


**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
WATER RESOURCES DIVISION
BRYANT THOMAS, DIRECTOR**

P.O. BOX 1105

Richmond, VA 23218

Subject: Guidance Memorandum No. GM25-2003
2026 Water Quality Assessment Guidance

To: Regional Directors

From: Bryant Thomas, Water Resources Division Director 

Date: 1/29/2026

Copies: Director of Operations, Water Operations Division Director, Water Quality Planning Managers and Staff

Summary:

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) 2006 Integrated Report Guidance recommends that states submit an "Integrated Report" (IR) that will satisfy Clean Water Act (CWA) requirements for both Sections 305(b) water quality reports and 303(d) impaired waters lists. According to EPA this Integrated Report should include the following information:

- delineation of water quality assessment units (AUs) based on the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD);
- status of and progress toward achieving comprehensive assessments of all waters;
- Water quality standard attainment determination for every AU;
- additional monitoring that may be needed to determine water quality standard attainment status and, if necessary, to support development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for each pollutant/AU combination;
- schedules for additional monitoring planned for AUs;
- pollutant/AU combinations still requiring TMDLs;
- TMDL development schedules reflecting the priority ranking of each pollutant/AU combination.

DEQ has incorporated relevant EPA integrated reporting guidance (EPA Guidance) into the Virginia 2026 Water Quality Assessment Guidance. The 2026 assessment guidance is designed to integrate or combine the 305(b) overall assessment of Virginia's waters and separate out those waters impaired and needing a TMDL as per Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. The EPA Guidance and the Assessment, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Tracking and Implementation System (ATTAINS) provide five different assessment categories in which every AU will be placed. The EPA Guidance allows the states to subdivide the federal categories to address state programmatic needs. Virginia's 2026 assessment guidance contains the categories and subcategories Virginia has chosen for enhanced tracking and data management purposes.

Virginia's 2026 assessment guidance contains a number of changes, all enumerated in Section 1. Two notable updates include; pollutants which have been assigned equations in EPA approved TMDLs to address aquatic

life impairments due to biological monitoring will be listed in Category 4, the water is impaired or threatened for one or more designated uses but does not require a TMDL; and impaired waters proposed for “nesting” within an EPA-approved TMDL watershed will have a rationale completed and released with the Draft IR for public comment.

The data window to be used in the development of the 2026 IR is January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2024, with a few exceptions due to delays in receiving laboratory analytical results with sufficient time to complete the water quality assessment. A General Notice of Public Solicitation of Water Quality Data for the 2026 IR was published in the Virginia Regulatory Town Hall on January 6, 2025, requesting the submittal of all data requested to be reviewed and considered in the 2026 IR be submitted by March 3, 2025

(<https://townhall.virginia.gov/L/ViewNotice.cfm?GNid=3028>). Water quality data received after this date will be reviewed for the 2028 IR. Virginia’s 2026 assessment guidance uses excerpts from the “EPA 2006 Integrated Report Guidance”, “2008, 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2024 EPA Integrated Report Clarification Guidance Memoranda”, and “EPA 1997 Guidelines for the Preparation of the 1998 State Water Quality Assessment 305(b) Reports”, along with other state and federal guidelines. The assessment methodologies reflect final triennial review amendments to the Water Quality Standards regulation approved by EPA on April 18, 2023, as well as the aluminum criteria which were approved on June 24, 2024.

Electronic Copy:

An electronic copy of this guidance in PDF format is available for staff internally on the Water Quality Assessments SharePoint site, and for the general public on DEQ’s website at:

<https://www.deq.virginia.gov/our-programs/water/water-quality/assessments/wqa-guidance-manual>.

Contact information:

If you have any questions regarding the guidance, you can contact Amanda Shaver, Department of Environmental Quality, P.O. Box 1105, Richmond, Virginia 23218. Telephone (804) 774-8416 or via e-mail amanda.shaver@deq.virginia.gov.

Certification:

As required by Subsection B of § 2.2-4002.1 of the APA, the agency certifies that this guidance document conforms to the definition of a guidance document in § 2.2-4101 of the Code of Virginia.

Disclaimer:

This document has been developed based on Virginia’s Water Quality Standards Regulation (9 VAC 25-260), with amendments approved by the State Water Control Board resulting from iterative Triennial Reviews or periodic rulemakings. It is provided as guidance and, as such, sets forth standard operating procedures for the agency. However, it does not mandate nor prohibit any particular method for the analysis of data, establishment of a wasteload allocation, or establishment of a permit limit. If alternative proposals are made, such proposals should be reviewed and accepted or denied based on their technical adequacy and compliance with appropriate laws and regulations.



WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT GUIDANCE

for

2026 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report

January 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	V
LIST OF TABLES	V
REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES	1
SECTION 1. MODIFICATIONS TO PREVIOUS GUIDANCE	4
SECTION 2. FEDERAL AND VIRGINIA ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES.....	4
SECTION 3. GENERAL RULES OF WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT.....	6
SECTION 4. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	12
4.1 Monitoring Station Siting and Delineation	12
4.2 Evaluation of Designated Uses	13
4.3 Chesapeake Bay Assessments	23
4.4 Biological Assessment	29
4.5 Toxics Assessments	32
4.6 Swamp Waters Assessment	35
4.7 Lakes/Reservoirs Assessment.....	35
4.8 Nonpoint Source (NPS) Assessment.....	44
4.9 Coastal Assessment.....	44
4.10 Wetlands Assessment	44
4.11 Continuous Monitoring Assessment Methodology.....	52
SECTION 5. PROCEDURES FOR VOLUNTEER AND NON-AGENCY MONITORING DATA	55
5.1 Assessment Process	55
SECTION 6. 303(D) LISTING/DELISTING AND TMDL PRIORITY RANKING	61
6.1 Alternative Control Waters (Category 4B/5R).....	61
6.2 Delisting Rules	62
6.3 TMDL Priority Rankings	64
APPENDIX A. CLEAN WATER REFERENCES.....	66
APPENDIX B. CLASSIFICATION OF VIRGINIA’S SHELLFISH GROWING AREAS	68
APPENDIX C. REQUIREMENTS FOR CATEGORY 5R WATERS.....	72
APPENDIX D-1. FISH TISSUE VALUES (TV).....	74
APPENDIX D-2. FISH TISSUE SCREEN VALUES (TSV)	77
APPENDIX E. CONSENSUS-BASED SEDIMENT SCREENING VALUES.....	79
APPENDIX F. SIGNIFICANT LAKES/RESERVOIRS BY REGION.....	82
APPENDIX G. MEMO TO STANDARDIZE ROUNDING METHOD FOR ASSESSMENT	86

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4-1. Chesapeake Bay Segmentation.	27
Figure 4-2. Annual temperature cycles in stratified lakes, Wisconsin DNR (WDNR) and University of Illinois ...	36
Figure 4-3. Multi-tiered sampling design of wetlands.....	48
Figure 4-4. Wetland water quality stress condition within the contributing drainage to a station.	50
Figure 4-5. Comparison of wetland water quality condition scores (mode).....	50
Figure 4-6. Comparison of in-stream water quality parameters (mean)	51
Figure 4-7. WetCAT Data Viewer.	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1. Designated Use Matrix.....	20
Table 4-2. Designated Use Assessment Methodology	21
Table 4-3. Trophic status in ATTAINS.....	41
Table 4-4. Lake/Reservoir Designated Use Assessment Summary.....	43
Table 4-5. Wetland Monitoring and Assessment Program Elements	48

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES

Under the [Clean Water Act](#), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requires that each state develop a program to monitor the quality of its surface and ground waters and prepare a report every two years describing the status of its water quality. Each state identifies waters of concern and schedules additional monitoring, if appropriate, to determine if designated uses are being met. EPA issues guidelines for States to use during the reporting cycle for national consistency purposes. States are encouraged to use these guidelines to prepare these water quality reports for EPA. EPA compiles the data from the state reports, summarizes them, and transmits the summaries to Congress, including an analysis of water quality nationwide. The 305(b)/303(d) integrated reporting process is the principal means by which the EPA, Congress, and the public evaluate current water quality, the progress made maintaining and restoring water quality, and the extent of remaining work to be done. Many states, including Virginia, rely on the 305(b)/303(d) process for information needed to conduct water quality planning. The 305(b)/303(d) process is an integral part of Virginia's water quality management program, requirements for which are set forth in [40 CFR 130](#). The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the principal state agency charged with conducting water quality assessments and associated activities.

In 1997, the General Assembly enacted the Water Quality Monitoring, Information and Restoration Act (WQMIRA; VA Code [§62.1- 44.19:4 through §62.1- 44.19:11](#)). This legislation supplements the CWA 305(b)/303(d) federal requirements. The requirements of this State legislation for assessment procedures or processes are briefly outlined as follows:

1. WQMIRA requires the 303(d) portion of the Integrated Report to identify geographically defined water segments as impaired if monitoring or other evidence shows:
 - a. exceedances of ambient [water quality standards](#) for aquatic life or human health;
 - b. fishing restrictions or advisories;
 - c. shellfish consumption restrictions due to contamination;
 - d. nutrient over-enrichment;
 - e. significant declines in aquatic life biodiversity or populations; and/or
 - f. contamination of sediments at levels which exceed water quality standards or threaten aquatic life or human health.
2. Waters identified as "naturally impaired", "fully supporting but threatened" or "evaluated" (without monitoring) as impaired shall be set out in the 303(d) portion of the Integrated Report in the same format as those listed as "impaired."
3. The 303(d) portion of the Integrated Report shall include an assessment, conducted in conjunction with other appropriate state agencies, for the attribution of impairment to point and nonpoint sources. The absence of point source permit violations at or near the impaired water shall not conclusively support a determination that impairment is due to nonpoint sources. In determining the cause for impairment, the Board shall consider the cumulative impact of 1) multiple point source discharges, 2) individual discharges over time, and 3) nonpoint sources.

4. The Board shall develop and publish a procedure governing its process for defining and determining impaired water segments and shall provide for public comment on the procedure.
5. The Integrated Report, inclusive of CWA sections 305(b) and 303(d) shall be produced in accordance with the schedule required by federal law and shall incorporate at least the preceding five years of data, where appropriate. Data older than five years shall be incorporated when scientifically appropriate for trend analysis or other longer-term considerations.
6. The Integrated Report, inclusive of CWA sections 305(b) and 303(d), shall be developed in consultation with scientists from state universities prior to submission by the Board to EPA.
7. The Integrated Report, inclusive of CWA sections 305(b) and 303(d), shall indicate water quality trends for specific, easily identifiable, geographically defined water segments and provide summaries of the trends using available data and evaluations. This will allow the citizens of the Commonwealth to easily interpret and understand the conditions of the geographically defined water segments.
8. Based on the information in the Integrated Report, inclusive of CWA sections 303(d) and 305(b), the Board shall request the Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR) or the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) to post notices at public access points for all “toxic” impaired waters. The notice, prepared by the Board, shall contain the basis for the impaired designation and a statement of potential health risks. The Board shall coordinate with the DWR and VMRC to assure that adequate notice of posted waters is provided to those purchasing hunting and fishing licenses.

WQMIRA directs DEQ to develop and publish a water quality assessment guidance document governing the process for defining and determining impaired waters, and to provide an opportunity for public comment on the assessment guidance.

The purpose of this guidance is to guide DEQ staff in the development and reporting of the 2026 Integrated Report. It is also intended to assist the public in understanding the water monitoring and assessment process. DEQ staff with expertise in Virginia’s water quality assessment protocols have developed a suite of automated tools using R programming language to assist with the assessment process. These tools are intended to provide consistency, efficiency, and reproducibility when completing water quality assessments across the state. The tools and associated documentation are available upon request.

Section 305(b) of the Clean Water Act requires each state to submit a biennial report to EPA describing the quality of its navigable waters. The 305(b) report provides DEQ’s best overall assessment of water quality conditions and trends in the Commonwealth. The report is intended to be used as a tool in planning and management of water quality in Virginia. The report also directs continuous planning and implementation activities in coordination with the State Water Quality Management Plan and the Continuous Planning Process (CPP).

Primary objectives of the Integrated Report are:

1. To educate and inform citizens and public officials about Virginia’s overall water quality.

2. To analyze water quality data to determine the extent to which Virginia's waters are supporting the applicable designated uses and to compare the results to water quality standards and other assessment thresholds.
3. To determine the causes for the "failure to support" the designated uses of the State's waters.
4. To determine the nature and recognizable extent of point and nonpoint source impacts in accordance with state and federal guidelines.

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and the Environmental Protection Agency's regulation [40 CFR Section 130.7 \(d\)](#), promulgated in July 1992, requires each state to submit a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Priority List to EPA on April 1 of even numbered years.

Category 5 signifies waters that are impaired and need a TMDL. Impaired waters needing a TMDL are those waters that do not meet water quality standards due to a pollutant(s). A pollutant, as defined in [40 CFR 122.2](#), means: *any dredged spoil, solid waste, incinerator residue, filter backwash, sewage, garbage, sewage sludge, munitions, chemical wastes, biological materials, radioactive materials (except those regulated under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.)), heat, wrecked or discarded equipment, rock, sand, cellar dirt and industrial, municipal, and agricultural waste discharged into water.*

EPA's Integrated Report Guidance recommends that states submit an "Integrated Report" that will satisfy Clean Water Act (CWA) requirements for Sections 305(b) overall water quality report, 303(d) Impaired Waters List and Section 314 assessment of publicly owned lakes. This Integrated Report shows the following information:

- delineation of water quality assessment units (AUs) based on [National Hydrography Dataset \(NHD\)](#);
- status of and progress toward achieving comprehensive assessments of all waters;
- attainment status of water quality standards (WQS) for every AU assessed;
- additional monitoring that may be needed to determine WQS attainment status and, if necessary, to support development of TMDLs for each pollutant/AU combination;
- schedules for additional monitoring planned for AUs;
- pollutant/AU combinations still requiring TMDLs; and
- TMDL development schedules reflecting the priority ranking of each pollutant/AU combination.

Virginia's biennial water quality assessment is conducted by DEQ, with the assistance of DCR and the Virginia Department of Health (VDH), to determine the water quality conditions in the Commonwealth. The results of this water quality analysis are usually reported to the EPA by April 1 of even numbered years. The Integrated Report describes the aggregated water quality conditions of the State and contains the individual listing of those waters identified as "impaired" for one or more designated uses and needing a TMDL. As per EPA guidance, the former 305(b) Water Quality Assessment Report and the 303(d) Impaired Waters List are now combined into a single Integrated Report. EPA compiles the data from all State reports into a national water quality status report that is presented to Congress.

SECTION 1. MODIFICATIONS TO PREVIOUS GUIDANCE

DEQ has incorporated EPA Integrated Reporting guidance initially developed in 2004, with all subsequent versions current to January 2025. DEQ's guidance for the 2026 Integrated Report contains the following notable modifications:

- 1) Pollutants assigned equations in EPA approved TMDLs to address aquatic life impairments due to biological monitoring will be listed in Category 4 instead of Category 3E (Section 4, Rule 19).
- 2) Impaired waters proposed for "nesting" within an EPA-approved TMDL watershed should have a rationale completed and released with the Draft IR for public comment (Section 6.2, Rule 3).

SECTION 2. FEDERAL AND VIRGINIA ASSESSMENT CATEGORIES

The 2026 EPA Integrated Report Guidance and the Assessment, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Tracking and Implementation System (ATTAINS) have five major categories and three subcategories into which every assessment unit (AU) is placed based on designated use attainment. Additionally, Virginia has created several subcategories to supplement the federal categories, enabling a more precise water quality tracking and reporting mechanism.

Below are the US EPA-defined categories and associated Virginia-defined subcategories:

FULLY SUPPORTING - Waters are supporting one or more designated uses.

EPA Category 1 - Attaining all associated designated uses and no designated use is threatened.

Va. Category 1A - waters are attaining all uses and a TMDL has been developed for one or more uses.

EPA Category 2 – Available data and/or other information indicate that some, but not all designated uses are supported.

Va. Category 2A - waters are supporting one or more uses for which they are assessed.

Va. Category 2B - the Shellfish Use is fully supporting, but harvesting is limited because of seasonal or conditional closures per VDH Department of Shellfish Sanitation.

Va. Category 2C - waters are now attaining the use(s) for which they were originally 303(d) listed and the TMDL is EPA approved but other applicable use(s) were not monitored and assessed.

INDETERMINATE - Waters needing additional information.

EPA Category 3 - Insufficient data and/or information to determine whether any designated uses are met.

Va. Category 3A - no data are available within the data window of the current assessment to determine if any designated use is attained and the water is not currently listed as impaired.

Va. Category 3B - some data exist but are insufficient to determine support of designated uses.

Such waters will be prioritized for follow up monitoring, as needed.

Va. Category 3C- data collected by a citizen monitoring or another organization indicating water quality problems may exist but the methodology and/or data quality has not been approved for a determination of support of designated use(s). These waters are considered as having insufficient data and are prioritized by DEQ for follow up monitoring.

Va. Category 3D - data collected by a citizen monitoring or other organization indicating designated use(s) are being attained but the methodology and/or data quality has not been approved for such a determination.

Va. Category 3E – waters are of concern to the state and data exist, but no water quality standard has been established for the pollutant. The waterbody either exceeds a state screening value or failed a toxicity test. Such waters will be prioritized for follow up monitoring, as needed.

IMPAIRED - Waters are impaired or threatened but a TMDL is not required.

EPA Category 4A – water is impaired or threatened for one or more designated uses but does not require a TMDL (an EPA approved TMDL already exists or the waterbody has been nested within an approved TMDL). In the case of a nested water, a new TMDL is not necessary to address the newly impaired water if the nesting procedure is followed (see Section 6.2, Rule 3).

EPA Category 4B - water is impaired or threatened for one or more designated uses but does not require the development of a TMDL because other pollution control requirements (e.g., best management practices) required by local, State or Federal authority expected to address all water-pollutant combinations and attain all WQs in a reasonable period of time.

EPA Category 4C - water is impaired or threatened for one or more designated uses but does not require a TMDL because the impairment is not caused by a pollutant. This category includes Virginia waters that are swampwaters awaiting aquatic life criteria reclassification because the impairment has been determined to be caused by natural conditions.

Va. Category 4D – part(s) of a water quality standard is attained for a pollutant with a TMDL, but the remaining criteria for the standard were not assessed due to insufficient information. Applies only to the dissolved oxygen parameter and the associated open water and deep water Chesapeake Bay specific designated uses as well as the overall aquatic life use if all other aquatic life parameters are meeting criteria.

IMPAIRED - Waters are impaired or threatened and require a TMDL.

EPA Category 5 - Waters are impaired or threatened and a TMDL is needed.

Va. Category 5A - a water quality standard is not attained. The water is impaired or threatened for one or more designated uses by a pollutant(s) and requires a TMDL (303d list).

Va. Category 5B - the water quality standard for shellfish use is not attained. One or more

pollutants causing impairment require TMDL development (303d list).

Va. Category 5C - the water quality standard is not attained due to “suspected” natural conditions. The water is impaired for one or more designated uses by a pollutant(s) and may require a TMDL (303d list). Water Quality Standards for these waters may be re-evaluated due to the presence of natural conditions.

Va. Category 5D - the water quality standard is not attained where TMDLs for a pollutant(s) have been developed and one or more pollutants are still causing impairment requiring additional TMDL development (303d list).

Va. Category 5F - the water quality standard is attained for a pollutant(s) with a TMDL and 303(d) delisting has been approved but the water remains impaired for additional pollutant(s) requiring TMDL development (303d list).

Va. Category 5R - the water quality standard is not attained, and the water is impaired, and implementation of an EPA-accepted advance restoration plan is expected to result in attainment (303d list). A status update will be provided each 303(d) cycle to evaluate progress.

EPA Category 5M – the water quality standard is not attained for mercury primarily due to atmospheric deposition (303d list).

SECTION 3. GENERAL RULES OF WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The 305(b)/303(d) assessments seek to characterize surface waters under typical, ambient conditions. For this reason, water quality assessments are based on data that are representative of normal conditions. The assessment begins by analyzing QA/QC-approved data from DEQ ambient water quality monitoring stations, biological, sediment and fish tissue monitoring, special studies and/or other non-DEQ water quality data collected during the six-year assessment period¹. This interval of time works in concert with the ambient rotating watershed monitoring program. Assessment data are compared to both numeric and narrative criteria established for Virginia’s designated uses and promulgated in its [Water Quality Standards](#) (WQS) regulation. DEQ does not interpret the impacts of a single pollution event (e.g., unusually intense wet-weather, incident response) as representative of ambient conditions if it is believed that the problem has been addressed through a permitting action or other control measure. Listing decisions will not be based on datasets that are solely targeted or biased².

The following list of rules is to be applied uniformly, only to be modified after internal review or directive from EPA. Specific designated use assessment methodologies are outlined in Section 4 of this document.

1 Unless otherwise noted in Section 4. Assessment Methodology.

2 DEQ may assess targeted datasets collected to investigate probable stressors for existing benthic impairments (i.e. toxics). This may lead to the identification of other assessment units with impaired aquatic life uses. These impairments may be addressed under the TMDL(s) developed to address the initial benthic impairment.

Rule 1

Impaired waters are defined as those with exceedances of recurring or human health-related WQS as documented by quality assured monitoring data. Predictive data generally refers to computer-generated modeling data and may be used for assessment purposes on a case-by-case basis. Impairments are generally determined from exceedances of the numeric/narrative WQS, using the guidelines described in Section 4 of this manual.

Previous EPA guidance allows for the use of an exceedance rate of >10.5% of the total samples analyzed to establish impairment using conventional parameters (i.e., dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature.) This “allowable” exceedance rate considers equipment failure and/or human error. Single samples (n = 1) will be considered insufficient information for assessment. For conventional parameters, two exceedances of the applicable WQS in a dataset with less than 10 samples or > 10.5% of samples in a dataset with more than 10 samples is required for a water to be listed as impaired.

Rule 2

Waters where restrictions are placed on the shellfishing and fish consumption uses by the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) are determined to not be meeting these designated uses ([9 VAC 25-260-10 A.](#)) and are listed as impaired, unless the designated use has been administratively removed. Uses are administratively removed in the presence of a permitted discharge outfall and any associated VDH safety zone, where the salinity regimes are not conducive for productive harvest, or where the VDH status is “prohibited” or “prohibited-nonproductive” within the assessment window.

Rule 3

Escherichia coli (in freshwater) and enterococci (in saltwater and the transition zone) data will be assessed for the recreation designated use. These indicators replaced fecal coliform bacteria in 2006. Any waters previously listed for fecal coliform will remain as impaired until appropriate bacteria data are available and assessed.

Virginia adopted EPA’s 2012 nationally recommended primary contact recreational water quality criteria in 2019. The criteria are comprised of a Statistical Threshold Value (STV), which can be exceeded no more than 10% of the time over any period up to 90 days, and a geometric mean value, which cannot be exceeded over any period up to 90 days. For determining primary contact recreation use support, a 90-day assessment period should be used. These periods will be assessed on a rolling basis (i.e., determined from each sample date and adding 89 days.) Each 90-day period that is assessed should be evaluated using a dataset containing at least one sample that is not used in a preceding or subsequent 90-day period. The STV is 410 counts per 100 ml for *E. coli* in freshwater and 130 counts per 100 ml for enterococci in saltwater and transition zone. The geometric mean criteria is 126 counts per 100 ml for *E. coli* in freshwater and 35 counts per 100 ml for enterococci in saltwater and transition zone. See [9 VAC 25-260-140-C](#) for freshwater, saltwater, and transition zone delineation. However, water quality data attributed to an unusually intense wet-weather event such as a hurricane or tropical storm may be excluded from geomean calculation because of the technical, science-based rationale that these data are not representative of normal conditions or that they don’t represent conditions used to develop the criteria.

For each assessment unit, primary contact recreation use assessments are based on bacteria monitoring data collected during the two most recent calendar years of the six-year assessment window. For the 2026 IR cycle this would mean only bacteria data collected between January 1, 2023, and December 31, 2024, will be

Final 2026

assessed for recreation use support. The focus on the most recent data collected aligns with the DEQ bacteria monitoring strategy as outlined in the [Water Quality Monitoring Strategy](#), updated in February 2022. The strategy outlines a high frequency monitoring network of approximately 100 sites over a two-year period prioritizing primary contact recreation and public access, areas where TMDL implementation plans have been established as well as other criteria for consideration. DEQ has elected to focus on the two most recent years of monitoring data because the 2012 nationally recommended criteria do not have a recommended return interval of excursions of the geometric mean criteria. Additionally, an evaluation of more recent data ensures that the primary contact recreation use attainment will be determined from a range of representative environmental conditions rather than from extreme wet-weather events that may occur sporadically within the six-year assessment window.

Ten or more samples in a 90-day period are required to calculate a geometric mean. No exceedances of the geometric mean and less than a 10 percent exceedance rate of the STV will result in a 'fully supporting' determination.

A decision of impairment will be made when there are one or more 90-day periods characterized by either; a) a geometric mean exceedance, b) a STV exceedance rate greater than 10 percent (when the sample size is greater than or equal to 10) and/or c) typically two or more STV exceedances in a small dataset ($n < 10$), due to the uncertainty with small datasets, but this scenario will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

Bacteria densities reported as both Colony Forming Units (CFU) and Most Probable Number (MPN) shall be assessed against the numeric values in [9VAC25-260-170-A](#), pursuant EPA's approval of the methods specified in [40 CFR Part136.3](#). Approved test methods that report either unit shall be used for assessment.

Rule 4

Conventional parameter (i.e., dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature) data generated by probabilistic monitoring (ProbMon) networks will be used to create a general overview of those waters and to direct targeted monitoring in the future. For most ProbMon stations, only one data point per parameter will be available, providing insufficient information for determination of impairment. For ProbMon stations with two data points for conventional parameters, assessment will be the same as any station with two or more data points.

Benthic data will be compared to the Virginia Stream Condition Index (VSCI) or Virginia Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index (VCPMI) and assessed accordingly.

A single "grab sample" exceedance of human health or aquatic life toxic criteria is assessed as insufficient information and follow-up monitoring should be conducted as resources allow to determine if the water is impaired. A single chronic or acute exceedance of a 30-day semi-permeable membrane device (SPMD) sample for a toxic parameter associated with aquatic life and wildlife use is considered insufficient information.

Rule 5

To be eligible for assessment, a continuous monitoring dataset must cover at least 30 days (consecutive or otherwise), except in the assessment of maximum hourly temperature change criteria, which may be assessed on a dataset spanning no less than 15 days. The continuous monitoring dataset will have undergone rigorous and standardized QA/QC screening before analysis. If a continuous monitoring dataset is used to place a water

on the 303(d) Impaired Waters List, then an additional continuous monitoring dataset, collected during a subsequent year, during the same month(s) as the listing dataset, must be used to delist it. See Section 4.11 for detailed assessment methodology.

Rule 6

When data are insufficient for the determination of use attainment but indicate possible impairment, additional monitoring should be considered. In past report cycles the parameter status “Observed Effects” was used to categorize indications in the form of single sample WQS exceedances, sediment and fish tissue screening value exceedances, observed pollutants or signs of water quality degradation (i.e., fish kills) lacking specific standards, or lower quality data that point to possible impairment (e.g., high bacteria counts on a Coliscan® plate). Where data are available, but no numeric criteria or assessment thresholds developed for this guidance apply, waters should be assessed as Category 3E. These waters are of concern to the state, but no water quality standard exists. Data show exceedances of a state screening value or failure of a toxicity test. This rule applies to conventional and toxic parameters (water column, sediment, nutrient, and fish tissue) as well as biological monitoring. Waters with single WQS exceedances or lower quality data that warrant follow-up monitoring would be Category 3B or Category 3C if non-agency data.

Rule 7

Waters that are suspected to be impaired due to naturally occurring, non-anthropogenic conditions will be classified as Category 5C (possibly needing a TMDL) of the Integrated Report. Examples of natural impairments include low DO and/or pH in slow-flowing waters or high temperature from thermal springs. If EPA agrees with DEQ’s assessment that the exceedances are a result of natural conditions, the parameter will then be listed in Category 4C (impaired but not needing a TMDL). For waters in Category 5C or 4C, the water quality standards will be reviewed and possibly updated during the next triennial review to reflect variations caused by natural conditions for these waters. Once appropriate water quality standards are in place, data will be reviewed again to determine whether these waters meet or exceed designated uses. It may be necessary to conduct a TMDL study or Use Attainability Analysis prior to standards modification in order to determine and/or verify the appropriate criteria based on natural pollutant loadings.

Dissolved oxygen should not be listed as an impairment cause in Class VII waters lacking human-induced pollutant sources, per [9VAC25-260-50](#). When available, other data—such as fish community composition, habitat assessment, benthic macroinvertebrate composition, etc. —should be evaluated against the narrative criterion to determine use support.

Rule 8

Waters that have been assessed as impaired (Category 4 or 5) will continue to be tracked in the DEQ Comprehensive Environmental Data System (CEDS), the Assessment, TMDL Tracking and Implementation System (ATTAINS) and the monitoring station list, whether they have recent monitoring data or not. These waters will retain the results of previous assessments for all impaired designated uses. Waters classified as Category 5 will carry this designation until a TMDL is developed, at which time the water will move to Category 4. Category 4 or 5 waters will carry the impaired designation until additional monitoring data reveal the waters are no longer impaired. Justification must be provided to EPA before removing an impaired water from the 303(d) Impaired Waters List. In contrast, fully supporting (Category 2) waters can only retain their status for two additional assessment cycles (based on data up to 4 years outside the current assessment data window) with no new data collected. After two assessment cycles with no data in the assessment data window, the

Final 2026

water will be classified as “indeterminate”, and the outdated supporting data will be removed from the monitoring station list. The water will remain as “indeterminate” until new data is collected and assessed. Furthermore, there should not be a change in the assessment determination made on partial datasets that remain in the assessment data window from previous assessment cycles. The initial determination based on the original dataset should remain in place and follow this rule until new data is collected.

Rule 9

Duplicate and/or split samples collected for QA/QC purposes will not be used in the assessment. The primary sample (S1) will be assessed against the appropriate standard and the duplicate/split sample (S2) will be used only to document lab analysis quality control.

Rule 10

Sampling stations that happen to be located within a permitted mixing zone, primarily via probabilistic monitoring, will not be individually assessed for aquatic life use. They will be included with the overall probabilistic assessment. Any other stations that were inadvertently located in mixing zones will not be assessed individually for aquatic life use as the use is exempt in mixing zones.

Rule 11

A review of stockable and some natural trout waters currently listed as impaired has revealed that many of these impairments are due to erroneous segment boundaries or natural conditions. Both issues were addressed as part of Virginia’s most recent review of its water quality standards. For the 2026 assessment, these waters will be categorized as 1) Category 2A if specifically addressed via amendments to the water quality standards regulation and currently meeting new criteria or 2) Category 4C (impaired due to natural conditions and not needing a TMDL) as long as supporting documentation is provided by the Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR) and endangered species are not being adversely affected. This should prevent and/or correct the misclassification of these segments, pending any amendments during Triennial Review. Once these standard reviews are completed and EPA approved, Category 4C waters will be re-evaluated and classified accordingly.

Rule 12

Data associated with multi-probe meters are to be rounded to one decimal place to best reflect the precision of the probes.

Rule 13

Nested impairments are those waters that are located within a watershed where there is an existing TMDL equation for the listing parameter. A TMDL establishes load allocations to meet TMDL endpoints and attain water quality standards for the pollutant of concern in waters within the TMDL watershed. Once the TMDL equation is approved by EPA, any waters within the watershed that are subsequently assessed as impaired for the parameter with an equation established in the TMDL will be proposed for listing as Category 4A (impaired but has a TMDL). Nested impairments are normally bacteria related to recreation and shellfish consumption uses but may also include benthic impairments (aquatic life use) depending on the stressors involved.

Rule 14

Division of Consolidated Laboratories (DCLS) has determined that total dissolved ammonia (STORET Parameter
Final 2026

Code 00608) and total ammonia (STORET Parameter Code 00610) are essentially the same parameter. Thus, where only dissolved ammonia data are available, these will be used to assess against the total ammonia criteria. Where both data are available, total ammonia should be used to assess the criteria, unless the total ammonia value is remark coded as less than the detection limit and the dissolved ammonia value is not. In which case the dissolved ammonia should be used to assess the criteria.

In general, dissolved toxic parameters, specifically metals, should be used to assess aquatic life criteria except for Aluminum and Selenium. Total Aluminum and Total Selenium should be used to assess against the aquatic life criteria. The total form of toxic parameters, including metals, should be used to assess human health criteria, where applicable. When data are only available for dissolved parameters, these results should be assessed against the human health criteria.

Rule 15

Shellfish waters where restrictions or prohibitions are due solely to the location of a discharge outfall and associated buffer zone or where the use is deemed too limited to harvest due to low salinity or other natural reasons—and not due to water quality exceedances—will not be included in the 303(d) list. In these cases, assessment is not conducted as the shellfish designated use has been administratively removed through the issuance of a discharge permit or prohibition on harvesting and there is no instream data indicating impairment.

Rule 16

Uncensored values should be used when evaluating data for the water quality assessment. Two exceptions include: bacteria parameters, where the Lower Detection Limit reported from the lab will be used for analysis and benthic chlorophyll-a, where a model-predicted value will be used to represent sampling events with less than 10% filamentous algae cover observed.

Rule 17

All instances of rounding in the assessment process will use the “round to even” approach to ensure consistency. The memo describing the approach is included as Appendix G.

Rule 18

Per [9VAC25-260-50](#), dissolved oxygen, temperature and pH data collected in a waterbody where the projected flow was below 7Q10 on the sample date will not be assessed.

Rule 19

A pollutant or pollutants with an EPA approved TMDL equation to address aquatic life impairments due to biological monitoring will be listed in Category 4 along with the original cause of impairment, indicating that additional TMDL development is not required. When the original cause of impairment shows improvement and will be proposed for delisting, both the original cause parameter and other associated listed parameter(s) can be proposed for delisting concurrently.

SECTION 4. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

4.1 Monitoring Station Siting and Delineation

DEQ has a vast network of active ambient water quality monitoring stations and biological monitoring stations statewide. The ambient stations are generally monitored bimonthly while the biological stations are normally monitored twice a year, usually in the spring and fall. Monitoring programs use non-random (ambient) or random (probabilistic) site selection, or a combination of the two, depending on program objectives. DEQ's [Water Quality Monitoring Strategy](#) describes the main objectives of the agency's water monitoring operations and provides a detailed overview of the monitoring programs.

During this assessment cycle, DEQ has continued to use a rotating watershed approach where stations are sited for two years of bimonthly sampling within a selected major river basin. DEQ's [Ambient Water Quality Monitoring Project Plan](#) (WQM QAPP) describes the agency's approach to generating water monitoring data through various sampling activities. The WQM QAPP ensures water monitoring samples are collected in a manner that produce comparable, representative, and complete datasets. To provide consistency between the regional assessment staff and to get an accurate number of assessed stream miles in Virginia, the following stream delineation guidelines are the primary considerations used in the assessment unit (AU) size decisions. However, in certain cases, best professional judgment of the regional staff may be used if the delineation results are contrary to these guidelines. Where appropriate, documentation of these decisions should be included in the AU narrative.

1. Typically, no more than 10 miles of free-flowing stream should be assessed from data collected at one ambient monitoring station. Miles assessed for a toxic pollutant or biological impairment may vary from the miles assessed for conventional or bacteria parameters.
2. One monitoring station should not be used to assess an entire watershed unless land use, source, and habitat are relatively homogeneous.
3. When determining the miles assessed for a free-flowing monitoring station, the following items need to be considered:
 - a) WQ Standards use designations (i.e. classes and/or special standards),
 - b) point and/or nonpoint source input to the stream or its tributaries,
 - c) watershed characteristics such as land use,
 - d) local habitat characteristics (i.e. riparian vegetation, stream banks, substrate, slope, or channel morphology),
 - e) entry of a large tributary or diversion, or
 - f) hydrologic features such as channelization or dams.

4. For tidal and estuarine stations not associated with the Chesapeake Bay monitoring program, EPA guidance suggests using a 4-mile radius for open water stations; a 2-mile radius for sheltered bay stations, and a 0.5 mile radius for highly sheltered bay stations³.
5. Segment delineation will be performed using the USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) coverage or another appropriate GIS dataset.
6. Spatial coverage for the assessment of estuarine probabilistic monitoring stations should be identified in conjunction with the development of the regional monitoring plan and coordinated by regional monitoring and assessment staff and/or the estuarine probabilistic monitoring coordinator and Bay monitoring staff.
7. If the mixing zone of a VPDES-permitted facility exists in an impaired segment, the parameter-specific length of the mixing zone is specifically understood to be separate from the impaired segment, even though the boundaries of the segment and/or its description may show the impairment as continuous.
8. Probabilistic stations in free-flowing waters will not be delineated into 303(d) segments unless they are characterized by toxics data, biological data, or more than one measurement of a conventional parameter.
9. AUs with more than one monitoring station should not be assessed based on pooled results from individual stations, unless specifically described in assessment methodology (i.e., data collected in the same assessment unit in Section 187 lakes/reservoirs or Chesapeake Bay segment). AUs historically assessed with multiple monitoring stations with significantly different assessment results within a given cycle should be split to accurately reflect current conditions.

4.2 Evaluation of Designated Uses

The 305(b) process assesses a total of six primary designated uses, as appropriate for a particular waterbody, based on water quality standards: wildlife, aquatic life, recreation, fish consumption, shellfishing, and public water supply uses. The Chesapeake Bay criteria, adopted in 2005, aim to protect unique aquatic life environments found in the Bay. Following are details relating to the assessment of the six designated uses of Virginia's waters. Details relating to the assessment of the Chesapeake Bay specific designated uses is included in Section 4.3.

4.2.1 Wildlife Use:

Wildlife use includes the propagation, growth, and protection of a balanced, indigenous population of wildlife. Support of the wildlife use is determined by assessing the toxic criteria for aquatic life found in [9 VAC-25-260-140 B](#). These criteria were developed to protect aquatic life as well as wildlife.

For toxic pollutant assessments, both chronic and acute criteria can be assessed whenever sufficient data are

³ https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-09/documents/guidelines_for_preparation_of_the_comprehensive_state_water_quality_assessments_305b_reports_and_electronic_updates_1997_supplement-volume2.pdf

available as applicable. Chronic criteria are to be assessed when multiple grab samples are collected within two separate four-day periods within a three-year period, or when there are two or more separate 30-day SPMD deployments within a three-year period. Two samples (either grab or SPMD) taken within three consecutive years are sufficient to assess acute criteria. The three-year period should start each calendar year on January 1 and be assessed on a rolling basis throughout the assessment window.

For toxic pollutant assessments, waters where there are two or more samples (either grab or SPMD) and no exceedances of aquatic life criteria within most of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered fully supporting for wildlife use. Waters where there are two or more exceedances of the same WQS aquatic life toxic criteria in at least one of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered impaired for the wildlife use. A single exceedance of a WQS aquatic life toxic criteria within the assessment window, is considered insufficient information for the wildlife use.

For ammonia in free-flowing and tidal waters, acute criteria are a one-hour average concentration not to be exceeded more than once every three years on the average, and chronic criteria are 30-day average concentrations not to be exceeded more than once every three years on the average. In addition, the four-day average concentration of total ammonia nitrogen (in mg N/L) shall not exceed 2.5 times the chronic criterion within a 30-day period more than once every three years on the average in free-flowing streams. See [9VAC-25-260-155](#) for additional information on calculating the ammonia criteria and applicable aquatic life considerations.

For all chronic criteria that are computed from site-specific inputs (e.g., total hardness), a median of the input data over the appropriate duration should be calculated before computing the criterion.

4.2.2 Aquatic Life Use:

Aquatic life use includes the propagation, growth, and protection of a balanced indigenous population of aquatic life (including game and marketable fish) which may be expected to inhabit the waters.

Support of aquatic life use can be determined by the assessment of one or more of the following data types: conventional parameters (dissolved oxygen, pH, and temperature), toxic pollutants in the water column, toxic pollutants in sediments, water toxicity testing, sediment toxicity testing, nutrient analysis, and the biological condition of benthic communities. All available data, relative to aquatic life use, shall be considered to determine if the aquatic life use is being supported. This assessment includes the sub-categories of aquatic life use associated with the Chesapeake Bay criteria.

Conventional parameters are assessed using the "Percent Method". A 10.5% exceedance threshold is used for determining full support or impairment for conventional parameters in datasets greater than or equal to 10 samples. An exceedance rate that is > 10.5% with at least two exceedances is normally considered impaired. An exceedance rate \leq 10.5% is considered fully supporting. A single exceedance in a small dataset (2-9 samples) is usually considered insufficient for use attainment determination, due to the uncertainty around small datasets, but this scenario will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

For dissolved oxygen, the instantaneous minimum standard is used to assess exceedances unless continuous monitoring data are available to assess the daily average. See Section 4.7 for assessment methodology for

lakes and reservoirs. See Section 4.12 for assessment methodology for continuous monitoring. Dissolved oxygen in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries is assessed according to the method outlined in Section 4.3.

For benthic macroinvertebrate assessments in free-flowing systems, data for the overall assessment period is rated as non-impaired when the Virginia Stream Condition Index (VSCI) or the Virginia Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index (VCPMI) scores are at or above their respective impairment thresholds (60 for the VSCI or 40 for the VCPMI). See Section 4.4 for additional methodology for biological assessments, including in estuarine systems.

For toxic pollutant assessments, both chronic and acute criteria can be assessed whenever sufficient data are available as applicable. Chronic criteria are to be assessed when multiple grab samples are collected within two separate four-day periods within a three-year period, or when there are two or more separate 30-day SPMD deployments within a three-year period. Two samples (either grab or SPMD) taken within three consecutive years are sufficient to assess acute criteria. The three-year period should start each calendar year on January 1 and be assessed on a rolling basis throughout the assessment window.

For toxic pollutant assessments, waters where there are two or more samples (either grab or SPMD) and no exceedances of aquatic life criteria within most of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered fully supporting for aquatic life use. Waters where there are two or more exceedances of the same WQS aquatic life toxic criteria in at least one of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered impaired for the aquatic life use. A single exceedance of a WQS aquatic life toxic criteria within the assessment window, is considered insufficient information for the aquatic life use.

For ammonia in free-flowing and tidal waters, acute criteria are a one-hour average concentration not to be exceeded more than once every three years on the average, and chronic criteria are 30-day average concentrations not to be exceeded more than once every three years on the average. In addition, the four-day average concentration of total ammonia nitrogen (in mg N/L) shall not exceed 2.5 times the chronic criterion within a 30-day period more than once every three years on the average in free-flowing streams. See [9VAC-25-260-155](#) for additional information on calculating the ammonia criteria and applicable aquatic life considerations.

For all chronic criteria that are computed from site-specific inputs (e.g., total hardness), a median of the input data over the appropriate duration should be calculated before computing the criterion.

4.2.3 Fish Consumption Use:

Fish consumption use includes the propagation, growth and protection of a balanced population of aquatic life including game and marketable fish. Human health is also a primary consideration with regards to fish consumption use. Support of this use is determined using three separate criteria.

First, support or lack thereof, is based on human health related advisories and/or restrictions issued by the Virginia Department of Health (VDH)⁴ based on monitoring data. The fish consumption use is determined to be impaired when the public is advised by VDH that fish consumption is prohibited for the general population or

⁴ <https://law.lis.virginia.gov/vacode/title32.1/chapter6/section32.1-248.01/>
Final 2026

that a certain fish species should not be consumed by the general population or sub-populations at greater risk, such as children and/or pregnant women. A water may be delisted once acceptable monitoring data has prompted lifting all fish consumption advisories within an assessment unit.

Second, a fish tissue sample (either a single specimen sample or composite sample) is compared to WQS criterion-based tissue values (TVs) and tissue screening values (TSVs) for toxic pollutants. No exceedances of a particular TV listed in Appendix D-1 results in a fully supporting assessment of the water for the fish consumption designated use, if there are no concurrent VDH fish consumption advisories. Two or more sample exceedances of a particular TV listed in Appendix D-1 results in an impaired assessment of the water for the fish consumption designated use. A single sample above a TV or TSV in the assessment window results in an insufficient information assessment and should be prioritized for follow-up monitoring.

Third, support of the fish consumption use is determined by comparison of water column or semi-permeable membrane device analytes to the human health criteria in public water supplies and/or other surface waters, as listed in the WQS ([9 VAC-25-260-140 B](#)). Criteria for human health metals should be assessed using total recoverable concentrations. When data are only available for dissolved metals, these results should be assessed against the human health criteria.

4.2.4 Shellfishing Use:

Shellfishing use includes the propagation, growth, and protection of a balanced population of aquatic life including marketable shellfish.

Use support is based on the determination of restrictions or condemnations on the harvesting and marketability of shellfish resources made by the VDH-Division of Shellfish Sanitation (DSS) as of the most recent condemnation list (December 2024) associated with the reporting period. DSS has the statutory authority to determine shellfish harvesting and marketability status. DSS uses four classifications for describing the status of shellfish waters:

Open:	Growing areas from which shellfish may be taken for direct marketing at all times.
Conditionally Condemned, Seasonally Restricted:	Growing areas where the water quality may be affected by seasonal or sporadic use of boat docks or harbor facilities are considered conditionally approved. Normally, this would occur during the boating season (April 30 through October 31).
Restricted:	Growing areas where a sanitary survey indicates a limited degree of pollution which makes it unsafe to market shellfish for direct marketing. Shellfish from such areas may be marketed after purifying or relaying activities in accordance with certain VDH-DSS requirements.
Prohibited, Prohibited-Nonproductive:	Growing areas where the harvesting of shellfish from these areas for direct marketing, relaying, or depuration is prohibited. The sanitary

survey may indicate dangerous numbers of pathogenic microorganisms or other contaminants that might reach that area. Additionally, prohibited areas due to administrative closures.

Specific information regarding DSS assessment methodology and the listing/delisting flowchart for shellfish waters can be found in Appendix B of this guidance document. For the 305(b)/303(d) Integrated Report, listing and delisting will be based on instream data assessed for the reporting period. However, as the TMDL begins development, if new or more recent data shows the shellfish water is no longer impaired, a petition for delisting will be crafted and submitted to EPA for their approval by the Watershed Program (TMDL) staff.

4.2.5 Recreation/Swimming Use:

Recreation use assessment includes swimming and other primary and secondary water contact recreation uses such as water skiing and pleasure boating. Support or lack thereof of the recreation use is based on comparison of primary contact recreational criteria and/or VDH closures or advisories due to excessive bacteria, the presence of harmful algal blooms (HABs), or nuisance algal growth.

Bacteria

Virginia's adoption of the EPA 2012 nationally recommended primary contact recreational water quality criteria has modified the assessment methodology for bacteria data. For each assessment unit, primary contact recreation use assessments should be based on bacteria monitoring data collected within the two most recent calendar years of the six-year assessment window.

A decision of impairment will be made when there are one or more 90-day periods characterized by either; a) a geometric mean exceedance, b) a STV exceedance rate greater than 10 percent (when the sample size is greater than or equal to 10) and/or c) typically two or more STV exceedances in a small dataset ($n < 10$), due to the uncertainty with small datasets, but this scenario will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

A decision of impairment is also determined if 10 or more days within a 90-day period are identified as having a VDH beach swimming advisory within the two most recent calendar years of the six-year assessment window.

No exceedances of the geometric mean and 10 percent or less exceedance rate of the STV in any 90-day periods will result in a fully supporting determination, as long as there is no VDH beach swimming advisory rising to the level of impairment.

For additional assessment information on bacteria monitoring in lakes/reservoirs, see Section 4.7 Lakes/Reservoirs Assessment.

Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs)

The Virginia Department of Health (VDH) is the agency responsible for issuing notices and swimming advisories due to the potential or confirmed presence of HABs. Advisories are issued based on VDH's "Guidance for Cyanobacteria Bloom Recreational Advisory Management" (VDH HAB Guidance) which is posted to the VDH website: <https://www.vdh.virginia.gov/waterborne-hazards-control/harmful-algal-blooms/>. VDH uses DEQ's monitoring data to inform advisory determinations. Impairment status for the recreation use due to HABs for a waterbody is based upon presence or absence of a VDH swimming

Final 2026

advisory and the applicable monitoring data collected to confirm the HAB, all conducted in accordance with VDH HAB Guidance and DEQ Monitoring Protocols.

A waterbody would be assessed as fully supporting for the recreation use if a VDH swimming advisory was issued in the two most recent years of the assessment window but was lifted after the minimum required follow-up sampling providing evidence which indicate there are no persistent HABs.

A waterbody would be assessed as impaired for the recreation use if there is an issued VDH swimming advisory and the HAB is confirmed through the initial follow-up sampling events in the two most recent calendar years of the assessment window. The regional assessor should delineate the impairment using the boundaries included in the VDH advisory.

A waterbody impaired for the recreational use due to HABs may be delisted and assessed as Fully Supporting if, within the 6-year assessment window, there are no VDH swimming advisories or there are VDH swimming advisories that are lifted after the minimum required follow-up sampling providing evidence which indicate there are no persistent HABs.

Water Quality Impacts Due to Algal Growth

Since the early 2010s, DEQ has fielded concerns over excessive filamentous algae in certain sections of the Shenandoah River basin. Citizen complaints have centered on the negative impact that filamentous algae blooms have on stream aesthetics and recreational activities such as swimming, wading, kayaking, and fishing. In response, DEQ conducted a special study during 2016-2019 with two goals: 1) To develop a scientifically based, defensible, and reproducible field method for quantifying filamentous algae growth and 2) to develop a body of information that could be used to determine benthic chlorophyll-a thresholds for nuisance filamentous algae growth. DEQ's [Water Quality Monitoring Standard Operating Procedures](#) describes the specific sampling procedures for filamentous algae in detail.

Assessment Methodology

DEQ has chosen to develop criteria for benthic chlorophyll-a, because it is a quantitative estimate of algal biomass. The benthic chlorophyll-a criteria apply in certain wadable portions of the mainstem sections of the Shenandoah River, North Fork Shenandoah River and South Fork Shenandoah River. The boundaries are set forth in Virginia's Water Quality Standards 9VAC25-260-310 (ii). The recreation use is assessed using either a two-month median or seasonal median for benthic Chlorophyll-a. A determination of persistent nuisance filamentous algae impeding the recreation use should be made when exceedances of either of the specified benthic chlorophyll-a concentration thresholds occur in more than one recreation season (May 1 to October 31) in three years. The three-year period should be represented by three consecutive calendar years (i.e., samples are taken between January 1 in the first year to December 31 in the third year.)

To allow for the appropriate calculation of the two-month median and seasonal median, a value of 16 mg/m² will be used as the conservative left-censored value to represent monitoring events where less than 10% cover was observed and no benthic chlorophyll-a sample was taken (per DEQ monitoring protocols). This value is referred to as a representative value and reflects that the site was monitored but the collection of a benthic

chlorophyll-a sample was not warranted because little to no algae was present⁵. Chlorophyll-a data and representative values will be aggregated at the assessment unit level. The following scenarios indicate an impairment of the recreation use due to persistent nuisance filamentous algae:

- where the monthly medians from two consecutive months exceeds 150 mg/m² in more than one year within any three-year-period in the assessment window, or
- a seasonal median calculated using at least four separate monthly medians in one season exceeds the seasonal criterion of 100 mg/m² in more than one year within any three-year-period in the assessment window.

A waterbody will be considered fully supporting if the assessment dataset shows there are no three-year periods in the assessment window for which an exceedance of either the two-month median or seasonal median criteria occurred in more than one recreational season. This scenario would also constitute a delisting of a recreation impairment due to benthic chlorophyll-a. Benthic chlorophyll-a samples collected by DEQ in response to user complaints on wadable waterbodies within the segments identified in 9VAC25-260-310 (ii) will be considered insufficient information if there are not enough samples collected in an assessment unit to calculate the two-month median or seasonal median. These locations will be considered for future monthly monitoring as regional resources allow (Category 3B).

User complaints and filamentous algae data⁶ and/or information submitted to DEQ for evaluation that is collected by volunteer or non-agency organizations on wadable waterbodies within the segments identified in 9VAC25-260-310 (ii) that do not meet agency QA/QC protocols, will be considered insufficient information, and prioritized for follow-up monitoring (Category 3C).

Filamentous algae data collected by DEQ in response to user complaints and filamentous algae data and/or information submitted to DEQ for evaluation that is collected by volunteer or non-agency organizations that do not meet agency QA/QC protocols, all collected on wadable waterbodies outside of segments identified in 9VAC25-260-310 (ii), will be considered insufficient information and considered for follow-up monitoring (Category 3E). These waterbodies may be considered for inclusion in 9VAC25-260-310 (ii) in the future.

4.2.6 Public Water Supply Use:

Waters that are used for public drinking water supply (PWS) are identified in the WQS and are protected by additional health-related standards that are applicable only to these waters. Taste and odor criteria to maintain acceptable taste, odor or aesthetic quality of drinking water apply at the only at the drinking water intake. Support or lack thereof of this use is based on a comparison of water column data to applicable public water supply criteria. Criteria for human health metals should be assessed using total recoverable concentrations. When data are only available for dissolved parameters, these results should be assessed against the human health criteria.

5 The censored benthic chlorophyll-a value of 16 mg/m² was derived from a linear regression model using log-transformed benthic chlorophyll-a data and total algae coverage (sum of filamentous algae and blue-green algae surber observations). The algae coverage was subsetted to 0-50% coverage, and the model used data from 2017 – 2023. This resulted in a total of 58 datapoints used for the model. This value will be recalculated for each assessment cycle based on all available % cover and benthic chlorophyll-a data.

6 Filamentous algae data include visual bank observations, the results of FILBEN analysis from DCLS (which includes both chlorophyll-a and chlorophyll-b, pheophyton, and ash-free dry mass) and biomass (wet-wrung weight) collected per DEQ's filamentous algae QAPP and SOP.

Impairment is determined if the median of two or more water samples exceeds human health criteria in PWS designated waters within the assessment window. A single exceedance of human health criteria from a single sample in PWS designated waters within the assessment window-would result in an insufficient information determination indicating follow-up monitoring is needed. No exceedances of human health criteria in PWS waters based on the median of two or more samples collected within the assessment window will result in a fully supporting assessment determination.

If an exceedance of a taste and odor criteria is observed within the PWS designated area, follow up monitoring at the closest drinking water intake should occur as regional office resources allow to make an assessment determination.

Table 1 and 2 summarize the kinds of information required to establish designated use support.

Table 4-1. Designated Use Matrix

DESIGNATED USE	USE DESCRIPTION/INDICATOR PARAMETERS
Aquatic Life Use, Chesapeake Bay specific designated uses	Description: The propagation, growth, and protection of a balanced indigenous population of aquatic life that may be expected to inhabit a waterbody
	Parameters: Dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, chlorophyll a*, nutrients*, water column and sediment toxics, toxicity tests, benthics, submerged aquatic vegetation
Fish Consumption Use	Description: Game and marketable fish species that are safe for human health
	Parameters: VDH notices, fish tissue toxics, water column toxics
Shellfishing Use	Description: Marketable shellfish (clams, oysters, mussels) that are safe for human health
	Parameters: VDH notices
Recreation (Swimming) Use	Description: Swimming, boating, and other recreational activities
	Parameters: VDH notices for bacteria and harmful algal blooms, bacteria, benthic chlorophyll-a**
Public Water Supply Use	Description: Drinking water safe for human health
	Parameters: Water column toxics
Wildlife Use	Description: The propagation, growth, and protection of associated wildlife
	Parameters: Water column toxics

*Chlorophyll *a* and nutrients (total phosphorus) are assessed only in the lakes listed in Section 187 of the WQS. Chlorophyll *a* is also assessed in the tidal James River.

**Benthic Chlorophyll-a is only assessed in sections of the Shenandoah River, North Fork Shenandoah River and South Fork Shenandoah River per 9VAC 25-260-310.ii.

Table 4-2. Designated Use Assessment Methodology

Designated Use	Parameter/Data Type	Fully Supporting	Insufficient Information (prioritized for follow-up monitoring)	Impaired
Aquatic Life Wildlife (toxics only)	Conventional ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceedance rate \leq 10.5% for field parameters Median lacustrine TP² below criterion 90th percentile lacustrine chlorophyll a below criterion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level II³ data with an exceedance rate $>$ 10.5% (Category 3C) Single exceedance in small dataset (samples $<$10; Category 3B) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceedance rate $>$ 10.5% for field parameters, with a minimum of two exceedances Median lacustrine TP above criterion 90th percentile lacustrine chlorophyll a above criterion
	Biological	Benthic index scores \geq impairment threshold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level II³ data suggest degraded community (Category 3C) Benthic index score conflicts with biologist's best professional judgment (Category 3B) 	Benthic index score(s) $<$ impairment threshold
	Toxics	Typically, two or more grab or SPMD samples and no exceedances of the same chronic or acute aquatic life criteria in a 3-year period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single exceedance of chronic aquatic life use criteria using temporally aggregated water column grab samples in a 3-year period or one SPMD sample exceedance of chronic aquatic life use criteria in a 3-year period (Category 3B) Single water column grab or SPMD sample exceedance of acute aquatic life use criteria in a 3-year period (Category 3B) One or more toxicity test failures or sediment screening value exceedances (aquatic life only; Category 3E) 	Two or more grab or SPMD exceedances of the same chronic or acute aquatic life criteria in at least one 3-year period within the assessment data window.
Recreation	Bacteria	No geometric mean exceedances and STV exceedance rate \leq 10% in a 90-day period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level II³ data with one or more geometric mean exceedances or STV exceedance rate $>$ 10% in a 90-day period (Category 3C) Single STV exceedance in one or more 90-day periods with less than 10 samples due to uncertainty with small datasets (Category 3B) No STV exceedance in one or more 90-day periods but geometric mean cannot be calculated. (Category 3B) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or more geometric mean exceedance(s) in a 90-day period STV exceedance rate $>$ 10% in a 90-day period, usually with a minimum of two exceedances
	Benthic Chlorophyll-a ⁶	No three-year periods in the assessment window for which an exceedance of either the two-month median or seasonal median criteria occurred in more than one recreational season	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single sample collected in response to user complaints on segments identified in the water quality standards (Category 3B) Data collected on waterbodies outside of the segments identified in the Water Quality Standards (Category 3E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The median of at least two samples taken in two consecutive months exceeds 150 mg/m² in more than one year within any three-year-period in the assessment window A median of four samples collected in separate months in one season above the seasonal criterion of 100 mg/m² in more than one year within any three-year-period in the assessment window.
	VDH notice (Bacteria)			10 or more days within a 90-day period are identified as having a VDH beach swimming advisory within the two most recent calendar years of the six-year assessment window.

Designated Use	Parameter/Data Type	Fully Supporting	Insufficient Information (prioritized for follow-up monitoring)	Impaired
	VDH notice (HABs)	A VDH advisory that is lifted after the minimum follow-up sampling events in the two most recent years of the assessment window.		A VDH advisory that persists past the minimum follow-up sampling events in the two most recent years of the assessment window.
Shellfishing	VDH notice	Approved shellfish harvest waters or area classified as “conditionally condemned or seasonally restricted”		Areas classified as “restricted” or “prohibited”—excluding VPDES ⁵ outfalls, non-productive areas and administrative closures where no instream data are available
Fish Consumption	Toxics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The median of two or more water samples meets human health criteria. No exceedances of fish tissue TVs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single exceedance of a human health criterion using grab sample or SPMD data (Category 3B) Single sample exceedance of a tissue value or tissue screening value (Category 3B or 3E) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The median of two or more water samples exceed a human health criterion using grab sample or SPMD data Two or more sample exceedances of a tissue value
	VDH notice	No advisories and fish tissue data meet criteria.	A VDH advisory which does not limit consumption is in effect, based on fish tissue data (Category 3B)	A VDH advisory or restriction limiting or prohibiting consumption, based on fish tissue data
Public Water Supply	Toxics	The median of two or more water samples meets human health criteria.	A single exceedance in a single sample of PWS WQS using grab or SPMD data. (Category 3B)	The median of two or more samples exceeds a PWS WQS using grab samples or SPMD data.

¹Refer to [Section 4.3](#) for methodology specific to Chesapeake Bay criteria. Refer to [Section 4.7](#) for methodology specific to lakes and reservoirs. Refer to [Section 4.11](#) for methodology specific to continuous monitoring data.

²TP = total phosphorus concentration. Along with lacustrine chlorophyll a, only data from the most recent two years are aggregated. See [Section 4.7](#) for methodology specific to lakes/reservoirs.

³ Level II data are lower-quality data submitted to DEQ from other sources. See [Section 5](#) for more information.

⁴SPMD = semi-permeable membrane device (an instrument that passively samples ambient toxics over some length of time)

⁵VPDES=Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System

⁶The benthic chlorophyll-a criteria only apply to certain sections of the Shenandoah River, North Fork Shenandoah River and South Fork Shenandoah River. See 9VAC 25-260-310.ii for boundary applicability.

4.3 Chesapeake Bay Assessments

In addition to assessment of criteria for state-wide aquatic life designated uses as described elsewhere in this document, the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries will be assessed for: 1) aquatic life uses specific to the Chesapeake Bay estuarine system, and 2) the general narrative standard for aquatic life use through assessment of benthic invertebrate community condition. The following describes the Chesapeake Bay specific designated uses, applicable criteria, assessment process, and segmentation issues, as well as the Assessment, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Tracking and Implementation System (ATTAINS) and Integrated Reporting issues. Bay-specific criteria for dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll *a*, and submerged aquatic vegetation/water clarity are detailed in [9 VAC25-260-185](#).

4.3.1 Chesapeake Bay Specific Designated Uses

Migratory Fish Spawning and Nursery Designated Use: waters in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries that protect the survival, growth, and propagation of the early life stages of a balanced, indigenous population of anadromous, semi-anadromous, catadromous, and tidal-fresh resident fish species inhabiting spawning and nursery grounds. This designated use extends from the end of tidal waters to the downriver end of spawning and nursery habitats that have been determined through a composite of all targeted anadromous and semi-anadromous fish species' spawning and nursery habitats (see boundaries in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland. This designated use extends horizontally from the shoreline of the body of water to the adjacent shoreline and extends down through the water column to the bottom water-sediment interface. This use applies February 1 through May 31 and applies in addition to the open-water use described in this subsection.

Shallow-Water Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Designated Use: waters in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries that support the survival, growth, and propagation of submerged aquatic vegetation (rooted, underwater bay grasses). This use applies April 1 through October 31 in tidal-fresh, oligohaline and mesohaline Chesapeake Bay Program segments, and March 1 through November 30 in polyhaline Chesapeake Bay Program segments and applies in addition to the open-water use described in this subsection.

Open-Water Aquatic Life Designated Use: waters in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries that protect the survival, growth, and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of aquatic life inhabiting open-water habitats. This designated use applies year-round horizontally from the shoreline at mean low water, to the adjacent shoreline but the vertical boundaries change seasonally. October 1 - May 31, the open water aquatic life use extends through the water column to the bottom water-sediment interface. June 1 - September 30, if a pycnocline is present and, in combination with bottom bathymetry and water column circulation patterns, presents a barrier to oxygen replenishment of deeper waters, this designated use extends down into the water column only as far as the upper boundary of the pycnocline. June 1- September 30, if a pycnocline is present but other physical circulation patterns (such as influx of oxygen rich oceanic bottom waters) provide for oxygen replenishment of deeper waters, the open-water aquatic life designated use extends down into the bottom water-sediment interface (see boundaries in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland. This designated use includes the migratory fish spawning and nursery and shallow-water submerged aquatic vegetation uses.

Deep-Water Aquatic Life Designated Use: waters in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries that protect the survival, growth, and propagation of a balanced, indigenous population of aquatic life inhabiting deep-water habitats. This designated use applies to the tidally influenced waters located between the upper and lower boundaries of the pycnocline where, in combination with bottom bathymetry (depth, contour & shape) and water circulation patterns, a pycnocline is present and presents a barrier to oxygen replenishment of deeper waters. In some areas, the deep-water designated use extends from the upper boundary of the pycnocline down to the bottom water-sediment interface (see boundaries in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland.) This use applies June 1 - September 30.

Deep-Channel Seasonal Refuge Designated Use: waters in the Chesapeake Bay and its tidal tributaries that protect the survival of a balanced, indigenous population of aquatic life inhabiting deep-channel habitats. This designated use applies to the tidally influenced waters at depths greater than the lower boundary of the pycnocline in areas where, in combination with bottom bathymetry and water circulation patterns, the pycnocline presents a barrier to oxygen replenishment of deeper waters (see boundaries in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland.) This use applies June 1 through September 30.

4.3.2 Dissolved Oxygen Assessment

Full details of the assessment processes are described in USEPA, *Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Dissolved Oxygen, Water Clarity, and Chlorophyll a for the Chesapeake Bay and Tidal Tributaries*, EPA 903-R-03-002, April 2003 and the 2004 (EPA 903-R-002 October 2004) and 2007 (CBP/TRS 285-07, EPA 903-R-07-003), 2007 (CBP/TRS 288/07, EPA 903-R-07-005), 2008 (CBP/TRS 290-08, EPA 903-R-08-001), 2010 (CBP/TRS 301-10, EPA 903-R-10-002), and 2017 (CBP/TRS 320-17, EPA 903-R-17-002) addenda. A very general summarization of key aspects of the process follows.

The assessment period for DO and water clarity shall be the most recent three consecutive years within the data window. When three consecutive years of data are not available, three years within the most recent data assessment window must be available and used for the assessment.

Attainment of the dissolved oxygen criteria shall be assessed through comparison of a cumulative frequency distribution of criteria exceedances to the applicable reference curve for each designated use. A first step in the process involves spatial interpolation and extrapolation of data collected at individual fixed locations to project water quality conditions throughout the segment. A subsequent step involves development of cumulative frequency distribution (CFD) of criteria exceedances combining both spatial and temporal domains for each segment-designated use combination. A final step is to compare this CFD of criteria exceedances against a reference CFD of allowable exceedances to determine if the criteria are attained.

The revised methodology for DO is described in the 2010 addendum. For DO, the algorithm used for the calculation of the pycnocline has been adjusted, and a 10% reference curve is being used for the assessment of the Open Water, Deep Water and Deep Channel designated uses.

An evaluation of continuous monitoring datasets collected in Chesapeake Bay waters during the assessment

window for the attainment of the Migratory Fish Spawning and Nursery and Open Water Use short-duration criteria will be provided in the Draft Integrated Report. This evaluation is not intended to be a formal assessment result within a Bay segment, but a report on water quality status at the shallow water monitoring station location. This evaluation is based on procedures published in the 2017 addendum.

4.3.3 Submerged Aquatic Vegetation and Water Clarity Assessment

For the Shallow Water Submerged Aquatic Vegetation use criteria, if the submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) acreage criteria are met in any individual Chesapeake Bay Program segment, then the shallow-water submerged aquatic vegetation use is met in that segment. If the SAV acres are not met, then the water clarity criteria shall be examined with either a CFD methodology or a “water clarity acres” methodology. If sufficient water clarity is available to support SAV growth through either of these alternatives, then the Shallow Water Submerged Aquatic Vegetation use is met regardless of the number of acres of SAV in that segment.

4.3.4 James River Chlorophyll Assessment

Chlorophyll criteria are only applicable to the mainstem portion of the tidal James River and shall be assessed over the six-year assessment window. For a James River segment to be assessed as fully supporting, it must meet all applicable chlorophyll criteria. Furthermore, segments assessed as “fully supporting” must have chlorophyll data for a minimum of five spring or summer seasons. A segment with more than two exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion or a greater than 10.5% exceedance rate of an applicable short-duration criterion shall be assessed as impaired. For a segment that is attaining its applicable short-duration criterion and has two consecutive exceedances of the same seasonal mean criterion, additional lines of evidence must be evaluated before assessing the segment as fully supporting. The occurrence of at least one of the following in the segment of concern during either of the “exceedance” seasons shall trigger an “impaired” categorization:

1. VDH HAB advisory issued by the Division of Shellfish Safety
2. A fish kill documented by DEQ coinciding with chlorophyll concentrations greater than the magnitude of the applicable short-duration chlorophyll-a criterion or a HAB event documented and confirmed by the HAB Task Force.
3. More than 10% of dissolved oxygen samples are below the Open Water instantaneous minimum criteria (4.3 mg/l for water temperature greater than 29°C and 3.2 mg/l for water temperature less or equal to 29°C).
4. More than 10% of pH samples are less than 6.0 or greater than 9.0.

All chlorophyll data collected at one meter or less in a segment in the James River should be aggregated spatially by date using the Bay Interpolator Grid. A median of same-day chlorophyll samples should be calculated for each grid cell. For segments JMSOH, JMSMH, and JMSPH, the median of grid values should be calculated to represent the chlorophyll expression of a segment over a specific date, and the median of same-month chlorophyll values should be calculated to represent the chlorophyll expression of a segment over that month. The seasonal geometric mean shall be calculated from the monthly chlorophyll values for a segment.

For segment JMSTF2, chlorophyll data collected in the "upper zone" (from the upstream boundary at the fall line to approximately river mile 95 (N37° 23' 15.27" / W77° 18' 45.05" to N37° 23' 19.31" / W77° 18' 54.03")) should be pooled, in the manner described above, separately from chlorophyll data collected in the "lower zone" (from river mile 95 to the downstream boundary of JMSTF2). The seasonal geometric mean for each of these zones should be calculated from their respective monthly chlorophyll values. To calculate the seasonal

segment-wide geometric mean, an area-weighted average of the zonal geometric means should be calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Upper Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.41 + \text{Lower Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.59$$

For segment JMSTF1, chlorophyll data collected in the "upper zone" (from the upstream boundary of JMSTF1 to approximately river mile 67 (N37° 17' 46.21" / W77° 7' 9.55" to N37° 18' 58.94" / W77° 6' 57.14")) should be pooled, in the manner described in subdivision bb (2) of this section, separately from chlorophyll data collected in the "lower zone" (between river mile 67 to the downstream boundary of JMSTF1). The seasonal geometric mean for each of these zones should be calculated from their respective monthly chlorophyll values. To calculate the seasonal segment-wide geometric mean, an area-weighted average of the zonal geometric means should be calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Upper Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.49 + \text{Lower Zone Geometric Mean} \times 0.51$$

4.3.5 Assessment Units

Figure 4-1 depicts the Chesapeake Bay program segmentation scheme (*Chesapeake Bay Program Analytical Segmentation Scheme-Revisions, Decisions and Rationales: 1983 -2003*, CBP/TRS 268/04. Chesapeake Bay Program, Annapolis, Maryland) which shall be used as the assessment unit to determine attainment of the criteria in this section for each designated use. The spatial boundaries of each aquatic life use subcategory within each of these CBP segment are described in the *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland. Assessment results for each CBP segment/designated use will determine the Integrated Report listing category of all waterbodies (i.e. all ATTAINS Assessment Units) geographically within that CBP segment/designated use. For example, the listing category of all tidal Onancock Creek assessment units will be determined by the appropriate designated use attainment of CBP segment CB7PH. In this example, it is likely that only open water and shallow water uses of CB7PH extend into Onancock Creek.




Figure 4-1. Chesapeake Bay Segmentation. The colored segments represent each labelled Chesapeake Bay segment. The inset shows an example segment with the detail of Virginia’s B-IBI Sub-Segmentation as described in Section 4.4.4. Within each colored CBP segment, solid black lines denote boundaries of the smaller B-IBI subsegments.

4.3.6 Assessment, Total Maximum Daily Load Tracking and Implementation System Reporting Units

The Assessment, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Tracking and Implementation System (ATTAINS) is used to track assessment data for all designated uses in distinct geographically defined waterbodies across the state. ATTAINS assessment unit spatial boundaries are defined by many factors including the spatial distribution of available data to assess for designated uses. There may be several ATTAINS assessment units included in each Chesapeake Bay Program segment.

ATTAINS can only accept estuarine assessment units defined by surface areas (i.e. square miles). The complete water column within that assessment unit is assigned to a single overall aquatic life use attainment. Each individual Bay segment assessment unit may have deep channel, deep water, and open water sub-categories of aquatic life designated use (that may only account for a portion of the total volume/area of the ATTAINS assessment unit).

Each ATTAINS assessment reporting unit will be designated as having the aquatic life use and Chesapeake Bay specific designated use status according to the appropriate CBP segment/Aquatic life sub-designated use assessment. The rules to be applied are:

- a) Open water designated extends from “shoreline to shoreline” within each CBP segment and thus all ATTAINS reporting units located within each CBP segment are reported as having “open water” aquatic life use attainment consistent with the CBP segment attainment of open water criteria.
- b) Deep water and deep channel designated use spatial boundaries within each CBP segment are spatially constrained as smaller areas within the larger CBP segments (see *Technical Support Document for Identification of Chesapeake Bay Designated Uses and Attainability 2004 Addendum*. Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, Maryland). Thus, the deep water or deep channel designated use status for each CBP segment will apply only to ATTAINS reporting units which contain a “deep water” designated use area. The two-dimensional (i.e. square miles) size of each CBP segment encompassing the impaired deep water use will be reported as the actual impaired area in ATTAINS-
- c) The Shallow Water Submerged Aquatic vegetation designated use applies only out to a maximum of 2 meter contour. Each ATTAINS unit having this use present in some portion will designate the use as attained or not. However, the actual size of the impaired use will be tracked outside of the ATTAINS system and reported in the Integrated Report as being only the size of area within the two-meter contour.
- d) The aquatic life use status of the ATTAINS unit will be assigned to the “worst case” status of the Chesapeake Bay specific designated use within that ATTAINS assessment unit (e.g. an ATTAINS reporting unit containing an open water use which meets its associated criteria and a deep water use which fails its associated criteria will be categorized as failing the aquatic life use). Other criteria applicable to the aquatic life use (e.g. for benthic communities, toxics, or “weight of evidence” etc...) will also determine the overall aquatic life use attainment. If the aquatic life use is impaired only due to a smaller area of the Chesapeake Bay specific designated use, then only the area (i.e. square mileage) of that use is reported as impaired for the overall aquatic life use.

4.3.7 Impact of Chesapeake Bay TMDL

The Chesapeake Bay TMDL, developed by EPA in cooperation with Bay state partners, was approved by EPA on December 31, 2010. This TMDL focuses on reductions to nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus) and sediment

inputs into Bay waters (including major tributaries). Improvements in DO and water clarity, which are indicators for the Aquatic Life and Shallow Water Submerged Aquatic Vegetation designated uses, are anticipated after the implementation of this TMDL.

All Bay waters that are on the 303(d) list for dissolved oxygen, SAV, and chlorophyll *a* impairments should be in Category 4, and any waters newly impaired for these parameters should also get this designation. Chesapeake Bay and tidal tributary assessment units, as described in [9 VAC 25-260-185](#) (d), that were listed for dissolved oxygen by EPA in the 1999 consent decree will continue to remain in Category 4 until all applicable criteria are attained (e.g. any 7-day mean or instantaneous criteria must be assessed and attained as well as the 30-day criteria).

Category 4D should be used to classify those waters over listed for dissolved oxygen by EPA that are found to be meeting all dissolved oxygen criteria for which they can be assessed. For instance, if a water meets the 30-day mean criterion for the Open Water designated use, but the 7-day mean and instantaneous minimum criteria cannot be assessed, the dissolved oxygen parameter and the associated Open Water designated use should be categorized as 4D. The overall aquatic life use will also be Category 4D if all other aquatic life parameters are meeting criteria.

4.4 Biological Assessment

Biological monitoring of streams and rivers using benthic macroinvertebrates is an integral component of the water quality monitoring program in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Biological monitoring allows the Virginia DEQ to assess the ecological condition of streams and rivers. Benthic macroinvertebrate surveys are used to determine if the waterbodies meet their designated aquatic life uses. DEQ's [Biological Monitoring Program Quality Assurance Project Plan for Wadable Streams and Rivers](#) (Bio QAPP) describes the agency's approach to generating benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring data. The Bio QAPP ensures biological monitoring samples are collected in a manner that produce comparable, representative, and complete datasets.

4.4.1 The Virginia Stream Condition Index (VSCI)

In 2000, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) contracted TetraTech to develop a multi-metric macroinvertebrate index for Virginia. This index contains eight core metrics that when calculated into one number is known as the Virginia Stream Condition Index (VSCI). TetraTech developed the VSCI using Virginia's existing biomonitoring database, which contained a significant amount of upstream (reference) control sites for use with the USEPA's Rapid Bioassessment Protocols.

Using an independent probabilistic database (sample n=350) with data collected from 2001-2004, Virginia has validated the VSCI using a spatially diverse (ecoregionally and stream size) data set free of pseudoreplication. These probabilistic data sets have allowed DEQ to narrow data gaps and test the proposed VSCI against many classification variables, which include season, stream size, ecoregion, bioregion, river basin, regional office, and sampling technique. The VSCI validation study was designed to incorporate suggestions provided through public comment from the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC), the USEPA and the regulated community.

The validation study using probabilistic biological data has confirmed that the VSCI works well to discriminate between sites with acceptable water quality and habitat versus sites with degraded water quality and habitat. A VSCI impairment threshold score of 60 was determined from statistical analyses of the original TetraTech report and the DEQ validation study. The VSCI validation study and the aquatic life use assessment guidance

using the VSCI was reviewed by the USEPA. The validation study “Using Probabilistic Monitoring Data to Validate the Non-Coastal Virginia Stream Condition Index” can be found on DEQ’s Probabilistic Monitoring website.

4.4.2 The Virginia Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index (VCPMI)

In the late 1990s, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) coordinated a six-state monitoring effort to develop a multi-metric macroinvertebrate index that included Virginia’s coastal plain. This index contained five metrics that when calculated into one number is known as the Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index (CPMI). This index was adopted by DEQ in the early 2000’s to make aquatic life use impairment determinations in the coastal plain of Virginia. Virginia biologists recommended validation of the index and initiated a special study.

Over the past decade DEQ compiled a new database of coastal plain macroinvertebrate data, which includes significantly more Virginia reference samples than the original CPMI study. Virginia has created the new VCPMI using a spatially diverse (ecoregion and stream size) dataset free of pseudoreplication. The VCPMI replaces metrics that did not work well in Virginia’s coastal plain and has correctly calibrated each metric’s best standard values. The VCPMI study has confirmed that the VCPMI works well to discriminate between sites with acceptable water quality and habitat versus sites with degraded water quality and habitat. The impairment threshold score of 40 was determined from statistical analyses conducted during the VCPMI study. The VCPMI study and the aquatic life use assessment guidance using the VCPMI was reviewed by the USEPA. The VCPMI technical report, “The Virginia Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index”, can be found on the DEQ’s Probabilistic Monitoring website.

4.4.3 Free-flowing Aquatic Life Use Determination

DEQ uses the Virginia Stream Condition Index (VSCI) for biological assessment of non-coastal streams and the Virginia Coastal Plain Macroinvertebrate Index (VCPMI) for biological assessment of coastal plain streams. Assessments may be based on a single VSCI or VCPMI score; however, bioassessments based on at least two unique sampling events are preferred to ensure that the biological condition of the site is accurately represented. These samples could represent a different seasonal window or the same seasonal window in a different year within the assessment data window. Staff who make assessment decisions based on biological data should ensure that the data adequately represent typical conditions at the site. In particular, when assessments are based on only one or two sampling events, staff should review field notes regarding on-site conditions and recent hydrologic data (if available) and if these, or any other observations indicate atypical conditions at the site, additional biological sampling should occur before the site is assessed as impaired or fully supporting.

In most instances, non-coastal streams with VSCI scores ≥ 60 or coastal plain streams with VCPMI scores ≥ 40 should be assessed as fully supporting and VSCI scores < 60 and CPMI scores < 40 should result in streams being assessed as impaired.

In instances where site scores conflict among sampling events (i.e. some scores above thresholds and some below thresholds) and there is evidence that some of the data collected are not representative of the biological conditions at the site, a final assessment determination may require case-by-case review and best professional judgement. It is essential that the biologists’ best professional judgement be supported by

empirical evidence. At all stages of the data collection process, including initial site scouting, field sample collection, and sample sorting and identification, staff should be thorough in documenting information that indicates whether the data collected are representative. Examples of documented evidence could include hydrograph data at or near the sampling site, field observations regarding flow conditions and the habitat available for sampling, the relative abundances of the taxa observed in the sample, and any other information that may provide evidence as to whether the data collected at the site are representative.

If the biologist has observed potential impacts due to atypical natural conditions, such as recent drought, flooding, or other factors that indicate that a sample may not be representative, they should document their lack of confidence in the survey and cite all relevant data and information supporting this judgement. If data more representative of typical conditions at the site are not available during the assessment window the site should be listed as having insufficient information to render an assessment determination until additional sampling can be conducted.

DEQ regional biologists should review samples collected within the assessment data window and should make a final biological assessment determination for each site. If regional assessment staff find there are conflicting assessment determinations at sites within a single assessment unit, the regional biologist should be consulted and the assessment unit split if conditions warrant. An attempt to average the data at a station or across an assessment unit would weaken the ability to accurately predict current conditions.

4.4.4 Estuarine Aquatic Life Assessment

In cooperation with EPA Region III and the State of Maryland, DEQ has developed a method for assessing estuarine benthic community data using a benthic index of biological integrity (B-IBI) developed specifically for the Chesapeake Bay. This method assures Bay-wide consistency in determinations of estuarine benthic impairments.

The spatial assessment unit for determining attainment of the general standard for aquatic life use using benthic community data will be the same as used in the 2024 assessment report. The Chesapeake Bay criteria assessment segments are described in "*Chesapeake Bay Program Analytical Segmentation Scheme-Revisions, Decisions and Rationales: 1983 -2003*, CBP/TRS 268/04. Chesapeake Bay Program, Annapolis, Maryland".

The statistical approach requires at least 10 samples within each Chesapeake Bay B-IBI subsegment (Figure 4-1), which closely follows the criteria segmentation with the caveat that minor tidal tributaries are often considered separate benthic assessment segments. To ensure sufficient sample size in as many segments as possible, a five-year data window is used. This corresponds with the data window used for the assessment of other biological data.

The benthic assessment method uses B-IBI scores at unimpaired reference stations to establish thresholds to which assessment-station B-IBI scores are compared. The reference conditions, and thus reference threshold B-IBI scores, vary by habitat type, of which there are seven, defined by salinity range and sediment type at the station location. Therefore, each station is compared to the reference threshold appropriate for the habitat type of the station. This enables segment-scale assessment while accounting for expected habitat-driven

spatial variation in biological condition within the segment. This is accomplished with a statistical procedure⁷ that uses the limited sample data in a segment (at least 10 samples) to estimate a segment-wide average (with 95% confidence interval) percentage of stations below their reference thresholds, or “percent degraded”.

An assessment segment will be classified as impaired (Category 5) if the segment average percentage degraded is statistically greater than ($\alpha = 0.05$) the percentage degraded expected (5%) even under reference conditions. A segment will be classified as having insufficient information (Category 3B) when the number of sites sampled during the five-year data window is less than 10. A segment will also be classified as Category 3B when the analysis suggests non-impairment but the difference between the upper and lower 95% confidence limits of assessment segment mean percentage degraded equals or exceeds 50% and the average B-IBI score for the segment is less than 2.7.

Assignment of aquatic life use status, as determined by benthic assessments to ATTAINS reporting waterbodies, will be the same as described in Section 5.3 for the Chesapeake Bay water quality criteria assessments. Each ATTAINS reporting unit will be assigned the general aquatic life use status of the benthic assessment sub-segment in which it is geographically located.

4.5 Toxics Assessments

Fish Consumption Use

The Fish Tissue Monitoring Program (FTM) collects fish tissue samples from designated monitoring stations for contaminant analysis. FTM staff provide data to water quality assessment staff for each sampling year in the assessment data window. Older fish tissue data may be included in assessment determinations when deemed appropriate.

DEQ collects fish tissue samples via protocols described in the [Quality Assurance/Quality Control Project Plan for the Fish Tissue and Sediment Contaminants Monitoring Program](#) (FTM QAPP). DEQ’s FTM QAPP ensures that fish tissue monitoring samples are collected in a manner that produces comparable, representative, and complete datasets. Fish tissue data collected at stations during routine monitoring throughout Virginia represent Tier 1 monitoring data. Tier 1 sampling stations may include freshwater, brackish or saltwater locations selected on a rotational river basin approach among the major river basins or sub-basins in Virginia. The samples collected at each site are dependent on what species are available. Collections at freshwater stations usually include 3-6 tissue samples, either as single species edible filets or composite tissue samples (usually 5-10 individuals of the same species per composite) consisting of fish species that are typically consumed by humans. Samples usually include at least one bottom feeder (e.g. catfish), which may be highly exposed to chemically contaminated sediments compared to other species, and two to four upper and middle trophic level feeders (e.g. bass and sunfish species, respectively.), which may be exposed to chemical contaminants via biomagnification. Tier 1 monitoring data are meant to identify sites where concentrations of contaminants in the edible portions of commonly consumed fish indicate a potential health risk to humans.

If Tier 1 results reveal potential problems, a more intensive Tier 2 study is initiated by the FTM staff to

⁷ Llansó, R. J., Dauer, D. M., & Vølstad, J. H. (2009). Assessing ecological integrity for impaired waters decisions in Chesapeake Bay, USA. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 59(1), 48–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2008.11.011>

determine the magnitude, geographical extent, and potential sources of contamination in the fish. The need for a Tier 2 study takes into consideration the severity of the potential concern and is initiated as soon after the discovery of a potential problem as resources allow. Generally, if additional information is requested by the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) for determining the need for fish consumption advisories, a follow-up monitoring effort is initiated the year after the discovery of the potential problem. If limited resources prevent this, the water body will be sampled more intensely as soon as resources allow and/or during the next scheduled monitoring event in the affected river basin.

Currently, most fish tissue monitoring is focused on the development of PCB TMDLs throughout the Commonwealth.

Analytical results for fish tissue are expressed in wet-weight and are compared to WQS Tissue Values (TVs) for the toxic pollutants using EPA risk assessment techniques for non-carcinogen and carcinogen effects. WQS human health calculations use the 10⁻⁵ risk level adopted by the State Water Control Board and exposure factors⁸ and relative source contribution factors recommended by EPA for the general U.S. population. These same values were used to calculate the human health water quality criteria found in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#). Also included in the calculation are toxicological data pertinent to human health effects. A reference dose (RfD) is used for non-carcinogen toxic effects and a cancer oral slope factor is used for carcinogen effects. TVs are based on the same toxicological data (and body weight, fish consumption, RfD or cancer risk level, and relative source contribution factors) that form the basis for the water quality criteria listed in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#), under the column labeled "Human Health, All Other Surface Waters". These water quality criteria are water column concentrations that are based on a specific fish tissue concentration, which were calculated to represent a safe or acceptable minimal human health risk level. The water quality criteria are designed to prevent the fish from bioconcentrating the toxic contaminants to levels greater than these fish tissue concentrations. The TV concentrations listed in Appendix D-1 represent the same fish tissue concentrations that are the basis for the water quality criteria listed in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#) and may be considered the fish tissue concentration equivalent of those water quality criteria. Appendix D-1 contains TVs for all chemicals for which Virginia has adopted water quality criteria. However, many of the chemicals listed in Appendix D-1 do not bioaccumulate and are not often found in fish tissue and have been included for completeness. All TVs are rounded to two significant digits.

Appendix D-2 also lists Tissue Screening Values (TSVs) for additional toxic chemicals for which Virginia has not adopted human health water quality criteria but are designed to prevent excessive bioaccumulation in fish tissue (those criteria listed under " Human Health, All Other Surface Waters" in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#)). It includes chemicals recommended for monitoring by EPA or of special interest to DEQ as well as some chemicals that are based on recent changes to toxicological data and/or exposure assumptions that are different from those used to calculate the water quality criteria found in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#). The TSVs are updated using available data from the EPA IRIS database and/or recommendations from EPA or VDH before each assessment effort.

If no samples exceed the WQS TVs in fish tissue samples in the assessment window, the water body

⁸ All fish tissue values in Appendix D-1 and D-2 assume the average body weight of 80 kg and a fish consumption rate of 22.0 grams/day.

should be assessed as fully supporting for the fish consumption use. If a fish tissue sample exceeds a single WQS TV or exceeds a TSV in the assessment window, the water body should be assessed as insufficient information and prioritized for follow-up monitoring. If the TV for the same toxic pollutant is exceeded in two or more samples from the same site in the assessment window, the water is considered impaired.

Data from all Tier 1 and Tier 2 monitoring studies are evaluated by DEQ as well as provided to the VDH for their consideration of the need for establishing fish consumption advisories. DEQ and VDH have signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that describes how the agencies exchange information regarding the results of all Tier 1 and Tier 2 fish tissue monitoring. If VDH issues a fishing ban or advisory, limiting consumption, the segment should be designated impaired for fish consumption use based on the advisory. The results of the Tier 2 study should be clearly communicated in the Integrated Report narrative.

Additionally, DEQ uses the Virginia WQS for human health in surface waters to assess the fish consumption use in public water supplies as well as all other surface waters ([9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#)). If the median of two or more water samples from the same site collected in the assessment window exceed the WQS, the water is considered impaired. If the median of multiple water samples does not exceed the WQS in the assessment window, the water body should be assessed as fully supporting for the fish consumption use. If a site is represented by only one toxic pollutant sample in the assessment window and it exceeds the WQS, the water body should be assessed as insufficient information and prioritized for follow-up monitoring.

In waters not designated as PWS, the criteria in the “All Other Surface Waters” column of [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#) should be used to assess the fish consumption use.

Aquatic Life/Wildlife Use

Sediment Analysis

Similar to the sediment monitoring and analysis conducted by FTM, the regional offices will assess ambient sediment data. For freshwater sediments collected above the fall-line and in tidal fresh zones, as described in the WQS, the consensus-based Probable Effects Concentrations (PEC; MacDonald et al. 2000) should be applied. Estuarine sediment contaminant data collected during scheduled AWQM monitoring should be compared to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA *Screening Quick Reference Tables* (SQuiRT) Tables 1999) for effects-range-median (ER-M) screening values (SVs) for sediment. Transition zones should be assessed against the more stringent of the two screening values. One or more exceedances of an ER-M/PEC value results in an insufficient information status for aquatic life use support. In these cases, additional biological monitoring should be scheduled to assess actual aquatic life use support. For estuarine sediment, a “weight of evidence” approach using benthic community condition, sediment toxicity, and sediment chemistry will be used to determine aquatic life designated use attainment. All metals contaminant screening values found in Appendix E have been converted to parts per million (ppm) for consistency.

Weight-of-Evidence Assessment in Estuarine Waters

DEQ uses a Weight-of-Evidence (WOE) approach for its general evaluation and assessment of the Aquatic Life Use (ALU) for benthic communities through its estuarine probabilistic monitoring program. The method is

based on the widely used Sediment Quality Triad (SQT) concept originally conceived and applied for the evaluation of the presence and effects of toxic contaminants in marine sediments⁹. The WOE approach combines data on sediment contaminants, sediment toxicity, and biological condition of the benthic community (the "Triad" in SQT) to provide an integrative assessment of sediment quality and its potential for degrading aquatic life.

Water Column Analysis

When assessing the aquatic life and wildlife use support for toxic contaminants in water samples, compliance should be based on meeting the aquatic life WQS found in [9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#). See [Section 4.2](#) for additional information.

Public Water Supply Use

When assessing the public water supply use support for toxic contaminants in water samples, compliance should be based on meeting the human health WQS in public water supplies ([9 VAC 25-260-140 B](#)) to assess the public water supply use in surface waters designated as PWS per [9 VAC25-260-380](#). See [Section 4.2](#) for additional information.

4.6 Swamp Waters Assessment

The natural conditions process is currently under revision. The agency is working in partnership with an Academic Advisory Committee to develop a new classification process for swamp waters. This new process will differ from past protocols in that the steps of classifying natural conditions and evaluating anthropogenic disturbance will be separated. This will allow for the correct assignment of waters to Class VII regardless of the level of anthropogenic disturbance in the system and surrounding watershed.

4.7 Lakes/Reservoirs Assessment

The current agency guidance on the monitoring of targeted lakes and reservoirs is found in the Department Guidance Memo No. 09-2005 "Monitoring of Lakes and Reservoirs" (December 2020). The guidance provides information on how DEQ prioritizes the many lakes and reservoirs in the Commonwealth for monitoring. This prioritization allows the Department to focus on the most important lakes as they relate to designated uses. The most recent updates to this guidance document removed all assessment methodology references. Section 5.7 provides guidance on how to conduct assessments on all lakes and reservoirs, whether they are considered 'significant' or not. GM09-2005 defines significant lakes and reservoirs: "*A significant lake/reservoir is defined as: a publicly accessible lake/reservoir that is a public water supply and/or 100 acres or more in size and is included in 9 VAC 25-260-187 list of reservoirs with nutrient criteria.*"

A list of the current "significant lakes" is included in Appendix F of this guidance. Since 2007, these are the man-made lakes and reservoirs identified under the nutrient standards for lakes and reservoirs in [9 VAC 25-260-187](#), and the two natural lakes, Mountain Lake and Lake Drummond, which have been assigned special standards for nutrients ([9 VAC 25-260-310](#)).

Publicly accessible means direct access to the water from public property during normal work hours.

⁹ Long, E. R., & Chapman, P. M. (1985). A Sediment Quality Triad: Measures of sediment contamination, toxicity and infaunal community composition in Puget Sound. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 16(10), 405–415. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X\(85\)90290-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0025-326X(85)90290-5)

The significant lakes designation includes the federally owned lakes which meet these criteria, but all other federally owned lakes would be excluded from the agency lakes monitoring program. There are additional lakes/reservoirs that should also be considered, as resources allow, for monitoring and assessment that are not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 but do meet one of the other two characteristics above. Although nutrient criteria do not apply to these, other criteria should be assessed as available data will allow.

At least one of these two criteria must be met for a lake or reservoir to be assessed as impaired:

1. A lake/reservoir has exceedances of numerical WQS or assessment threshold published in this guidance, as observed during multiple sampling events (see Table 4), or
2. a VDH Advisory or Closure during the assessment window occurred in the lake/reservoir.

4.7.1 Determination of Thermal Stratification

Determination of thermal stratification is needed to determine how to apply DO and pH criteria and trophic state indices (TSI) where applicable. During periods of thermal stratification of significant lakes/reservoirs, attainment of the minimum dissolved oxygen and pH criteria are only assessed in the epilimnion at monitoring stations where stratification is observed. Dissolved oxygen and pH criteria do not apply below the epilimnion during thermal stratification. Determination of thermal stratification in non-significant lakes/reservoirs is needed to determine if nutrient impacts through the TSI evaluation is needed. All dissolved oxygen and pH values recorded during sampling events on non-significant lakes/reservoirs should be assessed.

The usual procedure to determine thermal stratification is to plot temperature vs. depth to determine where a slope occurs in the temperature/dissolved oxygen profile measurement. In deeper lakes or reservoirs, it may be possible to use the classical textbook definition of lake stratification developed for natural lakes if the temperature profile meets the following definition for a thermocline: the temperature decrease reaches 1 degree C or more per meter of descent. The first instance of a 1 degree C change per meter of descent from the surface of the lake or reservoir should represent the bottom of the epilimnion. Under the classical procedure, if the bottom of the epilimnion cannot be delineated (*i.e.* the temperature decrease is less than 1 degree C for each meter of descent), then it is not considered to be thermally stratified. However, many lakes/reservoirs are shallow, often less than twenty feet deep, and exhibit stratification but do not meet the “classical” 1 degree C per meter of descent definition of stratification. In such situations, staff will need to use best professional judgment to determine whether a lake/reservoir is exhibiting stratification. Examples of annual temperature cycles in stratified lakes are given in Figure 4-2.




Figure 4-2. Annual temperature cycles in stratified lakes, Wisconsin DNR (WDNR) (left) and University of Illinois (right)

4.7.2 Nutrient Evaluation

Nutrients including chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus are assessed for aquatic life use. Total phosphorus is assessed in addition to chlorophyll *a* if there is documented use of algaecides any time during the monitoring period. Observations regarding nuisance algal, plant growth, or discolored water are assessed using the general standard; the nutrient criteria for lakes and reservoirs did not modify these existing criteria.

The nutrient criteria for the man-made lakes and reservoirs listed in [9 VAC 25-260-187](#) of the WQS only apply in the top 1 meter of the lacustrine zone. If chlorophyll *a* or total phosphorus are collected outside the lacustrine zone, the data will not be used to assess of the aquatic life use in other areas of the lake/reservoir. "Lacustrine" means the zone within a lake or reservoir that corresponds to non-flowing lake-like conditions within reservoirs that are generally deeper than 3 meters (10 feet). In small, shallow lakes and reservoirs where the classic lacustrine, transition and riverine zones are not pronounced, the lacustrine zone and nutrient criteria in 9 VAC 25-260-187 apply in a representative area of the water body. The other two zones within a deeper reservoir are riverine (flowing, river-like conditions) and transitional (transition from river to lake conditions). [Guidance Memo 09-2005](#) provides general characteristics of the riverine, transitional and lacustrine zones in lakes and reservoirs. The document also provides guidelines for identifying these zones within a lake/reservoir for assessment purposes. Assessment staff should consult with regional monitoring staff to confirm the location of lake monitoring stations as it relates to these zones.

This assessment procedure for nutrients in significant lakes and reservoirs replaces the combined TP/DO TSI approach used in previous assessments for nutrient assessment related to assessing natural low DO conditions. However, the TSI approach will continue to be used to determine natural conditions for non-significant lakes or reservoirs if DO problems have been documented.

A master copy of owner and/or manager contact information of significant lakes will be maintained by DEQ assessment staff. A request will be sent to these contacts at the beginning of each assessment cycle to determine the use of algaecides during the lake monitoring period. Any DEQ monitoring staff observations of algaecide applications during their monitoring runs on a lake or reservoir shall also be confirmed with these contacts. (The intent is to use both chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus when algaecides are applied within any zone of the reservoir.)

The 9 VAC 25-260-187 states, "The 90th percentile of chlorophyll *a* data collected at one meter or less within the lacustrine portion of the man-made lake or reservoir between April 1 and October 31 (considered a lake monitoring year) shall not exceed the chlorophyll *a* criterion for that waterbody in *each* of the two most recent monitoring years within the assessment window. For a waterbody that received algaecide treatment, the median of the total phosphorus data collected at one meter or less within the lacustrine portion of the man-made lake or reservoir between April 1 and October 31 shall not exceed the total phosphorus criterion in each of the two most recent years that total phosphorus data are available." The aquatic life (fishery) use of any lake assessment unit is considered impaired for nutrients if the criterion for either chlorophyll *a* or total phosphorus is exceeded at a station or pooled stations in that unit in each of the two most recent monitoring years within the assessment window.

For lake or reservoir assessment units with multiple stations or multiple samples collected in a month,

chlorophyll-*a* and total phosphorous data should be pooled by calculating the median of same-month observations from April to October of any given year in a relatively homogenous unit. The 90th percentile of monthly chlorophyll-*a* medians is the value used to compare to the chlorophyll-*a* criterion for a particular lake/reservoir, consistent with the criterion development. The median of monthly TP medians should be used to assess against the applicable total phosphorous criterion.

Assessment is based on the two most recent monitoring years that data are available within the assessment window. Each year must have data for at least six of the seven months (April 1 through October 31) of required monitoring to be considered a valid year. If sampled for fewer than six of the seven sampling months within a calendar year, the lake or reservoir is placed in Category 3 (insufficient data) for assessment purposes and sampling is conducted in the next calendar year, based on regional prioritization and available resources. A third sampling year may be needed if the two previous years result in differing assessment statuses. This monitoring should be done as soon as resources allow.

4.7.3 Assessment for aquatic life (fishery) use for nutrients in the two natural lakes:

Assessments of the two natural lakes in the special standards section will follow the guidelines above for chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus except that orthophosphate-P rather than total phosphorus applies to Mountain Lake.

4.7.4 Process for confirmation of use impairments when nutrient criteria are exceeded

9 VAC 25-260-187.C. includes a process for confirmation of the aquatic life (fishery) use impairments via a consultation with the Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources (DWR, formerly Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries) when the nutrient criteria in 9 VAC 25-260-187.B are exceeded. Where the nutrient criteria are exceeded but the designated uses of the water body are being attained, the water will still be considered impaired in accordance with § 62.1-44.19.5 of the Code of Virginia until site-specific criteria are adopted and become effective in order to remove the lake/reservoir from the impaired waters list. Site-specific criteria would be developed using the process described in § 62.1-44.15 of the Code of Virginia.

Consultation Process with DWR: When DEQ determines that the applicable nutrient criteria in Section 187 of the water quality standards regulation for a specific lake/reservoir are exceeded, the DEQ central office water quality standards program coordinator, or his/her designee, may contact the DWR Regional Fisheries Manager regarding the status of the fishery in determining whether or not the designated use for that water body is currently being attained. Since the nutrient criteria for lakes/reservoirs were developed using water chemistry data from those lakes/reservoirs where DWR biologists rated the fishery as good or excellent, documentation should support this level of fishery. Appropriate documentation for confirmation of maintenance of the designated fishery use would include the most recent information available on:

- catch per unit effort of specific size classes of managed fish populations
- population size structure
- observations or records regarding changes in fishing use or
- general trends in community structure.

If the above documentation requirements are met for DWR owned and managed lakes during the consultation process, the nutrient impairment observed during the assessment cycle should be classified as Category 5C.

Any other impairments in these lakes should be classified as Category 5A.

4.7.5 Dissolved Oxygen Evaluation

The dissolved oxygen criteria are based on the appropriate criteria established for that class of waters in Section [9 VAC 25-260-50](#). Dissolved oxygen (DO) information is used for assessment of aquatic life use.

Assessment for aquatic life use of lakes and reservoirs for the dissolved oxygen criterion:

The 10.5% rule is applicable to assessments for the minimum dissolved oxygen criterion in all lakes and reservoirs year-round. For lakes/reservoirs listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187, dissolved oxygen samples taken for all months, at all stations within a given lake or reservoir, are assessed only in the epilimnion if the water body is thermally stratified. If not stratified, dissolved oxygen should be assessed throughout the water column. Typically, two or more exceedances and >10.5% exceedance of data collected at an individual station are required before a water body is listed as impaired for the minimum dissolved oxygen criterion (4 mg/l for most freshwater lakes and reservoirs) under § 62.1-44.19:5 and 7 of the Code of Virginia.

In most cases, a single monitoring station should represent a lake/reservoir assessment unit. In cases where there are multiple stations in an assessment unit and it is determined that the water in that unit is relatively homogenous and not influenced by tributary contribution, the independent station assessment results may be pooled to determine DO exceedance rates in that AU.

In cases where the applicable nutrient criteria are met for the man-made lakes/reservoirs listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 but there are seasonal exceedances of the dissolved oxygen criterion due to fall overturn that result in the lake/reservoir assessment unit to be listed as impaired, a Category 4C rationale may be developed for EPA review. The rationale should include:

- maps of the lake/reservoir assessment unit and surrounding land-use to evaluate any potential sources in the watershed, and
- dissolved oxygen/temperature data profiles from at least two monitoring years in line with the Fall overturn phenomena.

In cases where the applicable nutrient criteria are not met, but there are seasonal exceedances of the dissolved oxygen criterion due to fall overturn that result in the lake/reservoir assessment unit to be listed as impaired, the lake or reservoir should be classified as Category 5C and recommended for a WQS review due to seasonal DO fluctuations.

4.7.6 pH Evaluation

The pH criterion ranges are based on the appropriate criteria established for that class of waters in section [9 VAC 25-260-50](#). pH information is used for assessment of aquatic life use.

Assessment for aquatic life use of lakes and reservoirs for the pH criterion range:

The 10.5% rule is applicable to assessments for the pH criterion range in all lakes and reservoirs year-round. For lakes/reservoirs listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187, pH samples taken for all months, at all stations within a given lake or reservoir, are assessed only in the epilimnion if the water body is thermally stratified. If not stratified, pH should be assessed throughout the water column. Typically, two or more exceedances and >10.5%

exceedance of data collected at an individual station are required before a water body is listed as impaired for pH criterion range (6.0-9.0 for most freshwater lakes and reservoirs) under § 62.1-44.19:5 and 7 of the Code of Virginia.

In most cases, a single monitoring station should represent a lake/reservoir assessment unit. In cases where there are multiple stations in an assessment unit and it is determined that the water in that unit is relatively homogenous and not influenced by tributary contribution, the independent station assessment results may be pooled to determine pH exceedance rates in that AU.

In cases where the applicable nutrient criteria are met for the man-made lakes/reservoirs listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 but the pH criterion range is not met, the lake or reservoir should be classified as Category 5C and recommended for a WQS review due to natural pH fluctuations. In lakes that are not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 and no nutrient problem is detected through TSI calculations, the waterbody would be listed as impaired (Category 5C), as well.

4.7.7 Assessment of Lakes/Reservoirs Not Listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187

Nutrient Evaluation using Trophic State Index (TSI)

TSI equations for secchi depth (SD), chlorophyll *a* (CA), and total phosphorus (TP) will be calculated in stratified lakes using aggregated station data from mid-June through mid-September (at 0.3 m for TP and CA) and will be used to determine if DO problems in lakes and reservoirs not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 are natural (Category 4C).

A trophic state index value of 60 or greater for any one of the 3 indices will indicate that nutrient enrichment from anthropogenic sources are adversely interfering, directly or indirectly, with the designated uses. A TSI value of 60 corresponds to a CA concentration of 20 ug/l, a SD of 1 meter, and a TP concentration of 48 ug/l.

The TSI equations:

$$TSI(SD) = 10(6 - (\ln SD / \ln 2))$$

$$TSI(CA) = 10(6 - ((2.04 - 0.68 \ln CA) / (\ln 2)))$$

$$TSI(TP) = 10(6 - ((\ln (48 / TP)) / (\ln 2)))$$

SD = meters

CA = ug/l

TP = ug/l

The following rules apply:

1. Do not calculate a chlorophyll *a* TSI in lakes that are treated with algaecides.
2. The chlorophyll *a* TSI will normally be the preferred indicator in untreated lakes.
3. Assume that typical Virginia freshwater lakes and reservoirs are phosphorus limited.
4. Do not use the secchi depth index in the assessment if it is much larger than the CA and TP indices in the same assessment unit (this indicates prevalence of inorganic matter).
5. The appropriate TSIs should be calculated based on all summer sample data collected in the segment using the spreadsheet that has been developed for easier data processing.

For each monitoring station, if one or more of the TSIs ≥ 60 , the lake/reservoir not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 will be assessed as impaired partially due to one or more pollutants from anthropogenic sources. The assessment unit or entire lake/reservoir will be placed in Category 5A for TMDL development.

For each monitoring station, if each of the TSIs < 60 , the lake/reservoir will be assessed as impaired due to pollution from natural sources and placed in Category 4C. A TMDL is not needed for the assessment unit represented by the monitoring station(s) and appropriate DO criteria will be developed for the hypolimnion.

If multiple stations are sampled on the lake/reservoir or within a lake/reservoir assessment unit, the individual TSI equations should be calculated at each station and then averaged (using a median or arithmetic mean) to determine the values for the waterbody.

Table 4-3. Trophic status in ATTAINS

Trophic Index Trophic State	Carlson Trophic State Index	IR Category
Hypereutrophic	80 – 100	5A
Eutrophic	60 – Less than 80	5A
Mesotrophic	40 – Less than 60	4C
Oligotrophic	0 – Less than 40	4C
Unknown	Insufficient Data	3A

4.7.8 Dissolved Oxygen/pH Evaluation

Lakes/Reservoirs not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 **should have all DO and pH samples collected during lake/reservoir sampling events assessed, regardless of thermal stratification determination.** Two or more exceedances and $>10.5\%$ exceedance of data collected at an individual station are required before a water body is listed as impaired for the minimum dissolved oxygen criterion (4 mg/l for most freshwater lakes and reservoirs) under § 62.1-44.19:5 and 7 of the Code of Virginia. Typically, two or more exceedances and $>10.5\%$ exceedance of data collected at an individual station are required before a water body is listed as impaired for pH criterion range (6.0-9.0 for most freshwater lakes and reservoirs) under § 62.1-44.19:5 and 7 of the Code of Virginia.

In most cases, a single monitoring station should represent a lake/reservoir assessment unit. In cases where there are multiple stations in an assessment unit and it is determined that the water in that unit is relatively homogenous and not influenced by tributary contribution, the independent station assessment results may be pooled to determine DO and pH exceedance rates in that AU.

4.7.9 Use of Citizen or Other External Data

In order to use citizen data in assessments for nutrient impairments: 1) the collector must provide documentation that the data meet QA/QC requirements per [Virginia's Citizen Monitoring Methods Manual](#) for chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus (orthophosphate-P for Mountain Lake), 2) the location of the sampling was within the lacustrine portion of the reservoir and outside the littoral (near shore) zone and 3) sampling corresponds with the lake monitoring year requirements.

Dissolved Oxygen and pH data must be collected throughout the water column and depth profile data (including temperature data) must meet the QA/QC requirements to be used for assessments of

lakes/reservoirs. Surface only dissolved oxygen, pH and temperature samples will not be included in lake/reservoir assessment determinations.

4.7.10 Other Parameters Assessed in all Lakes/Reservoirs

Bacteria Evaluation

The bacteria criteria are based on the appropriate criteria established for that class of waters in section [9VAC25-260-170](#). Bacteria information is used for assessment of the recreation use. Bacteria assessment methodologies are discussed in previous sections of this guidance and summarized in Table 4-4.

When individual stations (whether sampled by DEQ or non-agency/citizen groups) are located in the same assessment unit and they are sampled on the same day, the median of same-day bacteria measurements should be calculated.

Temperature Evaluation

Temperature data should be assessed throughout the water column using the “Percent Method” or 10.5% rule. In most cases, a single monitoring station should represent a lake/reservoir assessment unit. In cases where there are multiple stations in an assessment unit and it is determined that the water in that unit is relatively homogenous and not influenced by tributary contribution, the independent station assessment results may be pooled to determine temperature exceedance rates in that AU.

Aquatic Life/Wildlife Use Toxics Evaluation

For toxic pollutant assessments, waters where there are two or more samples (either grab or SPMD) and no exceedances of aquatic life criteria within most of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered fully supporting for aquatic life and wildlife uses. Waters where there are two or more exceedances of the same WQS aquatic life toxic criteria in at least one of the 3-year periods for which there are data within the assessment window, are considered impaired for the aquatic life and wildlife use. A single exceedance of a WQS aquatic life toxic criteria within the assessment window, is considered insufficient information for the aquatic life and wildlife use.

Ammonia is collected in the top 1 meter of lakes and reservoirs. Both chronic and acute water quality criteria are used to assess the aquatic life and wildlife uses. Calculations used to assess can be found in [9VAC25-260-155](#) as well as applicable aquatic life considerations. Two or more exceedances of the same acute or chronic toxic criteria in a 3-year period constitutes an impairment in a lake/reservoir assessment unit.

Public Water Supply (PWS) Use Toxics Evaluation

Nitrogen in the form of Nitrate, chloride, sulfate, and metals data are collected in the top 1 meter of lakes and reservoirs to assess the public water supply use. If the median of two or more samples exceeds the PWS criteria within the assessment window it constitutes an impairment in a lake/reservoir assessment unit.

Table 4-4. Lake/Reservoir Designated Use Assessment Summary

Designated Use	Parameter(s)	Lake/Station Type ⁽²⁾	Depth	Monitoring Year	No. of Monitoring Years	Assessment	Pool Data?
Aquatic Life (Wildlife Toxics Only)	Chlorophyll a	Significant Lacustrine	Collected in top 1m	Must have 6 out of 7 samples between Apr-Oct for valid monitoring year	2 most recent or 2 out of 3 if results conflict	90th percentile of all months within 1 monitoring year 9 VAC 25-260-187	Yes - calculate the median of same-month observations from April to October of any given year in a relatively homogenous lake AU, then assess.
	Total Phosphorus ⁽¹⁾	Significant Lacustrine (where there is documented use of algaecides)				Median of all months within 1 monitoring year 9 VAC 25-260-187	
	Trophic State Index (TSI) Secchi Depth, Chlorophyll a, Total Phosphorus	Non-Significant Stratified Lakes/Months Only	Chl a & TP collected in top 1m	Mid-June through Mid-September	All	TSI > 60 for any one of the 3 parameters will indicate impairment (Category 5)	Calculate TSI equations at each station and then average (using a median or arithmetic mean) to determine the values for the waterbody.
	Dissolved Oxygen	Significant All	If stratified: Epilimnion If not stratified: All depths	Year-round	All	Typically, two or more exceedances and >10.5% exceedance of total samples results in impairment	May pool exceedance rates for multiple stations in a relatively homogenous lake AU, not influenced by tributary contribution
		Non-significant All	All depths				
	pH	Significant All	If stratified: Epilimnion If not stratified: All depths	Year-round	All	Typically, two or more exceedances and >10.5% exceedance of total samples results in impairment	May pool exceedance rates for multiple stations in a relatively homogenous lake AU, not influenced by tributary contribution
		Non-significant All	All depths				
	Temperature	All	All depths	Year-round	All	Typically, two or more exceedances and >10.5% exceedance of total samples results in impairment	May pool exceedance rates for multiple stations in a relatively homogenous lake AU, not influenced by tributary contribution
Toxics	All	Surface Sample (0.3m)	All	All	Two or more exceedances of the same acute or chronic toxic criteria in a 3-year period	No	
Recreation	Bacteria (Freshwater-E.coli)	All	Surface Sample (0.3m)	All	All	n ≥ 10, one or more geometric mean exceedance(s) in a 90-day period or STV exceedance rate > 10% in a 90-day period results in impairment	Calculate the median of same-day bacteria measurements then assess, if within a relatively homogenous lake AU.
Public Water Supply	Toxics	All	Surface Sample (0.3m)	All	All	The median of two or more samples exceeds the criteria in the assessment window	No

Notes:

- 1) Orthophosphate-P rather than total phosphorus applies to Mountain Lake for nutrient evaluation.
- 2) 'Significant' refers to lakes/reservoirs listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187 and the two natural lakes, Mountain Lake and Lake Drummond. 'Non-significant' refers to lakes/reservoirs not listed in 9 VAC 25-260-187.

4.8 Nonpoint Source (NPS) Assessment

The Nonpoint Source Assessment Chapter of the Integrated Report will summarize Virginia's coordination of nonpoint source pollution control programs based on data reported annually through [EPA's Grant Reporting and Tracking System](#). In addition to measures and programmatic progress reported in the Chapter, watershed-based loadings of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment are calculated in collaboration with the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to support TMDL implementation project prioritization as part of the [Virginia Nonpoint Source \(NPS\) Pollution Management Program](#).

4.9 Coastal Assessment

Virginia has 120 miles of Atlantic Ocean coastline and approximately 2,500 square miles of estuary. This resource has a prominent place in Virginia's history and culture. It is valued for its commercial fishing, wildlife, sporting, and recreational opportunities, as well as its commercial values in shipping and industry. In the 1970's adverse trends in water quality and living resources were noted and prompted creation of the Federal-Interstate Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP). The coastal assessment is conducted in the same manner as the estuarine assessments previously. Additionally, the EPA Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health (BEACH Act) program, implemented by VDH, has enabled the collection of recreational use data during the swimming season. Assessment of this data has been incorporated into the Integrated Report.

4.10 Wetlands Assessment

4.10.1 Background

Virginia has a very broad and comprehensive statutory definition of state waters. Since at least 1968, state waters have been defined to include "all water, on the surface and under the ground, wholly or partially within or bordering the [Commonwealth] or within its jurisdiction." This definition was expanded in 2000 to include "all water, on the surface and under the ground, wholly or partially within or bordering the Commonwealth or within its jurisdiction, including wetlands." Virginia law prohibits excavating, filling, draining, or other activities that cause significant alteration or degradation of existing wetland acreage or functions without a permit.

Section 62.1-44.15:21 of the Code of Virginia specifies that the state utilize the Corps' Wetlands Delineation Manual (Technical Report Y-87-1, January 1987, Final Report) as the approved method for delineating wetlands, and that the state shall adopt appropriate guidance and regulations to ensure consistency with the Corps' implementation of delineation practices. The Corps has created Regional Supplements in an effort to address regional wetland characteristics and improve the accuracy and efficiency of wetland-delineation procedures. The Regional Supplements that apply to Virginia are: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (2010) "Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region," ERDC/EL TR-10-9, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (2010). "Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual - Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Region (Version 2.0)," ERDC/EL TR-10-20, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

The Virginia State Water Control Law (62.1-44.15:21(C)) allows DEQ to make its own State Surface Water Determinations (SSWDs) using accepted Corps field methods, including the Corps' 1987 Manual and regional supplements or DEQ may accept a Corps confirmation.

Tidal wetlands are defined to include tidally influenced areas within Tidewater Virginia contiguous to mean low water extending landward to an elevation 1 1/2 times the mean tide range at a site and upon which is growing certain listed plant species. They also include “non-vegetated wetlands” which include unvegetated lands between mean low water and mean high water tides.

4.10.2 Purpose

Two key aspects of the VADEQ non-tidal wetlands¹⁰ program consist of ensuring that (1) there is no net loss of wetland acreage and function through permitted impacts, and (2) there is a net gain in wetland resources through voluntary programs. In order to accomplish these goals, it is critical to first know the status of wetland resources in Virginia, in terms of location and extent of wetlands in each watershed and have a general knowledge of the quality of these wetland resources. Secondly, the functions of wetland resources impacted through the Virginia Water Protection (VWP) permitting program must be accurately evaluated to determine those functions to be replaced through compensatory mitigation. It is also important to assess the degree to which the required compensatory mitigation is performing in relation to those impacted functions. Characterizing and evaluating wetlands quality is a third key aspect of this monitoring program. Using this information, the agency can then track changes in wetland acreage and quality within the Commonwealth, target problematic watersheds, and help determine the effectiveness of compensatory mitigation to replace lost wetland acreage and function.

A **monitoring and assessment program** is defined as the establishment and operation of appropriate devices, methods, systems and procedures necessary to monitor, compile, and analyze data on the condition of wetlands (adapted from the United States Environmental Protection (EPA) Agency’s “*Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program*”, March 2003). Monitoring is the systematic observation and recording of current and changing conditions, while assessment is the use of that data to evaluate or appraise wetlands to support decision-making and planning processes. Wetlands can be characterized both by their condition and by functions. Wetland condition is the current state as compared to reference standards for physical, chemical, and biological characteristics, while functions represent the processes that characterize wetland ecosystems.

The overarching goal of Virginia’s wetland monitoring and assessment strategy was to develop a long-term implementation plan for a wetland monitoring and assessment program that protects the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of the Commonwealth’s water resources, including wetlands. In order to accomplish this goal, it is critical to first know the status of wetland resources in Virginia, in terms of location and extent of wetlands in each watershed and have a general knowledge of the quality of these wetland resources. Secondly, the functions of wetland resources impacted through VWP permitting program must be accurately evaluated to determine those functions to be replaced through compensatory mitigation. It is also important to assess the degree to which the required compensatory mitigation is performing in relation to those impacted functions.

10 DEQ administers the wetland monitoring and assessment program in the Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection and is the legal authority for the protection of non-tidal wetlands. The Code of Virginia designates the authority for tidal wetlands protection primarily to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), but DEQ also retains some authority in tidal waters. See permitting information at the VMRC Habitat Management web page <http://www.mrc.virginia.gov/regulations/hm-permits.shtm> and [DEQ web page https://www.deq.virginia.gov/permits/water/wetlands-streams-vwp](https://www.deq.virginia.gov/permits/water/wetlands-streams-vwp).

Since 2003, the overall wetland monitoring and assessment strategy has been to establish baseline conditions in various broad contexts, such as land use, watershed, and wetland type. This information can then be used to guide management decisions regarding wetland restoration efforts, programmatic compensatory mitigation, and integration with overall WQ Standards. This strategy provides the ultimate framework for an ongoing assessment of the status of the Commonwealth's wetland resources and the success of both wetland regulatory and voluntary programs. The wetlands monitoring strategy will be coordinated with Virginia's comprehensive water quality monitoring program strategy. The monitoring objectives are designed to support regulatory decision-making, allow reporting of wetland conditions, and provide information for policy development.

The wetland monitoring program will also meet the Clean Water Act objectives for water monitoring programs by addressing the quality of the Commonwealth's wetlands and their condition as part of the overall condition assessment of state waters.

4.10.3 Wetlands Assessment Approach

Virginia has developed an integrated three-tiered approach to wetland sampling and analysis. Comprehensive coverage of all mapped wetlands is achieved with a GIS based analysis of remotely sensed information (Level I analysis). These data are summarized on the basis of small watersheds or hydrologic units. It provides a first order evaluation of the condition and functional capacity of wetlands based on their landscape position.

The second level assessment (Level II) is intended for use in a statistically selected sub-sample of the watershed wetland population and involves a more sophisticated analysis of remotely sensed information and a site visit for verification and additional data collection. The third level assessment (Level III) involves very detailed analysis of wetland performance of specific functions (i.e., habitat and water quality). This involves extensive sampling of a limited number of sites, specifically chosen to allow validation of the conceptual model of wetland function that underlies the Level I and Level II assessments.

A critical part of the overall monitoring and assessment strategy is effective validation and calibration of the underlying models. The Level III assessments are designed to specifically evaluate performance of functions in wetlands under varying degrees of stress, as indicated by the Levels I and II protocols (for additional detail see [wetcat havens-et-al-2018 \(vims.edu\)](#)).

4.10.4 Wetlands Monitoring Program Development

The DEQ wetlands program, in coordination with the overall DEQ water quality monitoring program, has developed a ten-year plan for wetland monitoring and assessment in Virginia. This work is being accomplished as work products under EPA State Wetland Development Grants CD-983380-01, CD 983815-01, BG 983924-4, and BG-983925-01, BG-98392502, BG-98392503, BG-98392504-0, BG-98392504-4, BG-98392505-0 and BG98392505-9 to the Department of Environmental Quality. The development of this strategy follows the EPA March 2003 document "[Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program](#)," EPA May 2006 "[Application of Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program for Wetlands](#)" (a supplement to the 2003 EPA document) and includes discussion of the following 'Ten Essential Elements of a State Water Monitoring and Assessment Program':

1. Monitoring Program Strategy
2. Monitoring Objectives

Final 2026

Information derived from monitoring will be used to:

- Report ambient wetland conditions in Virginia's Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 305(b) reports;
- Assist in the evaluation of environmental impacts of proposed impacts to wetlands during permit review as part of Virginia's regulatory program;
- Evaluate the performance of wetland restoration and compensatory wetland mitigation in replacing wetland acreage and function; and
- Evaluate the cumulative impacts of wetland loss and restoration in watersheds relative to ambient ecological conditions.

3. Monitoring Design
4. Core and Supplemental Water Quality Indicators
5. Quality Assurance
6. Data Management
7. Data Analysis/Assessment

Examples of different wetland quality data analyses may include:

- Comparison of wetland quality within a watershed and between watersheds
- Comparison of wetland quality within a locality and between different localities
- Comparison of wetland quality within a watershed or locality over time
- Comparison of wetland quality between wetland types
- Correlation of wetland type and specific stressor
- Comparison of wetland quality within and between hydrogeomorphic (HGM) classes
- Comparison of wetland quality within a specific wetland over time

8. Reporting
9. Programmatic Evaluation
10. General Support and Infrastructure Planning

Virginia's wetland monitoring and assessment program is being implemented through a cooperative agreement between DEQ and the Center for Coastal Resources Management at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (CCRM) using funds awarded through EPA's Wetland Program Development Grants to continue these efforts.

Parameters used in the assessment reflect information from published literature, with consideration of on-going work being conducted through the Mid-Atlantic Wetland Workgroup (MAWWG), regarding each parameter's validity, usefulness, and utility for field data collection.

The protocol for the wetland monitoring and assessment developed in Virginia consists of a multi-tiered sampling design coupled with methods for regulatory updates and field office data delivery (see Figure 2 below). Each assessment level informs the other levels and is essential in development of the final assessment protocol. The elements of Virginia's wetland monitoring and assessment program are listed in Table 5 below.




Figure 4-3. Multi-tiered sampling design of wetlands

Table 4-5. Wetland Monitoring and Assessment Program Elements

Monitoring Strategy	Establish baseline condition of nontidal wetlands by broad category scalable from individual wetland to small watershed to physiographic province to entire State. Guide management decisions regarding restoration, compensation, and regulation of wetlands.
Monitoring Objectives	Support regulatory decision-making. Report wetland condition. Guide policy development. Evaluate cumulative impacts of wetland loss. Evaluate wetland restoration and compensatory mitigation effectiveness.
Survey Design	Three-Tiered: Sample Frame = all NWI wetlands Enhanced GIS analysis (census) – Level I. Probability-based sampling for field assessment of anthropogenic stressors – Level II. Intensive study of biological endpoints (birds, amphibians, water quality) along stressor gradient – Level III+
Assessment Indicators and Methods	Level I: land use adjacent, within 200m, and within 1000m of wetland, wetland size, type, hydroperiod, proximity to other wetlands, road type, road density, and road alignment. Level II: Field assessment of anthropogenic stressors within 30m of wetland assessment point and within 100m of wetland assessment point.

	Level III: Population and community structure metrics for birds and amphibians. Water quality modification metrics.
Quality Assurance	An EPA-approved Quality Management Plan coupled with the Center Quality Assurance Plan used to prevent random and systematic errors. Techniques include direct electronic field data assimilation to prevent transcription error as well as random return site visits and redundant QA assessment loops.

The strategy continues to develop a complete wetland monitoring and quality assessment in Virginia’s Coastal Plain, Piedmont, and Ridge and Valley physiographic provinces in Virginia. The strategy developed in Phase 1 provides the framework for the ongoing assessment of the status of the Commonwealth’s wetland resources and performance measures for both the wetland regulatory and voluntary programs. Products from this strategy directly support Goal 4 of EPA’s Strategic Plan to provide “...*additional focus on assessment of wetland condition*” and the National Priority of “*wetlands monitoring and assessment.*”

One of the advantages of the Virginia protocol for monitoring and assessment of nontidal wetlands is the opportunity to develop a comprehensive assessment of the functional condition of all mapped wetlands whenever there is updated land cover information. This information is particularly useful for evaluating the performance of the regulatory program. It is also useful for indicating cumulative impacts to wetland resources arising from development activities that do not directly impact wetlands. This information can help to raise awareness of consequences and motivate essential change in general land use management and planning that affects lands outside wetland jurisdictional boundaries. Linking decisions in these areas to wetlands policy will be essential to attainment of the no net loss goal.

In a pilot study that used the analysis of wetland condition change, the water quality data was analyzed for Virginia’s coastal plain. By developing catchment areas for the various water quality monitoring stations, the primary objective of this task was to search for relationships between water quality condition recorded at DEQ water quality stations and the condition of wetlands in the contributing drainage.

To test wetland water quality condition scores, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality coastal plain water quality stations (n=99) were used to determine possible trends between wetland water quality condition scores and in-stream water quality metrics (E. coli, fecal coliform, total nitrate nitrogen, DO, pH, and turbidity). Contributing drainage areas were developed for water quality stations using the same protocol for development of individual wetland drainage areas (Figure 3). Water quality station data was compared to contributing drainage wetland water quality condition scores for multiple years (1996, 2001, and 2006).




Figure 4-4. Wetland water quality stress condition within the contributing drainage to a station.

While there were no obvious trends between wetland water quality condition score and average DO, pH, and turbidity, there were trends in total nitrate nitrogen, fecal coliform levels, and E. coli levels. As shown in Figure 4, the higher the wetland water quality condition score in the contributing drainage the lower the levels of nitrate, fecal coliforms, and E. coli suggesting a relationship between those water quality parameters and wetland condition.




Figure 4-5. Comparison of wetland water quality condition scores (mode)




Figure 4-6. Comparison of in-stream water quality parameters (mean)

4.10.5 GIS Wetland Data Viewer

Coordination with VIMS and DEQ staff to design and implement procedures to facilitate the routine application of inventory and monitoring data for regulatory decisions on wetland permits is ongoing and is based on stakeholder input. The data collected has been compiled into a wetland data viewer created by CCRM with substantial input from DEQ. The goal is to automate the processing of database information through GIS necessary to support DEQ’s regulatory decision-making, allow reporting of wetland condition, and provide information for policy development.

Stakeholders are continually canvassed for suggestions of additions of data sets and GIS layers that allows Virginia to continue to enhance the GIS-based wetland data viewer for use by regulatory agencies and the general public (see Figure 6). By having a statistically-validated tool that measures wetland quality as a function of habitat and water quality parameters, our permit staff are able to make better permit decisions relative to potential cumulative impacts. Further, we are also able to measure how well we are protecting the function of our more vulnerable wetlands (i.e. isolated wetlands, vernal pools, Atlantic white cedar swamps), by comparing the condition of wetland habitat and water quality parameters, as a function of the assessment scoring over time.

The interactive Wetland Dataviewer, also identified as the Wetland Condition Assessment Tool (WetCAT), allows users to access wetland condition in designated buffers or by HUC unit and allows analysis of linear projects to meet the specific needs of the Virginia Department of Transportation for NEPA review, mitigation requirements, and analyzing linear corridors for cumulative wetland impacts. WetCat received the Governor’s Technology Award and the Environmental Council of States Award.




Figure 4-7. WetCAT Data Viewer.

The wetland data viewer illustrated above is currently available for general use on DEQ's website at <https://www.deq.virginia.gov/water/wetlands-streams/wetcat>. Development of mechanisms for formatting desk-top delivery of assessment material for permit review are ongoing.

Additional information regarding DEQ's Wetland Monitoring and Assessment Strategy can be found at <https://www.deq.virginia.gov/water/wetlands-streams/monitoring-assessment-strategy>.

4.11 Continuous Monitoring Assessment Methodology

Continuous monitoring, in which multiple observations are collected during a 24-hour period or midnight-to-midnight at a relatively high frequency, can provide for a more comprehensive assessment of water quality than what more traditional discrete or "grab sample" monitoring provides because it generates more accurate descriptive statistics and can reveal daily, weekly, monthly, or seasonal variability. High-frequency data collection allows for a more accurate calculation of the frequency and duration of excursions as well. This is especially true for conventional field parameters (i.e., dissolved oxygen concentration and saturation, conductance, pH, temperature, and turbidity). Traditional sampling regimes (semi-monthly, monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly) can only provide a snapshot of conditions, only allowing evaluation of parameter magnitudes and a very rough estimate of excursion frequencies. Another advantage of continuous monitoring is that it monitors environmental conditions at times when field staff rarely sample, such as during nighttime or early morning hours.

Although these are significant benefits of continuous monitoring, the large datasets generated by such monitoring can be a challenge for assessment. It is considered appropriate to apply a 10.5% rule to grab sample datasets, which tend to be relatively small, but applying that rule to a continuous monitoring dataset, which can contain as many as tens of thousands of observations, could result in a water being assessed as attaining the standard for a parameter that it may be actually impaired for. Thus, using continuous monitoring data for listing and delisting waters requires caution and thoughtfulness. The following rules were crafted with

this in mind.

Rule 1

A continuous monitoring dataset that is eligible for assessment must cover at least thirty 24-hour periods (with the exception of data being assessed for maximum temperature exceedances, which must cover at least fifteen 24-hour periods). When sampling in the critical period (May to September), when exceedances of conventional field parameters are most expected, this minimum requirement allows for an informative characterization of the waterbody.

Rule 2

The continuous monitoring dataset will have undergone rigorous and standardized QA/QC screening before analysis. Every 24-hour period with at least 75% of its observations deemed as valid should be assessed and counted as a single sample. Grab samples must be collected during the run that a continuous monitor is deployed.

Rule 3

Daily averages are the mean of all valid observations (including grab samples from the same station) collected during a 24-hour period. An excursion of the DO daily average is defined as a mean calculated from all valid data collected during a 24-hour period that is below the appropriate daily average criterion for a given water.

Rule 4

A 24-hour period exceeds minimum and maximum instantaneous criteria when > 10.5% of its observations exceed the criteria. Any two such days, even if consecutive, would count as two separate exceedances. Water temperature should be evaluated for exceeding increases as described in Section 9VAC25-260-60 of the Water Quality Standards regulation. Exceedances recorded during the continuous monitoring run should be combined with grab samples within the assessment data window. A 10.5% rule should then be applied to the combined data set.

Rule 5

For water temperature standards specifying a maximum hourly change ([9VAC25-260-70](#)), a 10.5% rule should be applied to the total number of monitored hours where data meet QA/QC (including hours of the first and last days of deployment.) The frequency of hourly change exceedances should be determined by dividing the number of hourly change exceedances into the total number of hours monitored. An additional continuous monitoring dataset, collected during a subsequent year during the same month(s) as the listing dataset, must be used for delisting.

Rule 6

If a continuous monitoring dataset is used to list a water on the 303(d) Impaired Waters List, then an additional continuous monitoring dataset, collected during a subsequent year, during the same month(s) as the listing dataset, must be used to delist it. A water that was previously listed using grab samples may be delisted using continuous monitoring data collected for at least 30 days, during a subsequent year and during the same month(s) when exceedances were previously found.

Scenario # 1: A monitor was deployed July 31 at noon and run continuously through September 1 (noon) at a station. Five grab samples were collected at that station during the same year as the monitor’s deployment (during February, April, June, July, and November); no other data exist in the assessment window for this station. No excursion of the minimum DO criterion is detected in the grab samples, while four 24-hour periods in the continuous monitoring dataset have >10.5% of their total observations not meeting the minimum DO criterion.

Assessment

- The sample size is 36 (31 continuous monitor “samples” + 5 grab samples). The first and last 24-hour periods observed by the monitor should not be used for assessment, since at least 75% of the diurnal cycle was not recorded by the monitor on these two days.
- The exceedance rate is 11.1% and is therefore excessive. Accordingly, the water fails to meet the water quality standard for DO and should be placed on the 303(d) Impaired Waters list for this parameter.
- To delist this water, a continuous monitor must be set up for the same length of time as the original run, during the same month (August). Grab samples should be collected during other months of the year to maintain “temporal representativeness”.

Scenario # 2: A monitor was deployed April 1 at noon and run continuously through August 31 (noon). Three grab samples were collected at that station during the same year as the monitor’s deployment (February, October, December), and ten were collected two years previously. None of the newer grab samples exceed any standard, but twelve 24-hour periods, the majority clustered in the summer months, have >10.5% of their observations not meeting the minimum DO criterion. The older dataset contained two excursions of the DO minimum criterion, and these excursions were also found during the summer. The water had therefore been placed on the 303(d) Impaired Waters list during the previous cycle.

Assessment

- The sample size is 164 (151 continuous monitoring samples + 3 new grab samples + 10 older grab samples).
- The exceedance rate is not technically excessive (8.5%), as defined by the 10.5% rule. However, there is evidence that the water experiences hypoxia during the summer. Before considering to delist the water, the assessor should address the following questions:
 - a) Do the excursions observed in the continuous monitoring dataset correspond temporally to those found in the older dataset used to list the water?
 - b) What is the average duration of the excursions? It would not be wise to delist a water characterized by long durations of excursions—particularly for excursions of the DO minimum.
 - c) What is the temporal frequency of the excursions? Are the exceeding 24-hour periods mostly consecutive, or are they spaced relatively far apart (potentially allowing for aquatic life recovery if the excursions are not too severe)?
 - d) Were hydrological and/or weather conditions similar between the current dataset and the older dataset?
 - e) Were there specific documented practices put into place that have improved water quality over the two-year period? (refer to Appendix D for more details)

- f) Are excursions observed in the grab samples collected during the continuous monitoring run?

Note that this is not an exhaustive list of considerations. To resolve situations such as the one described above, the assessor may need to rely on best professional judgment rather than following a strict interpretation of the 10.5% rule.

SECTION 5. PROCEDURES FOR VOLUNTEER AND NON-AGENCY MONITORING DATA

In 2002, the Virginia General Assembly passed legislation that established the Virginia Citizen Water Quality Monitoring Program in the Code of Virginia (§62.1-44.19:11). Over the past 20 years, DEQ has built a reputable volunteer monitoring program, providing technical assistance and funding through the Citizen Monitoring Grant Program. Local governments, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, volunteer organizations, community organizations and colleges are all examples of who has benefited from this program.

DEQ routinely receives water quality data from volunteer and non-agency sources. The review and assessment of non-agency data is done using the same QA/QC review as with volunteer monitoring data.

5.1 Assessment Process

The process of assessing water quality data submitted to DEQ involves staff from both the central office and the regional offices. In order to include any volunteer or non-agency monitoring data in the 305(b)/303(d) Integrated Water Quality Assessment Report (IR), it must be received and evaluated by central office staff before the published data solicitation deadline. By adhering to the tasks outlined below, the agency can ensure that all qualifying monitoring data is properly assessed.

Submitting Data for Evaluation:

1. All water quality data provided to DEQ from volunteer and non-agency organizations with approved Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) should be uploaded through the Virginia Data Explorer (VDE) before the published data solicitation deadline. The appropriate QA/QC staff in the Water Monitoring and Assessment (WMA) Program will review all standard operating procedures (SOPs), QA/QC plans or QAPPs for each volunteer/non-agency monitoring group submitting water quality data.

For review of volunteer/non-agency chemical and bacteria monitoring programs, central office assessment staff will work with the WMA Quality Assurance (QA) coordinator. The QA coordinator, Biological Monitoring Program Coordinator, and regional biologists will review all supporting documentation for benthic macroinvertebrate volunteer/non-agency monitoring programs. Based upon the review of all procedures, the QA coordinator will determine the use of the data based on a three-tiered system.

2. The designation of [DEQ tiered uses of data](#) will be determined based upon the review of all procedures in conjunction with the organization submitting the water quality data. Any changes in QA/QC and/or SOP methods and/or any additions or deletions of current monitoring sites should be brought to the attention of the appropriate QA/QC staff in the WMA Program.

Since 2007, DEQ has provided a [data use authorization form](#) to monitoring groups. Because not all

organizations may wish to have their data used for water quality assessment determinations, this form allows DEQ to meet their wishes. This authorization form cannot be used to upgrade the use of lower tiered data for a higher tiered purpose. Such an example would be a data submitter requesting DEQ to assess their data for Level III (use for 303(d) listing/delisting of impaired waters) based on Level I or Level II quality data.

Volunteer and Non-agency Station Data Validation

The QA coordinator and WQM Data Coordinator will perform an initial QA and data validation of non-agency and volunteer monitoring water quality data and station metadata to ensure the completeness and accuracy of locality data. During assessment years (odd years), an initial data pull of the two most recent full years will be performed after the data solicitation deadline. In non-assessment years (even years), a data pull of the most recent full year will be performed mid-year. Data are pulled from the VDE API via an R script, locality data are validated, and assessment unit and water quality standard information are attributed to stations. The data validation process for locality data will proceed as follows:

The following station parameters will be evaluated for accuracy by cross-checking station data from the most recent assessment cycle:

1. DEQ station ID: Check to determine if current DEQ station IDs match DEQ station IDs from the previous IR cycle.
 - a. If there is no matching DEQ station ID, the station will be flagged as a new station requiring a new DEQ station ID assignment. See DEQ Data Entry Manual for station ID formatting requirements (i.e. 2BRTL-RSC01-ACB, 9STE-10-SOS, etc.)
2. Station description: Evaluate the accuracy and completeness of the station description.
 - a. Waterbody name present
 - b. Adequate physical description of the site (i.e. Sample River at Route 646 bridge crossing downstream of XY Creek confluence)
 - c. Description matches geographic coordinates
3. Geographic coordinates
 - a. Geographic coordinates match description
 - b. Station is clearly plotted on or near intended waterbody
4. WQS ID and AUs
 - a. WQS IDs and AUs will be populated using information from previous assessments and available WQS and assessment GIS layers.
5. Stations with incomplete or inaccurate descriptions are returned to groups to be corrected. Any stations not corrected in a timely manner will be omitted from the final volunteer/non-agency monitoring dataset sent to water quality assessment staff.

Central Office Assessment Tasks:

1. The QA coordinator will provide a copy of all Level II and III citizen and non-agency monitoring data received during a given assessment cycle to the Water Quality Assessment (WQA) Data Coordinator. The format of the data provided will be as follows:
 - a. Data will be in electronic spreadsheet format compatible with DEQ automated assessment scripts.
 - b. Level II and III data will be combined with columns denoting the applicable QA status and assessment use for that data point.
 - c. All data not meeting QA/QC requirements or otherwise not relevant for assessment will be omitted by the QA Coordinator. However, an unedited master copy of all data submitted will be maintained. Examples of excluded data could include benthic macroinvertebrate samples collected outside the spring and fall season or lake monitoring performed outside of the April-October timeframe.
 - d. At a minimum, all volunteer and non-agency monitoring sites submitted to the regions for assessment will contain the following metadata:
 - I. Name of waterbody monitored
 - II. Latitude and Longitude information
 - III. Physical description of the site (i.e. Sample River at Route 646 bridge crossing downstream of XY Creek confluence)
 - IV. DEQ Station IDs (if available)
 - V. Assessment Region Code
2. The QA coordinator will review data collected without SOPs and QAPPs plans. This data will be acknowledged in the applicable river basin evaluation as appropriate.
3. In coordination with the QA coordinator and the WQA data coordinator, each regional office should provide any appropriate final editing of the volunteer and non-agency monitoring assessment levels. Regional assessment staff should review the site locations to ensure that the assigned data level and the resulting assessment decisions are appropriate, or if the data should be downgraded or excluded. Final decisions to exclude or downgrade data due to sampling location should be reviewed and approved by the QA coordinator. A narrative explanation of the reasoning for site exclusion, along with any supporting data should be retained by the QA coordinator along with the original dataset and provided to the volunteer or non-agency monitoring group for review and correction.
4. After the release of the final Integrated Report, regional monitoring staff should review the station list results with regional assessment staff to consider including sites for follow-up monitoring as appropriate to their regional monitoring plan.

5. The QA coordinator will provide all data approved by DEQ for use in the Integrated Report as tables to be saved on the internal Water Quality Assessment SharePoint site. These data will also be available by request.

Regional Office Assessment Tasks:

1. All approved conventional parameter data should be characterized according to the procedures and considerations in Section 5 of this manual.
2. All approved benthic macroinvertebrate data submitted by volunteer and non-agency monitoring organizations, will be evaluated, and assessed in the following manner:
 - a. For organizations that complete the requirements for Level III, DEQ staff will assess the data for the purposes of 305(b)/303 (d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report. If a validation study showed inconclusive correlation with DEQ benthic protocols, the corresponding scores showing inconclusive correlation will not be assessed as Level III. The data from an inconclusive validation study may be used to characterize waters as having insufficient information with or without the need for follow-up monitoring (Cat 3C or 3D).
 - b. For all other methods not validated by DEQ or using DEQ protocols, biological monitoring sites characterized by volunteer and non-agency organizations as “excellent,” “good” or “acceptable” should be designated as “Area of low probability for adverse conditions” (Category 3D). Biological sites periodically characterized as “fair,” “poor,” “unacceptable” or “moderate” should be designated as “Area of medium probability for adverse conditions” and listed as insufficient data and prioritized for follow-up monitoring (Category 3C). Likewise, biological sites that are consistently “poor” or “unacceptable” should be characterized as “Area of high probability for adverse conditions” and listed as insufficient data with DEQ follow up monitoring to be prioritized (Category 3C).
 - c. Volunteer or non-agency benthic data collected outside of the established sampling seasons will be excluded from assessment.
3. Segment lengths represented by a monitoring site should be determined using the mileage delineation guidance found in Section 5.1. Each monitoring site used in the assessment should have a unique station ID using a system similar to the DEQ station ID system. The regional office staff assigns this station ID to each volunteer or non-agency monitoring site and should relay the newly assigned DEQ station ID to the QA Coordinator.
4. Level III data collected at sites that complement and are comparable (i.e. chemical to chemical comparisons and biological to biological comparisons) to DEQ monitoring sites, should be included in assessment determinations. However, the final assessment of that segment will be made using the DEQ monitoring data and the data collected by the monitoring organization would be used as supplemental data. If the assessment results differ between these stations, the data will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

5. Level III data collected at sites that do not complement or compare (i.e. benthic to chemical comparisons) to DEQ monitored sites, should be included in assessment determinations. For example, Level III volunteer benthic macroinvertebrate data shows impairment of the aquatic life use while a nearby DEQ chemical monitoring station does not directly show impairment of the aquatic life use. The assessment unit would be impaired for benthic macroinvertebrates.
6. Level II ambient and bacteria data collected at sites will undergo a similar evaluation process as used for Level III and DEQ results. Since Level II data may have some variation in quality assurance, corresponding waterbodies that indicate poor water quality will be listed as insufficient information and prioritized for follow-up monitoring (Category 3C). Waterbodies that have Level II data indicating good water quality will be listed as insufficient information with low probability for adverse conditions (Category 3D).
7. If during the regional assessment process, a discrepancy between data from DEQ monitoring stations and data from nearby volunteer/non-agency monitoring stations is believed to be suspect, the QA coordinator should be notified and effort made to rectify the discrepancy.

The QA coordinator and WQA data coordinator will evaluate the potential causes for the data disparity and/or review the QAPP and the monitoring techniques of the data submitting group. After this evaluation is complete and a problem is confirmed, appropriate corrective actions will be recommended to the monitoring group for inclusion in the volunteer/non-agency monitoring organization's QAPP and/or SOPs.

Until the discrepancies with the data and/or methods are fully evaluated by DEQ, the data (either for the parameter(s) of concern or for all observations) should not be used in assessment determinations. If the volunteer or non-agency monitoring group does not initiate corrective action, the QAPP for that parameter and/or for the group may no longer be considered valid by DEQ, and the data will not be considered for assessment determinations.

8. Regional assessment staff should use best professional judgement to determine which sampling sites are appropriate for use in assessment determinations until changes to volunteer and non-agency monitoring plans can be reviewed to exclude inappropriate sampling sites. Final decisions to exclude or downgrade data due to sampling location should be reviewed and approved by the QA coordinator. A narrative explanation of the reasoning for site exclusion, along with any supporting data should be retained by the QA coordinator along with the original dataset and provided to the volunteer/non-agency monitoring group for review and correction.
 - a. If during regional review, location information of Level III volunteer/non-agency monitoring stations cannot be confirmed, the data will be downgraded to Level II until the location of the sampling can be confirmed. DEQ regional assessment staff should work with the QA Coordinator as well as the WQA data coordinator to document these issues as they are discovered.

Other State and Federal Water Quality Data

After confirmation of approved QA/QC protocols, DEQ will consider data generated by other State and Federal

monitoring programs for use in the Integrated Report. DEQ accepts water quality data from several state and federal agencies including but may not be limited to the Virginia Department of Health, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Hampton Roads Sanitation District, Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Lab, National Park Service, and the United States Geological Survey.

Virginia Department of Health (VDH) - DEQ reviews bacteria data and swimming advisory information and lists waters as impaired due to high Enterococcus bacteria levels and potential harmful algal blooms (HABs). DEQ also reviews condemnation information provided by VDH to list waters as impaired for shellfish harvesting due to high Fecal Coliform bacteria levels. All Enterococcus bacteria results provided by VDH are also used along with any DEQ water quality data in assessing water quality. Any other water quality data collected by VDH and shared with DEQ will be used at the latter agency's discretion.

Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) – As part of Virginia's Chesapeake Bay Monitoring Program, VIMS collects and analyzes data to support assessments of several Chesapeake Bay-specific designated uses. DEQ reviews Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) data and analysis results, water clarity analysis results and shallow water continuous monitoring data for the assessment of several Bay dissolved oxygen (DO) criteria.

Hampton Road Sanitation District (HRSD) – Hampton Roads Sanitation District conducts weekly underway water quality monitoring (called "Dataflow") in the lower portion of the tidal James River during the summer and summer months. These spatially-intensive datasets are submitted to DEQ every two years for the purpose of the James River chlorophyll-a criteria assessment.

Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Lab (OWML) – The Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Lab routinely monitors the Occoquan Reservoir. DEQ requests and receives water quality data, such as pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, ammonia and nutrients, to assess the reservoir for attainment with applicable beneficial uses.

National Park Service (NPS) - The National Park Service has several long-term monitoring programs in place at many of the national parks in Virginia. Many of the parks monitor for chemical and benthic macroinvertebrate parameters using varying methodologies or procedures. Because of this, the liaison and QA coordinator provide guidance to the regional office assessment staff in assessing data received from the parks.

United States Geological Survey (USGS) - The USGS monitors several water quality stations throughout Virginia. Data collected by the USGS is considered Level III by DEQ and is used in assessing water quality including 303(d) impairment listings and delistings. Water quality parameters for which there are no established numerical criteria in Virginia's Water Quality Standards regulation or developed assessment thresholds for this guidance are not used for the purposes of 303(d) impairment listing but can be used to assess waters for follow-up monitoring (Category 3C/3D).

SECTION 6. 303(D) LISTING/DELISTING AND TMDL PRIORITY RANKING

6.1 Alternative Control Waters (Category 4B/5R)

6.1.1 Category 4B – Alternative Control

EPA’s 2006 IR Guidance acknowledged that the most effective method for achieving water quality standards for some water quality impaired segments may be through controls developed and implemented prior to the TMDL development and/or implementation (referred to as a “4B alternative”). DEQ requests EPA to evaluate, on a case-by-case basis, the Commonwealth’s decisions to exclude or delist certain segment/pollutant combinations from Category 5 based on the 4B alternative. A 4B rationale will be provided to EPA in the submission of the 2026 IR which supports the Commonwealth’s conclusion that there are “other pollution control requirements” sufficiently stringent to achieve applicable water quality standards within a reasonable period of time.

Category 4B rationales should include the following:

- (1) a statement of the problem causing the impairment,
- (2) a description of the proposed implementation strategy and supporting pollution controls necessary to achieve water quality standards, including the identification of point and non-point source loadings that when implemented assure the attainment of all applicable water quality standards,
- (3) an estimate or projection of the time when water quality standards will be met,
- (4) a reasonable schedule for implementing the necessary pollution controls,
- (5) a description of, and schedule for, monitoring milestones for tracking and reporting progress to EPA on the implementation of the pollution controls, and
- (6) a commitment to revise, as necessary, the implementation strategy and corresponding pollution controls if progress towards meeting water quality standards is not being shown.

6.1.2 Category 5R – Advance Restoration Plan

EPA’s 2016 IR Guidance acknowledges that restoration plans that are done ahead of TMDLs may be the best option to reach water quality standards faster. However, when an Advance Restoration Plan (ARP) lacks enforceable “other pollution control requirements,” the water cannot be assessed as 4B, and must remain in category 5. In EPA’s 2016 IR Guidance the national subcategory of 5-alternative (now advance) is discussed and introduced. In Virginia this is the state subcategory 5R (detailed description in Appendix C). The actions described in an ARP are intended to result in the attainment of water quality standards and DEQ must periodically evaluate ARP implementation progress to ensure that the ARP remains the more immediately beneficial or practicable method to achieve water quality standards in lieu of a TMDL. Paramount to a successful ARP and an ARP that is acceptable as a 5R is the engagement of stakeholders and their willingness to commit to actions described in the ARP. As implementation occurs and monitoring results and/or other additional data become available, it may become necessary to modify restoration activities or, if there is a lack of progress towards the attainment of water quality standards, it may become necessary to develop a TMDL. Implementation of an ARP may include prioritizing actions that may be the most effective and practicable to achieving water quality standards. After an ARP is developed, DEQ requests EPA to review the plan. While EPA cannot approve the plan, they can review it and accept it as a 5R ARP. The main elements of an acceptable 5R ARP are outlined in Appendix C. Once EPA has accepted a 5R ARP, the impaired waters that are addressed by this plan are to be assessed as state subcategory 5R. The waterbody remains in category 5 to acknowledge

that a TMDL may become necessary if implementation of the ARP does not result in the attainment of water quality standards.

6.2 Delisting Rules

Rule 1

Waters listed as impaired and needing a TMDL in the Integrated Report will remain on the list and tracked in subsequent Integrated Reports until: An EPA approved TMDL is developed for all pollutants causing impairment **or** a subsequent assessment of new monitoring data (or in special cases, modeling data) results show that the water is no longer impaired, and EPA approves the delisting of the water. In the case of parameter listings associated with an EPA approved TMDL to address aquatic life impairments due to biological monitoring, once the biological monitoring shows improvement, all associated parameters with the listing can be delisted. If a subsequent stressor analysis is completed and associated parameter listings change, the original associated parameters may be delisted.

Rule 2

Documentation required by EPA for delisting previously listed impaired waters that are now restored:

Scenario # 1: when new data demonstrates a previously impaired waterbody is currently attaining WQS, DEQ should submit the following information to justify the delisting of this segment from the 303(d) list.

- Cause Group Code, Assessment Unit ID, Stream Name and Listed Parameter, Associated Use(s) and Initial List Cycle
- ATTAINS Rationale for the decision to remove the previously impaired segment from the 303(d) list
- Any differences between the sampling techniques should be explained

Scenario # 2: when new water quality modeling determines the stream is now attaining WQS, DEQ should submit the following documents to justify the removal of this segment from the 303(d) list.

- Cause Group Code, Assessment Unit ID, Stream Name and Listed Parameter, Associated Use(s) and Initial List Cycle
- ATTAINS Rationale for the decision to remove the previously impaired segment from the 303(d) list
- Submission of any new data that were used in the modeling
- A copy of the EPA approved model that was used. A summary of the differences between the new and the old models. The reasons why the stream attains WQS under the new model opposed to the former model (data, modeling assumptions, modeling applications, etc.)

Scenario # 3: when new management practices from point and/or nonpoint sources lead to the attainment of WQS, DEQ should submit the following documents to justify the removal of this segment from the 303(d) list.

- Cause Group Code, Assessment Unit ID, Stream Name and Listed Parameter, Associated Use(s) and Initial List Cycle
- ATTAINS Rationale for the decision to remove the previously impaired segment from the 303(d) list
- Submission of the most recent 2 years of water quality data that indicate the water is a candidate for delisting and

- A description of the new management practices and other changes that have occurred in the watershed to explain the change in water quality.

The TMDL staff should apply the Proactive Approach, as appropriate, any time a TMDL is scheduled for development. Appendix D contains additional procedural information on this approach.

Scenario # 4: when errors are detected in the rationale for the initial listing of the segment or WQ Standards have been modified and the segment is attaining WQ Standards, DEQ should submit the following documents to justify the removal of this segment from the 303(d) list.

- Cause Group Code, Assessment Unit ID, Stream Name and Listed Parameter, Associated Use(s) and Initial List Cycle
- ATTAINS Rationale for the decision to remove the previously impaired segment from the 303(d) list
- Documentation of the errors in the initial listing
- A copy of the data and/or modeling that demonstrates the segment attains WQS

The following statement should be noted in delist documentation where the WQ Standards have been amended and the water is now classified as a Class VII swamp water:

“The _____ watershed was reclassified as Class VII swamp water in Virginia’s EPA-approved water quality standards regulations during the 2024 cycle. Per Virginia’s Water Quality Standards regulation (9VAC25-260-50), numeric dissolved oxygen standards only apply to Class VII waters when there is sufficient evidence the narrative criterion is not protective of aquatic life uses. To date, this Class VII water has not exhibited a need for a site-specific DO criterion, so the dissolved oxygen impairment has been removed.

In certain cases, EPA may request additional documentation to justify the removal of the segment from the 303(d) list.

Rule 3

A new impairment is “nested” when it is determined that the impairment has the same source/cause as a previously listed impairment within an existing TMDL watershed. In such a case, it is assumed the new impairment is adequately addressed by the pre-existing TMDL equation and should thus be classified as Category 4A. Assessors should coordinate with TMDL staff to review nesting guidance for specific qualifications for nesting, procedural requirements, and appropriate documentation.

Nesting bacteria impairments may be appropriate if the segment(s) to be nested are within the approved TMDL watershed boundary as delineated on DEQ’s Environmental Data Mapper at the time of assessment. Nesting bacteria impairments may also be appropriate if the segment(s) to be nested and the waters included in the existing TMDL watershed are tidal and the segment(s) to be nested are contiguous (either upstream or downstream) to the approved TMDL watershed boundary. Nesting is only appropriate when land uses in the approved TMDL watershed and newly impaired segment are comparable, and all existing point and non-point sources are accounted for in the TMDL.

Nesting non-bacterial impairments may be appropriate if the existing TMDL(s) addresses all appropriate stressor(s) for benthic impairments or all source(s) for other non-bacterial impairments. It is not appropriate if

new applicable stressor(s) or source(s) exist.

A rationale memo describing the TMDL project, the watershed, and the relevant assessments unit(s) as well as justification for the nesting should be submitted to EPA through the Draft IR submittal process.

6.3 TMDL Priority Rankings

Section 303(d) requires States to “establish a priority ranking” for the waters it identifies on the impaired waters list, taking into account the severity of the pollution and the uses to be made of such waters, and to establish TMDLs “in accordance with the priority ranking.” Federal regulations provide that “schedules for submissions of TMDLs shall be determined by the Regional Administrator and the State” (40 CFR 130.7(d)(1)). Other reasonable factors such as the State’s use of a rotating basin approach or commitments specified in court orders or consent decrees may also be considered when States develop priorities and schedules.

In scheduling TMDLs for development, every effort should be made to address all related impairments in a watershed at the same time. If endangered species are affected by an impairment listing, TMDL development should be scheduled as expeditiously as possible. If a public water supply is affected by an impairment listing, TMDL development should be scheduled as expeditiously as possible. In the absence of impacts to public water supplies or endangered species, a watershed approach should be used for TMDL development scheduling. Other factors that may impact TMDL scheduling include public interest and support, locally available funding to implement controls, or the coordination of TMDL development efforts with an adjoining state.

Beginning in 2016, Virginia developed a list of priority waters for TMDL or TMDL alternative development as part of EPA’s Vision for Clean Water Act Section 303(d) Program which was effective through 2022. EPA has now implemented the 2022-2032 Vision for the CWA Section 303(d) Program (Vision 2) which includes the development of a list of priority waters every two years for which DEQ will pursue development of restoration projects. Restoration projects can be TMDLs or other approaches such as an Advance Restoration Plan (ARP). An ARP is the new name for a TMDL alternative which was coined with the implementation of Vision 2.

Vision 2 is effective through 2032 and includes an iterating process whereby states will develop a priority list of impaired waters for TMDL or ARP development every two years consistent with the IR cycle. This began with priority impairments selected for the 2023-2024 period reported in the 2022 IR and continued with priority impairments selected for the 2025-2026 period reported in the 2024 IR and will continue through 2032. A high priority ranking is given to those selected impairments and were listed as such in Appendix 1a of their respective IRs by denoting each with an “H” under the “TMDL Development Priority” column indicating a high priority for the development of a TMDL or ARP. Note that although the column is entitled “TMDL Development Priority”, priority waters may also include ARP development. The decision between TMDL or ARP development will be made with project area stakeholders.

A key component of Vision 2 was a call for each state to develop a Prioritization Framework describing its own unique water quality objectives. Virginia’s Prioritization Framework was introduced in the 2024 IR and outlines long-term goals and focus areas. Beginning with the 2025-2026 prioritization cycle and for each subsequent two-year period through 2032, the waters prioritized for TMDL or ARP development will be selected in line with the target impairments and concepts discussed in the planning, prioritization, and

restoration section of the Prioritization Framework. Accordingly, Virginia is currently focusing efforts on fish consumption, aquatic life, and recreation impairments. For example, high priority waters include those impaired for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), waters impaired due to harmful algal blooms, and waters with impaired benthic communities along with other causes of aquatic life use impairments. The prioritization process also incorporates an evaluation of other factors and watershed characteristics such as age of impairment, community stakeholder interest, and the presence of co-existing impairments and size of the watershed to maximize efficiency.

For a variety of reasons, the priority ranking of an impaired water may change from the list that was originally public noticed. One example of this occurrence is when a TMDL or ARP project is initiated for priority waters and other potentially new impairments existing in the watershed are identified that should be included. In this case, the priority of the TMDL or ARP project may shift to account for the inclusion of the additional impairments. As the process is dynamic, any priority ranking may be altered if substantial factors change or become apparent during the scheduling process.

APPENDIX A. CLEAN WATER REFERENCES

Clean Water Act Sections

SEC. 305. WATER QUALITY INVENTORY

- (b) (1) Each State shall prepare and submit to the Administrator by April 1, 1975, and shall bring up to date by April 1, 1976, and biennially thereafter, a report that shall include—
- (A) a description of the water quality of all navigable waters in such State during the preceding year, with appropriate supplemental descriptions as shall be required to take into account seasonal, tidal, and other variations, correlated with the quality of water required by the objective of this Act (as identified by the Administrator pursuant to criteria published under section 304(a) of this Act) and the water quality described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph;
 - (B) an analysis of the extent to which all navigable waters of such State provide for the protection and propagation of a balanced population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife, and allow recreational activities in and on the water;
 - (C) an analysis of the extent to which the elimination of the discharge of pollutants and a level of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of a balanced population of shellfish, fish, and wildlife and allows recreational activities in and on the water, have been or will be achieved by the requirements of this Act, together with recommendations as to additional action necessary to achieve such objectives and for what water such additional action is necessary;
 - (D) an estimate of (1) the environmental impact, (ii) the economic and social costs necessary to achieve the objective of this Act in such State, (iii) the economic and social benefits of such achievement, and (iv) an estimate of the date of such achievement; and
 - (E) a description of the nature and extent of nonpoint sources of pollutants, and recommendations as to the programs which must be undertaken to control each category of such sources, including an estimate of the costs of implementing such programs. (2) The Administrator shall transmit such State reports, together with an analysis thereof, to Congress on or before October 1, 1975, and October 1, 1976, and biennially thereafter.

GRANTS FOR SEC. 106. POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

Beginning in fiscal year 1974 the Administrator shall not make any grant under this section to any State which has not provided or is not carrying out as a part of its program—

- (1) the establishment and operation of appropriate devices, methods, systems, and procedures necessary to monitor, and to compile and analyze data on (including classification according to eutrophic condition), the quality of navigable waters and to the extent practicable, ground waters including biological monitoring; and provision for annually updating such data and including it in the report required under section 305 of this Act;

SEC. 204 LIMITATION AND CONDITIONS

(a) Before approving grants for any projection for any treatment works under section 201(g)(1) the Administrator shall determine—

“that (A) the State in which the project is to be located (1) is implementing any required plan under section 303(e) of this Act and the proposed treatment works are in conformity with such plan, or (ii) is developing such a plan and the proposed treatment works will be in conformity with such plan, and (b) such State is in compliance with section 305(b) of this Act;”

SEC. 314. CLEAN LAKES

(a) Each State shall prepare or establish, and submit to the Administrator for his approval—

“(A) an identification and classification according to eutrophic condition of all publicly owned lakes in such State;

“(B) a description of procedures, processes, and methods (including land use requirements), to control sources of pollution of such lakes;

“(C) a description of methods and procedures, in conjunction with appropriate Federal agencies, to restore the quality of such lakes;

“(D) methods and procedures to mitigate the harmful effects of high acidity, including innovative methods of neutralizing and restoring buffering capacity of lakes and methods of removing from lakes toxic metals and other toxic substances mobilized by high acidity;

“(E) a list and description of those publicly owned lakes in such State for which uses are known to be impaired, including those lakes which are known not to meet applicable WQ Standards or which require implementation of control programs to maintain compliance with applicable standards and those lakes in which water quality has deteriorated as a result of high acidity that may reasonably be due to acid deposition; and

“(F) an assessment of the status and trends of water quality in lakes in such State, including but not limited to, the nature and extent of pollution loading from point and nonpoint sources and the extent to which the uses of lakes is impaired as a result of such pollution, particularly with respect to toxic pollution.

“(2) SUBMISSION AS PART OF 305(b) (1) REPORT. – The information required under paragraph (1) shall be included in the report required under section 305(b) (1) of this Act, beginning with the report required under such section by April 1, 1988”.

APPENDIX B. CLASSIFICATION OF VIRGINIA'S SHELLFISH GROWING AREAS

ROBERT E. CROONENBERGHS, PHD

The Division of Shellfish Sanitation (DSS) follows the requirements of the National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP), which is regulated by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The NSSP classification uses the shoreline survey as its primary tool for classifying shellfish growing waters. Fecal coliform concentrations in seawater samples collected in the immediate vicinity of the shellfish beds function to verify the findings of the shoreline surveys, and to define the border between approved and condemned (unapproved) waters.

DSS uses the shoreline survey to locate as many sources of pollution as possible on the watersheds of shellfish growing areas. DSS conducts a property-by-property inspection of the onsite sanitary waste disposal facilities of many properties on un-sewered sections of watersheds, and investigates other sources of pollution such as wastewater treatment facilities (WWTF), marinas, livestock operations, landfills, etc. The information is compiled into a written report with a map showing the location of the sources of real or potential pollution found, and sends it to the various state agencies that are responsible for regulating these concerns and the city or county. The local health departments (LHDs) of the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) play a major role in the process by obtaining correction of the onsite sanitary waste disposal problems. Most of the Division's shoreline survey effort is focused on locating potential fecal contamination, and in this manner we prevent significant amounts of human pathogens from getting into shellfish waters. We believe that this is a primary reason why we have not had a confirmed shellfish-borne disease outbreak due to Virginia-grown shellfish since the early 1960's. VDH is reducing the input of these pathogens to back yards, waterways, unofficial swimming areas and shellfish waters. The shoreline survey work is the foundation of the shellfish growing area classification program.

In addition to the shoreline survey, the NSSP requires that DSS collect seawater samples in the growing areas as part of the classification procedure. States must use the most recent 30 samples, collected randomly with respect to weather (scheduled one month in advance), to classify a station. The two-part standard for fecal coliforms in waters for direct shellfish harvest to market is a geometric mean no greater than 14 MPN fecal coliforms/100 ml and an estimated 90th percentile no greater than 31. Exceeding either number requires closure of that station.

To a lesser degree, the Division collects shellfish samples from sentinel growing areas and has them analyzed for heavy metals and chlorinated hydrocarbons (pesticides and PCBs). Such toxic substances in shellfish are not a public health threat in Virginia's waters, with the potential exception of the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River and perhaps Little Creek, both of which are located in the Hampton Roads area.

Thus, classification based on fecal pollution is a multi-layered and multi-step process. Initially one uses the shoreline survey to determine if there are any actual or potential sources of fresh fecal pollution to the growing area. If so, then the area cannot be used for the direct harvest of shellfish for marketing. Hampton Roads is an example. Most of Hampton Roads is permanently closed, due to the tremendous amount of shipping and the concern of contamination from treated sewage outfalls and runoff from the urban watershed. However, microbiological results are generally acceptable.

Another example of actual or potential pollution that requires closure is a discharge, such as from a WWTF or

Final 2026

the potential discharge from boats in marinas. DSS uses relatively simple computer models developed by VIMS, which employ fairly sophisticated mathematics, to determine the size of buffer zones around these sources. These models use inputs of fecal coliforms (estimated from sewage treatment facility outfall volumes or factors related to the number and size of boats in marinas), die-off factors, and readily available tidal current and channel configuration information. Buffer zones around marinas are typically only in effect during the warmer boating months (April 1 - October 31), whereas those around WWTF are in effect all year. Once these buffer zones are determined, they do not change in size unless the capacity of the WWTF or the marina changes.

Our third layer of classification, and our most common in Virginia, consists of evaluating areas that are not affected by urban runoff or significant wastewater discharges. One must evaluate the watershed for the potential impacts of known failing onsite sanitary waste facilities to estimate whether their input could be of such a magnitude as to require closure, even if the water quality data is acceptable. If the impact from these failing systems does not appear to pose an undue threat, then the water quality data can be used to verify whether the waters should be classified as approved or not.

Since DSS collects approximately 9-10 seawater samples annually, this means that our geometric mean typically incorporates data reaching back 2.5 to 3 years. Heavy rainfall or very high tides due to winds or moon phase can wash unusually high concentrations of fecal coliforms into shellfish growing areas that can increase the geometric mean or the 90th percentile beyond the allowed standard. As more data is collected and the unusually high concentrations fall off the trailing end of the data set, the water quality then appears to improve. This is one of the factors that can cause a continual fluctuation in the classification of the water quality at the interface between impacted upstream waters and the relatively unaffected downstream water body.

Since DSS is not a research organization, we cannot do much to determine the cause of water quality deterioration in areas. However, the Division has tried over the years to do so, and we have encouraged the Commonwealth to put resources into determining those causes. The Division has rarely found an association between obviously failing septic systems adjacent to growing areas and deteriorating water quality in large bodies of water. We have seen areas where impacts on fecal coliform concentrations in smaller bodies of water occur due to failing onsite sanitary waste disposal systems, but these seem to be rare. This should not be taken to downplay the concern from such failing onsite sanitary waste disposal systems, since even small inputs of fecal coliforms from these systems are quite likely to contain significant concentrations of human pathogens. Indeed, failing onsite sanitary waste disposal systems are one of the types of pollution sources of greatest concern with regard to the consumption of bivalve molluscan shellfish. Drainfields located in seasonally high water tables may contribute significant numbers of fecal coliforms to impact water quality, and research into this potential source is needed.

Virginia's urban suburban watersheds like the Lynnhaven River in Virginia Beach are clearly impacted by the flushing action of rapid runoff from storm drains. Other areas are much less predictable. Sometimes heavy rainfalls cause elevated counts in rural areas and sometimes they do not. While the Division used to depend upon rain gauges at airports and other widely scattered locations, it now uses NOAA Doppler predicted rainfall, which provides much improved data during spotty summertime thunderstorms. We may find that with this new data, that some areas respond more predictably to rainfall events than was apparent in the past.

In more rural areas the wildlife component of fecal coliform inputs is significant, as can be the human

Final 2026


input. Wildlife, such as raccoons, muskrats and deer, living near the intertidal zone, can have dramatic local impacts on fecal coliform concentrations in the adjacent shellfish waters, with the attendant possibility of introducing human pathogens. New data indicates that wildfowl can have significant impacts on water quality too. Wildlife inputs of fecal material are basically accounted for by the seawater sampling data.

The Division is not seeing a steady increase in the number of acres of condemned waters in the state. Instead, what we see are fluctuations in the location of the border between acceptable and unacceptable water quality measurements moving up and down tributaries over time. Again, these fluctuations seem to be due largely to changing factors on the watershed, chance weather events (rain, high tides), changes in wildlife populations near shore or unknown factors (perhaps movement of livestock from one field to another, migratory bird flocks, or runoff from recently plowed fields that later contribute little when crops stabilize the soil).

Man does directly impact the fecal coliform counts in the waters. The headwaters of smaller streams are impacted by development due to the loss of the filtering and detention of runoff waters through upland swamps and other slow moving water areas. These natural detention areas provide the extended time element so that predators (*e.g.*, rotifers and ciliates) and sunlight can reduce the numbers of fecal coliforms and pathogenic human bacteria and viruses. When these are replaced with drainage systems the fecal coliforms and potentially present human pathogens are directly discharged into the shellfish waters.

EPA Shellfish Listing /Delisting Chart

Making §303(d) & §305(b) CWA Listing Decisions Based on National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP) Growing Area Classifications



* 2007 NSSP Model Ordinance Subsection IV.@03: Growing Area Classification

APPENDIX C. REQUIREMENTS FOR CATEGORY 5R WATERS

An Advance Restoration Plan (ARP) may be the more immediately beneficial or practicable method for achieving water quality standards in some watersheds. ARPs accepted by EPA can be placed into Category 5R. EPA specifically recommends that ARP documentation describe the following elements:

- a) *Identification of waters addressed by the ARP.* Provide all waterbody names and assessment units to be addressed by the Advance Restoration Plan (ARP.)
- b) All point and nonpoint sources that are causing or contributing to the water quality impairments.
- c) *The analysis supporting the use of an ARP to achieve water quality standards.* i.e. explain why DEQ believes that implementation of the ARP will result in attainment of water quality standards. This may include, for example, estimated pollutant load reductions necessary to meet water quality standards that can be achieved through the actions described in the ARP.
- d) *The restoration activities for all point and nonpoint sources necessary to improve and restore WQS.* This includes a schedule of activities or actions designed to meet WQS with both interim and target milestones and dates, and a description of deliverables. An adaptive management approach is assumed in that modification of activities and dates may become necessary as additional information and data is obtained during implementation. The schedule can be revised and updated at each 303(d) listing cycle. Where applicable, describe any authorities that may require water quality controls to be implemented (e.g., state or local regulations, permits, contracts and grant/funding agreements). For point sources that are causing or contributing to the impairment, consider the use of Water Quality Based Effluent Limitations (WQBEL) or Best Management Practice Approach, as appropriate.
- e) *Cost estimates and funding opportunities to implement the actions described in the ARP necessary to attain WQS.* Also, describe any funding commitments, if known. This provides assurance that water quality restoration can occur through the implementation of water quality restoration activities.
- f) *Identification of parties that are committed to actions included in the ARP and description of need for additional commitments if necessary.*
- g) *An estimate or projection of time when WQS are expected to be met.* As noted above, projects are expected to follow adaptive management as implementation occurs allowing critical milestones to be adjusted as project plans and goals may change or as new information or data is available.
- h) *A water quality monitoring component to periodically evaluate and track the effectiveness of the scheduled water quality restoration activities.* Baseline water quality conditions should be established in order to accurately measure water quality progress.
- i) *Commitment to periodically evaluate the ARP to determine if it remains the more immediately beneficial or practicable method to achieve WQS.* At each 2-year 303(d) listing cycle, provide a brief, high-level summary of activities that have occurred in this cycle towards achieving WQS and identify any need for adaptive management, if appropriate (e.g. a modification to restoration activities or a modification of dates by which WQS are expected to be achieved). The project will continue to be reviewed every 2-year 303(d) listing cycle until WQS are met. Once water quality standards have been met, the State may determine that the waterbody is appropriate to be included in category 1 or 2. If the project does not meet water quality standards by the estimated target date, a discussion of water quality improvement trends, evaluation of implementation successes, and necessary modifications to the ARP with updated

implementation milestones and dates should be submitted to EPA. This is necessary in order to continue implementation of the ARP in lieu of TMDL development.

In some complicated watersheds, an ARP can take an extended period of time to develop. EPA acknowledges that such circumstances exist and will be supportive of ARP development under the assumption that an ARP continues to be the more immediately beneficial or practicable method for achievement of WQS.

APPENDIX D-1. FISH TISSUE VALUES (TV)

FISH TISSUE VALUES (TV)*		NON-CARCINOGEN	CARCINOGEN
		CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)	CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)
COMPOUND	CAS #	PPB (wet-weight)	PPB (wet-weight)
Acenaphthene	83-32-9	44,000	
Acrolein	107-02-8	360	
Acrylonitrile	107-13-1		67
Aldrin	309-00-2		2.1
Anthracene	120-12-7	220,000	
Antimony	7440-36-0	580	
Benzene	71-43-2		660
Benzidine	92-87-5		0.2
Benzo(a)anthracene	56-55-3		50
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	205-99-2		50
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207-08-9		500
Benzo(a)pyrene	50-32-8		5
Bis2-chloroethyl ether	111-44-4		33
Bis2- chloroisopropyl ether	108-60-1	29,000	
Bis2- ethylhexyl Phthalate	117-81-7		2,600
Bromoform	75-25-2		8,100
Butyl benzyl phthalate	85-68-7		19,000
Carbon tetrachloride	56-23-5		520
Total Chlordane	57-74-9		100
Chlorobenzene	108-90-7	15,000	
Chlorodibromomethane	124-48-1		910
2-Chloronaphthalene	91-58-7	230,000	
Chloroform	67-66-3	7,000	
2-Chlorophenol	95-57-8	3,600	
Chrysene	218-01-9		5,000
Cyanide	57-12-5	440	
DDD	72-54-8		170
DDE	72-55-9		120
Total DDT	50-29-3		120
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	53-70-3		5.0
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95-50-1	220,000	
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541-73-1	7,300	
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106-46-7	51,000	
3,3-Dichlorobenzidine	91-94-1		81
Dichlorobromomethane	75-27-4		1,100
1,2-Dichloroethane	107-06-2		11,000
1,1-Dichloroethylene	75-35-4	36,000	

FISH TISSUE VALUES (TV)*		NON-CARCINOGEN	CARCINOGEN
		CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)	CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)
1,2-Trans-dichloroethylene	156-60-5	15,000	
2,4-Dichlorophenol	120-83-2	2,200	
1,2-Dichloropropane	78-87-5		1,000
1,3-Dichloropropene	542-75-6		300
Dieldrin	60-57-1		2.3
Diethyl phthalate	84-66-2	580,000	
2,4-Dimethylphenol	105-67-9	15,000	
Dimethyl Phthalate	131-11-3	7,300,000	
Di-n-butyl phthalate	84-74-2	360,000	
2,4-Dinitrophenol	51-28-5	1,500	
2-Methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol	534-52-1	220	
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	121-14-2		54
Dioxin	1746-01-6		0.00023
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	122-66-7		45
Endosulfan (I and II)	115-29-7	4,400	
Endosulfan sulphate	1031-79-8	4,400	
Endrin	72-20-8	870	
Endrin aldehyde	7421-93-4	870	
Ethylbenzene	100-41-4	16,000	
Fluoranthene	206-44-0	29,000	
Fluorene	86-73-7	29,000	
Heptachlor	76-44-8		8.9
Heptachlor epoxide	1024-57-3		6.6
Hexachlorobenzene	118-74-1		36
Hexachlorobutadiene	87-68-3		910
Hexachlorocyclohexane (alpha-BHC)	319-84-6		5.8
Hexachlorocyclohexane (beta -BHC)	319-85-7		20
Hexachlorocyclohexane (gamma-BHC) (lindane)	58-89-9	8,500	
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	77-47-4	4,400	
Hexachloroethane	67-72-1		2,500
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	193-39-5		50
Isophorone	78-59-1		38,000
Mercury (Methyl) **	22967-92-6	300	
Methyl Bromide	74-83-9	15,000	
Methylene Chloride	75-09-2		18,000
3-Methyl-4-chlorophenol	59-50-7	73,000	
Nickel	744-00-2	73,000	
Nitrobenzene	98-95-3	1,500	
N-nitrosodimethylamine	62-75-9		0.71
N-nitrosodiphenylamine	86-30-6		7,400

FISH TISSUE VALUES (TV)*		NON-CARCINOGEN	CARCINOGEN
		CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)	CRITERION BASED TISSUE VALUE (TV)
N-nitrosodi-n-propylamine	621-64-7		5.2
PCB Total/congeners	1336-36-3		18
Pentachlorophenol	87-86-5		91
Phenol	108-95-2	440,000	
Pyrene	129-00-0	22,000	
Selenium	7782-49-2	18,000	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79-34-5		180
Tetrachloroethylene	127-18-4		17,000
Thallium	7440-28-0	49	
Toluene	108-88-3	7,100	
Toxaphene	8001-35-2		33
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120-82-1		1,300
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71-55-6	15,000,000	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79-00-5		640
Trichloroethylene	79-01-6		730
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88-06-2		3,300
Vinyl Chloride	75-01-4		24
Zinc	7440-66-6	1,100,000	

*These fish tissue values have been calculated based on the Virginia Water Quality Standards that are associated with the latest Triennial Review criteria proposals as adopted by the State Water Control Board in October 2019. Additionally, the values reflect the current default values for fish consumption rate (22 g/day) and body weight (80 kg) recommended by USEPA.

**The fish tissue criterion for methylmercury applies to fish species commonly eaten in the local waterbody and applies to most fish species in the DEQ database except bowfin or longnose gar because fish consumption surveys show that these species are rarely consumed in Virginia. Total mercury concentrations in fish tissue are assumed to equal methylmercury concentrations.

APPENDIX D-2. FISH TISSUE SCREEN VALUES (TSV)

RISK-BASED TISSUE SCREENING VALUE (TSVs) FOR FISH TISSUE DERIVED FROM REFERENCE DOSE AND ORAL SLOPE FACTORS PUBLISHED BY EPA FOR GENERAL POPULATION (ADULT)

BODY WEIGHT (KG) 80
 RISK LEVEL 10^{-5}
 CONSUMPTION RATE (KG/DAY) 0.022

Fish Tissue Screening Values (TSV)		NON-CARCINOGEN	CARCINOGEN
		TISSUE SCREENING VALUE (TSV)	TISSUE SCREENING VALUE (TSV)
COMPOUND	CAS #	PPB (wet-weight)	PPB (wet-weight)
Aluminum	7429-90-5	3,600,000	
Arsenic (inorganic)	7440-38-2		240*
Barium	7440-39-3	730,000	
Beryllium	7440-41-7	7,300	
BHC isomers (Technical HCH)	608-73-1		20
Brominated Diphenyl ethers (BDEs)		500 (VDH)**	
Cadmium	7440-43-9	3,600	
Decabromdiphenyl ether	1163-19-5	25,000	
Hexabromodiphenyl ether	68631-49-2	730	
Pentabromodiphenyl ether	32534-81-9	7,300	
Chromium III	16065-83-1	55,000	
Chromium VI	18540-29-9	11,000	
Chlorpyrifos	2921-88-2	1,100	
Copper	7440-50-8	36,000	
Diazinon	333-41-5	720	
Disulfoton	298-04-4	150	
Ethion	563-12-2	1,800	
Kepone	143-50-0		300 (VDH)**
Manganese	7439-96-5	510,000	
Methoxychlor	72-43-5	18,000	
Mirex	2385-85-5	730	
Oxyfluorfen	42874-03-3	11,000	
PAHs (sum PEC) ***			5.0
Silver	7440-22-4	18,000	
Terbufos	13071-79-9	180	
Tributyltin	56-35-9	1,100	
Vanadium	7440-62-2	36,000	

* The screening value of 240 ug/kg total arsenic is based on the estimate that 10% of total arsenic detected in fish tissue is inorganic arsenic (the most toxic form). Organic forms of arsenic are not carcinogenic and are relatively nontoxic. There is a general consensus that 85 to 90% of arsenic found in fish tissue is organic arsenic.

** These values are based on recent changes to the toxicological data used to calculate the screening values, or recent recommendations from U.S. EPA or the Virginia Department of Health. These screening values are not based on the same toxicological data that were used to develop the existing water quality criteria.

*** Mixtures of seven polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) that are classed as probable human carcinogens were assessed based on a screening value concentration of 5.0 ppb calculated as a sum potency equivalency concentration (PEC) using methods described in EPA's Guidance for Assessing Chemical Contaminant Data for Use in Fish Advisories, Vol. 1, (EPA 823-R-95-007) and Vol. 2 (EPA 823 B-00-008) using the following

equation;

$$PEC = \sum (R_{Pi} \times C_i)$$

where;

R_{Pi} = relative potency for the i th PAH

C_i = concentration of the i th PAH in fish tissue)

The relative potency estimates used for these PAHs were:

Benzo(a)pyrene	1.0
Benzo(a)anthracene	0.145
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	0.167
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	0.020
Chrysene	0.0044
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	1.11
Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	0.055

APPENDIX E. CONSENSUS-BASED SEDIMENT SCREENING VALUES

Freshwater Consensus- Based Sediment Screening Values (SVs)	
Analyte (Metals)	Consensus PEC (ppm) dry weight
Arsenic	33
Cadmium	4.98
Chromium	111
Copper	149
Lead	128
Mercury	1.06
Nickel	48.6
Silver	NA
Zinc	459
Analyte (Organics/Pesticides)	Consensus PEC (ppb) dry weight
Acenaphthene	NA
Acenaphthylene	NA
Anthracene	845
Benzo-a-pyrene	1,450
Benz(a)Anthracene	1,050
Chrysene	1,290
Dibenz[a,h]Anthracene	NA
Fluoranthene	2230
Fluorene	536
Methylnaphthalene, 2-	NA
Naphthalene	561
Phenanthrene	1,170
Pyrene	1,520
LMW PAHs	NA
HMW PAHs	NA
Total PAHs ** (see footnote)	22,800
Chlordane	17.6
DDD	28
DDE	31.3
DDT	62.9
DDT, total	572
Dieldrin	61.8
Total PCBs	676
Endrin	207
Heptachlor Epoxide	16
Lindane	4.99
NA = Not Available	

Estuarine NOAA-based ER-M Sediment Screening Values (SVs)	
Trace Elements (Metals)	ER-M Value ppm (dry weight)
Antimony (Sb)	NA
Arsenic (As)	70
Beryllium	NA
Cadmium (Cd)	9.6
Chromium (Cr)	370
Copper (Cu)	270
Lead (Pb)	218
Manganese (Mn)	NA
Mercury (Hg)	0.71
Nickel (Ni)	51.6
Selenium (Se)	NA
Silver (Ag)	3.7
Thallium	NA
Zinc (Zn)	410

Pesticides and Other Organic Substances –parts per billion dry weight		
CAS #	Substance	ER-M Value (dry weight) (ppb)
336363	Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)	180
309002	Aldrin	NA
57749	Chlordane	6
NA	total DDT (include metabolites)	46.1
72548	DDD	20
50293	DDT	7
72559	DDE	27
60571	Dieldrin (EPA proposed criteria)	8
72208	Endrin	NA
76448	Heptachlor	NA
1024573	Heptachlor epoxide	NA
118741	Hexachlorobenzene	NA
608731	Hexachlorocyclohexane	NA
58899	Lindane	NA
2385855	Mirex	NA
108952	Phenol	NA
117817	Di (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	NA
84742	N-Butyl Phthalate	NA
83329	Acenaphthene	500 LMW PAH
208968	Acenaphthylene	640 LMW PAH
120127	Anthracene	1100 LMW PAH
50328	Benzo-A-Pyrene	1600 HMW PAH

Pesticides and Other Organic Substances –parts per billion dry weight		
CAS #	Substance	ER-M Value (dry weight) (ppb)
191242	Benzo [GHI] Perylene	NA HMW PAH
56553	Benz[A] Anthracene	1600 HMW PAH
218019	Chrysene	2800 HMW PAH
53703	Dibenz [A,H] Anthracene	260 HMW PAH
206440	Fluoranthene	5100 HMW PAH
86737	Fluorene	540 LMW PAH
193395	Indeno (1,2,3-CD)Pyrene	NA HMW PAH
91576	Methylnaphthalene, 2	670 LMW PAH
91203	Naphthalene	2100 LMW PAH
85018	Phenanthrene	1500 LMW PAH
129000	Pyrene	2600 HMW PAH
NA	Low Molecular Weight (LMW)PAHs	3160
NA	High Molecular Weight (HMW) PAHs	9,600
NA	Total PAHs **(see footnote)	44,792

*Changes or updates to any of the ER-M or PEC screening values should be updated in the assessment scripts used to calculate the estuarine weight of evidence.

**sum of 24 Polyaromatic hydrocarbons used in previous reports, also polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PNAs)

DEQ acknowledges the use of the ER-M or PEC may be limited (for several reasons) in their ability to accurately predict biological effects. Given that DEQ continues to employ the collection of bulk sediment with chemical analysis as a cost-effective way to monitor a great number of sediment sites, these thresholds are an appropriate tool for assessing sediment data relative to its potential harm to aquatic life.

Citation:

Freshwater PECs: MacDonald, D.D., C.G. Ingersoll, T.A. Berger. 2000. Development and Evaluation of Consensus-Based Sediment Quality Guidelines for Freshwater Ecosystems. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 39:20-31.

Estuarine ER-Ms: Buchanan, M.F. 1999 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration *Screening Quick Reference Tables*, NOAA HAZMAT Report 99-1 Seattle, WA, Hazardous Materials Response and Assessment Division, 12 pages.

APPENDIX F. SIGNIFICANT LAKES/RESERVOIRS BY REGION

<u>Lake Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Size (Acres)</u>	<u>Designation</u>
Northern Regional Lake – 18 Reservoirs/Lakes			
Abel Lake	Stafford	174	PWS
Aquia Reservoir (Smith Lake)	Stafford	131	PWS
Beaverdam Reservoir	Loudoun	301	PWS
Breckenridge Reservoir	Prince William	47	PWS
Burke Lake	Fairfax	208	DWR
Curtis Lake	Stafford	58	
Goose Creek Reservoir	Loudoun	40	PWS
Hunting Run Reservoir	Spotsylvania	440	PWS
Lake Anna	Louisa, Spotsylvania, Orange	9,595	
Lake Manassas	Prince William	675	PWS
Lake Mooney	Stafford	537	PWS
Lake Orange	Orange	124	
Lake Pelham	Culpeper	250	PWS
Lunga Reservoir	Prince William	477	PWS
Motts Run Reservoir	Spotsylvania	137	PWS
Mountain Run Lake	Culpeper	73	PWS
Ni Reservoir	Spotsylvania	408	PWS
Northeast Creek Reservoir	Louisa	178	PWS
Occoquan Reservoir	Fairfax, Prince William	1,333	PWS
Piedmont Regional Office – 22 Reservoirs/Lakes			
Amelia Lake	Amelia	98	DWR
Briery Creek Lake	Prince Edward	825	DWR
Brunswick Lake	Brunswick	138	DWR
Lake Chesdin	Chesterfield	3,164	PWS
Chickahominy Lake	Charles City	1,049	PWS
Diascund Creek Reservoir	New Kent	1,055	PWS
Emporia Lake	Greensville	290	PWS
Falling Creek Reservoir	Chesterfield	88	
Fort Barfoot Reservoir	Nottoway	319	
Great Creek Reservoir	Lawrenceville	219	
Harrsion Lake	Charles City	60	
Holliday Lake	Appomattox	113	
Lake Nottoway	Nottoway	161	
Lakeview Reservoir	Chesterfield	43	
Little Creek Reservoir	James City	926	PWS
Lunenburg Beach Lake	Town of Victoria	12	PWS
Modest Creek Reservoir	Town of Victoria	20	PWS
Powhatan Lake (Upper & Lower)	Powhatan	61	
Sandy River Reservoir	Prince Edward	718	
Swift Creek Lake	Chesterfield	102	

<u>Lake Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Size (Acres)</u>	<u>Designation</u>
Swift Creek Reservoir	Chesterfield	1,581	PWS
Troublesome Creek Reservoir (SCS Impoundment #2)	Buckingham	53	PWS
Southwest Regional Office – 11 Reservoirs/Lakes			
Bark Camp Lake	Scott	29	USFS
Big Cherry Lake	Wise	103	PWS
Hidden Valley Lake	Russell	58	DWR
Hungry Mother Lake	Smyth	100	DCR
J. W. Flannagan Reservoir	Dickenson	1,177	USACE/PWS
Lake Keokee	Lee	97	DWR
Laurel Bed Lake	Russell	312	DWR
North Fork Pound Reservoir	Wise	116	USACE/PWS
Rural Retreat Lake	Wythe	85	DWR
South Holston Reservoir	Washington	1,699	TVA/PWS
Wise Reservoir	Wise	46	PWS
Tidewater Regional Office – 21 Reservoirs/Lakes			
Airfield Pond	Sussex	120	DWR
Harwood Mills Reservoir	York	258	PWS
Lake Burnt Mills	Isle of Wright	638	PWS
Lake Cohoon	City of Suffolk	454	PWS
Lake Drummond	City of Suffolk	3,242	
Lake Kilby	City of Suffolk	200	PWS
Lake Lawson	City of Virginia Beach	75	
Lake Meade	City of Suffolk	490	PWS
Lake Prince	City of Suffolk	709	PWS
Lake Smith	City of Norfolk	185	PWS
Lake Whitehurst	City of Norfolk	495	PWS
Lake Wright	City of Norfolk	12	
Lee Hall Reservoir	City of Newport News	290	PWS
Little Creek Reservoir	City of Norfolk	200	PWS
Lone Star Lake F	City of Suffolk	19	PWS
Lone Star Lake G	City of Suffolk	90	PWS
Lone Star Lake I	City of Suffolk	33	PWS
Speights Run Lake	City of Suffolk	118	PWS
Stumpy Lake	City of Virginia Beach	263	
Waller Mill Reservoir	York	288	PWS
Western Branch Reservoir	City of Norfolk	1,205	PWS
Valley Regional Office – 21 Reservoirs/Lakes			
Beaver Creek Reservoir	Albemarle	96	PWS
Chris Greene Lake	Albemarle	57	PWS
Coles Run Reservoir	Augusta	11	USFS/PWS
Douthat Lake	Bath	47	DCR

<u>Lake Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Size (Acres)</u>	<u>Designation</u>
Elkhorn Lake	Augusta	51	DWR
Fluvanna Ruritan Lake	Fluvanna	51	DWR
Lake Albemarle	Albemarle	37	DWR
Lake Arrowhead	Page	36	DWR
Lake Frederick	Frederick	67	DWR
Lake Nelson	Nelson	41	DWR
Lake Robertson	Rockbridge	24	DWR
Mount Jackson Reservoir	Shenandoah	1	PWS
Ragged Mountain Reservoir	Albemarle	71	PWS
Rivanna Reservoir	Albemarle	399	PWS
Lake Shenandoah	Rockingham	36	DWR
Silver Lake	Rockingham	11	PWS
Staunton Dam Lake	Augusta	21	PWS
Strasburg Reservoir	Shenandoah	5	PWS
Switzer Lake	Rockingham	99	USFS/PWS
Sugar Hollow Reservoir	Albemarle	47	PWS
Totier Creek Reservoir	Albemarle	37	PWS

Blue Ridge Regional Office – 31 Reservoirs/Lakes

Beaverdam Creek Reservoir	Bedford	70	PWS
Bedford (Stony Creek) Reservoir	Bedford	28	PWS
Carvin Cove Reservoir	Botetourt	632	PWS
Cherrystone Reservoir	Pittsylvania	104	PWS
Claytor Lake	Pulaski	4,287	PWS
Clifton Forge (Smith Creek) Reservoir	Alleghany	10	PWS
Conner Lake	Halifax	98	DWR
Fairystone Lake	Henry	127	
Gatewood Reservoir	Pulaski	176	PWS
Georges Creek Reservoir	Pittsylvania	8	PWS
Graham Creek Reservoir	Amherst	40	PWS
Hogan Lake	Pulaski	36	PWS
Kerr Reservoir (within Virginia)	Halifax, Mecklenburg	33,300	USACE/PWS
Keysville Reservoir	Charlotte	36	PWS
Lake Gordon	Mecklenburg	115	DWR
Lake Gaston (within Virginia)	Brunswick	5,817	PWS
Leesville Reservoir	Bedford	2,630	PWS
Little River Reservoir	Montgomery	60	PWS
Martinsville Reservoir	Henry	181	PWS
Mill Creek Reservoir	Amherst	190	
Lake Moomaw	Bath	2,389	USACE
Pedlar Lake	Amherst	118	PWS
Phelps Creek Reservoir	Campbell	19	PWS
Philpott Reservoir	Henry	2,813	USACE
Roaring Fork Reservoir	Pittsylvania	19	PWS
Smith Mountain Lake	Bedford	19,820	PWS

<u>Lake Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Size (Acres)</u>	<u>Designation</u>
Spring Hollow Reservoir	Roanoke	113	PWS
Stonehouse Creek Reservoir	Amherst	34	
Talbott Reservoir	Patrick	141	
Thrashers Creek Reservoir	Amherst	32	
Townes Reservoir	Patrick	28	

Total 124 = Significant Reservoirs/Lakes statewide

PWS = Public Water Supply Water Quality Standards Designation

DWR = Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources Owned or Managed

DCR = Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation Owned or Managed

USACE = U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Owned or Managed

USFS = U.S. Forest Service Owned or Managed

APPENDIX G. MEMO TO STANDARDIZE ROUNDING METHOD FOR ASSESSMENT

Memorandum

TO: John Kennedy, Director of the Office of Ecology
Sandra Mueller, Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Manager
Andrew Garey, Water Quality Monitoring Team Lead
Mark Richards, TMDL Team Lead
Amanda Shaver, Water Quality Assessment Coordinator
David Whitehurst, Water Quality Standards Analyst

From: Tish Robertson, Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Scientist

Subject: Need for standardized rounding method for water quality assessment

DATE: October 29, 2019

Assessment staff are instructed to list water bodies as impaired when data indicate a greater than 10.5% exceedance rate for conventional parameter criteria (DO, pH, temperature, and bacteria). This practice is based on guidelines from EPA's *Consolidated Assessment and Listing Methodology: Toward a Compendium of Best Practices*, which recommends conventional pollutant criteria be allowed a 10% exceedance frequency. For recreational bacteria criteria, this "10% rule" is codified in the water quality standards (WQS). Since this "10%" is expressed as a whole number in the WQS rather than as a value with decimal places, calculated exceedance frequencies should be rounded to the nearest whole number before evaluating them.

Under the most common method of rounding—wherein if the digit to be dropped is 5 or greater, the preceding digit is rounded up—an exceedance of 10.5% would be rounded up to 11%. Thus, under this method, a water body exhibiting an exceedance rate of 10.5% for the single sample maximum bacteria criterion can be said to be in non-compliance with the WQS.

However, under the "round to even" method an exceedance rate of 10.5% is rounded to 10%. If the digit to be dropped is 5, the preceding digit is rounded up if it is odd and kept the same if the digit is even. When rounding 10.5% to the nearest whole number, "0" (the preceding digit) is kept since it is even. Thus, under this rounding method a water body with an exceedance rate of 10.5% is in compliance with the WQS.

While it can be inferred from the "greater than 10.5% exceedance rate" rule stipulated in the assessment guidance manual that assessors are supposed to be using the "round to even" method, there is currently no reference to this method anywhere in the guidance manual. It is very possible some staff are unaware of this rounding method and thus may be applying it only for the evaluation of exceedance rates rather than for all assessment decisions. The "round to even" method is just as valid as the more commonly used "half round up" method, but it is hard to defend the combined use of those methods.

There is a strong policy justification for adopting the "round to even" method. VPDES staff are instructed to use the "round to even" method in their implementation guidance for permit limits and DMRs (DEQ Guidance memo no: 06-2016). EPA and other organizations involved in the preparation of promulgated analytical

methods under Clean Water Act Section 304(h) are instructed to use the “round to even” method as well¹¹. Thus, incorporating a statement into the assessment guidance that directs staff to use the “round to even” method would ensure consistency with existing DEQ and EPA policy. A similar policy could also be adopted by the Watersheds program so that TMDLs and IPs are consistent with the other water quality programs.

If a “round to even” rule was incorporated into the assessment guidance manual, automated tools (Access, Excel, SAS, and R tools) will need to be programmed accordingly, since typically the “half round up” is the default method. Additionally, staff who are unfamiliar with this method will need to be introduced to it.

¹¹ [EPA. \(1996\) Guidelines and Format for Methods to be proposed at 40 CFR Part 136 or Part 141. Office of Science and Technology. Washington, DC.](#)