

**Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments to Parts I, II, III, and XIII of the Virginia
Stormwater Management Program Permit Regulations
(4 VAC 50-60-10 et seq.)
Hungry Mother State Park
Marion, Virginia
June 30, 2009 – 7:00 p.m.**

Meeting Officer: Christine Watlington
Policy and Budget Analyst
Department of Conservation and Recreation

Opening:

Ms. Watlington: Good evening, I would like to call this public hearing on the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board's proposed amendments to Parts I, II, III and XIII of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program Permit Regulations to order. I am Christine Watlington, Policy and Budget Analyst for the Department of Conservation and Recreation. I will be serving as the meeting officer this evening. I welcome you to this hearing.

With me this evening I have Doug Fritz, from DCR's Division of Soil and Water Conservation; David Dowling, DCR's Policy, Planning and Budget Director, Ryan Brown, our Policy and Planning Assistant Director, who will serve as our technical presenter and Michael Fletcher, DCR's Board Liaison who will be preparing a detailed transcript of this meeting. This meeting will be recorded.

I hope that all of you have registered on our attendance list. If not, please do so. Those wishing to speak should note that on the attendance list. Please also make sure that your contact information, including your name and address, is legible and complete as we will be utilizing it to keep you informed on the status of the regulatory actions.

Purpose of the public hearing:

The purpose of this hearing is to receive input from interested citizens on the Board's two proposed regulatory actions during the 60-day public comment period, which closes on August 21st. The first regulatory action proposes amendments to Parts I, II, and III of the Virginia Stormwater Management Program Permit Regulations related to stormwater definitions, water quality and quantity technical criteria, and local program criteria. The second action proposes amendments to Part XIII of those regulations related to stormwater fees.

The Department used the participatory approach to develop the proposals. Following the publication of the Notices of Intended Regulatory Action regarding these regulations and the public comment period on the NOIRAs, the Department formed a Technical Advisory Committee to assist in the development of the proposed regulations. The TAC included

representatives from localities, consulting firms, environmental organizations, state agencies, colleges and universities, planning district commissions, soil and water conservation districts, and federal agencies. The TAC met 17 times over the course of a two and a half year period. Following the completion of the TAC's work, the Soil and Water Conservation Board proposed these regulations at its meeting held on September 25, 2008. Copies of the proposed regulations are located on the table near the attendance list.

Although we have already been considering regulatory solutions to issues with the proposed regulations that we are aware of, it is the Board's approved version that we were required to publish and seek comments on. However, during the regulatory overview, we will share with you a few areas that we already recognize will need further consideration. We do want to note that all public comments received will be carefully considered by the Department and the Board in developing final regulations. The Board's recent regulatory actions demonstrate a history of being responsive.

This concludes my introductory remarks. I would like to introduce Ryan Brown, DCR's Policy and Planning Assistant Director, who will provide information regarding what the proposed regulations do.

Mr. Brown: Thank you Ms. Watlington.

Although we know that many of you here are very familiar with the regulatory process that has led up to the proposed regulations, we thought we would take a couple of minutes and give a summary of the regulatory action itself as well as what the key portions of the proposed regulations are.

To give some history, before 2004 stormwater management requirements in the Commonwealth varied depending on where a project was located in the state. Four different citizen boards (Soil and Water Conservation Board, Board of Conservation and Recreation, Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Board, and State Water Control Board) and three different state agencies (DCR, Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department, and Department of Environmental Quality) all had various stormwater management requirements. This led to inconsistent requirements and uncertainty for the regulated community. During the 2004 General Assembly, this inconsistency and uncertainty was sought to be addressed by House Bill 1177, which created the Virginia Stormwater Management Program, or VSMP, and effectively consolidated stormwater management responsibilities for municipal separate storm sewer systems and construction activities into DCR and the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board. Also key to House Bill 1177 was the concept that responsibilities for permitting of construction stormwater be eventually passed down to localities, similar to the way that Erosion and Sediment Control has been administered historically.

Following the enactment of House Bill 1177, the existing stormwater regulations utilized by the Department of Environmental Quality were transferred to the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board in order to allow for the administration of the federal Clean

Water Act stormwater permitting program. These regulations are essentially what is on the books today, and are what are utilized in Virginia's stormwater management program at the current time. In order to fully implement House Bill 1177's requirements and to meet Virginia's water quality goals, however, these regulations need to be amended.

The first area that needs to be addressed in the VSMP regulations concerns local administration of stormwater management programs. Allowing construction stormwater management to be implemented on a local level was a key assumption of House Bill 1177, which requires local programs to be adopted by localities located within the area impacted by the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, as well as MS4 localities. Other localities may adopt local programs on a voluntary basis or DCR will administer a program in their locality. These changes require amendments to Part III of the VSMP regulations. Complimentary to these amendments are changes to Part XIII of the regulations, which contain the fees that apply to the VSMP program. By law, these fees need to be established at a level that is sufficient to support a stormwater program.

The quality of Virginia's waters, as well, need to be protected from pollutant discharges from regulated construction activities. Enhancing these stormwater regulations is a key part of Virginia's overall approach to improving water quality statewide and restoring the Chesapeake Bay, which includes pollution reductions from sewage treatment plants and farmland runoff. Regulated construction activities generally include those one acre or greater statewide, as well as those 2500 square feet or larger in areas subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. Addressing post-development runoff from these sites is a key component of Virginia's water quality goals for rivers, streams, lakes, and the Chesapeake Bay. In fact, EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program has estimated that 32% of phosphorus loads to the Bay can be attributed to urban and suburban runoff sources, of which stormwater runoff from developing lands is a part. While gains are being made in addressing other sources, including agricultural sources, sewage treatment plants, industrial sources, and atmospheric deposition, the loadings for developed lands continue to increase. Water quality criteria are contained in Part II of the VSMP regulations.

The graphic from the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program illustrates the share of nitrogen, sediment, and phosphorus pollution coming from urban sources to the Chesapeake Bay.

The quantity of water leaving developed lands similarly continues to be of concern. The current standards contained in the VSMP regulations and in the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations still result in significant flooding and channel erosion, and residents continue to report flooding impacts created by upstream development. It is believed that the current criteria needs revisions to address these concerns, as well as to allow long term consistency of the VSMP regulations and the Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations for the regulated community (although amendments to the Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations will require a separate regulatory action in the future). As with water quality, the water quantity technical criteria are contained in Part II of the VSMP regulations.

Recognizing all of these needs, in late 2005, DCR and the Board embarked on a regulatory process to amend the VSMP regulations. This was commenced through the publication of Notices of Intended Regulatory Action related to Parts I, II, III, and XIII of the VSMP regulations. A technical advisory committee, or TAC, was formed to assist with the preparation of proposed regulations. The TAC was composed of nearly 30 members representing localities, consulting firms, environmental organizations, state agencies, colleges and universities, planning district commissions, soil and water conservation districts, and federal agencies. Overall, the TAC met 17 times between May of 2006 and August of 2008. Subcommittees held an additional 8 meetings. Numerous other meetings were held related to the regulations. In all, over 50 public meetings have been held to date, along with a series of design charrettes which examine real-world site planning. These charrettes have been held statewide and attended by over 400 individuals. Following the completion of the TAC's work and these other meetings, the Board proposed the amended VSMP regulations on September 25, 2008. As is required by Virginia's administrative process, the regulations as they were proposed on this date are what is now before you for public comment, although we are aware of a number of areas that will additionally need consideration before preparing final revisions to the regulations.

With this background, what do the proposed regulations do? Four different parts of the VSMP regulations are amended by this action. These include the definitions contained in Part I, the technical criteria (including water quality and quantity) contained in Part II, the requirements for local stormwater management programs contained in Part III, and the stormwater permit fees contained in Part XIII.

Turning first to Part II, water quality and quantity, these are the technical criteria that will be employed by a locality when it operates a local stormwater management program and, for those localities that do not adopt their own program, the criteria that will be utilized by DCR in administering a local stormwater management program within a locality.

As it pertains to water quality, the amended Part II maintains the current approach of focusing on phosphorus as an indicator pollutant. By employing practices that remove phosphorus from discharges from a site, it has been demonstrated that other pollutants (such as nitrogen and sediment) will likewise be reduced. Through examination of Virginia's Tributary Strategy goals for the Chesapeake Bay, however, it has been determined that the current 0.45 pounds of phosphorus per acre per year standard for new development projects is continuing to allow degradation. The proposed amendments to Part II amend this standard to 0.28 pounds per acre per year, which is the level indicated by Virginia's Tributary Strategies but more lenient than a forested situation that is 0.11 pounds per acre per year. This is a design standard, meaning that the site will be designed in a manner that is deemed to achieve this standard. It is not a load limit that would require monitoring from the site. The water quality requirements also provide a more lenient standard for redevelopment, which would be required to achieve a load 20% below that present prior to the redevelopment of the site. This is more stringent than today's 10% requirement, but, with the goal of not creating an obstacle to redevelopment

projects, has been established at a level much lower than the 44% that is indicated by the Tributary Strategy goals.

Compliance with water quality requirements would be achieved through utilization of the new Runoff Reduction Method and an expanded set of best management practices contained in the regulations. Implementing BMPs consistent with a plan developed based on the Runoff Reduction Method would achieve compliance with the standard; additionally, the proposed amendments allow for local adoption of other methods, off-site compliance, and participation in regional stormwater management plans and pro-rata fees. DCR is also currently working on guidance related to the new nutrient offsets program, which would allow for another “trading for compliance” option.

The proposed Part II also contains new provisions related to water quantity. A special water quantity workgroup was developed to work specifically on this issue, and section 66 of the proposed regulations is the result of this group’s work. To alleviate stream channel erosion and downstream flooding, section 66 contains requirements related to channel protection and flood protection that vary based upon the condition of stormwater conveyance system that is being discharged into. Sheet flow is also addressed. It is DCR’s long term intention to use these criteria, when finalized, to amend MS19 of the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations to bring consistency across the Stormwater and Erosion and Sediment Control programs.

Secondly, the proposed regulations do establish the framework for local stormwater management programs (both locality administered “qualifying local programs” and DCR-administered programs for those localities that do not adopt their own programs). Due to the timeframes established by law for the effective date of these regulations and the timing for local program adoption, local programs are not likely to begin being adopted until between October 2011 and April 2012, with all programs being in place by April of 2013.

Part III requires that all local stormwater management programs implement the new Part II technical criteria. Specific requirements for up-front plan review, permit issuance, inspections (during and post-construction), long term BMP maintenance, and other program components are contained in Part III as well.

Finally, the proposed regulations do include amendments to the permit fee schedule contained in Part XIII. As noted earlier, the law requires that fees be established at a level sufficient to adequately fund the administration and oversight of stormwater management programs. The fees proposed are scaled based upon acreage of the project, and were established based upon the actual work that is projected to be necessitated by the site. Twenty-eight percent of the overall fee is attributed to technical assistance and local program oversight and will go to DCR. In the case of a locality-administered qualifying local program, the remaining 72% is believed to be sufficient to fund the locality’s responsibilities.

The previous slides summarize what is contained in the proposed regulations. As noted earlier, however, since the time of the Board's proposal of these regulations in September of last year, DCR has become aware of a number of issues that need to be considered going forward. These include grandfathering of existing projects from the requirement to meet the new technical criteria, the effect of the new technical criteria on commercial, redevelopment and infill sites, as well as sites located in urban development areas; nutrient offsets; and questions as to whether it is appropriate to have a single statewide standard or whether different standards for different regions of the state would be more appropriate. DCR is already considering these concerns. Public comment will undoubtedly produce other issues that need to be considered carefully.

Finally, although these regulatory actions have been ongoing for several years, there are still many important steps remaining. Following the close of the public comment period on August 21, all public comments will be carefully considered as final regulations are developed and forwarded to the Board for approval. By law, they cannot become effective prior to July 1, 2010. Similarly by law, the adoption of local stormwater management programs will follow the effective date of these regulations by 15 to 21 months, placing them at earliest between October 2011 and April 2012.

More information on these regulatory actions can be found on DCR's website or the Virginia Regulatory Townhall at the addresses appearing in this presentation. Public comment information is also included on the final slide of this presentation, as well as in the handout provided.

Ms. Watlington: Thank you Mr. Brown.

Before we begin receiving testimony on the proposed regulations, I would like to stress that this is an information-gathering meeting. Everyone wishing to speak will be heard. If necessary, we may ask speakers questions concerning their testimony or to request additional information concerning a subject believed to be important to the process in order to help the clarify and properly capture your comments. Staff will be available after this hearing to take any individual questions you may have.

We will now begin the public comment portion of the hearing. When I call your name, please come to the front and use the podium. Please state your name and who you represent. If you have an extra copy of your comments, please provide it to us so that it may be utilized in developing the minutes of this hearing. The first person I will call is Gary Earp.

Gary Earp, Tazewell County

This is the first time I've ever spoken at a public hearing. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am the Tazewell County engineer. We do E&S. I work with DCR to help regulate this.

But, these regulations I disagree with. The development cost is going to double. I mean, it's really going to impact this part of the state. I understand that the Chesapeake

watershed is reducing down to the 0.28 phosphorus level. But out here, that is going to kill development.

It's going to drive the costs up. Sixteen percent is the baseline now for the Chesapeake Bay. With this reduction it's going to be reduced to 8% impervious. If you build a site and you have 8% impervious you have to do water quality. Now water quality out in these mountains. I mean people aren't going to do it. They're just not going to do it. They're not going to spend the money to do that. And that development creates tax revenue. If our people don't develop, then as a County we don't get the tax revenue.

If you don't get the tax revenue, then on the TMDL studies, we've had two done in our locality. One of them was for fecal coliform. We all know where fecal coliform comes from. It comes from our agricultural sites or our collection systems from wastewater treatment sites. And these streams are impaired because of it.

If we don't get the tax revenue, then we don't get the money to fix our problems with the wastewater treatment plant. And we can't fence off farms to clear up these streams.

This regulation is going to kill development. Once it kills development, that kills the revenue, it's just a vicious cycle. It's not going to help this part of the state.

Can't we separate the Chesapeake Bay? Reduce it to 0.28 there, but don't reduce it here. We need more people. The regulations are out there but we don't have the people to enforce it. And if we don't enforce it, it's not going to get done. Then we have the impaired streams.

Part of these regulations (deal with) karst topography. All these regulations are based on infiltration. This is karst territory. If you put in a rain garden you are removing the pollutants from the surface water, but you are injecting it into the groundwater. Then you have it in wells. People will be drinking these pollutants. Consider what you are doing.

You mentioned the enforcement. We run the E&S program. We are meeting your requirements. But we are barely meeting your requirements because we don't have the funding to handle enforcement.

It all comes down to money, but we don't have money. We can't generate tax revenue to hire more people because we don't have the development. With this you are going to kill development.

It doesn't make good sense.

I don't want to say this. But I think these regulations are an unfunded mandate. What they do in the Chesapeake Bay is fine, but don't take it across the whole of the state. You are just going to kill this part of the state.

Thank you.

Ms. Watlington: Thank you Mr. Earp. Mr. Williams did you wish to speak?

Clegg Williams

I too am a local administrator for E&S. I just have a few comments.

One, I'm not exactly prepared to ask questions or make comments. I just received notice of this hearing last week and just got my hands on a copy of this tonight.

One comment is that I read in this flyer that you're looking at increasing requirements for farmland runoff. Can you expand on this and tell me if agricultural activities are going to be regulated under the stormwater requirements?

Mr. Brown: They're not. That may just be referring to other efforts across the state related to agriculture, but not the stormwater program specifically. (Mr. Brown reviewed the document in question). This is actually a quote from our Director in a news release. It is referring to the broader water quality actions, such as in the case of sewage treatment plants. I think everybody is aware of the upgrades that are going on there through separate programs at the Department of Environmental Quality. And with agriculture, referring to our Agriculture BMP program which is separate from stormwater. This was referring comprehensively to the Commonwealth's water quality strategy and not specifically stormwater.

Mr. Williams: So there's no attempt to bring agriculture under stormwater.

Mr. Brown: No, in fact agricultural activities are specifically exempt from stormwater through both the Code of Virginia and the Clean Water Act. That's not to say that everyone who is a farmer, everything they construct would be exempt. It depends on the nature of it and the agricultural interest that is involved. But this program doesn't reach out to regulate agriculture.

Mr. Williams: O.K. I'd like to get one thing clarified. You had mentioned that there are several jurisdictions that are mandated to adopt and enforce but in certain areas of the state it would be run by DCR if the locality opted not to adopt a stormwater program.

Mr. Brown: That's correct and this is spelled out in the Code of Virginia, I think it's in 10.1-603.3. Localities that fall under the jurisdiction of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, which is Tidewater Virginia (generally east of I-95), are mandated to adopt. More direct to this area would be those localities covered by the MS4 program, which would be Bristol, Christiansburg, and Blacksburg. Other localities are voluntary and can adopt or not adopt based on what they see fit.

Mr. Dowling: If they don't adopt, DCR will operate a stormwater program in their localities.

Mr. Williams: Basically as they are doing now, is that a fair statement?

Mr. Brown: It's a much greater developed program with upfront plan review and a much greater presence. But yes the arrangement would be similar to today, where DCR operates the program. The locality would continue to do Erosion and Sediment Control.

Mr. Williams: That comment actually brings me to a question. One of my biggest criticisms of the current program is that there is no plan review process. That's one of the biggest criticisms I get from local developers. They submit plans to the local jurisdiction. They're reviewed. They're approved from an E&S standpoint. They think they are good to go. And then they find out there is a conflict with stormwater regulations after the fact. After the bidding, after the construction. And that's created a lot of turmoil in our area. So is that one of the proposed changes to require plan reviews prior to construction activity?

Mr. Brown: That is. That's a problem that the proposal seeks to address.

Mr. Williams: Alright. With all of the redundancy that's found in E&S regulations and stormwater regulations is there any discussion of making them mirror each other or eliminating some of that redundancy. The problem that creates, the problem I see in Southwest Virginia with DCR regulating stormwater and the local jurisdiction regulating E&S, is that you have two inspectors on the site and it could be a matter of different interpretations leaving the developer in a bit of a quandary.

Mr. Brown: That would certainly be our long term strategy. I can't promise you that this one regulatory action by itself would take care of that, but we also, following the completion of these regulations, whatever form they take, see working on the Erosion and Sediment control regulations to try to unify the requirements across the programs and to eliminate a lot of that. For the localities that intend to operate their own local stormwater management program, one of the primary goals of doing that is that the developer, consultant or whoever is making the communication would have one person to talk to instead of two separate agencies.

Mr. Williams: I couldn't help but notice during the presentation that a lot of this obviously centers around the Chesapeake Bay. And a lot of the proposed regulations are the result of a number of groups coming together and discussing this, and you mentioned developers, soil conservation, environmental groups and local jurisdictions. I was wondering how many of those entities were from Southwest Virginia.

Mr. Brown: That's a great question. I don't know off the top of my head. I know we had the New River Valley PDC on the technical advisory committee, the City of Roanoke or Roanoke County. I could sit down and figure that out for you. We did have some representation and the reason we're here tonight is because we're hearing concerns from this area of the State and want to give you folks some more information and some

opportunity to give us some more information concerning what you think is the right thing to do for this area.

Mr. Williams: Okay and with that I guess I have to echo a lot of his comments, that this is rural Southwest Virginia. I understand the reasoning for a lot of these requirements. But I would like to hear some justification about how that criteria also fits Southwest Virginia. We don't have the urbanized areas. We don't have the development. We don't have the Chesapeake Bay. Maybe you're not prepared to answer that. But if someone could follow with that I would appreciate it.

Mr. Dowling: It's a very good question, certainly, and we've heard that a lot as Ryan indicated. That is one of the very issues we're looking at, should there be a different standard between the Bay part of the State and the Southern Rivers. We felt at the time when this was put together, because that was a discussion item, that 0.28 was really a level where you could keep stormwater from continuing or trying to level off the impacts. Even at 0.45 when you have development, you're getting phosphorus and nitrogen and sediments going into the stream. 0.28 was trying to level that out.

From a biological perspective, 0.28 makes sense to a certain degree across the state. I mean, understanding some of the discussion points we've had here. We also know the sensitivity of some of the Southern Rivers, for example some of your high quality waters with mussel populations. Certainly cool water streams and cold water streams have a greater sensitivity and pressure point associated with them. So there certainly was rationale behind putting a 0.28 statewide. Is it the right number? That's the purpose of these meetings, to hear from each of you and go back and reassess if 0.28 is the right number.

Mr. Williams: I appreciate that. I'm just wondering. I see those pie graphs and I see the amount of phosphorus and what is coming in. I couldn't help but notice that those apply to the Chesapeake Bay. I would be curious to see what a pie chart is for the south fork of the Holston River. My guess is that a big chunk of that pie is going to be from agriculture and possibly sewage treatment. Development is going to diminish.

Mr. Dowling: It's not so much the source of all of it, but it's what level of phosphorus, at least from the development perspective, should you be getting down to. Certainly your discussion points are well founded and that's one of the items we'll have to go back and look at.

Mr. Williams: Thank you. And I assume we can continue to ask questions until the comment period is over?

Mr. Brown: Absolutely. The majority of the comments we get on this regulatory action will be in written form either through the Regulatory Townhall or by mail. Certainly don't hesitate to contact staff with any questions that you have during that time period and after.

Mr. Williams: Just one more and I promise I'll sit down. When and if these regulations come around, is there discussion about education and training opportunities. That's another big part of it that should be emphasized. There are plenty of opportunities and especially in Southwest Virginia. The running joke is that Virginia ends at Roanoke. We see a lot of that especially in the training opportunities. We are constantly traveling to Richmond and places like that to get the necessary training. Is there discussion to make sure that those opportunities are available for all of the players involved?

Mr. Brown: I didn't get much into it during my presentation, but the law requires that these regulations can't become effective before July 1, 2010. It also specifies that local programs aren't adopted until 15-20 months following that. So, following the finalization of these regulations, there's nearly a couple of years in there before they become effective. We are very aware of the need to do a lot outreach during that time period and thereafter. We're also aware of the need to establish a training program. We're not there yet. We have to wait to see what the program looks like, but that's definitely in our plan for the future.

Darian Musick

My name is Darian Musick. I'm a resident of Washington County. My comments are in regards to lines 242-246 of the draft regulations. These particular lines indicate that there are no changes to the current regs.

This section pertains to the definition of linear development. This definition includes "such as but not limited to" and follows with a list of projects: construction of electrical utility lines, natural gas pipelines and so forth.

Although the language appears clear in the "such as but not limited to" portion, it's clear that the projects listed are examples of linear development projects and that the list is not exclusive to the ones that are stated.

Also water and sewer line construction are not materially different than gas and pipeline construction with respect to stormwater management issues.

In spite of this, Department staff have indicated that waterline development and sewer line developments are not linear projects. And the reason given by Department staff is that water and sewer pipeline projects are not specifically listed in the such as category.

I would ask that DCR consider adding these projects to the "such as" list or preferably to appropriately interpret the definition to include water and sewer line construction without having to amend the regulation at all.

Ms. Watlington: That completes the list of those individuals who signed up to speak. Are there other individuals who would wish to comment or leave written remarks?

Closing:

Ms. Watlington: A handout is provided on the table outlining the public comment submittal procedures I am about to cover and the dates and locations of the remaining public meetings.

Persons desiring to submit written comments pertaining to this notice and this meeting may do by mail, by the internet, or by facsimile. Comments should be sent to the Regulatory Coordinator at: Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, 203 Governor Street, Suite 302, Richmond, Virginia 23219. Comments also may be submitted electronically to the Regulatory TownHall. Or comments may be faxed to the Regulatory Coordinator at: (804) 786-6141. All written comments must include the name and address or email address of the commenter. In order to be considered, comments must be received by 5:00 PM on August 21, 2009.

With that announcement, I would like to thank each of you for attending this meeting and providing us with your views and comments. This meeting is now officially closed. Staff will be available afterwards to take any individual questions you may have.

I hope that everyone has a safe trip home.

DCR Staff in attendance:

Christine Watlington
David Dowling
Ryan Brown
Doug Fritz
Michael Fletcher
Kelly Miller
Elizabeth Abe
Cody Boggs
Phyllis Hinch

Members of the public in attendance:

Timothy B. Compton, Appalachian Technical Services, Inc.
Billy Badger, AMT
Jo DeBusk, Appalachian Technical Services, Inc.
Gary S. Earp, Tazewell County
J.C. Smith, Town of Abingdon
Clegg Williams, Smyth County
Jane Walker, VWRRC, Virginia Tech
Darian Musick, Abingdon