

**Public Hearing for Proposed Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes  
and Reservoirs**

**Thursday, February 8, 2018 4:00 – 6:00 pm Central Time**

**Public Hearing Transcript**

**Gemma Kite:** Hello and welcome to today's virtual public hearing titled "Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule." This public hearing is sponsored by EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The purpose of today's webinar is for EPA to provide background on the rulemaking and then for interested parties to provide oral comments on the proposed rule. I am Gemma Kite of the Horsley Witten Group, contractor to EPA and I will be moderating today's hearing. Thank you for joining us.

Let's start by going over a few housekeeping items. We are now on slide two of the presentation. If you hear an echo from your computer speakers please close all browser windows except for the webcast presentation. Alternatively you can press the speaker icon in the lower left-hand corner of your screen. When the speaker button turns red you have muted your computer's audio. If you are experiencing technical difficulties you can type your issue into the white box at the bottom of your screen and click the "Ask" button. The responses from the tech team will appear below the white box. Since the response area is small, you may not see all of the questions or answers. Use the scrollbar on the right side of your screen to scroll up and down to see additional text. If you cannot see the white box at the bottom of your screen, change your screen resolution by clicking on tools in your web browser and selecting "Zoom out". If you like to make an oral comment we would provide a call in number in just a few minutes. You will need to use a phone to call in and provide your oral comment. Once you call into the phone line, please mute your computer speakers. Directions on how to make an oral comment it will be provided after the speakers have introduced the proposed rule.

Today's presentation is available to download in the "Downloads" tab. To view the presentation, each viewer must click on the blue "Downloads" tab on top of your screen. Scroll down to the item titled "Presentation Slides" and click the hyperlink to initiate the download. To return from the "Downloads" tab back to the presentation slide click on the "Slides" tab at the top of your screen.

Today's hearing will be recorded and transcribed and all oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. As such when developing the official response to public comment and finalizing the rule, the oral comments provided today will become part of the official record along with the written public comments submitted via the docket on this rulemaking. If you provide an oral comment during today's virtual hearing you do not have to submit the same comment in writing in order for to be included in the official record. If you are interested in making a written comment, directions will be provided during this hearing. EPA will

not respond to comments today, however EPA will respond to comments received at this hearing along with all comments received during the comment period in EPA's response to comments document. EPA will also not be responding to questions today. Today's presentation for the virtual public hearing has been reviewed by EPA staff for technical accuracy. However, the views of those making an oral comment and their organization and any supporting visual aids provided by commenters are their own and do not necessarily reflect those of EPA. Mention of commercial enterprises, products or publication does not mean that EPA endorses them.

Now that we have completed the discussion and housekeeping items let's start today's virtual public hearing. We are now on slide three of the presentation. The Environmental Protection Agency is proposing to establish federal nutrient criteria to protect designated uses for the state of Missouri's lakes and reservoirs. On August 16, 2011 EPA disapproved most numeric criteria for total nitrogen, total phosphorus, and chlorophyll-a submitted by the state in 2009. Therefore, under the terms of the December 1, 2016 consent decree, EPA proposes to establish federal nutrient criteria to address the 2011 disapproval. This federal rulemaking will proceed unless Missouri submits criteria to address EPA's 2011 disapproval and EPA approves those criteria as meeting Clean Water Act requirements. In that case, EPA will not proceed with final rulemaking or will withdraw its final rule, if applicable. In developing these proposed federal nutrient criteria EPA has taken into account available science, legal requirements and EPA policies and guidance. Public comments on the proposed rule must be received on or before February 26, 2018.

We are now on slide four of the presentation. EPA is offering this virtual public hearing so that interested parties may provide oral comments on EPA's proposed rule. Following a brief presentation from EPA, the Agency will accept oral comments that will be limited to three minutes per commenter so each commenter has an opportunity to present his or her views. During this brief presentation from EPA we will hear from our speaker Mario Sengco. Mario is a physical scientist from EPA headquarters and is the rule manager for this rule. Ann Lavaty is a Water Quality Standards Coordinator from EPA Region 7 and she is one of the rule managers and contacts for this rule. Two other EPA staff will also provide support during today's live hearing. Danielle Anderson is the Regional Branch Team Leader with the Water Quality Standards Program at EPA headquarters and Jeffery Robichaud is the Director of the Water, Wetlands, and Pesticides division in EPA Region 7. And with that we will begin the presentation by EPA. I will now turn it over to Mario to provide a brief overview of the proposed rule.

**Mario Sengco:** Thank you Gemma. This is Mario Sengco at US EPA headquarters. I am now on slide five. On December 15, 2017, the EPA Administrator signed a proposed rule that would establish federal Clean Water Act or CWA criteria for nutrients to protect designated uses for Missouri's lakes and reservoirs consistent with the terms of a 2016 consent decree.

Moving on to slide six. First let me give you some background information to provide context for

this proposed rulemaking. Under the EPA's regulation at 40 CFR part 131.11(a)(1), "states and authorized tribes shall adopt those water quality criteria that protect the designated use as described under the Clean Water Act section 101(a)(2) and that such criteria must be based on sound scientific rationale and must contain sufficient parameters or constituents to protect the designated use." For waters with multiple use designations the criteria shall support the most sensitive use.

Moving on to slide seven. In 2009, Missouri submitted to the EPA for review and approval numeric criteria for total nitrogen or TN, total phosphorus, TP, and chlorophyll-a for the State's lakes and reservoirs. EPA concluded that Missouri had failed to demonstrate the criteria would protect the State's designated uses and who are not based on sound science consistent with Clean Water Act statutory EPA regulatory requirements and disapproved most of Missouri's criteria on August 16, 2011. The Clean Water Act directs the EPA to promptly propose water quality standards that meet Clean Water Act requirements if a state does not adopt standards addressing an EPA disapproval.

Slide eight. On February 24, 2016, the Missouri Coalition for the Environment or MCE sued EPA for failure to perform mandatory duty under the Clean Water Act to propose and promulgate criteria to address the EPA's 2011 disapproval. On December 1, 2016, the EPA entered a consent decree with MCE that committed EPA to sign a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking by December 15, 2017 to address EPA's 2011 disapproval unless the State submits and EPA approves nutrient criteria that address the disapproval on or before December 15, 2017. At the time of this proposal was signed on December 15, 2017, Missouri had not adopted and submitted its rule for the EPA's Clean Water Act 303(C) review.

Slide nine. Under the current consent decree, the EPA is required to sign a final rule by December 15, 2018 unless the State adopts and the EPA approves the water quality criteria addressing the EPA's 2011 disapproval. If this occurs, the EPA would not proceed with the final rulemaking for those waters and/or pollutants for which the EPA approves Missouri's new or revised criteria. If the EPA finalizes this proposed rule and Missouri subsequently adopts and submits new or revised criteria that the EPA find meets Clean Water Act requirements, the EPA would expeditiously undertake a rulemaking to withdraw the federal criteria such that Missouri's criteria would be effective for Clean Water Act purposes.

I am now at slide 10. So let me tell you about EPA's perspective on nutrient criteria. The EPA has long recommended that states adopt numeric criteria for total nitrogen and total phosphorus, the nutrients that in excess can ultimately cause adverse effects on designated uses. For this reason, TN and TP are often referred to as causal parameters. Additionally, the EPA also recommends response parameters as well such as chlorophyll-a and turbidity. However, the EPA recognizes that the specific levels of TN and TP that adversely affect designated uses may vary from water body to water body depending on many factors including geomorphology and

hydrology among others. As a result, EPA has worked with several states as they develop a combined criterion approach that allows the states to further consider whether a water body is meeting designated uses when elevated TN and TP levels are detected. Under this approach, an exceedance of a causal variable acts as a trigger to consider additional physical, chemical and biological parameters that serve as indicators to determine protection or impairment of designated uses. These additional parameters are collectively termed response parameters.

Slide 11. Now let me tell you about the scope of EPA's proposed rule. The EPA included two alternatives for establishing federal water quality criteria for nutrients in its proposal for public comment. Under the first alternative the EPA proposes a set of nutrient protection values and eutrophication impact factors in a combined criterion approach. This alternative mimics Missouri's proposal. Under the second alternative, EPA proposes a similar combined criterion approach that would mirror the state of Missouri's October 2017 proposal for lake nutrient water quality standards that includes standalone chlorophyll-a criteria, screening values and eutrophication impacts.

Slide 12. Alternative one is comprised of nutrient protection values that are defined as maximum ambient concentrations of TP, TN, and chlorophyll-a based on the three year rolling average geometric mean of nutrient data collected April through September. Alternative one includes five eutrophication impacts that operate in coordination with the nutrient protection values to determine impairment. These five eutrophication impacts are: number one, eutrophication related mortality or morbidity events for fish and other aquatic organisms; two, an excursion from the dissolved oxygen or DO or pH criteria in Missouri's water quality standards applicable for Clean Water Act purposes; three, cyanobacteria count equal to or greater than 1,000 cells per milliliter; four, observed shifts in aquatic diversity directly attributable to eutrophication; or five, excessive levels of mineral turbidity that consistently limit algal productivity during this period May 1 to September 30, or Secchi disk measurements of turbidity equal to or less than EPA's recommended level three ecoregion nine or 1.53 meters, or ecoregion eleven, 2.86 meters.

Slide 13. Under alternative one, uses nutrient protection values for TN, TP and chlorophyll-a derived using a reference condition approach built on earlier collaborative efforts among the four states of EPA Region 7, for the Plains ecoregion and a combined Ozarks ecoregion. The nutrient protection values for chlorophyll-a function as standalone criteria independent from the TN and TP nutrient protection values and other eutrophication impact factors. Under alternative one, lakes and reservoirs water quality must not exceed protection values for TN or TP unless each of the eutrophication impacts are evaluated and data demonstrate that none occur within the same three year rolling average period as a TN or TP exceedance. EPA included this presumption to address potential for data gaps for eutrophication impacts. As such, when TN and TP levels are exceeded, the designated uses would be considered impaired unless sufficient information exists demonstrating no eutrophication impacts are occurring.

Moving on to slide 14. Alternative two includes chlorophyll-a criteria for three ecoregions, the Plains, Ozark Border, and Ozark Highland, that determine impairment independent of screening values and eutrophication impacts. Alternative two also includes screening values for TN, TP and chlorophyll-a at the lower value than the chlorophyll-a criteria, based on the three year rolling average geometric mean of nutrient data collected April through September. Alternative two also includes five eutrophication impacts that operate in coordination with the screening values to determine impairment. These five eutrophication impacts are: one, occurrence of eutrophication related mortality or morbidity events for fish and other aquatic organisms; two, epilimnetic excursions from dissolved oxygen or pH criteria; three, cyanobacteria counts in excess of 100,000 cells per milliliter; four, observed shifts in aquatic diversity attributed to eutrophication; and five, excessive levels of mineral turbidity that consistently limit algal productivity during the period May 1 to September 30.

Slide 15. Under alternative two, a lake with water quality that exceeds the TN, TP, or chlorophyll-a screening values at a screening level is deemed impaired for excess nutrients only if one or more of the eutrophication impacts are documented to occur within the same year. Exceeding screening values for TN, TP or chlorophyll-a at a screening level would not be considered to be impaired unless and until additional information for the eutrophication impacts is collected and evaluated to confirm the impairment.

Moving on to slide 16. Both alternatives would apply to all lakes and reservoirs that A) are listed in Table G and the Missouri Use Designation Dataset in Missouri's Water Quality Standards, B) equal or exceed 10 acres, C) are located outside the Big River Flood Plain ecoregion and D) are not listed in Table M of Missouri's Water Quality Standards. The EPA is also taking public comment on whether the scope is appropriate for the current rule.

Slide 17. The EPA is providing a 60-day public comment period that ends on February 26, 2018. Written comments must be received in the docket on or before this date. Please submit your comment identified by docket ID number EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0010 at <http://www.regulations.gov>. To access the proposed rule supporting documents into more details on how to make written comments, visit EPA's water quality standards website at the following link. I will pause here for 10 seconds to allow you to note this information.

And with that we look forward to receiving your comments. I turn it back over to you Gemma.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you, Mario for providing an overview of the proposed rule. If listeners would like to contact our speakers following today's presentation, the contact information is on this slide. I will pause here for a few moments to allow time to record this contact information.

In a moment we will provide instructions for making an oral come in today by using your telephone but first we will provide instructions for submitting written comments in one of the following ways. You can submit a written comment through the website [regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), e-mail

your written comments, mail your comment or submit a written comment via hand delivery. The information for submitting a written comment through these mechanisms is explained in more detail on this slide. In addition, you can also obtain this information if you navigate to the "Downloads" tab in this webinar. Find the document titled "Comment Submittal Instructions" and download it as needed. Remember when submitting a written comment please make sure to reference the docket ID number EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0010. I will pause here for a few moments to allow time to record this information.

We will now open the hearing for interested parties to make an oral comment. Oral comments will be taken by telephone only. Before calling please be sure to mute your computer speakers to avoid an echo. Do not worry about losing the public hearing audio when you mute your computer or audio speakers. All call-in participants will still be able to hear the audio portion through the conference phone line. Remember EPA will not respond to comments today. However, EPA will respond to comments received at this hearing along with all comments received during the comment period in EPA response to comments document. In addition, EPA will not be answering any questions during the hearing today.

Now for the call in information. If you would like to make an oral comment please dial 877-407-4035 on your telephone keypad and enter the following passcode, 13675267. Once you have joined the conference press \*1 to be placed in the queue to speak. Participants will be prompted to record their name and affiliation. Please speak clearly as this audio will be used in the public record along with your comments. If you missed the call-in details, the phone number and passcode will be provided on multiple slides throughout the virtual public hearing. Each commenter will be announced before providing an oral comment. Each commenter will have a maximum of three minutes to make an oral comment. A timer will appear on the screen indicating approximately how much time each caller has left. Commenters are responsible for watching their own time. At the three minute mark, the slide will read time is up in the phone line will automatically be disconnected. After you have made your comments, please hang up the phone and unmute your computer speakers to listen to the rest of the hearing.

If there are a number of callers wishing to make a public comment, your call may be placed in a queue to speak. Again once you have joined the conference press \*1 to be placed in queue to speak. Please wait patiently as others provide their oral comments. When it is your time to make an oral comment, your name will be announced in your phone line will be opened. At this point, your three minute time will start. If you provide one oral comment and would like to provide a second comment, you may do so after all commenters have provided their first comment. Please call back into the call in number at that time. At this time if you are calling the number to make a verbal comment please mute your computer speakers to avoid an echo. Again you must mute your computer speakers while providing your verbal comment or the entire audience will hear an echo. Please listen as the operator announces your name to ensure that your name and affiliation are pronounced correctly. We will now hear from our commenters. There may be a

short pause before the first caller is introduced. Operator, do we have any commenters on the line?

**Operator:** Our first commenter is Chris Wieberg, Director of Water Protection Programs, Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Please proceed with your question.

**Chris Wieberg:** My name is Chris Wieberg. I'm the Director of the Water Protection Program for the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on EPA's proposed numeric nutrient criteria rule and provide support for the state of Missouri's proposal. We understand EPA's obligation to propose this rule however, we believe that Missouri is on the best path for Missouri's lakes. The Missouri Clean Water Commission adopted a numeric nutrient criteria rule for lakes on January 4, 2018. The State anticipates submitting a certified rule to the EPA for approval by May 2018. We urge EPA to review and approve Missouri's rule, a rule that is developed by Missourians with Missouri data and includes the appropriate criteria for Missouri. Missouri is strongly committed to protecting lake water quality. Missouri's lakes and reservoirs from the deep clear reservoirs of the Ozarks to the large recreational reservoirs of the Plains are highly valued public resources. 61 percent of Missourians participate in water-based recreational activities. Much of that is on our lakes and reservoirs. No one cares more about the quality of our lakes than we do. Missouri continues to come, or visitors continue to come to Missouri for water-based activities at an ever increasing rate, about 2.7 percent per year. They spend more each year as well about 5.4 percent more than the year previous. These recreational activities generate 14.9 billion in customer spending and support 33,000 direct jobs. Purchases associated with lakes generate 889 million in state and local taxes. The EPA proposed option one will result in impairment findings for 77 percent of lakes, which there is existing data. This includes our large reservoirs which drive this economy. The EPA proposed option one would result in impairments for many high quality referenced lakes even though there has been no documented use impairment. The EPA proposed option one will compel Missouri citizens within these impaired watersheds to spend an estimated \$1.7 billion dollars to upgrade wastewater treatment facilities to remove nutrients. By contrast the estimated fiscal impact of Missouri's rule is \$83.1 million. Missouri needs a rule that ensures that it's addressing all lake impairments while avoiding costly measures to address nonexistent problems. The department has worked extensively with stakeholders to develop numeric nutrient criteria that appropriately protects the diverse aquatic life in Missouri's various lake ecosystems. Missouri's rule provides a nutrient criteria framework that is scientifically rigorous, reproducible and incorporates years of site-specific data from Missouri lakes. The State of Missouri has over 40 years protecting and maintaining the quality of our lakes and reservoirs. We look forward to EPA approving Missouri's numeric nutrient criteria so that we can continue to do this successful work. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you for providing your comment. You may now hang up and listen to the virtual hearing audio through your computer speakers. Let's hear from our next commenter.

Operator, do we have another commenter in the queue?

**Operator:** Our next comment comes from Lacey Hirschvogel with Missouri Public Utility Alliance. Please proceed with your question.

**Lacey Hirschvogel:** Hello, my name is Lacey Hirschvogel from Missouri Public Utility Alliance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on EPA's proposed rule. However, we want to go on record that we are opposed to the rule moving forward. The State of Missouri has proposed their own lake nutrient criteria that is protective against algal blooms and protective of designated uses. The Missouri lake nutrient criteria was developed with Dr. Jack Jones, a lake scientist with over 40 years experience using Missouri specific data from 1999 to present. Missouri DNR went through their formal stakeholder engagement process during the creation of their rule and used input from municipalities, environmental scientists, engineers and EPA. Additionally and most importantly, Missouri's proposed rule will only impact thirty-four lakes and 30 facilities whereas EPA's proposal would designate 113 lakes as impaired including Lake of the Ozarks, Truman Lake, and Mark Twain Lake. Overall EPA's rule would impact 739 wastewater facilities in Missouri based on current data. The cost to municipalities would be astronomical and would result in many water quality standard variances. Again, Missouri takes care of Missouri, and our water quality rule protects human health and the environment with a much smaller price tag for Missouri communities and facilities. Thank you.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you for providing your comments. You may now hang up and listen to the virtual hearing audio through your computer speakers. Let's hear from our next commenter. Operator do we have another commenter in the queue?

**Operator:** Our next comment comes from Michael Bader with the Interdisciplinary Environmental Clinic at Washington University. Please proceed with your question.

**Michael Bader:** Good afternoon my name is Michael Bader and I'm a student at the Washington University Interdisciplinary Environmental Clinic. The Clinic represents the Missouri Coalition for the Environment. We are concerned about EPA's reliance on nutrient protection values and in particular the five proposed eutrophication impact factors. Not only are the factors ill-defined, but their reactive nature does not protect Missouri's lakes from water quality degradation. Let me briefly explain some of the major issues the designated eutrophication factors. The first factor is described in the proposed rule as eutrophication-related mortality events for fish or fish kills, but the rule does not define the phrase so there are no quantitative thresholds for action. Further a fish kill must be witnessed before it counts toward impairment and the State apparently intends to rely on citizen reports to document this. This is not only unreliable and unscientific, but also means the standards are strictly reactive and do not protect existing uses of Missouri's lakes. Second, EPA plans to use an excursion from a dissolved oxygen or pH criteria as a eutrophication impact factor. Once again, the rule fails to define the term excursion so interpretation can differ from observer to observer. We would hope to see a



specific definition included in the proposed rule language to reduce subjectivity and create a clear designated threshold for action. The third eutrophication impact factor calls for action when the cyanobacteria level exceeds 100,000 cells per milliliter. The threshold of accumulation does not consider the erratic nature of cyanobacteria scums. Cyanobacteria regulate their depth using gas vesicles that can be disrupted during weather events causing rapid accumulation, thus increasing risk factors. In order to develop comprehensive criteria EPA must include a more comprehensive approach to cyanobacteria scum prevention. The fourth eutrophication impact factor is proposed as observed shifts in aquatic diversity attributed to eutrophication as an indicator of potential nutrient impairment. Yet again, the lack of a definition invites manipulation. Finally, EPA lists the fifth eutrophication factor as excessive levels of mineral turbidity that consistently limit algal productivity during the period of May 1 to September 1. Turbidity can vary with geology, soils, land uses, weather events, flow manipulation, and other factors unrelated to nutrient concentrations, so it is not a widely useful nutrient indicator. We suggest that EPA set numeric nutrient criteria rather than nutrient protection values for the State of Missouri due to the flaws inherent in the eutrophication impact factors. This would ensure the protection of Missouri's water quality and avoid impairments and potentially costly cleanups. Thank you.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you for providing your comments. You may now hang up and listen to the virtual hearing audio through your computer speakers. Let's hear from our next commenter. Operator do we have another commenter in the queue?

**Operator:** We have no further commenters in the queue.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you. We will now pause here to wait for more commenters.

**Operator:** Our next comment comes from David Stokes with Great River Habitat Alliance. Please proceed with your comment.

**David Stokes:** Thank you. First, EPA uses a combined criteria approach for the proposed standards in both alternatives one and two and we believe the combined criteria approach is not appropriate for Missouri. The use of protection values in alternative one and screening values in alternative two are problematic because they do nothing to prevent water quality degradations over time. The State and EPA appear to consider these values nonbinding because they are not criteria. We ask EPA to reject the protection values and screening values and instead implement binding criteria which will help prevent degradation. Second alternatives two should not be approved because it relies on sport fish populations as an indicator of overall ecosystem health. This is not a protective approach since neither EPA nor Missouri can provide evidence that the most sensitive aquatic species are protected such as small fish and invertebrates. EPA's alternative two asserts the State finding that sports fish are a measure of ecosystem health because of their status as apex predators however, Missouri manages the sport fish population in many lakes and reservoirs including Merrimack Spring State Park and many others through stocking and harvesting programs which means that sport fish populations are not dependent on

the natural ecosystem for survival in the same way that other species are. So we don't think the sport fish count really is quite as accurate when there is so much stocking going on through Missouri. Finally, EPA should not accept Missouri's supporting documentation as support for alternative two as the State has failed to provide adequate scientific support and data to back up its claims in several key areas including the adequacy of the proposed standard to protect all designated uses including its most sensitive use. The effectiveness and reliability of its proposed eutrophication impact factors and the development of conservative screening values. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed water quality standards. We think EPA should reject alternative two. Thank you.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you for providing your comment. You may now hang up and listen to the virtual hearing audio through your computer speakers. Let's hear from our next commenter. Operator, do we have another commenter in the queue?

**Operator:** We have no further commenters in the queue.

**Gemma Kite:** Thank you. We will pause here to wait for more commenters.

**[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** This is the moderator. Thank you for turning in for the virtual public hearing titled "Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule." This public hearing is sponsored by EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The phone lines are open if you would like to provide oral comments on EPA's proposed rule. All oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. If you would like to make an oral comment, please follow the directions on the slide and call in using your telephone keypad. Please remember to mute your computer speakers at that time. If you've already provided an oral comment and would like to provide a second comment, you may do so at this time. Please call back into the phone line to make your second comment. You may hear silence as we wait for commenters. The phone lines will remain open for the duration of this hearing until 6:00 p.m. Central, 7:00 p.m. Eastern time. Thank you.

**[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** This is the virtual public hearing entitled "Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule." This public hearing is sponsored by EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The phone lines are open for interested parties to provide oral comments on EPA's proposed rule. All oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. Before calling to make an oral comment, please make sure to mute your computer speakers to avoid an echo for the entire audience. Do not worry about losing the audio when you mute your computer speakers. All call-in participants will still be able to hear the audio portion of this public hearing through the

conference phone line after computer speakers have been muted. To make an oral comment please dial 877-407-4035 on your telephone keypad and enter the following passcode 13675267. Once you have joined the conference press \*1 to be placed in queue to speak. Participants will be prompted to record their names and affiliations. Please speak clearly as the audio will be used in the public record along with your comment. If you missed the call in details the phone number and passcode are provided on multiple slides. Each commenter will be announced before providing an oral comment each commenter will have a maximum of three minutes to make an oral comment. A timer will appear on the screen indicating approximately how much time each caller has left. Commenters are responsible for watching their own time. At the three minute mark the slide will read, "Time is up," And the phone line will automatically be disconnected. After you have made your comment hang up the phone and unmute the computer speakers to listen to the rest of the hearing. If you've already provided an oral comment today and would like to provide a second comment, you may do so at this time.

While we are waiting let's talk about how to submit a written comment on the rule. As previously mentioned, if you would like to submit a written comment, there are several ways that you can do this. If you have provided an oral comment, you do not have to submit the same comment in writing in order for to be included in the official record. You can submit a written comment through [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), e-mail your written comment, mail your comment or submit a written comment via hand delivery. The information for submitting a written comment through these mechanisms is explained in more detail on this slide. In addition, you can also obtain this information if you navigate to the "Downloads" tab in this webinar, find the document titled "Comment Submittal Instructions" and download it as needed. Remember when submitting a written comment, make sure to reference the docket ID number listed on the slide.

You may hear silence as we wait for commenters. The phone lines will remain open for the duration of this hearing until 6:00 p.m. Central, 7:00 p.m. Eastern time. Thank you.

### **[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** This is the moderator. Thank you for tuning into the virtual public hearing titled "Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule." This public hearing is sponsored by EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The phone lines are open if you would like to provide oral comments on EPA's proposed rule. All oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. If you would like to make an oral comment please follow the directions on the slide and call in using your telephone. Please remember to mute your computer speakers at that time. If you already provided an oral comment and would like to provide a second comment you may do so at this time. Please call back into the phone line to make your second comment. You may hear silence as we wait for commenters. The phone lines will remain open for the duration of this hearing until 6:00 p.m. Central, 7:00 p.m. Eastern time. Thank you.

**[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** This is the moderator. Thank you for tuning in to the virtual hearing titled “Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule.” This public hearing is sponsored by the EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The phone lines are open if you would like to provide oral comments on EPA’s proposed rule. All oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. If you would like to make an oral comment please follow the directions on this slide and call in using your telephone. Please remember to mute your computer speakers at that time. If you already provided one comment and would like to provide a second comment, you may do so at this time. You may hear silence as we wait for commenters. The phone lines will remain open for the duration of this hearing until 6:00 p.m. Central, 7:00 p.m. Eastern time. Thank you.

**[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** This is the moderator. Thank you for turning into the virtual public hearing titled “Public Hearing for Water Quality Standards for the State of Missouri's Lakes and Reservoirs Proposed Rule.” This public hearing is sponsored by EPA's Office of Science and Technology and EPA Region 7. The phone lines are open if you would like to provide oral comments on EPA's proposed rule. All oral comments will be considered part of the official record for this rule. If you would like to make an oral comment, please follow the directions on this slide and call in using your telephone. Please remember to mute your computer speakers at that time. If you've already provided an oral comment and would like to provide a second comment, you may do so at this time.

While we are waiting, let's talk about how to submit a written comment on the rule. As previously mentioned if you would like to submit a written comment there are several ways that you can do this. If you have provided an oral comment, you do not have to submit the same comment in writing in order for it to be included in the official record. You can submit a written comment through regulations.gov, e-mail your written comment, mail your comment, or submit a written comment via hand delivery. The information for submitting a written comment through these mechanisms is explained in more detail on this slide. In addition, you can also obtain this information if you navigate to the "Downloads" tab in this webinar. Find the document titled “Comment Submittal Instructions” and download it as needed. Remember when submitting a written comment please make sure to reference the docket ID number listed on this slide.

As a reminder you can access the proposed rule and supporting documents by visiting EPA water quality standard website listed on this slide. Please note written comments must be received on or before February 26, 2018. You may hear silence as we wait for commenters. The phone lines will remain open for the duration of this hearing until 6:00 p.m. Central, 7:00 p.m. Eastern time. Thank you.

**[Long silence]**

**Gemma Kite:** At this time I would like to conclude today's public hearing. Thank you to everyone who joined us and provided an oral comment. Remember, if you would like to provide a comment you can submit a written comment to the docket. That ends the hearing for today. Thank you again for joining us.