



CHESAPEAKE BAY TMDL PHASE III WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
URBAN STAKEHOLDER MEETING
 August 22, 2018, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
 Brite Transit Facility, 51 Ivy Ridge Lane, Fishersville, VA 22932

Meeting Summary

In attendance:

Patrick Wilkins, City of Staunton	Nesha McRae, DEQ- Harrisonburg
John Reeves, Private Citizen	Chris Slaydon, Rockbridge County
Morgan Shrewsberry, Augusta County	Sara Bottenfield, DEQ- Harrisonburg
Jeff Rankin, Town of Glasgow	Jeff Martone, City of Lexington
Dorothy Baker, DEQ- Richmond	Jason Weakley, VDH
Kim Sandum, CAP	Jonathan Griffin, Rockbridge County
Barbara White, VDOF	Michael Ramsey, City of Waynesboro
Nickie Mills, City of Staunton	Sherry Ryder, Bath County
Jay Gilliam, Natural Bridge SWCD	Jim Echols, DCR
Ashley Hall, Stantec (on behalf of VDOT)	Rebecca Stimson, City of Harrisonburg
Anita Riggleman, HRRSA	Kelley Junco, City of Harrisonburg
Natasha Skelton, Valley Conservation Council	Jason Wilfong, Headwaters SWCD
Jean Andrews, ACSA	Rachael McCuller, Headwaters SWCD
Hunter Moore, CSPDC	Liza Vick, CSPDC



MEETING NOTES:

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Those in attendance introduced themselves to the group.

II. Review of the Phase III WIP Process

- A PowerPoint (attached) was presented to those in attendance to offer a review of the Phase III WIP process by Liza Vick.
- Hunter Moore, GIS Specialist, presented a web app map. The purpose of the map was to offer a visual for those in attendance of the amount of unregulated developed space or “urban areas” present within the region and opportunities for best management practices to be implemented as there are many unregulated developed areas across the region.
- Liza Vick presented the Letter of Participation template.
 - The letter of participation will need to be submitted or signed by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) or equivalent of your Locality/organization.
 - Your CAO can use the template provided by the CSPDC or documentation as simple as an email to hunter@cspdc.org stating “xyz locality/organization agrees to participate in the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan process” will work as well.
 - The letter/statement of participation does not represent a commitment to implement BMPs, programmatic actions or strategies resulting from the meetings. It simply says that the locality/organization agrees to participate in the planning process.
 - If there are any questions that you or your CAO have please contact the CSPDC.
- An explanation of the workbook (attached) that meeting participants were given was provided.

III. BMP Input Discussion

- Conservation Policy BMP Discussion
 - There was a recommendation that all three of the Conservation Policy BMPs (Growth, Forest, and Agricultural) be available instead of just one.
 - The majority of the group chose the Growth Policy BMP since only one could be chosen.
 - A participant did not like the use of the word policy and recommended the word strategy be used.



- A concern was shared about the lifetime of BMPs in the list and that the communication of long term maintenance requirements for the BMPs be made to DEQ and the general public.
- A question regarding how the maximum amount a BMP can be employed was determined was asked. It was determined based on the model which uses land use cover to determine how many units a BMP can be implemented.
- There was a cost effectiveness handout (part of the workbook—attached) of BMPs. The CSPDC encouraged participants to view it as a tool for comparing BMPs to each other, but not focus on actual numbers as they are 2010 dollars and a state-wide average.
- Based on the BMPs available to our Region in the DEQ provided input deck the CSPDC led the participants in evaluating the BMPs and to what extent they could be implemented.
 - Developed Sector BMPs:
 - This included looking at each BMP individually, evaluating the suggested WIP II amount, and the 2017 (or on the ground) amount to determine how many units of the BMP could be implemented by 2025 if the necessary funding, capacity, programmatic actions, etc. were in place.
 - The advanced IDDE BMP was noted as impractical to apply by participants from localities.
 - Participants from localities agreed that bioretention was a BMP that was highly likely to be implemented.
 - Bioswales were noted as useful in unregulated areas.
 - Dry detention ponds were noted as not recommended and will likely decrease in implementation in the coming years for the area. The same was true for dry extended detention ponds.
 - There are opportunities for some use of filtering practice, but feedback from participants seemed minimal in unregulated areas.
 - There was an agreement from participants regarding the use of forest buffers as impractical in urban areas due to small lots and homeowners not wanting the buffer.
 - Forest plantings and tree planting canopy were noted as possibilities in unregulated areas.
 - Nutrient management plans were listed as an opportunity for the region.
 - Permeable pavement was listed as unlikely due to maintenance and cost and the fact that it is not likely to be used in an unregulated area.
 - More information regarding storm drain cleaning was needed by the participants such as the average amount of material removed per cleanout. According to the

amount of pollutant reduction achieved by this practice it does not yield a phosphorus or nitrogen reduction.

- Stormwater performance standard-runoff reduction was a practice that participants saw as an opportunity, but not to the extent that WIP II called for.
- While it was noted that wet ponds and wetlands can be risky in our region due to karst areas participants still saw it as an opportunity for implementation.
- Natural Sector BMPs:
 - Discussion about the urban stream restoration by participants included concerns that the practice was costly and while there are stream miles for the practice to be implemented it is not highly likely that it will to a large extent.
 - Wetland enhancement is not a popular BMP among landowners due to standing water.
- Septic Sector BMPs:
 - Septic Connections is an opportunity for our region, but difficult at the same time due to non-existence of sewer line, long timelines for construction of sewer lines, and expense.
 - Septic Pumping is a practice that participants agreed is a BMP that can be increased.
 - Definitions of Septic Sector BMPs were different from what VDH uses, and some of the numbers seemed a little off. VDH will be following up with more information for participants.
- Questions to follow-up on:
 - A question regarding the amount of unregulated developed land within the CSPDC region was brought up.
 - Does the land conservation policy BMP require a conservation easement for assignment of credits? Could the establishment of an Ag Forrestral District count?
 - Do Filterra units count as a filtering practice BMP?
 - Can a better description of an infiltration BMP be given? Is there any infrastructure associated with it?
 - Is the tree-canopy BMP in units of acres treated or acres of trees?
 - Can a better description of vegetated open channel BMP be given? Why does the CSPDC region not have a C/D soils option for this practice?
 - If MS4s did urban stream restoration outside of the developed area and took a baseline reduction, is this information reported?
 - Why are grass riparian buffers not an option?
 - What credit is associated with each septic pumping BMP?



IV. Funding and Capacity Discussion

- NFWF Funds
 - It is difficult to receive funding for practices and approaches that are not considered innovative.
 - There needs to be consistent funding for regular stormwater BMPs.
- SLAF Funds
 - The funding source needs to be more consistent.
 - Categories for funds would be nice such as: stream restoration, nutrient trading, urban stormwater BMPs.
- New Funds
 - Funds for design projects and engineering assistance.
 - Funds for in-between grant amounts such as the \$50,000-\$60,000 range.
 - Funds to address project pairing such as pairing transportation and drainage with water quality projects.
 - Funds for more staff.
- VCAP Funds
 - It is inconsistently available.
 - SWCDs only make \$500/project in TA funding and are therefore not likely to shift focus to this project when funds are so minimal.
 - Because VCAP is a cost-share program more affluent landowners typically benefit.
- Other Ideas
 - Zoning ordinances for developers.
 - Stormwater utility fee.
- Additional Issues Shared
 - Some localities have to contract out some or most of stormwater facility maintenance.
 - Few localities have adequate staff to maintain stormwater facilities.
 - Funding for invasive species control would be helpful.

V. Programmatic Recommendations Discussion

- Septic Pumping
 - There needs to be a way to capture pumping. Maybe pumping companies could report more information on where they are pumping.
- VCAP



- Practices such as green roofs are impractical as the roof has to be engineered to hold the weight, but the program is only for properties three years or older.
- It is hard to find contractors to construct BMPs that are a part of the VCAP.
- Additional Hurdles
 - Short funding timelines make large scale planting projects difficult.
 - Consideration of a program like the Highlands Action Program as it was a source of funding for developing infrastructure for trained staff to complete projects.
 - VDH no longer requires permits for installation of certain components of septic systems. This results in a lack of information generally requested when funding assistance is provided through a grant.

VI. Co-benefits Discussion

- Due to time constraints this item was not addressed at this meeting, but it will be discussed at the September meeting.

VII. Public Comment

- None

VIII. Adjourn

Next meeting: Thursday, September 20, 2018
November- Joint PDC and SWCD (TBD)