

Rush River, Hughes River, Hazel River and Thornton River

TMDL

Implementation Plan Development

Steering Committee Meeting #2

March 30, 2009

7 P.M.

Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission

Attendees

Jenn Allen, Friends of the Rappahannock
Tim Bondelid, RappFLOW
Deirdre Clark, Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
Katie Conaway, VA Dept. of Environmental Quality
Debbie Cross, VA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation
Bev Hunter, RappFLOW
Don Loock, Piedmont Environmental Council
Kenner Love, Virginia Cooperative Extension Service
John McCarthy, Rappahannock County
David Massie, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
Byron Petrauskas, Engineering Concepts, Inc.
May Sligh, VA Dept. of Conservation and Recreation
BJ Valentine, RappFLOW
Greg Wichelns, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District

Meetings to Date

- First Public Meeting – September 16, 2008
- Agricultural Working Group meetings- September 16, 2008; November 18, 2008; January 12, 2009
- Residential Working Group meetings – September 16, 2008, November 18, 2008
- Government Working Group meeting – January 12, 2009
- First Steering Committee Meeting – February 23, 2009

AGENDA REVIEW

- **Steering Committee Meeting Notes – February 23, 2009:** Reviewed and accepted as written.
- **Government Working Group Report to Steering Committee - Revised:**
 - In response to comments regarding the format and content of the Government Working Group report to the Steering Committee, the document was revised. Changes included separating Key Topics and Recommendations, grouping, summarizing and clarifying certain aspects of the report and removing a reference interpreted as ascribing regulatory authority to the Government Working Group. All changes were accepted as written.
- **Implementations Chart Review** – suggested changes include:
 - Shade column headings;
 - Include definitions for all acronyms; and
 - Eliminate abbreviations.
- **Draft Public Document Plan Review** –
 - Noted that the Public Document is a condensed version of the Technical Plan as developed with input from the public in response to the TMDL;
 - **Issues discussed** include:
 - Projected implementation costs - high due to the large number of streams in the region and high number of livestock exclusion practices needed;
 - Well water quality;
 - Surface/groundwater relationship - identified as a greater concern in karst and coastal plain areas;
 - Connection between water quality and herd health;

- Economic benefits of clean water to tourism – tourism, fishing, aesthetics, etc.
 - Pet waste issues and proposed management practices should be handled in a reasonable manner;
 - Numbers of pet waste composters recommended might be reduced if buffers were included;
 - Check monitoring station locations – route numbers/road crossings;
 - Check monitoring schedule; and
 - Consider adding new monitoring stations – Battle Run, Hazel River (outlet of watershed), and Rush River.
 - Recommended changes include:
 - **Bold** Working Group names in the text;
 - Assure that numbers/details in narrative match those in the tables and that details are easily understood -for example, Table 2 seems to suggest 60 FTEs; however, the text clarifies the need for an equivalency of 6 FTEs over a 10 year period;
 - Assure that colors in all figures are easily distinguished;
 - Include reference to "Streamside Livestock Exclusion" publication by Benham, Lunsford and Zeckoski;
 - Include a paragraph regarding surface/groundwater interaction;
 - Tailor comments in "Benefit Analysis" to the watershed.
 - Include comments from local farmers regarding benefits of Ag BMP programs;
 - Include information in text to support photographs of alternative on-site sewage disposal system (p.27).
 - Numbers of pet waste composter proposed should reasonably reflect the number of households where the practice might be applicable;
 - Include cost share funds for hardwood riparian buffers to reflect availability of stimulus funds for carbon sequestration; and
 - Include a text reference that LE-1T and LE-2T stream exclusion practices will be cost-share eligible even though numbers are not quantified in the IP, and
 - Adjust Table 6 to reflect needed changes in locations and monitoring schedule.
- **Power-Point Preview:**
 - Issues discussed include:
 - Importance of presenting information in a manner that is readily understandable by all members of the public;
 - Change of language to "Clean Water Action Plan" rather than TMDL-IP;
 - Emphasis should be on the watershed, not just particular stretches of streams;
 - Emphasize the connection between herd health and exclusion fencing;
 - Can terminology other than "BMP" be used to convey information;
 - Importance of citizen involvement in the IP development;
 - Explain "cost share";
 - Concern for the role of the average citizen in the I.P. and;
 - How does the presentation reach those with no interest in livestock?
 - Recommended changes include:
 - Include information on the potential numbers of riparian buffers that might be created;
 - Add information on pasture management;
 - Adjust slide on sewage treatment systems to de-emphasize alternative systems;
 - Include DEQ's slide to demonstrate measurable goals and milestones;
 - Funding costs should include "average";
 - Remove monitoring text – use map only;
- **Public Meeting Outreach** – advertising will include:
 - Signs and bulletins posted throughout the watershed;
 - Local newspapers postings in "Events" column;
 - Postings in electronic newspapers and bulletin boards; and
 - E-mails to those who have participated in previous meetings.
- **Reporting and Integrated Data Management;**

- Linear feet of fencing installed and number and types of BMPs developed and implemented ,along with all funds allocated, are tracked by CSWCD and DCR (agricultural practices) and the Virginia Department of Health (septic practices);
 - The CSWCD, along with DCR, will work on tracking the implementation of agricultural BMPs identified in the IP, including those not funded through cost-share programs;
 - Water quality is tracked by way of DEQ monitoring; and
 - Currently, there is no mechanism to track and integrate all bacteria source reduction actions that take place in the Upper Hazel across all agencies programs and stakeholder efforts.
- **Next Steps:**
 - The final public meeting will be held at the Washington Fire House, 10 Firehouse Lane, Washington, VA on April 23, 2009 at 7P.M.
 - The power-point presentation, as reviewed and edited, will be presented; and
 - Citizens will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments.