (Mud) Pond TMDL received by EPA on May 10, 2004 (electronically) and May 12, 2004 (signed hard copy). EPA has determined that this TMDL meets the requirements of §303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and of EPA's implementing regulations (40 CFR Part 130). Attached is a copy of our approval documentation.

Cobbossee Stream is also listed on Maine's 2002 303(d) list of impaired waters, due primarily to pollutants from Pleasant Pond. We concur that the TMDL for Pleasant Pond was developed with consideration of downstream water quality standards, and that the in-lake target set for Pleasant Pond is stringent enough to provide for the attainment of water quality standards in Cobbossee Stream as well as in Pleasant Pond. It is our understanding that, based on this TMDL approval for Pleasant Pond, ME DEP intends to propose an off-ramp from Maine's 303(d) list for both Pleasant Pond and Cobbossee Stream to category 4A in Maine's 2006 integrated 305(b)/303(d) list.

My staff and I look forward to continued cooperation with the ME DEP in exercising our shared responsibility of implementing the requirements under Section 303(d) of the CWA.

Sincerely,

Linda M. Murphy, Director
Office of Ecosystem Protection

cc (electronic):
David Courtemanch, ME DEP
David Halliwell, ME DEP

In-house distribution:

Jennie Bridge
Mel Cote
Ann Williams
Steve Silva

J:\data\FY04\JEB\TMDL\Pleasant(Mud) P\PleasantPappr.wpd

5/20/04

EPA NEW ENGLAND'S TMDL REVIEW

TMDL: **Pleasant (Mud) Pond**, Kennebec and Sagadahoc Counties, Maine
HUC: ME 0103000311; ME ID#5254 located in: Litchfield, Richmond,
Gardiner, ME
2002 303(d) list: Primary Contact; 2002-3 TMDL development.

STATUS: Final

IMPAIRMENT/POLLUTANT: Primary Contact / excessive nutrient loading from nonpoint source pollution. The TMDL is calculated for total phosphorus (TP).

BACKGROUND: The Maine Department of Environmental Protection (ME DEP) submitted electronically to EPA New England the final Pleasant (Mud) Pond TMDL for total phosphorus (TP) with a transmittal letter dated May 10, 2004; a revised hard copy document was received by EPA on May 12, 2004. All of EPA's April 6, 2004 comments (on the March 26, 2004 draft TMDL) were taken into account in the final submission.

REVIEWERS: Jennie Bridge (617-918-1685) E-mail: bridge.jennie@epa.gov

REVIEW ELEMENTS OF TMDLs

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and EPA's implementing regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 130 describe the statutory and regulatory requirements for approvable TMDLs. The following information is generally necessary for EPA to determine if a submitted TMDL fulfills the legal requirements for approval under Section 303(d) and EPA regulations, and should be included in the submittal package. Use of the verb "must" below denotes information that is required to be submitted because it relates to elements of the TMDL required by the CWA and by regulation.

(1) **Description of Waterbody, Pollutant of Concern, Pollutant Sources and Priority Ranking**

The TMDL analytical document must identify the waterbody as it appears on the State/Tribe's 303(d) list, the pollutant of concern and the priority ranking of the waterbody. The TMDL submittal must include a description of the point and nonpoint sources of the pollutant of concern, including the magnitude and location of the sources. Where it is possible to separate natural background from nonpoint sources, a description of the natural background must be provided, including the magnitude and location of the source(s). Such information is necessary for EPA's review of the load and wasteload allocations which are required by regulation. The TMDL submittal should also contain a description of any important assumptions made in developing the TMDL, such as: (1) the assumed distribution of land use in the watershed; (2) population characteristics, wildlife resources, and other relevant information affecting the characterization of the pollutant of concern and its allocation to sources; (3) present and future growth trends, if taken into consideration in preparing the TMDL; and, (4) explanation and analytical basis for expressing the TMDL through surrogate measures, if applicable. Surrogate measures are parameters such as percent fines and turbidity for sediment impairments, or chlorophyll a and phosphorus loadings for excess algae.

The Pleasant (Mud) Pond TMDL describes the waterbodies and the cause of impairment as identified in the 2002 303(d) list for both Pleasant Pond and for Cobbossee Stream, the outlet for the Pond (see page 9 TMDL report). The document describes the pollutant of concern, total phosphorus, and identifies the location (by tributary subwatershed) and magnitude of phosphorus sources from atmospheric deposition (4%) and from 23 subcategories of land use within the watershed which include: agriculture and forested land, shoreline development, non-shoreline development, and non-developed (see Table 4 page 30, TMDL report). Information on population and growth characteristics is provided (page 10 TMDL report). Internal sediment recycling is evaluated (page 33 TMDL report). Pleasant Pond is determined to be the primary source of pollutant causing impairment of Cobbossee Stream (page 29 TMDL report).

ME DEP explained that it was not possible to separate natural background from nonpoint sources (page 28 TMDL report). In this case, not separating natural background is reasonable because of the limited and general nature of the information available (land use categories) related to potential phosphorus sources. Without more detailed site-specific information on nonpoint source loading, it would be very difficult to separate natural background from the total nonpoint source load, and attempting to do so would add little value to the analysis.

ME DEP provides an explanation and analytical basis for expressing the TMDL for nuisance algae blooms through surrogate measures using Secchi disk transparency (SDT), phosphorus loadings, and chlorophyll a (pages 28, 32-34 TMDL report). (See also section 2 below which documents ME's water quality standards.)

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that the ME DEP has done an adequate job of characterizing sources of impairment. Furthermore, EPA confirms that Cobbossee Stream, the outlet for Pleasant Pond, is also listed as an impaired waterbody, and was considered in the development of the TMDL for Pleasant Pond. A 1.5 mile segment of Cobbossee Stream is listed in the 2002 303(d) list for impairment of aquatic life criteria and nutrients, due to a "eutrophic lake source", and "habitat".

2. Description of the Applicable Water Quality Standards and Numeric Water Quality Target

The TMDL submittal must include a description of the applicable State/Tribe water quality standard, including the designated use(s) of the waterbody, the applicable numeric or narrative water quality criterion, and the antidegradation policy. Such information is necessary for EPA's review of the load and wasteload allocations which are required by regulation. A numeric water quality target for the TMDL (a quantitative value used to measure whether or not the applicable water quality standard is attained) must be identified. If the TMDL is based on a target other than a numeric water quality criterion, then a numeric expression, usually site specific, must be developed from a narrative criterion and a description of the process used to derive the target must be included in the submittal.

Pleasant Pond TMDL describes the applicable narrative water quality standards (see pages 28-29 TMDL report). The report defines applicable narrative criteria, designated uses, and antidegradation policy (page 29).

ME DEP identifies a numeric water quality target for the TMDL of **15 ppb** total phosphorus (TP) (727 kg TP/yr) which ME DEP predicts will result in the attainment of water quality standards (page 29 TMDL report). The numeric target was selected using best professional judgment based on available water quality data (average epilimnion grab/core samples) corresponding to non-bloom conditions, as reflected in measures of both Secchi disk transparency (>2.0 meters) and chlorophyll-a (<8.0 ppb) levels in lightly colored water (ave. 29 SPU) (page 29 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that ME DEP has properly presented its water quality standards and has made a reasonable interpretation of the narrative water quality criteria in the standards when setting the numeric water quality target.

Furthermore, EPA concurs that the target loading or TMDL set for the pond is designed to protect downstream uses, including impaired Cobbossee Stream, as well as in-pond water quality because:

- (1) Impairment to Cobbossee Stream is due primarily to pollutants from Pleasant Pond.
- (2) ME DEP took into consideration the water quality standards of downstream waters when setting the TMDL for Pleasant Pond.
- (3) The in-lake target set for Pleasant Pond is conservative or stringent enough to provide for the attainment and maintenance of the water quality standards in Cobbossee Stream as well as in Pleasant Pond.

3. Loading Capacity - Linking Water Quality and Pollutant Sources

As described in EPA guidance, a TMDL identifies the loading capacity of a waterbody for a particular pollutant. EPA regulations define loading capacity as the greatest amount of loading that a water can receive without violating water quality standards (40 C.F.R. § 130.2(f)). The loadings are required to be expressed as either mass-per-time, toxicity or other appropriate measure (40 C.F.R. § 130.2(i)). The TMDL submittal must identify the waterbody's loading capacity for the applicable pollutant and describe the rationale for the method used to establish

the cause-and-effect relationship between the numeric target and the identified pollutant sources. In most instances, this method will be a water quality model. Supporting documentation for the TMDL analysis must also be contained in the submittal, including the basis for assumptions, strengths and weaknesses in the analytical process, results from water quality modeling, etc. Such information is necessary for EPA's review of the load and wasteload allocations which are required by regulation.

In many circumstances, a critical condition must be described and related to physical conditions in the waterbody as part of the analysis of loading capacity (40 C.F.R. § 130.7(c)(1)). The critical condition can be thought of as the "worst case" scenario of environmental conditions in the waterbody in which the loading expressed in the TMDL for the pollutant of concern will continue to meet water quality standards. Critical conditions are the combination of environmental factors (e.g., flow, temperature, etc.) that results in attaining and maintaining the water quality criterion and has an acceptably low frequency of occurrence. Critical conditions are important because they describe the factors that combine to cause a violation of water quality standards and will help in identifying the actions that may have to be undertaken to meet water quality standards.

The loading capacity for Pleasant Pond is set at **727 kg TP/yr** (see page 32 TMDL report). The loading capacity is set to protect water quality and support uses during critical conditions which occur during the summer season when environmental conditions (e.g., higher temperatures, increased light intensity, etc.) are most favorable for aquatic plant growth (page 34 TMDL report).

ME DEP links water quality to phosphorus loading by:

- (1) picking a target in-lake phosphorus level, based on historic state-wide and in-lake water quality data,
- (2) using an empirical phosphorus retention model, calibrated to in-lake phosphorus concentration data, to determine the pollutant loading corresponding to the desired water quality in the lake, and
- (3) comparing the loading target to existing phosphorus loadings estimated by applying phosphorus export coefficients to land area with specified land uses (see Table 4 page 30 TMDL report).

These analytical methods are widely recognized as appropriate for lake TMDL development.

ME DEP explains that selected phosphorus loading coefficients in Table 4 (primarily for roads and non-shoreline residential use) "were reduced (from total P values) to account for the estimated bioavailability of the soil runoff sources according to available literature." (page 31 TMDL report).

ME DEP explains the justification for expressing the loading capacity as an annual load, as opposed to a daily load, lies in the lake basins moderately low flushing rate of 5.6 flushes per year (pages 32 TMDL report). Although this flushing rate is more than four times the average for Maine lakes, Maine lake biologists use >6 flushes/year as the cut-off for distinguishing lakes versus rivers in the evaluation of total phosphorus loadings in aquatic environments in Maine (see section on seasonal variation page 35 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that the loading capacity has been appropriately set at a level necessary to attain and maintain applicable water quality standards. The TMDL is

based on a reasonable and widely accepted approach for establishing the relationship between pollutant loading and water quality in lakes.

EPA New England also concurs with expressing the TMDL as an annual loading based on the reason provided by ME DEP (relatively long average hydraulic residence time).

4. Load Allocations (LAs)

EPA regulations require that a TMDL include LAs, which identify the portion of the loading capacity allocated to existing and future nonpoint sources and to natural background (40 C.F.R. § 130.2(g)). Load allocations may range from reasonably accurate estimates to gross allotments (40 C.F.R. § 130.2(g)). Where it is possible to separate natural background from nonpoint sources, load allocations should be described separately for background and for nonpoint sources.

If the TMDL concludes that there are no nonpoint sources and/or natural background, or the TMDL recommends a zero load allocation, the LA must be expressed as zero. If the TMDL recommends a zero LA after considering all pollutant sources, there must be a discussion of the reasoning behind this decision, since a zero LA implies an allocation only to point sources will result in attainment of the applicable water quality standard, and all nonpoint and background sources will be removed.

ME DEP calculates that the total load of phosphorus contribution to Pleasant Pond must be limited to **727 kg TP/yr** in order to achieve the in-lake target goal of 15 ppb TP. The TMDL allocates all of this loading capacity as a gross allotment to existing and future nonpoint sources and to natural background (page 34 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that the load allocation is adequately specified in the TMDL at a level necessary to attain and maintain water quality standards. The degree of load reductions necessary to achieve the in-lake phosphorus level is based in part on an estimate of current loadings.

5. Wasteload Allocations (WLAs)

EPA regulations require that a TMDL include WLAs, which identify the portion of the loading capacity allocated to existing and future point sources (40 C.F.R. § 130.2(h)). If no point sources are present or if the TMDL recommends a zero WLA for point sources, the WLA must be expressed as zero. If the TMDL recommends a zero WLA after considering all pollutant sources, there must be a discussion of the reasoning behind this decision, since a zero WLA implies an allocation only to nonpoint sources and background will result in attainment of the applicable water quality standard, and all point sources will be removed.

In preparing the wasteload allocations, it is not necessary that each individual point source be assigned a portion of the allocation of pollutant loading capacity. When the source is a minor discharger of the pollutant of concern or if the source is contained within an aggregated general permit, an aggregated WLA can be assigned to the group of facilities. But it is necessary to

allocate the loading capacity among individual point sources as necessary to meet the water quality standard.

The TMDL submittal should also discuss whether a point source is given a less stringent wasteload allocation based on an assumption that nonpoint source load reductions will occur. In such cases, the State/Tribe will need to demonstrate reasonable assurance that the nonpoint source reductions will occur within a reasonable time.

Pleasant Pond is a Class GPA water in Maine. According to Maine statute, “There may be no new direct discharge of pollutants into Class GPA waters.” [38 MRSA 465-A (1) (c)] ME DEP explains that, as there are no known existing point sources of pollution (including regulated stormwater sources) in the watershed, the waste load allocation for all existing and future point sources is set at 0 (zero) kg/year of total phosphorus (page 34 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concurs that the WLA component of the TMDL is appropriately set equal to zero based on ME DEP’s determination that there are no existing point source discharges subject to NPDES permit requirements in the watershed.

6. Margin of Safety (MOS)

The statute and regulations require that a TMDL include a margin of safety to account for any lack of knowledge concerning the relationship between load and wasteload allocations and water quality (CWA § 303(d)(1)(C), 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(c)(1)). EPA guidance explains that the MOS may be implicit, i.e., incorporated into the TMDL through conservative assumptions in the analysis, or explicit, i.e., expressed in the TMDL as loadings set aside for the MOS. If the MOS is implicit, the conservative assumptions in the analysis that account for the MOS must be described. If the MOS is explicit, the loading set aside for the MOS must be identified.

The Pleasant Pond TMDL includes an implicit margin of safety (MOS) through the relatively conservative selection of the numeric water quality target of 15 ppb as well as the selection of relatively conservative phosphorus export loading coefficients for cultural pollution sources. Based on both Pleasant Pond historical records and ME DEP’s analysis of a state-wide limnological database for lightly colored lakes (>26 SPU), ME DEP believes that a target of 15 ug/l is a fairly conservative goal because “nuisance algae blooms (plankton growth of algae which causes Secchi disk transparency to be less than 2 meters) are more likely to occur at 17 ppb or above.” The difference between the in-lake target of 15 ppb and 17 ppb represents a 12% implicit margin of safety for Pleasant Pond. ME DEP also mentions an additional unquantified margin of safety for attainment of state water quality goals is provided by the inherently conservative methods used to estimate future growth. (See page 32 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that adequate MOS (roughly 12%) is provided for the following reasons: (1) EPA believes a significant implicit MOS is provided in the selection of an in-lake TP concentration of 15 ppb based on a state-wide data base for naturally colored lakes, and (2) the adequacy of this MOS is supported by in-lake data for lightly colored lakes.

7. Seasonal Variation

The statute and regulations require that a TMDL be established with consideration of seasonal variations. The method chosen for including seasonal variations in the TMDL must be described (CWA § 303(d)(1)(C), 40 C.F.R. § 130.7(c)(1)).

Pleasant Pond TMDL considered seasonal variations because the allowable annual load was developed to be protective of the most sensitive time of year - during the summer, when conditions most favor the growth of algae and aquatic macrophytes (see page 35 TMDL report). The TMDL is protective of all seasons, given the pond's flushing rate of 5.6 flushes per year, and the fact that BMPs implemented (implemented and proposed) have been designed to address TP loading during all seasons.

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that seasonal variation has been adequately accounted for in the TMDL because the TMDL was developed to be protective of the most environmentally sensitive period, the summer season. In addition, phosphorus controls are expected to be in place through the year so that these controls will reduce pollution whenever sources are active.

8. Monitoring Plan for TMDLs Developed Under the Phased Approach

EPA's 1991 document, Guidance for Water Quality-Based Decisions: The TMDL Process (EPA 440/4-91-001), recommends a monitoring plan when a TMDL is developed under the phased approach. The guidance recommends that a TMDL developed under the phased approach also should provide assurances that nonpoint source controls will achieve expected load reductions. The phased approach is appropriate when a TMDL involves both point and nonpoint sources and the point source is given a less stringent wasteload allocation based on an assumption that nonpoint source load reductions will occur. EPA's guidance provides that a TMDL developed under the phased approach should include a monitoring plan that describes the additional data to be collected to determine if the load reductions required by the TMDL lead to attainment of water quality standards.

The Pleasant Pond TMDL describes the history of volunteer monitoring (since 1976, CWD and VLMP), and describes the continued cooperative long-term water quality monitoring to be conducted monthly from May to October through the routine efforts of the Cobbossee Watershed District (CWD). ME DEP anticipates sufficient data will be acquired to adequately track seasonal and inter-annual variation and long term trends in water quality in Pleasant Pond (see page 24 TMDL report).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that the ongoing monitoring by the CWD and VLMP in cooperation with ME DEP is sufficient to evaluate the adequacy of the TMDL.

9. Implementation Plans

On August 8, 1997, Bob Perciasepe (EPA Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water) issued a memorandum, "New Policies for Establishing and Implementing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)," that directs Regions to work in partnership with States/Tribes to achieve nonpoint source load allocations established for 303(d)-listed waters impaired solely or primarily by nonpoint sources. To this end, the memorandum asks that Regions assist States/Tribes in

developing implementation plans that include reasonable assurances that the nonpoint source load allocations established in TMDLs for waters impaired solely or primarily by nonpoint sources will in fact be achieved. The memorandum also includes a discussion of renewed focus on the public participation process and recognition of other relevant watershed management processes used in the TMDL process. Although implementation plans are not approved by EPA, they help establish the basis for EPA's approval of TMDLs.

The Pleasant Pond TMDL describes recent and current NPS/BMP efforts in the watershed (some funded through CWA §314 lakes, and §319 nonpoint source program), and provides recommendations for future work (pages 19-25 TMDL report). Specific recommendations for six action items address the following sources of pollution: landowners (residential and commercial), shoreline residential, shoreline septic systems, roadways, agriculture, agriculture, and forestry. The issue of in-lake nutrient inactivation (alum treatment) is also addressed (page 24 TMDL report).

Assessment: Addressed, though not required. EPA New England thinks that ME DEP has done an admirable job in targeting BMPs to achieve the TMDL

10. Reasonable Assurances

EPA guidance calls for reasonable assurances when TMDLs are developed for waters impaired by both point and nonpoint sources. In a water impaired by both point and nonpoint sources, where a point source is given a less stringent wasteload allocation based on an assumption that nonpoint source load reductions will occur, reasonable assurance that the nonpoint source reductions will happen must be explained in order for the TMDL to be approvable. This information is necessary for EPA to determine that the load and wasteload allocations will achieve water quality standards.

In a water impaired solely by nonpoint sources, reasonable assurances that load reductions will be achieved are not required in order for a TMDL to be approvable. However, for such nonpoint source-only waters, States/Tribes are strongly encouraged to provide reasonable assurances regarding achievement of load allocations in the implementation plans described in section 9, above. As described in the August 8, 1997 Perciasepe memorandum, such reasonable assurances should be included in State/Tribe implementation plans and "may be non-regulatory, regulatory, or incentive-based, consistent with applicable laws and programs."

ME DEP addresses reasonable assurances that load reduction will occur by providing information on past and current surveys and work in the watershed and upstream lakes, which point to a long-term local commitment to improving water quality in Pleasant Pond. CWD has worked diligently since early to mid-1970s, and now partner with the recently formed Four Towns Watershed Association to assess and correct NPS pollution problems in the Pleasant Pond watershed. ME DEP commends the Towns of Litchfield, Richmond, and the City of Gardiner for their continued support of and cooperation with CWD in the pursuit of regional lake protection and improvement. (page 24 TMDL report).

Assessment: Addressed, though not required.

11. Public Participation

EPA policy is that there must be full and meaningful public participation in the TMDL development process. Each State/Tribe must, therefore, provide for public participation consistent with its own continuing planning process and public participation requirements (40 C.F.R. § 130.7(c)(1)(ii)). In guidance, EPA has explained that final TMDLs submitted to EPA for review and approval must describe the State/Tribe's public participation process, including a summary of significant comments and the State/Tribe's responses to those comments. When EPA establishes a TMDL, EPA regulations require EPA to publish a notice seeking public comment (40 C.F.R. § 130.7(d)(2)).

Inadequate public participation could be a basis for disapproving a TMDL; however, where EPA determines that a State/Tribe has not provided adequate public participation, EPA may defer its approval action until adequate public participation has been provided for, either by the State/Tribe or by EPA.

The public participation process for Pleasant Pond TMDL is described preliminarily on page 35 of the report. ME DEP issued public notice of the TMDL availability on March 26, 2004 via local newspapers, and on ME DEP's Internet web site, following a preliminary review by 16 interested individuals representing the stakeholder group of various agencies and organizations (March 4-18, 2004). CWD also participated in several local education/outreach meetings from 2001 – 2003. The public comment period deadline was April 23, 2004. ME DEP fully addressed the only comments received (from EPA).

Assessment: EPA New England concludes that ME DEP has done an adequate job of involving the public during the development of the TMDL, provided adequate opportunities for the public to comment on the TMDL, and provided reasonable responses to the public comments.

Data for entry in EPA's National TMDL Tracking System

TMDL Name	Pleasant (Mud) Pond
Lead State	Maine (ME)
TMDL Status	Final
Pollutant ID	515 (total phosphorus)
TMDL End Point	15 ppb TP
TMDL Type	Nonpoint Source
List ID (from system)	
Impairment ID	Primary Contact: excessive nutrient loading from nonpoint sources. (Use same as East Pond ID # 2469)
Cycle (list date)	2002
Establishment Date (approval)	May 20, 2004
EPA Developed	No