



CHESAPEAKE BAY TMDL PHASE III WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
URBAN STAKEHOLDER MEETING
 September 20, 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
Sandra Stuart, NBSWCD	Sara Bottenfield, DEQ- Harrisonburg
Jeff Rankin, Town of Glasgow	Jeff Martone, City of Lexington
Dorothy Baker, DEQ- Richmond	Jason Weakley, VDH
Trafford McCrae, City of Waynesboro	Jonathan Griffin, Rockbridge County
Barbara White, VDOF	Michael Ramsey, City of Waynesboro
Benjamin Bradley, Stantec (on behalf of VDOT)	Sherry Ryder, Bath County
Natasha Skelton, Valley Conservation Council	Lisa Perry, Rockingham County
Kelley Junco, City of Harrisonburg	Rebecca Stimson, City of Harrisonburg
Hunter Moore, CSPDC	Rebecca Joyce, CSPDC

MEETING NOTES:

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Those in attendance introduced themselves to the group.
- Hunter Moore (CSPDC) gave a quick overview of the WIP III Process and what the group has accomplished up to this point.
- Hunter informed the group that the participation letters could still be turned in.



II. Review of Region's Urban BMP Scenario

- Hunter showed the group the scenario developed at the last meeting, which fell about 90,000 lbs short of the nitrogen reduction goal for WIP III.
- Hunter explained the process that the PDC used to develop alternative scenarios that would meet the goal and how CAST was used to calculate scenario reductions.
- Three different scenarios that the PDC developed were run through CAST and adjustments were made with each run. The last attempt was about 3,000 lbs over the reduction goal; however, the scenario may be too unrealistic.
- The group then began to re-evaluate the scenario developed at the last meeting, in effort to close the 90,000 nitrogen lb gap.
- Conservation Policy discussion:
 - One participant asked how scenarios were impacted by the Growth Management strategy BMP and noted that there needs to be more clarity with respect to the actions that are associated with this strategy. It would be helpful to spell these out better so that localities understand the action items associated with growth management.
- Developed, Natural & Septic Sector BMPs
 - It was noted that most of the Bioretention filters put in in the Valley are in C/D soils; however, Rockingham County has some B soils. Participants agreed that A/B soils are not abundant in the area. It was clarified that the extent of bioretention filters is based on acres treated, not the footprint of the BMP.
 - Another participant asked what the total unregulated area for the PDC region was. Hunter explained that the total acreage of non MS4 urban developed land as of 2017 is estimated at 140,000 acres, and projected 2025 acreage is 145,000 acres.
 - Urban Stream Restoration was noted as expensive but provides a big return in terms of pollutant reductions and generally well accepted by the public.
 - Dept. of Forestry can provide a process for tracking tree plantings, public and private with verification by localities. DOF does not have the capacity to verify these, so localities would have to assume this role to get credit for these plantings.
 - The group discussed the likelihood of accomplishing BMP goals and it was reiterated that the plan is non-binding and much of the intent is to demonstrate needs to state and federal agencies.
 - Forest buffers and tree plantings were discussed as another cost-effective BMP.

- The group agreed that the Tree Canopy Planting practice should be maxed out. Forest Buffers can be increased since stream restoration is going to be increased (these will go hand in hand). The group agreed that if funding is unlimited, localities would lean towards more aesthetically pleasing BMPs since these are things that the public likes and associates with community improvement. This includes Impervious Surface Reduction and this BMP was also increased.
- It was noted that Nutrient Management is a practice that produces high nutrient reductions and is relatively cost effective.
- Localities discussed the use of Wet Ponds and Wetlands and several participants agreed that these practices aren't too popular in their areas.
- It was suggested that Storm Draining Cleaning could be increased along with Street Cleaning.
- The group suggested maxing out the Septic Pumping practice. It was noted that additional reporting requirements would need to be attached to any effort to significantly increase Septic Pumping.
- The group discussed potential increases in Septic Secondary Treatment Conventional and thought that this practice wouldn't go up much. The Septic Secondary Treatment enhanced practice could be increased though, as someone could put in a non-nitrogen reducing system coupled with something else.
- The group discussed Vegetative Open Channels. Participants liked this practice for C/D soils but didn't think that much would go in for A/B soils. One participant asked if Vegetative Open Channels is the same thing as grassed channels in the BMP clearinghouse.
- The group discussed the Permeable Pavers practice and the challenges associated with installation and maintenance of this practice.
- The group discussed Dry Extended Detention Ponds and concluded that that this BMP is not attractive and has low co-benefits.
- The group discussed limitations of Infiltration practices in karst topography. Better guidance is needed on the use of this practice in karst, as of now the recommendation is just not to use it.

III. Co-benefits Discussion

- The group reviewed a list of co benefit examples
- Hunter asked the group if there were other co benefits that they could think of that were not on the list.



- One participant suggested including *human health*. Hunter noted that *increased property values* is another to consider. *Education* was also suggested as a co-benefit. *Energy conservation* was also noted as a co-benefit.
- *Aesthetics* and *economic improvement* were also noted as co-benefits. *Water quantity/drainage improvement* was noted as a benefit, though this may be captured under flood control. *Cultural* benefits could be experienced as well. Septic practices will include *community services* as a benefit.

IV. Funding and Capacity Discussion

- Hunter encouraged participants to identify their needs to make these BMPs happen.
- Hunter read through the list made at the last meeting of funding / capacity issues and additional ideas.
- A participant suggested having funding for meetings or network group to discuss process and assist unregulated communities similar to MS4 groups.
- A participant suggested a block – grant type allocation for localities based on acreage instead of a competitive grant process.
- Staff / Funding sources needed for implementation of BMPs

V. Programmatic Recommendations Discussion

- Funding for creating a citizen incentive program
- Possible Nutrient Management Plan that would be implemented /required by HOAs; would need a consultant to organize / implement program
- Need programs that promote benefiting the local area; rather than just the bay. “community first” program that would attract local members to participate since it benefits surrounding area but also benefits the bay.
- Questions to follow up on:
 - Can we receive more clarity on the actions that are associated with the Growth Management Policy?
 - Are Vegetative Open Channels the same thing as grassed channels?
 - Can Urban Stream Restoration be implemented on non-developed area outside of MS4 boundaries?
 - For the Permeable Pavement BMP, does replacing old pavers count or just adding new pavers?
 - How do BMPs nitrogen reduction “cancel each other out” in the CAST model?
 - Can we receive more clarification and guidance on the Infiltration BMP? Can it be used in karst topography?



-
- How is land-use methods a co-benefit?

VI. Public Comment

- None

VII. Adjourn

Next meeting: November- Joint PDC and SWCD (Date and Location TBD)