

**Clinch Powell Clean Rivers Initiative  
Meeting Summary 7/8&9/08**

**Meeting Purposes:**

- (1) Determine organizational structure**
- (2) Populate teams and task teams with specific action items and timelines**
- (3) Adopt initial Work Plan**

*July 8, 2008 -*

**I. Report on morning meeting of Agency MOU Working Group**

-Virginia DCR to be added to list of MOU Signatories.

-MOU Agency Working Group will continue meeting quarterly. Tom Welborn (EPA IV) and Ellen Gilinsky (VA DEQ) would like to sit on CPCRI Steering Committee to ensure communication and coordination between CPCRI and MOU Agency Working Group.

-MOU Agencies interested in providing data links on a web-platform (TNC, USGS, Virginia Tech Water Resources Center are all possible options). Suggest that the CPCRI develop a web-based platform for data sharing and promotion of key activities and initiatives.

-The MOU Agencies are interested in pursuing the development of an 'indicator of mussel health', similar to the IBI or other indices. There is support for the CPCRI science team establishing a recommendation for how to best do this.

-MOU Agencies are interested in investigating historical land uses issues in Clinch-Powell to determine legacy environmental effects.

-DEQ is beginning to work on its TMDL for the Powell River. Allen Newman will contact CPCRI members for review and input on initial TMDL assessment.

-MOU Agencies will work to summarize current BMPs and develop a set of recommendations for better implementation in the Clinch-Powell watershed.

-EPA will provide CPCRI information on grant opportunities.... It is a competitive process but opportunities exist.

-DEQ interested in participating in planned mussel survey efforts at TNC's Cleveland Island Preserve July 28-30<sup>th</sup>.

**II. Draft CPCRI Work Plan**

-Needs mission statement and more general goals. Suggestions provided by Scott Gain. Brad Kreps will revise and circulate to the group.

-General acceptance of work plan and team structure (Discussions about the details of team goals, tasks, and membership summarized below).

### **III. Steering Committee Discussion and Selection of Members**

-Most important function of the Steering Committee is to keep CPCRI on track and making progress towards work plan goals.

-Very important for Steering Committee to be kept to a manageable number while ensuring good representation from various stakeholders as well as geographic representation from Virginia and Tennessee.

-Steering Committee populated and work plan items agreed upon (see Work Plan).

### **IV. Report on morning meeting of the Science Team; Discussion of Draft Science Plan**

-The draft plan was circulated and Ken Hyer provided an overview of the draft Science Plan emphasizing its three basic components.

-Component #1 includes sampling design, mussel indicator/viability rankings, measurement of mussel population characteristics, measurement of key environmental variables/stressors, and a statistical analysis to determine if mussel viability correlates with certain environmental variables/stressors across sampling sites. Component #1 is the priority for the Science Team at this juncture.

-Component #2 includes in-stream and lab work to better understand stressors identified in Component #1.

-Component #3 includes a landscape analysis to better characterize sources of stress in a watershed context. Mapping and Modeling aspect to this piece of the science effort.

-General feeling among Science Team is that Components #1 and #3 could be initiated simultaneously but Component #2 depends on completion of Component #1.

-It was also recognized as being absolutely critical to involve Clean Water Act regulatory agency representatives on the Science Team to ensure that the design and implementation of the science plan is done in such a way that QA/QC standards are followed. Information produced should inform regulatory assessments in the future.

-Science Team members have organized into sub-groups and have a plan in place to develop a scope of work and budget for phase I by September 1, 2008. Additional deliverables are included in the updated CPCRI work plan.

-Science Team populated and leaders selected via group consensus.

*July 9, 2008 –*

## **V. Monitoring and Information Management Team Discussion and Selection of Members**

-MOU Agencies interested in creating a web-based platform for providing access to monitoring data. This team would help move that effort forward.

-Team will create a list of all current data and provide recommendations for how to best make it available.

-Team populated, leaders selected via group consensus, and tasks defined (see Work Plan).

## **VI. Outreach and Communications Team Discussion and Selection of Members**

-Web platform for CPCRI needs to be investigated. Brad Kreps agreed to see if TNC could possibly host a CPCRI web platform. Other possibilities include USGS data portal and Stephen Schoenholtz at Virginia Tech also has ideas for how the Water Resources Research Center could help with hosting a web-platform.

-Discussion of content for next symposium led to a vote. Majority chose to focus the next symposium on built environment issues such as urban stormwater, transportation corridor spills, straight-pipes, etc. Also a great deal of interest in broader non-point source issues such as agriculture and forestry.

-General approach to the next symposium will be a day of field trips, a day of presentations on built environment issues, and a day of presentations on the progress of the CPCRI and implementation success stories in the watershed.

-It was pointed out that one major short-coming of the first symposium was the lack of attendance from local government officials. That group needs to be targeted for next symposium.

-Team was populated, leaders selected via group consensus, and task defined (see Work Plan).