

**FINAL Meeting Minutes
Rivanna River Basin Commission
Organizational Meeting**

April 25, 2007

6:00 pm

Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission
401 East Water Street, Charlottesville

Attendance

Rivanna River Basin Commission (Commission) Members

Present:

Ms. Jeri Allen, Greene County Board of Supervisors
Mr. Lindsay Dorrier, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors
Mr. John E. Easter II, Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors
Ms. Kendra Hamilton, Charlottesville City Council
Mr. John Martin, Albemarle County Citizen
Mr. Marvin F. Moss, Fluvanna County Board of Supervisors
Mr. Gene F. Ott, Fluvanna County Board of Supervisors
Mr. Robert Runkle, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors
Ms. Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors
Mr. Andy Wilson, Fluvanna County Citizen

Absent:

Mr. Smith Coleman, Greene County Citizen
Mr. Mickey Cox, Greene County Board of Supervisors
Dr. Paolo D'Odorico, Charlottesville Citizen
Mr. Kevin Lynch, Charlottesville City Council

Speaker

Mr. Ridge Schuyler, The Nature Conservancy

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Schuyler thanked everyone for attending the meeting, welcomed the group, and gave an overview of what the meeting would entail. Mr. Schuyler suggested the Commission proceed with the first item on the agenda – selecting a temporary chair to run the first meeting.

1. Select a Temporary Chair to Run First Meeting

Mr. Moss volunteered to serve as the temporary chair for the first meeting.

2. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 pm by Mr. Moss.

3. Appoint Someone to Take Minutes

Ms. Diane Frisbee with The Nature Conservancy volunteered to take minutes of the meeting.

4. Roll Call

The members introduced themselves and attendance was taken.

5. Determination of Quorum

It was determined a quorum was present.

6. Approval of the Agenda

A copy of the agenda was distributed to the Commission members. Mr. Moss made a motion to approve the agenda and the agenda was approved unanimously.

7. New Business

Presentation by Mr. Schuyler, Piedmont Program Director, The Nature Conservancy

Mr. Schuyler gave a presentation on the origin of the Commission, where we are today, and the threat of sedimentation facing the Rivanna watershed. The Rivanna watershed is 766 square miles in area, and lies within the James River watershed and the larger Chesapeake Bay watershed. He stated that the challenges we face in the Rivanna watershed are the same as those threats all along the east coast. He stressed that the Commission has the opportunity to do ground-breaking work that can be used not only in the Rivanna, but also throughout Virginia, the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and the east coast.

Mr. Schuyler stated that one challenge facing the Rivanna is that the watershed lies in seven different localities and each of the localities has its own set of goals and policies, which makes management of the watershed difficult. He showed a map indicating the portion of each locality within the watershed. The localities and the portions of their areas that lie within the watershed include: City of Charlottesville (100%), Albemarle County (67.9%), Greene County (57.1%), Fluvanna County (51.7%), Louisa County (2.8%), Orange County (2.4%), and Nelson County (0.2%).

Mr. Schuyler discussed the State of the Basin Report which was the culmination of a large effort undertaken by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission to look at the Rivanna watershed in 1996 and 1997. The group looked at the history, geology, and water quality of the watershed because they had identified the watershed as a special place. He mentioned that The Nature Conservancy has also identified the Rivanna watershed as something special through ecoregional planning. The Nature Conservancy has identified the Rivanna watershed as one of the finest watersheds remaining in the Piedmont region, despite the fact that Charlottesville is located in its center. He went over several of the recommendations from the State of the Basin Report and highlighted the last recommendation: “Develop a Corridor Plan to guide decision making related to preservation and use of the Rivanna River. The plan should be developed by an oversight group, possibly as continuation of the Rivanna River Roundtable, with a charge approved by the local jurisdictions and funds for development of the plan.” Mr. Schuyler stated that this recommendation is what led The Nature Conservancy to work to establish the Rivanna River Basin Commission. He also stated that each of the four major localities in the Rivanna

watershed has identified problems facing the watershed in their comprehensive plans, and showed relevant language from the comprehensive plans. He mentioned that the hope is that the Commission can help address these comprehensive plan goals collectively.

Mr. Schuyler then gave an overview of how the Commission was established. In 2004, Governor Warner signed the statute authorizing creation of the Commission. Mr. Schuyler then visited each of the localities in the watershed to request that they agree to join the Commission. The four localities that make up the majority of the Rivanna watershed (Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, and Charlottesville), agreed to join the Commission. The localities with minor portions of their land area in the watershed declined to join. The Commission has 14 members: 2 of each governing body (Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, and Charlottesville), 1 each from the two local Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and 1 citizen from each locality.

An issue that came up when Mr. Schuyler met with the localities was a concern that the localities would be asked to provide funding for the Commission. As a result, The Nature Conservancy went to work to raise money for the Commission through private donations. To date, there is \$285,000 in hand in a checking account at The Nature Conservancy that is designated for the Commission. Another \$100,000 has been pledged. This money will be turned over to the Commission after the Commission designates a fiscal agent.

Mr. Schuyler then discussed the sedimentation threat facing the Rivanna watershed. He described how The Nature Conservancy worked with partners and local experts to conduct an analysis to identify the stresses affecting the watershed. Through this analysis, the group determined that sedimentation is a high threat to streams, tributaries, and rivers in the watershed. He stated that sedimentation is a problem we all share and that the comprehensive plans for each of the major localities in the watershed address it. He then showed a diagram that indicated that the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir, the main drinking water supply for Charlottesville and urban portions of Albemarle, is losing storage capacity at a rate of 1% per year to sedimentation in the reservoir. The community is now facing a \$130 million cost to develop a new reservoir, in part due to the loss of storage in the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir.

Mr. Schuyler showed a diagram indicating what is known about the sources and causes of sedimentation. The two major sources of sediment include overland and instream sources. Overland sediment comes from active land disturbance and altered land cover. Instream sediment sources come from streambank/streambed disturbing activities and legacy stream sediment erosion. Altered land cover also causes altered hydrology which leads to accelerated stream flows and accelerates the impact of the other sediment sources. Mr. Schuyler noted that we know these are the sources of sedimentation but what we don't know is the relative contribution of these sources. He stated that we need to know the magnitude of these contributions or else we won't know which management strategies to use to address the sedimentation threat. He presented a few slides that show the impact of increased runoff on stream erosion, which is likely to be a large contributor to sedimentation in the watershed.

Mr. Schuyler finished his presentation by stating that we hope the Commission can tell us the right thing to do to protect the Rivanna watershed.

The group requested printed copies of the presentation. Mr. Moss asked if there were any strings attached to the funding that has been raised for the Commission. Mr. Schuyler said that the money is unrestricted. Mr. Moss congratulated Mr. Schuyler and said the people of Fluvanna thank him for his efforts.

Organizational Items

1. Review Draft Charter

a. General Discussion

Mr. Moss walked the members through the charter and asked if members had comments or suggested changes on each article.

Article 1 (Establishment): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 2 (Purpose): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 3 (Powers and Duties): Mr. Moss mentioned that this article is very important because the Commission needs to have a clear understanding of what they can and cannot do. Mr. Schuyler stated that the legislative counsel said the Commission shall have no regulatory power, and that the goal of the Commission is to provide guidance.

Article 4 (Membership): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 5 (Terms): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 6 (Officers): Mr. Moss asked for clarification from Mr. Schuyler on item 3. Mr. Schuyler stated that The Nature Conservancy has had several meetings with the staff of the localities comprising the Commission to develop the charter. He stated that the charter provides 4 options for selecting the initial Chair and Vice Chair. He also stated that they decided not to include selection of a Treasurer and Secretary in the charter, but that the Commission is welcome to have them if they want. Mr. Moss stated that he thought it was interesting that a duty of the Vice Chair is to issue findings of the Commission. Ms. Allen liked the inclusion of this duty, and Ms. Thomas pointed out that this is also a duty of the Chair.

Article 7 (Committees): The group agreed that there are a lot of talented people in our community and we should have a committee to include them in the Commission's work. Mr. Moss stated the goal of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was a bit unclear. Mr. Schuyler responded that the Commission won't be able to meet on a regular basis. The idea was that the TAC would be made up of staffs of the entities comprising the Commission and that the staff members would be given a charge by each of the localities to take part. The Commission members would also be on the TAC if they wanted to be. Commission members and their staff would form the core of the TAC. There could be up to 12 other members on the TAC from the community that are not Commission members or staff of the localities. These other members would not be voting members of the TAC. Mr. Schuyler explained that if a vote needed to be taken about a recommendation to make to the Commission, the core would vote on the

recommendation. Mr. Moss asked if Alyson Sappington, Harrison Rue, and others are aware this will take place and that they will be asked to participate and contribute staff time. Mr. Schuyler stated that the charter was developed through discussions with the staff members and he believes most if not all of them are aware of this. Ms. Alyson Sappington of the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District was in attendance and stated that the district had a meeting today and are aware of this.

Mr. Dorrier asked if the Commission needs to make a formal commitment to coordinate its efforts with the James River Commission, Chesapeake Bay Commission, and other commissions. Mr. Moss stated that he thinks this should be on the agenda for the next meeting to be sure we are in line with other efforts in the Chesapeake Bay. Mr. Moss mentioned that Ms. Thomas recently told him Albemarle County has voluntarily decided to meet many of the requirements for Chesapeake Bay localities. He stated that Greene and Fluvanna have not done that and he thinks the Commission should talk about integration of those efforts. Ms. Allen stated that Greene's view is that these regulations are coming and they're probably going to wait until they come their way. Mr. Moss stated the Commission should think about the regulatory programs coming and how the Commission can take advantage of them. Mr. Schuyler added that there are also grant programs that he would love to be able to apply for on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Moss mentioned the Watershed Plan Builder is a tool recently developed by EPA that fits in nicely with the Commission's work.

Mr. Martin asked how often the Commission will meet and what the relationship would be between the Commission and the TAC. He asked if the Commission would provide direction to the TAC and how the direction would be formulated and communicated, and stated that he would feel left out if the Commission met quarterly and he didn't know what was going on in the TAC. Mr. Moss stated that that was a good question and asked if we wanted to go into this level of detail about the TAC in the charter. Mr. Moss suggested that perhaps Paragraph 1 and 2 could remain in the charter, but that items a-f under Paragraph 2 could be deleted. Ms. Hamilton asked if it was necessary to have the TAC or if it would be possible for the Commission to meet more often and try to get more done. She stated that it seems the TAC would be the one driving the cart. Mr. Schuyler responded that he envisions, for example, that the Commission authorizes a scope of work for what needs to be done to address the sedimentation threat. He stated that someone will have to oversee the day-to-day activities such as managing contracts and sending out and drafting RFPs. Ms. Allen agreed that it might be strange to have the TAC meeting monthly and the Commission meeting quarterly. She asked if it would make sense that a few members of the Commission go to the monthly TAC meetings and they then update the other Commission members. Mr. Dorrier suggested maybe the Commission could have an Executive Committee that oversees the TAC. Mr. Martin agreed that an Executive Committee with a Chair and a Vice Chair is a good idea. Mr. Schuyler stated that there has been a de facto informal TAC with the staff that The Nature Conservancy has been meeting with prior to this meeting. He stated that they have not had a Chair and that the meetings have worked, but that that might be too loose of a setup for the TAC. Ms. Allen agreed that there should be a Chair. Ms. Thomas stated that we need to decide first how often the Commission wants to meet. She stated that if it is quarterly, there would be more need for an Executive Committee and/or TAC, but if we want to meet more often, there is less need. Mr. Moss agreed. Ms. Allen suggested that the

Commission approve Paragraph 1 and Paragraph 2 items a, b, and c. She stated that Paragraph 2 items d, e, and f get into specifics that don't have to be adopted tonight.

Article 8 (Meetings): Mr. Moss asked the group how they felt about having 6 meetings per year (meeting bimonthly). Ms. Allen felt that the Commission should meet more often initially. Mr. Moss and Mr. Ott agreed. Mr. Runkle stated that there is a lot of work to do and that the Commission could hire a staff and then the Commission can meet quarterly. Mr. Moss asked Mr. Schuyler how much time he could contribute to the Commission and what he thought about the Commission hiring a staff person. Mr. Schuyler stated he could contribute as much time as needed and that hiring a staff person was an idea he had as well. He stated one option is that the Commission could hire someone to do the literature review to compile what is known about the threat of sedimentation, and then perhaps that person could stay on as the project manager. Mr. Schuyler stated that he believes there will be a lot of work to oversee projects, and the role of the TAC could be to guide that effort and distill the information for the Commission. He also said that perhaps at a later date an Executive Director could be hired if needed. Mr. Ott stated that if the Commission waits three months to meet again it will be too long. He agreed that the Commission needs to meet at least initially in the next month to select a Chair and complete other organizational tasks. He suggested the Commission would then meet again soon after the second meeting. Mr. Easter suggested that the Commission move ahead with review of the charter and flesh out at the next meeting how often to meet. Mr. Easter suggested that Article 8 Paragraph 1 be rewritten to state "Meetings of the Commission shall be held." Mr. Moss stated that he also did not want to adopt the charter language on the TAC tonight. Mr. Ott said that the Commission may also want to think tonight about if there is anyone who wants to serve as the Chair or Vice-Chair. Ms. Allen suggested that Paragraph 1 should read "Meetings of the Commission shall be held not less frequently than quarterly."

Article 9 (Quorum; Voting): Mr. Easter asked Mr. Schuyler if the Commission should allow proxy. Mr. Schuyler stated that he felt the Commission should not allow proxy. Ms. Allen and Ms. Thomas agreed. The Commission approved the language in Article 9.

Article 10 (Order of Business): Mr. Dorrier asked if it was necessary to have Article 10 in the charter. Ms. Thomas suggested Paragraph 1, item g be rewritten to state "Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting." Ms. Hamilton stated it seems like a bad idea to have a different note taker at each meeting. Mr. Moss asked if Ms. Diane Frisbee of The Nature Conservancy would take minutes at future meetings. Ms. Frisbee agreed. Mr. Moss proposed Article 10 remains in the charter for now. Ms. Thomas mentioned that nowhere in the charter does it say the Commission needs to operate under Robert's Rules of Order for items not in the charter.

Article 11 (Funding): Mr. Moss asked Mr. Schuyler for elaboration. Mr. Schuyler stated that if the Commission decides it wants to have a foundation to raise money for the Commission that is an option. Ms. Allen asked if Mr. Schuyler thought a 501(c)(3) was necessary. Mr. Easter said that he thought 501(c)(3) status might be necessary for fundraising. Mr. Schuyler stated he would look into the issue to see if donations to the Commission would be tax deductible. Mr. Moss asked Mr. Schuyler how he sees the funding for the Commission working. Mr. Schuyler said he sees the scope of work being drafted that would then list steps. The steps and the cost of

each step would be spelled out. He stated that grant funding should play a significant role, and that the money that has been raised by the Commission is the perfect match for grants since it is from private donations. Ms. Allen asked for clarification on the process written in the statute for distributing the costs among local governing bodies. Mr. Schuyler stated that they wanted to include a statement that each locality will give a percentage of the funding based on the population within the watershed, but that the Commission can choose not to use this process. Ms. Allen stated that Greene County is in the headwaters of the watershed and doesn't use the river, so they are concerned about having to provide funding for the Commission. Mr. Moss stated that Fluvanna County's Board of Supervisors is also concerned about having to pay.

Article 12 (Fiscal Agent): Mr. Moss asked Mr. Schuyler what he thought about the fiscal agent. Mr. Schuyler said that the Commission could establish a 501(c)(3), the Commission could be its own fiscal agent, or one of the localities could be designated as the fiscal agent. Ms. Allen asked if The Nature Conservancy could be the fiscal agent. Mr. Schuyler said that his hope is that the Commission is its own entity and is not viewed as The Nature Conservancy's entity. Ms. Thomas stated that the Commission also needs legal advice and insurance. She asked if The Nature Conservancy could be the fiscal agent and provide legal advice and insurance. Mr. Schuyler said that The Nature Conservancy could probably find insurance for the Commission and he would look into this and whether or not The Nature Conservancy could serve as the fiscal agent and provide legal advice. Mr. Dorrier said that whether or not the Commission is its own fiscal agent depends a lot on how much activity is required of the fiscal agent. Ms. Allen said she thinks The Nature Conservancy should be the fiscal agent and apply for grants on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Moss agreed, saying that this would not prevent someone else from being the fiscal agent later. Mr. Moss suggested they make a decision about whether or not The Nature Conservancy will be the fiscal agent at the next meeting. Mr. Schuyler said he wants to make sure that the decision they make regarding the fiscal agent is the right thing for the Commission.

Article 13 (Compensation): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 14 (Staffing and Support): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Article 15 (Amendments): Mr. Dorrier stated he thinks the language should be rewritten to state "This charter may be altered, amended, repealed or added to by a two-thirds vote of the Commission members" rather than a majority vote. Other members stated they felt a majority vote was fine for now.

Article 16 (Withdrawal; Dissolution): There were no comments or suggested changes on this article.

Mr. Moss proposed the charter be adopted tonight. Ms. Thomas agreed, stating that the charter says we can develop resolutions to the charter later if need be.

b. *Establish process for selecting initial Chair and Vice Chair*

Mr. Moss read through the options for selecting the initial Chair and Vice Chair provided in Article 6, Paragraph 3 of the charter. Mr. Moss stated he preferred option 3. Option 3 states that a Nominating Committee composed of three members shall be elected by majority vote of the

Commission members. The Nominating Committee shall recommend a Chair and Vice Chair and voting shall occur at the beginning of the second meeting. In the event that the slate is not elected, the Nominating Committee shall recommend another slate. All members agreed with Mr. Moss to use option 3 to select the initial Chair and Vice Chair. Mr. Moss stated he thinks the three members of the Nominating Committee should be from different jurisdictions and members agreed. Mr. Moss asked if there were volunteers to serve as members of the Nominating Committee. Mr. Moss, Ms. Hamilton, and Mr. Martin volunteered. Ms. Thomas moved that Mr. Moss, Ms. Hamilton, and Mr. Martin would constitute the Nominating Committee and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Hamilton asked if any of the members would like to be the Chair or Vice Chair. Mr. Moss responded that he wouldn't mind being Vice Chair but was too busy to be Chair. Ms. Thomas also stated that she might be able to be Chair.

c. *Determine at which meeting Chair and Vice Chair for ensuing term shall be selected.*

Members agreed to insert "May" into the blank in Article 6 Paragraph 4.

d. *Set meeting day, time and place for 2007 meetings*

The second meeting was set for May 17, 2007. The Commission deferred setting additional meeting dates until the second meeting.

e. *Any other changes to draft charter*

See amendments to charter below.

2. Adopt charter

Ms. Thomas moved to adopt the charter as amended and the motion passed unanimously. The amendments to the charter include:

Article 6, Paragraph 3 – The paragraph now reads: "The initial Chair and Vice Chair shall be chosen by the following process. A Nominating Committee composed of three members shall be elected by majority vote of the Commission members. The Nominating Committee shall recommend a Chair and Vice Chair and voting shall occur at the beginning of the second meeting. In the event that the slate is not elected, the Nominating Committee shall recommend another slate. Members of the Nominating Committee may be nominated as Chair or Vice Chair."

Article 6, Paragraph 4 – The paragraph now reads: "The Chair and Vice Chair to be chosen for the ensuing term shall be elected by a majority vote held during the May meeting."

Article 7, Paragraph 2 – Items d, e, and f were removed from the charter.

Article 8, Paragraph 1 – The paragraph now reads: "Meetings of the Commission shall be held not less frequently than quarterly."

Article 10, Paragraph 1 – Item b was deleted. Item g was rewritten so that it now reads: "Approval of the minutes of the preceding meeting."

3. Actions required prior to next meeting

a. *Discuss process for appointing Technical Advisory Committee*

Mr. Moss asked if the Commission should postpone appointing a TAC. Ms. Thomas asked why the Commission should postpone this activity. Ms. Allen asked who the Commission is supposed to appoint to the TAC. Mr. Ott said the Commission members should just think about who they would want from their entity and appoint them to the TAC. Mr. Schuyler said staff of the localities, such as Kristel Riddervold with the City of Charlottesville, would be potential members of the TAC. Mr. Moss suggested the Commission members meet in consultation with the staff of the entities and others to decide who from each entity would be on the TAC. Ms. Allen asked Mr. Runkle if there was someone from the Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District that could serve on the TAC. Mr. Runkle stated he would need to find out. Mr. Ott said that it is important for staff to be involved in the Commission. He stated that having at least one person from the Fluvanna County Planning Department on the TAC would be great. Ms. Thomas stated that she pictures that at the next meeting each member from an entity comes with names of people who might be appropriate for the TAC and whose supervisors have agreed that they may serve on the TAC. Ms. Allen asked what type of people do we want – planners, environmental, other? Ms. Thomas said that if the Commission addresses the sedimentation threat there may be different people they would have on the TAC than if the Commission addresses another issue. Ms. Hamilton suggested maybe the Commission should have more information on the expertise of potential TAC members, such as through an application process similar to the online application process the City of Charlottesville uses. Ms. Allen stated that before the next meeting maybe each locality and each Soil and Water Conservation District should have one name, and perhaps the TAC can be expanded later. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Schuyler what kind of non-staff people should be on the TAC. Mr. Schuyler responded that people like John Murphy with Streamwatch, Andrea Terry with Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, and others who have been feeding into these discussions for awhile would be good members. Mr. Moss said we also should tap Leslie Middleton for the TAC. Mr. Schuyler suggested that each locality bring a name or names of staff and that staff will help determine non-staff members to recommend for the TAC.

b. *Appoint someone to send notices of meetings*

Mr. Moss requested that The Nature Conservancy continue doing communications and noticing meetings for the Commission. Mr. Schuyler agreed that The Nature Conservancy would continue in this capacity.

c. *Discuss posting notices of meetings*

It was agreed that The Nature Conservancy would post notices of meetings for now.

d. *Appoint someone to prepare annual budget*

Mr. Moss stated that he felt it was premature to appoint someone to prepare the annual budget at this point. The Commission members agreed.

e. *Set next meeting date*

The next meeting was set for May 17 at 6 pm at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission.

f. *Appoint someone to prepare agenda for next meeting*

The Nature Conservancy will prepare the agenda for the next meeting. Mr. Moss suggested that members should email him and Mr. Schuyler any items to add to the agenda for the next meeting.

4. Status of funding

Mr. Schuyler discussed the status of funding in his presentation. To date, there is \$285,000 in hand in a checking account at The Nature Conservancy that is designated for the Commission. Another \$100,000 has been pledged.

Initiating Work Product

1. Review draft summary Scope of Work

This item was not addressed.

2. Approve funding to contribute to land cover and impervious cover classification

This item was not addressed.

3. Authorize submission of grant applications on behalf of the Commission

Ms. Allen moved to authorize submission of grant applications on behalf of the Commission and the motion was approved unanimously. Mr. Moss suggested that any grant application should be approved by the Commission before it is submitted. Mr. Dorrier said it would be helpful if the Commission were given a timeline of when grants would be coming due so they could be prepared to review them.

Mr. Moss asked that each Commission member state what they want to do with the Commission.

Mr. Wilson stated that sedimentation is a very good place to put the first priority of the Commission. He said that we also need to keep up with the TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) process, and that the Commission may want to review the draft TMDL. Mr. Moss stated that he thinks that someone should give the Commission a presentation on the TMDL, and that an agenda item for the next meeting should be to learn more about the TMDL and the enforcement, if any, associated with it. Mr. John Murphy with Streamwatch was in attendance and stated that the short answer to that question is that there is no enforcement associated with the TMDL. Mr. Wilson said we will need money to implement the TMDL. Ms. Rochelle Garwood with the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission was in attendance and stated that the TMDL study must be completed by May 2008. Ms. Alyson Sappington with the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District was in attendance and stated that implementation is the next step after the TMDL study was completed.

Ms. Thomas said that she came to Charlottesville long ago and joined the League of Women Voters. The first thing she discovered was that the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir was dying. She said that most of the interest is on the reservoir and she sees the Commission being able to

expand the focus beyond the reservoir. She has also been interested in water issues for awhile. She thinks the science is very important and there is a lot we don't know. She stated that if you don't understand the problem, you really don't know what management to do. She doesn't think we should support management without answers. She also stated that she feels strongly that the Commission needs to really accomplish something.

Mr. Runkle said he thinks we already know what is causing the problem, but we need to find out exactly where it's coming from and we need to work on the specifics. He thinks we should get someone to walk the river and find out where the problem areas are.

Mr. Dorrier stated that he grew up on the James River and noticed the water was murky at times upstream. He always wondered why the James River Commission wasn't more active. He sees an opportunity for the Rivanna River Basin Commission to link up with the James River Commission and Chesapeake Bay efforts. He stated the Commission can use the money it has to write grants and increase funding. He wants the money to be used to see how we can make the Rivanna better but also look holistically at the entire system including the James and Chesapeake Bay. He would also like to have lectures from experts such as the local staff and others in attendance at the meeting tonight.

Ms. Allen said she is a closet tree hugger, and knows nothing about water but loved the concept when Mr. Schuyler came and talked about it. She said she is a learner and is very excited to be here.

Mr. Martin said that from a citizen's perspective it is very meaningful that a body containing officials from multiple jurisdictions has been formed. He stated that a book of all the ordinances from the localities should be produced. He also said we need to be sure to talk to the people involved with the water authorities.

Ms. Hamilton said she grew up on the Ashley River in Charleston. She said sedimentation isn't the only thing that interests her. She is very interested in fresh produce, farmers markets, and local food, and she is very concerned about non-point source runoff in the rural areas. She is also very interested in working with the other localities, and in the role the Commission can play in education. She said the Commission needs to make sedimentation sexy and explain how what landowners do in their backyards can make a big difference.

Mr. Ott stated that he is from Lake Monticello which is dependent on the Rivanna River since they get their water from the river and return their treated sewage to the river. He stated that a lot of sediment is trapped in Lake Monticello, and the lake is still in decent shape but they are spending a lot of money to keep it that way. Mr. Ott is concerned about the population centers and the problems they cause, in particular, the results of the Streamwatch analysis. There is a tremendous pressure to add more people to the lake and to put houses right on the river. He stated it is very important to them to maintain the buffers around the river. He is concerned about the lake being a bedroom community for Charlottesville, and the river is a part of that.

Mr. Easter declined comment.

Mr. Moss stated that there is potential for the Commission to make a big difference in the Rivanna watershed. He said he is tired of meeting after meeting with nothing happening, and thinks the Commission is about making an impact. One issue for him is that in his county, groundwater resources are key. There are two questions – what do we know about groundwater and what can we do with that information? For example, they could recommend that development at a certain density in a certain area not be permitted. He also stated there is so much discussion about the Chesapeake Bay but not much action. He is also concerned with the results of Streamwatch that imply that no matter what you do you may see impacts if you have population. Another idea of Mr. Moss's is that a large public project could be made into a model of green energy, water conservation, etc. He suggested that each member should come up with a demonstration project in their jurisdiction that can be used as an educational tool and to set an example for others. Mr. John Murphy with Streamwatch was in attendance and made the point that the Streamwatch model is built from current data that are affected by both current and historic land use practices. He stated that if we keep conducting the practices we're doing today, the model is a useful predictor of what may happen in the future. However, we can improve our practices which could make a difference in the future.

Ms. Allen mentioned that groundwater is a big concern in Greene County. Mr. Schuyler said that sedimentation and groundwater are related issues, since the increased runoff over hardened surfaces prevents rainwater from infiltrating into the ground and recharging groundwater. Mr. Moss stated that the Commission ought to take advantage of the knowledge of Nick Evans and Ed Imhoff, and suggested that perhaps they could come present to the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Attachments:

- A. RRBC Agenda 07Apr25
- B. RRBC Memo to Agenda 07Apr25
- C. RRBC Inaugural meeting powerpoint 07Apr25
- D. RRBC Land cover map 07Apr25
- E. RRBC Draft charter 07Apr25
- F. RRBC Amended charter 07Apr25
- G. RRBC Statute 07Apr25
- H. RRBC Proposed Framework 07Apr25
- I. RRBC VA Acts of Assembly 07Apr25
- J. RRBC Sedimentation assessment need 07Apr25
- K. RRBC Sediment assessment SOW 07Apr25