



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

Meeting Minutes – July 13, 2018

Attendees:

Matthew Aylor	Madison County
Kendall May	Culpeper County
Ron Battaglia	Town of Warrenton
Paul Bernard	Town of Warrenton
Deirdre Clark	John Marshall Soil and Water Conservation District
Joe Costello	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
Garrey Curry	Rappahannock County
Derek DiDonato	Van Metre Homes
Michelle Edwards	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
David Evans	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Kimberly Fogle	Fauquier County
Lee Frame	Orange County
Kathleen Harrigan	Friends of the Rappahannock
Jennifer Herzog	Land Trust Alliance
Richard Jacobs	Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
Greg Wichelns	Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
Adrian Joye	Fairfax County Health Department
Ann Jurczyk	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Patrick Mauney	Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission
John McCarthy	Piedmont Environmental Council
Mark McIntosh	Van Metre Homes
Alex Perez	Van Metre Homes
Ben Rowe	Virginia Farm Bureau
David Saltzberg	Northern Virginia Conservation Trust
Robbie Talbert	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. She pointed out that David Evans would be the region's

main point of contact with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the lead state agency for this process.

Overview of the Phase III WIP Process

Michelle Edwards, RRRC

Michelle Edwards presented an overview of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan Process, including roles and timeline. Updates to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and on-the-ground evidence of progress were also discussed. Her presentation is available on RRRC's Chesapeake TMDL webpage at www.rregion.org/chesbaytmdl.html.

Discussion of Stakeholder List

Ms. Edwards went over the list of invited stakeholder organizations, and asked participants for any recommended additions. None were voiced. She stated that suggestions for invitees could be sent to her via email or attendees could also pass along the meeting invitation to their contacts.

Initial Review of Region's Urban BMP Data

Ms. Edwards walked attendees through the region's WIP III data and templates, provided by DEQ as an Excel workbook. She noted that the workbook would be provided to attendees via email and posted on RRRC's Chesapeake TMDL webpage (www.rregion.org/chesbaytmdl.html). The following spreadsheets are included in the file:

- Region's Local Area Planning Goal Loads
- Region's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for 2017 Progress, WIP II with 2025 Land Use, and Available Land for Each BMP
- Urban BMP Crosswalk
- Septic BMP Crosswalk
- BMP Definitions
- BMP Cost-effectiveness
- Programmatic Action Template
- Programmatic Actions Examples

Ms. Edwards facilitated a discussion of questions and comments from meeting participants, including the following key points:

- The BMP input deck from the Phase II WIP with 2025 Land Use (included in the region's BMP spreadsheet) can be used as a starting point for developing the region's WIP III BMP deck. Meeting participants were encouraged to look at BMPs added to the state BMP Clearinghouse since WIP II, especially those with the highest cost-effectiveness ratings (recognizing the ratios are State averages). It was noted that Agricultural and Forest Land Conservation are new BMPs that have been very recently added to the Bay Watershed Model.
- Attendees questioned how Agricultural Conservation, Forest Conservation, and Growth Management Policies are credited. Ms. Edwards shared the BMP definitions provided by DEQ, but stakeholders requested more detail on what is required to satisfy this BMP, and

how environmental improvements are credited. The Healthy Watershed Forest Initiative is potentially a big consideration in the region.

- A question arose as to how the activities of Nutrient Banks (and relatedly Wetlands Mitigation Banks) are credited in the Bay Model. Is it the location of the bank or the construction project that determines the locality/watershed that receives the credits? If the bank is located in the planning area, but credits are purchased outside the area or vice versa, what credits are attributed locally?
- During DEQ's meeting with PDCs at the George Washington Regional Commission on July 10, it was noted that the Stormwater Performance Standard BMP could be used in WIP development as a catch-all stormwater BMP for future construction projects. What are the relative merits of broadly identifying the Standard as a BMP vs. identifying more specific BMPs?
- There was discussion amongst participants regarding the allocation of BMP acreage regionally in both the PDC-led process and in the Soil and Water Conservation Area process for agricultural BMPs.
- Participants discussed the need to identify metrics to measure performance for programmatic actions that may be more suited to local strategies and/or implementation, such as ordinance development. Localities generally prefer to take a regional approach to development of programmatic actions for this process rather than committing to individual locality actions. Locality-specific metrics would likely require approval of the Board of Supervisors.

Discussion of Regional Process & Resources Needed

Ms. Edwards asked stakeholders if there were any questions or comments on the planned process. None were raised.

She then asked if there were any additional data resources attendees felt were needed moving forward. A request was made for GIS data denoting the most effective areas of the region to place BMPs to reduce nutrient loading in the Bay. Mark Bennett, USGS, was suggested as a possible contact. Ms. Edwards agreed to attempt to track down such data.

Kimberly Fogle of Fauquier County requested septic system data, particularly information on failing systems in the region. Whitney Wright, VDH, agreed to provide estimates of failing systems by jurisdiction. All participants were asked to inform Ms. Edwards of data needs they identify and to send her any relevant data from their organization.

Public Comment

Ms. Edwards open 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 August 17, 2018 at 1:00 – 3:00 pm in the Culpeper County Library.