



**CHESAPEAKE BAY TMDL PHASE III WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
URBAN STAKEHOLDER MEETING**

Meeting Minutes – August 16, 2018

Attendees:

Matthew Aylor	Madison County
Kendall May	Culpeper County
Ron Battaglia	Town of Warrenton
Julie Bolthouse	Piedmont Environmental Council
Ben Bradley	Virginia Department of Transportation/Stantec
Deirdre Clark	John Marshall Soil and Water Conservation District
Joe Costello	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
Garrey Curry	Rappahannock County
Michelle Edwards	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
David Evans	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Kathleen Harrigan	Friends of the Rappahannock
Richard Jacobs	Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
Greg Wichelns	Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
Hunter Joseph	Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission
Ann Jurczyk	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Patrick Mauney	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
John McCarthy	Piedmont Environmental Council
Alex Perez	Van Metre Homes
James Sawyer	Fauquier County
Elizabeth Vick	Central Shenandoah Planning District Commission
Barbara White	Virginia Department of Forestry
Whitney Wright	Virginia Department of Health

Welcome and Introductions

Michelle Edwards of the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission (RRRC) welcomed attendees and introductions were made. All meeting handouts distributed to attendees will also be made available via email and on RRRC's Chesapeake TMDL webpage at www.rrregion.org/chesbaytmdl.html.

Follow-up to Previous Stakeholder Questions

Michelle Edwards, RRRC and David Evans, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Ms. Edwards began the meeting by sharing DEQ's responses to questions raised by participants during the previous Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) stakeholder meeting on July 13, 2018 (see attached), with assistance from David Evans, DEQ. She also shared another handout provided by DEQ that maps nutrient loads and delivery factors to the Chesapeake Bay and local streams. This data can be used in determining where to site Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to reduce the most nutrients reaching local streams and the Bay, and was requested by attendees during the previous meeting. Stakeholders can also receive the GIS data by contacting Joe Costello of RRRC at jcostello@rrregion.org. Mr. Costello will provide a regional map of the data during the next stakeholder meeting after clarifying several details about the data with DEQ staff.

Initial Review of Region's Urban BMP Data

Copies of the urban BMP WIP II data for the region and each County in the region under 2025 land use projections were distributed to attendees (see attached). As discussed during the previous stakeholder meeting, this data can be used as a starting point for developing the region's WIP III BMP deck since it meets the Local Area Planning Goal for Nitrogen. The data comes from the EPA online tool CAST, and RRRC staff will be using the regionally aggregated data to develop the WIP III input deck with stakeholders. While derived from updated data provided by Bill Keeling of DEQ, these numbers differ slightly from those DEQ previously provided in Excel format during the previous meeting. The previously provided BMP Cost Effectiveness data was also distributed to attendees for their convenience (see attached).

Discussion began with BMPs added to the state BMP Clearinghouse since WIP II, and attendees were provided a spreadsheet listing only those BMPs and the amount of any 2017 Progress. Due to interest during the previous meeting, RRRC staff ran scenarios in CAST assuming all five counties applied each of the three Land Policy BMPs (Forest and Farm Preservation, and Growth Management) separately. Staff compiled the results in a spreadsheet and distributed it to attendees (see attached). Ms. Edwards explained that only one Land Policy BMP can be applied to a given location at a time, and it must be done for the County as a whole, not by acreage. The only Land Policy BMP that produced significant nitrogen load reductions was Growth Management. Farm Preservation actually increased the region's nitrogen loads. After discussion, all jurisdictions supported applying the Growth Management BMP to all counties in the region for the WIP III BMP input deck, because it provided by far the greatest reduction in nitrogen loads of the three possible Land Policy BMPs. Additionally, there are a broad range of potential implementation possibilities, such as continuing to fund Fauquier County's PDR program and implementing recommendations from the Healthy Watershed Forest Initiative, that the localities are already planning to do.

Ms. Edwards then asked Whitney Wright, Virginia Department of Health (VDH), to discuss the quarterly data he compiled on Sewage Repair Permits by County from 2016-Present. The repair rate ranged from 412-439 systems annually. Estimates were also provided for future repair needs based on variable failure rates for the approximately 36,000 septic systems within the five

counties. Due to new regulations Mr. Wright anticipates 80% less septic repairs in the future because they are now being defined as maintenance in Virginia. John McCarthy asked whether alternative systems and pump outs are included in the data, to which Mr. Wright replied yes for alternative systems, but pump outs are not.

Mr. Wright explained that VDH's septic pump out data is not comprehensive, and the only reporting is that done by the SWCDs through their cost-share program. There is no requirement for RRRC counties to report this data. James Sawyer noted that Fauquier County has a pump out ordinance, but does not track them. Ms. Edwards suggested that a reporting requirement for haulers in areas outside of the Chesapeake Bay Act could be included as a Policy Need by the region. Mr. Wright stated that VDH might be able to track pump outs for alternative septic systems and could also implement an educational program asking haulers to report pump outs. Several stakeholders concurred with these ideas, so this issue will be revisited by the group when implementation actions and resource needs are discussed at a future meeting.

The WIP II pump-out value for RRRC was 5,073 systems. There was general agreement that this number was reasonable and would be kept as is for the WIP III input deck.

Ms. Edwards next directed stakeholders' attention to the Septic Connection BMP. There were questions regarding what the BMP covers, and belief that it only included existing septic systems that are retired and converted to sewer connection to wastewater treatment. A question was asked whether this would be residential only, or if any commercial connections should be included. Ms. Edwards and Mr. Evans agreed to check on the assumptions of this BMP. All agreed that the WIP II value of 3,403 systems is extremely high if only existing systems are included, and after further discussion, a WIP III level of 500 systems was agreed to.

For the Septic Denitrification BMP, Mr. Wright stated that about 8,000 such systems have been put in place since 2008. The question was raised whether this BMP should capture only conversion of existing systems, or new (replacement) systems. Ms. Edwards and Mr. Evans agreed to also check on the assumptions of this septic BMP. It was agreed by general consensus that the 6041 systems for this BMP in WIP II would be kept as is for WIP III.

Discussions then turned to the following remaining new BMPs available for use in the RRRC Input Deck:

- **Bioretention/Rain Gardens in C/D Soils:** None of these BMPs were included in the region's WIP II plan, though 2,900 acres in A/B Soils were included. There are 2 acres reported as in-place for C/D soils in 2017. Friends of the Rappahannock (FOR), Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC), and Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) have all done work on these practices (although soil type is unknown) and it was discussed that the WIP III target should be based on what the counties would like to do if resources were available. Stakeholders agreed to set the WIP III acreage at 20, in light of fact that

most of these practices would be on very small (residential) parcels and are not as well suited to these soil types.

- **Bioswale:** 10 acres were in place in 2017. Discussions noted that these are inexpensive to install and maintain. CBF noted that this BMP is especially relevant to churches, schools and other public buildings. NFWF was seen as a good potential funding source. A WIP III target of 500 acres was agreed to.
- **Erosion and Sediment Control 2:** Ms. Edwards noted that discussions are underway with DEQ on what would satisfy this BMP, and RRRC believes that the current Stormwater Construction GP should. Some participants observed that the CAST model language doesn't accurately reflect what the Stormwater GP requires. Attendees agreed that the 877 acres of Erosion and Sediment Control listed in 2017 Progress was a reasonable target for WIP III, but it was unclear based on the definitions DEQ provided in the workbook whether it should be listed as Erosion and Sediment Control 1 or 2. 2017 Progress was listed as ESC 1 even though those projects should be under the specifications of the Construction General Permit. Attendees requested that DEQ clarify whether new construction done under the 2012 Construction General Permit (outside MS4 areas) should be entered as the ESC 2 BMP.
- **Floating Wetlands:** PEC, FOR and CBP stated they have installed a small amount of these BMPs. Attendees agreed to enter 5 acres as the WIP III target for floating wetlands.
- **Storm Drain Cleaning:** Richard Jacobs noted that Lowes and Walmart contracts to have their storm drains cleaned. Stakeholders agreed to add 50 lbs of sediment, 5 lbs of nitrogen and 45 lbs of phosphorous to be removed for this BMP. CAST requires direct entry of each nutrient for this practice. Stakeholders were not certain of typical amounts of nutrient removed per lb of sediment with this practice and requested advice from DEQ.
- **Stormwater Runoff Reduction/Stormwater Treatment:** The question was raised as to whether these BMPs only include retrofit projects. Stakeholders tentatively agreed to include the 2017 Progress acreages, but were not sure how much impervious acreage and linear feet to include for those projects already completed. Mr. Evans agreed to check into both items.

RRRC staff ran the revisions to the BMP input deck through CAST several times during the meeting. While several urban BMP amounts were added/raised to compensate for the large reduction to the number of planned septic system connections from WIP 2 numbers, the Local Area Planning Goal for Nitrogen was not met. Additional BMPs will need to be increased during the next meeting.

Public Comment

Ms. Edwards opened the floor to any additional comments from the public. None were made.

Next Stakeholder Meeting

After discussion, the next Urban Stakeholder Meeting was scheduled for September 21, 2018 at 1:00 – 3:00 pm in RRRC's conference room.