

Technical Advisory Committee
Rivanna River Basin Commission
Meeting Agenda
July 14, 2009 9:00 am– 12:00 pm
The Nature Conservancy
490 Westfield Road, Charlottesville

1. Introductions

9:09am – Sam began meeting. Introductions.

2. Review and adopt meeting agenda

Sam – will attempt to adjourn before noon.

3. Review and approve minutes of May 19 meeting

Leslie - change the discussion/allocation of resources from NFWF grant. Get change from Leslie.

see Rochelle's changes:

(under Discussion TNC Fundraising) "... they felt that in the long run the funding for the RRBC need to receive funding from the locality members. " Probably just cut to, "...they felt in the long run the RRBC needs to receive funding from the locality members. "

(under Election of Chair and Vice-Chair) "Alyson Sappington explained that Sam Austin could not be at this meeting and asked if she could act as Chair for the meeting, to which she agreed." This one made me giggle, because it sounds like Alyson had a nice conversation with herself. Was it "was asked if she"?

all TAC members agreed to approve minutes.

4. Welcome Rose Brown as Recording Secretary for the RRBC

5. Welcome Steve Williams, Executive Director of TJPDC

Background – watershed and env issues. Tjpd and npo have been active in transportation, but Steve's background is more broad. Also works on water quality issues. In last position in n.h. produced watershed mngmt plans, monitoring, gis data warehousing, contamination issues. In CA, water quality planning agency and tech agency for Monterey bay wildlife sanctuary, gis database, watershed models. Glad that rrbc exists in this community. Open to discussing how pdc can help rrbc with watershed issues.

6. Reports from sub-committees

a. Monitoring

Leslie and jeff – has been focused on developing a plan/strategy for monitoring the 4 bmps being funded by nfwf grant – not a lot of \$ allocated for that – not clear how to get data that nfwf requires by this grant (nitrogen and phos) – discussing what is acceptable

for this grant, what will further the work in the watershed (since volume and sediment are primary threats) – what can be done w/\$ that rrbc has. Sw will be hired to coordinate the monitoring effort. John m has been gathering info. Cville highschool will be built first. Process will be iterative and possibly incomplete. Jeff – trying to scale project to meet the \$ available – will use automatic samplers, how to analyze all of the samples, narrowing down parameters. Nutrients, sediment, flow.. cville hs bioretention area is under construction, will install monitoring stations. Alb co is moving forward in crozet to build treatment system for downtown crozet. Monitoring stations will be installed if rrbc decides to montiro that project. May focus more on Fluvanna hs monitoring. Want to know how building will affect the nearly pristine watersheds near the h.s. crozet project will deal with existing conditions and may be a demo of a system that other watersheds could install. Can get pre-development #s now and more #s later. Deciding how to get most bang for buck. Park (which one??) – focus on stream that runs through park and how health changes with development. Automatic samplers will take work hours, analysis will need work hours. Grappling with many variables. Leslie possibility to work with ?? to get some of the monitoring data. sam – the nature of some of the samplers may affect some of the result – a lot of variables. Steve – cost of analyzing samples – who is rrbc working with? Jeff – right now at uva lab, using students. Rrbc may pursue that. Other option is to send samples to lab approx \$40 per sample. Any ideas? Steve – have grappled w/same issue. Public health agency w/robust lab did analysis at cost (below cost of private lab). Jeff – maybe talk to rwsa. Dave Hirsch – that lab does a lot of analysis, work on nutrients. Sam –time period? Leslie – 2 years, but this is part of the decision making process. Want to make best use of \$ for long term. Nfwf wants prediction of what will be done w/in 5 years, even though funds end at 2 year. sally - rwsa has some \$ that was put aside for this type of work – may be available? Jeff- may pursue other funding to continue monitoring. Bill k - does nfwf require qa? Dave – yes, a qapp. Leslie – grant is about building rrbc effectiveness in community, not just how much sediment, nitrogen and phos was removed from stream. Tricky ?s and other grantees are grappling with same issues.

b. Watershed modeling

Greg – background – committee was focused on urban stormwater, and wondered if perfect stormwater management would eliminate stream impairment. Committee needed to decide what the relative contributions are of land uses such as forestry, ag, development etc. worldview land cover map will make this more clear. Committee will work with streamwatch and report back more data to support the hypotheses. No meetings lately, but committee is waiting for the map and sw report. Background on landcover map – john at SW needed more data for analysis, approached localities and asked about interest in a detailed land cover map. want to correlate stream assessments to different variables of land cover. Refine what the community knows about what is driving the impairments. Also want to see how land cover is changing over time. Worldview is having some trouble with some of the details, such as distinguishing between pasture and lawns. Has opened discussions in the subcommittee about how the data will be used, and what differentiations are not as important. Worldview has no trouble distinguishing impervious vs. non-impervious. Leslei – there is an offer of 2007

data. 2009 data has another layer, which makes analysis easier. Greg – 2009 data does not have the early spring green forests like the 2007 map. Leslie – in order for sw to complete the lue study, some portions of 2007 data may be used. But other partners will need 2009 data too – will be used on an ongoing basis.

c. Rainwater harvesting

Dan – sitting in for krysal, and she did not leave a report. Alyson – no activity right now. In hands of vhealth dept, and there are debates about guidelines. Dave – rainwater harvesting from stormwater – specs were just posted on bmp clearing house website (DCR stormwater), with spreadsheet, different tank configurations. These are non – proprietary bmp. If you want to use rainwater to meet stormwater requirements, there are no guidelines yet for tank size, what uses are allowed, etc. greg – was local rainwater stats used? Dave – yes. Does not include any vdh requirements for potable water. Alyson – tech standards for indoor potable? Dave – no, that has to be a vdh issue. 3 state agencies, depending on use of water.

7. News from the Executive Director

See notes below

8. (added during discussion above) RRBC take on a nutrient trading program. Dave – would be helpful to have an education about opportunities. Start with the tac, then decide on a subcommittee, then move toward educating localities and community. Alyson – this will only matter if regs are adopted. Dave – then regs will come into effect in july. Alyson – need to gauge interest from localities. Leslie – could address this during the nov meeting. Sally – officials might have a different approach to the regs if they knew a local program could be created/adopted. Discussion of bmp inspections and responsibilities of maintenance. New regs will put burden on county to insure the inspections. Prop owners are ultimately responsible. Dave- may be better to use \$ toward local restoration projects over small bmps that would need longterm maintenance. Dan Frisbee – what would be a useful comment for localities to make on the regs, before aug 21? Dave – we realize that the tool is available, we need the tool, help us in the nearterm to develop the guidance to make it happen. Greg – TAC members need to go back to whomever is commenting w/in our orgs, and alert them to this option. Jeff- uva has a similar system already, since 5 years ago. Leslie – the rrbc may be in the position to take on or help create such a bank.

9. Facilitated discussion of the TAC's role and next steps.

5 year goals

alyson – stay in confines of what RRBC needs from TAC, which should lead to RRBC helping localities to make informed decisions. The purpose from the commission was read.

Sam – TAC identified altered hydrology as a main threat to the watershed. Goal to work toward achieving a forested condition with respect to flows and watershed health.

Sally – what elected officials want to have from TAC: what they should do and how they can do it, TAC facilitates the “how” to do it.

Discussion about what is ‘technical’? is this a tech group or a policy group? Sam - - that diversity (tech and policy joined) can be very productive.

Darren – initially, TAC may have been a scientific adv committee; planners, etc may have watered that down. RRBC may be served better by requesting more specific tasks from TAC. Two TACs – one for science, one for policy recommendations?

Alyson – or form a policy subcommittee?

Rochelle – the core tac members are the non-technical members. Darren – some of the tech members are frustrated at the lack of scientific discussion.

Alyson – need rrbc to begin this conversation and tell tac what they need. What does the rrbc need in order to do their job?

Sally – tac should not just wait for an assignment. TAC can see some aspects of issues that RRBC does not know. RRBC takes leadership role, but TAC is the scientific underpinning. Can take a leadership role, educate the rrbc.

Dave – recreational access – trying to get people to care about a watershed that they cannot get to. Mission is about stewardship and education, but no entity on the watershed scale has taken on rec access, and how it plays into education and stewardship. Get th public and public officials onto the river.

Darren – rivanna river coordinating group – outlined the need for more publicity and education. Can rrbc act as an umbrella for the various groups and issues (policy, recreation, scienc)...

John martin – with regards to access, perhaps it is better in the longterm for certain parts of the river to be inaccessible because it may serve as protection. Sam – do you want to protect specific areaa? John - Would like a list of the top ten specific threats to the watershed, from the jurisdictions. Rrbc can be a forum to engage multiple jurisdictions to influence decisions and negotiate how/where to protect.

Darren – this would be less politically neutral and more activist...

Alyson – commission could be useful for rrbc to bring officials together. Missy – could drive the rrbc apart. Darren – need to have good structure in place. Cannot just be an activist/political group, must have other arms of science in place.

John – rivanna river basin is w/out political boundaries. Find top 10 threats and address them without political boundaries.

Sally – the river is not very ‘sick’ right now, so part of the job is to report the problems to the community. Sam – no crisis forcing us to manage the watershed.

Leslie – rrbc and tac are unique because they have been asked to think on a watershed scale. A unique roll, but uncharted territory. How can the tac help empower the commission to think and speak. John m would say science! May need more emphasis on scientific understanding on threats in term of impairments; update on conservation strategy from tnc; update of the state of the basin report.

John – a science based rivanna basin management plan in place in 5 year. Knowing that it will be subject to politicization. The RRBC foundation will dampen some of the splits that will inevitably occur. Need the scientific foundation to keep things from getting as messy politically. Management plan can start with what we know would be the ideal, with regards to land use. Would be integrated in locality comp plan.

Dave – help localities with updates of comp plans. Land use, utility.

Darren – Fluvanna comp plan as an example.. the rrbc could inform all parts of the comp plan.

Leslie –land cover map; healthy waters; sw lue study – could all be referenced in the comp plans as tools to be utilized – all before we get to an overall management plan.

Darren – rrbc can help keep awareness among public and officials of the importance of a comp plan, and why to stay aware of it. In 5 years, elected officials should continue to be champions of their own comp plans. Capitalize on the strengths of the watershed

Leslie – how does the TAC relate to the RRBC staff in 5 years? Rrbc staff could include technical staff, so it does not always have to draw on the TAC skills so much.

John – keep marriage of policy and science representatives.

Missy – science staff list issues, and then policy staff figure out how to present that broadly to the localities.

Darren – the NFWF grant has moved the rrbc out to the public realm, and has also pulled the tac away from the scientific discussions of a year ago. The balance is a good thing. Reiterate that the balance does not necessarily have to occur in one group. The rrbc may be able to achieve more through more than one TAC. Thinks that should be recommended to rrbc. (Multiple advisory committees)

Sam – all excellent discussion. For next meeting – read through these and perhaps continue discussion.

Leslie – should sept meeting be focused on science with a presentation and discussion?
Most of the scientists are not here today, and we can round out the discussion.

Darren - Rrbc needs to make the ultimate decision about how many tacs it wants, etc.

10. Confirm next TAC meeting date and adjourn before 12:00 pm

Sept 15, 9 – noon

Nov 17, 9 – noon

RRBC meets 4th thurs in Jan, apr, july, oct.

Meeting was adjourned by sam at

Executive Director's Report to the RRBC TAC July 14, 2009

1. Commission news

- Welcome Keith Lancaster, citizen representative from City of Charlottesville. Southern Development. Planning background. Formerly with Albemarle County Division of Zoning and Current Development
- John Martin (Albemarle) and Andy Wilson (Fluvanna) reappointed to 4-year terms (2013)
- Chair of RRBC will be elected on July 23
- July 23, 2009 Fluvanna RRBC meeting: 3 pm field trip, 6 – 8 pm meeting.
- Other candidates who may be interested in serving on the TAC or one of its subcommittees:
Alex Foraste, Project Manager, Senior Civil Engineer, McKee Carson, rainwater harvest
Eugene Ryang, Water Street Studio, certified Landscape Architect, stormwater, and LID
Jeff Werner, Land Use Field Officer for PEC, certified planner, transp, water supply

These were all candidates for RRBC city of cville representative. Want to get involved somehow, may be added to the TAC in the future.

2. Funding update

- Mini-grant from DCR to cover the non-Rivanna portion of Greene County
- NFWF grant agreement due to be executed with 1-2 weeks
- Healthy Waters initiative: executing grant agreement with DCR to include contracts with VCU and StreamWatch, presently under intense scrutiny due to 10-15% budget cut. Meanwhile, EPA (Healthy Watersheds Initiative) notes Rivanna River Basin Commission on its Fact Sheet

3. NFWF project update

- Task 1 - "grants" to localities will require certification that BMPs were constructed according to specifications and other documentation and inspection requirements
- Task 2 - StreamWatch will provide project management and coordination of monitoring of BMP task
- Task 4 - collaboration meetings underway between UVA/SELRC/RCS, TJPDC, and RRBC regarding watershed planning tools and recommendations to localities in the watershed. Looking for areas of overlap and collaboration, most likely to include developing incentive tools and staff education. Starting to envision a watershed-wide workshop or symposium.

This work has begun, because it can be paid by grant retroactively. Rochelle – what was task 3? Leslie – looking for opportunities in fluv and green for BMP retrofits

4. Land Cover Map project

- Need RRBC TAC representative to provide technical oversight of mapping project

Greg – several TAC members are on that committee. John M has been explicit that he is representing SW interests. Greg could switch hats and represent RRBC instead of Alb county. Darren agrees to help as much as possible.

5. Developer Roundtables

- Please see attached compilation and *draft letter* from RRBC to DCR re stormwater regulations

Not done yet. Some compilations are out for comments by participants. Committed to forward the compilations to dcr. Will happen w/in next week or 2. Can send to tac for comment, will definitely have to go through rrbc. The comments will nto be from the rrbc, but rrbc is passing the participants comments on to dcr. Greg – will the rrbc make comments? Sally – there is a division of opinions – if a meaningful consensus cannot be made, then a comment will not be submitted. Leslie – on agenda for next rrbc meeting. Greg – alb co is making comments, which are generally critical of the program. Greg is uncomfortable with one comment – that more stringent rules will cause developers to develop in less dense areas. Alyson – fact is that if no change is made, the regs are contributing to sprawl. Greg – new regs may increase cost of low density development. Dave – debatable issues. Darren – has heard 2 main arguments. Sally – has heard suggestions for not putting as much expense on the developer, with nutrient trading practices. Alyson – if devel are going to pay into ag to offset development, there is not enough ag to offset all of the devel. Also, ag land is usually temporary. Dave – nutrient. TAC discussed many possible comments and issues with the DCR regs. Dave - need to know where is \$ going. Right now, the impact could be in downtown, but the \$ could be shipped out to nutrient banks. Community does not get \$ for local restoration projects. Leslie – could rivanna watershed be a local program? Dave – yes. Leslie – could this be an opportunity for the rrbc? Dave – yes, this could be. Localities seem to just be criticizing the program instead of finding workable options. The rrbc could facilitate the strengthening of the offset program. Leslie – a new subcommittee? Sam – do we really understand what we are trading? Rrbc could help outline what exactly. Dave – curt stevens at VT could collaborate, help give guidance for state regs. Article in cwp newsletter about nutrient trading. Dan – city needs to participate because of the new development in cville. Need a program to keep the trades from leaving cville. Dave- redevelopment may not be more difficult, but there is a debate. Dave and leslie – going to public hearing in Richmond. Add to agenda for later – will tac add a subcommittee for this?.

- Public comments due by August 21 to DCR
6. RRBC undergoing legal and fiscal evaluation of procedures and policies, including:
 - Conflict of interest and FOIA
 - Procurement policy (contracting with TAC members, sole source)
 7. TAC hours match (please fill out spreadsheet with your best estimates)
 8. New TAC meeting location suggestions
 - DOF (Fontaine Avenue) CCDC, 5th Street Extended, others?

Move meeting location to make it more publicly accessible? Jeff – county office building? Darren – does not matter where it is, the issue will always be present. Sally – tnc has great parking. Greg – tnc room is a little small. Jeff – county’s 5th street office? Jeff - rotate locations? Sally – try moving to a different place, see if public attends. Will choose a new location based on availability.