

KELLY MILLER NOTES:

Wolf Creek TMDL Revision

2nd Community Engagement Meeting

Date: 6/25/2025

Location: DEQ-Southwest Regional Office

Attendance

See Sign-in Sheet

Welcome & Introductions

Landon Jenkins, DEQ-SWRO TMDL Coordinator welcomed the attendees and explained the goal of today's meeting. Copies of the presentation were available, and attendees were asked to complete the sign-in sheet.

Presentation

Katie Shoemaker and Jacob Bellinger, WSSI, gave the presentation on the draft Wolf Creek TMDL.

Question & Answer

Q: The benthic data includes specifically looking at the benthic filtering community. If sediment is determined to be the main stressors, could nutrients also cause an increase in filters.

A: The weight of evidence approach shows habitat is most likely impacted by sediment more than nutrients.

Q: It appears the model gives equal treatment to turf, pervious, and impervious.

A: Explain the datasets used and how the calculated loadings are assigned.

Q: If pasture is re-classified as good, how much will that impact the load reduction requirements?

A: WSSI will run the numbers and get back to us.

Q: Trends towards agriculture, especially crop and pastureland, and looking for reductions.

A: Cropland has decreased significantly and is changing every year. Housing construction is increasing. Cattle numbers are steady with density shifts.

Q: There is no data to assess the headwaters. If we had data on the status of the upper reaches, would that change our decision on the best scenario?

A: Very true. The watershed changes as we go downstream. Cost-efficiency usually comes during the implementation phase.

Discussion

There are three Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permits in the watershed. No representatives attended the meetings from these permits. Their load reductions expectations vary between the presented scenarios. Funding for urban conservation practices is much less than agricultural cost-share. When the TMDL is approved, the MS4 permittees will be assigned a wasteload allocation and be required to achieve a percentage of reductions each year of their five-year permit.

The model does not distinguish between the quality of riparian buffers when considering streambank conditions.

Suggestions

In the Upper Wolf Creek scenarios, reduce the load from cropland by 25%. There is just not that much crop production in the watershed. Hay crop production is listed at 68% and that is unrealistic as there are very few BMPs to apply to hay land. Suggest reducing that to 25%. A 68% reduction is appropriate for pasture. Shifting more of the load to Abingdon

MS4 will impact more of the lower watershed. Localities can choose how to achieve the reductions. Moving the wasteload allocation to 33-40% and see if that meets the target.

In the Lower Wolf Creek scenarios, land-use shifts from agricultural to more urban. In scenario 2, suggest shifting the same as the upper. Focus on streambank restoration in both agriculture and urban areas.

Adjourn

With nothing further, the meeting concluded at 4:41 p.m.

CRAIG LOTT NOTES:

Wolf Ck TMDL redo (Benthic) meeting notes (6/25/2025)

In attendance: Hunter , Braven Beaty, Landon Jenkins, Kristy Woodall, Kelly Miller, Katie Shoemaker, Jacob

Braven: Who would you like to have at the meeting?

Landon: This is a TMDL redo, so it would be good to have more local Community folks (including residents, town folks, permittees like Abingdon, VDOT, and the local community college, those are the three MS4's), farmers, other recreational users. We've had meetings in the evening and so I set this one during work hours for those local leaders who might need to participate during their work hours.

Landon goes through the TMDL presentation first 15 or so slides.

WSSI: Katie presents beginning with the Land Cover areas. Then showed the MS4's (including newly the VHCC area) on a map, and explained the All-Forested-X ratio approach vs the older Reference approach.

Braven: how do you know that addressing sediment will address all the pollutants needed to be addressed (instead of also nutrients), although some will be addressed by addressing sediment with some of your BMPs, probably...?

Katie: yes, the stressor analysis helped separate the most probable stressor and what we needed to address from some other stressors that might not have as much of an impact as addressing the sediment issues in the watershed.

Jacob: Scenarios Upper explained; and Lower (including the WLA and LA from the Upper minus the MOS and FG) also explained.

Craig: Does it help to have a higher reduction required for ag lands?

Hunter: yes; its included in the calculation for the funding (especially for the federal funding and the HUC prioritization includes a factor that is the reduction).

Braven: ??

extreme shallow soils in the lower watershed so thats why its forested. Soil is not being busted there to put crops in. General herd dynamic is stable...less farmers, but same stable herd numbers (cattle, etc).

Braven: in the assessment, you identified the headwater streams as unimpaired, but we don't have data to know that. much of the ag lands is in the headwaters. should we take the whole NHD network as impaired. Different levels of funding for ag vs localities for developed areas. This one seems like it is pretty developed in this upper area. something looks like 26%...

Kelly: Abingdon will have to do something, but funding is not always available, VDOT may be able to

Hunter: does riparian buffers on pasture impact the streambank erosion also, or just the pasture in both the upper and lower segments, the stakeholders decided on a 25% adjusted scenario reductions on Crop and Hay leaving the pasture reductions and then adjusting the reductions upward for the urban from the lowest urban reduction scenarios.

ACTION ITEMS:

Follow up with the three local MS4s to determine which allocation scenario they best prefer? Do they prefer aggregated or sub-aggregated.