

**Comment Response Document
Regarding the Total Maximum Daily Load of Fecal Coliform for the Restricted Shellfish
Harvesting Area in the Lower Choptank River Mainstem in Dorchester and Talbot
Counties, Maryland**

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) has conducted a public comment period of the proposed Appendix E and revisions to the fecal coliform total maximum daily load (TMDL) for the Shellfish Harvesting Area in the Lower Choptank River Mainstem. The public comment period was conducted from January 19, 2018 to February 19, 2018. One set of comments was received and are presented below.

Below is a list of the commentors, their affiliations, the date comments were submitted, and the number referenced to the comments. In the pages that follow, comments are summarized along with MDE’s responses.

List of Commentors

Author	Affiliation	Date	Comment Number
Ms. Jillian Adair	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 3	Feb. 8, 2018	1-4

Comments and Responses

1. The commentor suggests editing the legend of Figure E-1. Currently, the dark red area is labeled “5-Impaired, TMDL Needed” and the light pink area is labeled “4a-Impaired, TMDL Complete”. These labels may be misleading as Appendix F states that the 2010 impairment listing is covered by the 2006 TMDL; therefore, no TMDL is needed. The commentor suggests referring to these two segments consistently throughout the appendix, such that the label “5-Impaired, TMDL Needed” may be revised to “5-Impaired, 2010 listing” and the label “4a-Impaired, TMDL Complete” may be revised to “4a-Impaired, 2008 TMDL segment”.

Response: The figure has been modified.

2. The commentor references page E1, 2nd paragraph: The report states “The watershed for the 2010 listing was fully defined within the drainage to the 2008 TMDL segment, watershed loads, water quality, and hydrodynamics of this reach were explicitly simulated in the HEM-3D model for the TMDL.” The commentor suggests replacing the comma after “2008 TMDL segment” with a semi-colon to denote the relatedness of the two phrases and to minimize uncertainty.

Response: The edit has been made.

FINAL

3. The commentor states three of the five wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) identified in the report (Cambridge WWTP, Trappe WWTP and Oxford WWTP) are located downstream of the 2006 TMDL area and do not influence the water quality of the 2006 TMDL area. Do these facilities influence the water quality of the 2010 listing area?

Response: The Cambridge WWTP, Trappe WWTP and Oxford WWTP are located downstream of the 2010 listing area and do not influence the water quality of the 2010 listing area.

4. The commentor references Section 4.6, page 21 of the main report quoting, “There is one point source facility (Easton WWTP, permit number 00DP0579A) that has a permit regulating the discharge of fecal coliform into the Lower Choptank River mainstem watershed. The permitted fecal coliform load from this point source is approximately 1.467×10^9 counts per day and will be included in the wasteload allocation (WLA).” This statement is inconsistent with the revisions made in the Point Source section. Please correct.

Response: The text has been corrected.

5. The commentor states although it appears that Preston WWTP and Easton WWTP are assigned individual WLAs as described in “Section 2.4, Point Source Assessment” and “Section 4.8”, the commentor suggests explicitly stating the individual WLAs assigned to the two facilities in Section 4.8.

Response: In these types of TMDLs, the WLA is assigned as an aggregate load. When permits are issued, the WLA is assigned to each facility. Please note the WLA is 2.45% of the TMDL and the reductions to meet water quality standards would come from the load allocation (nonpoint sources).