

## **Nassawadox Creek TMDL Public Meeting**

October 22, 2015

Meeting Notes

**Location:** Exmore Town Hall located at 3305 Main St, Exmore, VA

**Start:** 6:30 pm

**End:** 8:00 pm

### **Meeting Attendees:**

Dr. S. Dawn Goldstine-resident, Linda Goldstine-resident, Jim Goldstine-resident, Anne Snyder-resident, Cole Charnock-ESSWCD, Jay Ford-Shorekeeper, Bob Meyers-resident, Diana LoVecchio-Riverside Hospital, John Peterman-Riverside Hospital, Robert Duer-Town of Exmore, H.Taylor Dukes-Town of Exmore, Jennifer Howell-DEQ/TRO, Jian Shen-VIMS, Mac Sisson-VIMS

### **I. Agenda Item: Outline the TMDL Process**

**Discussion:** Mac Sisson (VIMS) gave a presentation to the attendees to give an overview of the TMDL process and the procedures used the source assessment and modeling component. The impaired segments have excessive bacteria concentrations and are listed in the current Integrated Report for not meeting the Shellfish Consumption Life Use and the Recreation Use. It was mentioned that some of the segments have an approved shellfish bacteria TMDL in place and was approved in 2007. Since then, there have been additional impairments for shellfish as well as a recreation impairment added in the watershed. Instead of modifying the existing TMDL, DEQ decided to rewrite the entire report using current and more watershed-specific data. It was also noted that Warehouse Creek previously had an administrative closure that has since been partially removed by VDH-DSS since the project contract was put in place. The current TMDL will include the recent changes to the Warehouse Creek condemnation area.

### **II. Agenda Item: Questions & Answers/Comments**

Q: There are a lot more monitoring stations (DEQ & VDH-DSS) on Nassawadox than on Little Mosquito and Assawoman. Why are there more DEQ stations here?

A: DEQ monitoring station 1.62 is the one that has the most continuous data. The others were established for special studies and have limited data points and parameters.

Q: Explain the Warehouse Creek condemnation and why it is being added to the project.

A: VDH-DSS has had an administrative closure to the portion of the creek in which the hospital discharges. In a previous condemnation notice, VDH-DSS designated a larger portion of the creek. In recent notices, the admin closure area has reduced in size based on recent data and a large reduction in discharge flow. The creek still has a small admin closure area along with a regular VDH-DSS condemned area.

Q: In the distribution of mean FC concentration graph, there is a large spike in April. Is this specific to Nassawadox?

A: VIMS didn't recall seeing this spike in watersheds to the south. They will be looking at the data more in depth and will break it down into the sub-watershed level to see if there is a trend across this watershed.

Q: Lack of tidal flushing always seems to be a factor in shellfish condemned areas. Will information from TMDL reports be used to communicate with VMRC that dredging channels might improve the situation?

A: VMRC takes a lot of information into consideration when determining if channels should be dredged. It should be noted that dredging is not always the clear answer. Other factors affecting flushing are natural depth of the streams and the whole tidal prism.

Q: Pit privies are listed in the table as a human source. Will they be more accurately identified?

A: The ANPDC has provided a rough estimate and approximate locations of pit privies in this watershed. VIMS and DEQ will follow up to determine if more accurate numbers could be supplied for the TMDL.

Q: The shore plaza shopping center has a septic drainfield that is piped to Nassawadox Creek. This should be added, or at least noted, to the source table under "septics".

A: DEQ and VIMS will follow up with VDH to get more information.

Q: Is the wildlife load on impervious surface considered?

A: The load will be based off the 600 ft buffer used in calculating the populations and be distributed with even weight across the watershed.

Q: Will the data presented at this meeting be used in the model?

A: Unless there is local input to the data, this is what will be used as assumptions in the model. That is why we have the public and work group meetings.

Q: In conclusion, what is the worst (news) part of the study?

A: Having condemned areas for shellfish use is not a good thing. That is why we write the TMDLs and prepare IPs. The major contributors to fecal coliform pollution are from the high deer and geese populations. Also, there is human input that needs to be removed from the streams. Over the whole Eastern Shore, the pollution seems to be a precipitation-event driven issue.

Q: Could you give examples of sources of enterococci used to distinguish the recreation impairment?

A: Enterococci is used as an indicator species in estuarine waters and used in the assessment for recreation use. It is found in fecal matter from warm-blooded animals.

Q: Do the headwaters of the tributaries listed as condemned have any issues that contribute to the impairment?

A: All of the tributaries have large wetland areas, which leads to high wildlife populations. The discharge from hospital is not a contributor to the bacteria load. The data from the DMR indicates they have minimal FC in their discharge.