

**Final Summary
Technical Advisory Committee
Rivanna River Basin Commission
Organizational Meeting**

June 18, 2007
12:00 pm
The Nature Conservancy
490 Westfield Road, Charlottesville

Attendance

Core TAC Members

Present:

Ms. Tamara Ambler, Natural Resources Manager, Albemarle County
Mr. Roger Black, Site Inspector, Fluvanna County
Ms. Kate Cooper, Senior Planner, Fluvanna County
Mr. Travis Estes, Erosion and Sediment Control Administrator, Greene County
Mr. Chris Gensic, Park & Trail Planner, City of Charlottesville
Mr. Greg Harper, Water Resources Manager, Albemarle County
Ms. Kristel Riddervold, Environmental Administrator, City of Charlottesville
Ms. Alyson Sappington, District Manager, Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District
Mr. Greg Wilcheln, District Manager, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District

Absent:

Ms. Stephanie Golon, County Planner, Greene County

Rivanna River Basin Commission (Commission) Members

Ms. Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors
Mr. John Martin, Albemarle County Citizen
Mr. Robert Runkle, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Directors

Other

Mr. Ridge Schuyler, Piedmont Program Director, The Nature Conservancy
Ms. Diane Frisbee, Watershed Protection Specialist, The Nature Conservancy

1. Introductions

Ms. Thomas gave an introductory statement and welcomed the group. Mr. Schuyler introduced himself and gave an overview of what the meeting would entail. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Background on Rivanna River Basin Commission

Mr. Schuyler provided a brief background on the Commission and how it came to be established.

3. Discuss role of Technical Advisory Committee

The group discussed the role of the TAC. The TAC emphasized that their role is to serve as a technical advisory group rather than a citizen advisory group. The TAC will provide guidance to the Commission on technical issues relating to the Commission's work. The TAC will provide the Commission with the sound scientific foundation that the Commission needs to undertake studies and make recommendations to protect the health of the Rivanna watershed.

4. Discuss role of fiscal agent

5. Discuss mechanism for project management, ongoing operations, and fundraising

Agenda item 4 and 5 were discussed together. The outcome of these discussions was that, until the work product of the Commission is more tightly defined, it is premature to select a permanent fiscal agent or mechanism for project management, ongoing operations, and fundraising. The TAC recommended that in the interim, the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District (TJSWCD) serves as the fiscal agent, with the role of issuing checks as authorized by the Commission. The Nature Conservancy would transfer the Commission's funds to TJSWCD. During this interim period, The Nature Conservancy would assume the role of project manager. In this role, The Nature Conservancy would draft an RFP for the first phase of the Commission's work and would manage contracts, with oversight and review from the TAC. It should also be noted that the TAC commented that they did not feel they were best positioned to make this recommendation since this is a legal and organization question rather than a technical one.

6. Discuss potential non-staff TAC appointments

The group talked about people who have technical expertise on watershed health, hydrology, and similar topics that may serve as potential non-staff TAC members. The TAC recommended the following people be considered for appointment to the TAC:

- Samuel Austin, U.S. Geological Survey
- Rochelle Garwood, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission
- David Hirschman, Center for Watershed Protection
- Ed Imhoff, retired
- John McLean, Virginia Department of Transportation
- OR-
- Louise Finger, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
- John Murphy, StreamWatch
- Will Smith, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Andrea Terry, Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority

7. Discussion of threats to the health of the Rivanna watershed (sedimentation, other?)

This discussion was initiated but not concluded. While most of the group felt that sedimentation was the threat worth tackling, the group wanted further discussion on this topic.

8. Review and discuss draft summary Scope of Work for sedimentation threat assessment

The group did not review the Scope of Work in detail, but had a lot of discussion about various ways of addressing threats to the Rivanna watershed. The group resolved to narrowly define the questions that need answers in order to proceed with the Commission's work to protect the watershed.

9. Discuss likely work product

The likely work product was not discussed to great extent at this time. This will likely be a part of future discussions of the threats to the health of the watershed and the scope of work the Commission will undertake.

The group decided they should meet again soon. Mr. Schuyler will send an email to everyone with proposed meeting dates.

Amendments to Minutes

Greg Wilhelms (6/19/07): I suggest one addition since the topic was touched on several times in our discussions; that extensive studies may not be the preferred emphasis since much is already known and effective implementation of regulations and voluntary tools maybe be lacking irregardless of how much we know. This may be beyond the TAC responsibilities but many of those present can speak to this and it seems worth the reporting.

Attachments

- A. Memo to Agenda 07Jun18
- B. Sedimentation SOW 07Apr25