

**FINAL Meeting Minutes
Rivanna River Basin Commission**

February 24, 2010
9 am – 10 a.m.
Greene County Administration Building – 40 Celt Road

Attendance

Rivanna River Basin Commission (Commission) Members Present:

Mr. Jim Frydl, Greene County Board of Supervisors
Ms. Roberta Savage, Greene County Citizen, Chair
Mr. Carl Schmitt, Greene County Board of Supervisors

Others present:

Ms. Leslie Middleton, RRBC Executive Director
Ms. Rose Brown, RRBC Program Coordinator
Mr. Dave Hirschman, Center for Watershed Protection (and RRBC TAC)
Mr. Dan Ratzlaff, Greene County (RRBC TAC)
Mr. Bart Svoboda, Greene County
Mr. Greg Wichelns, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District (RRBC TAC)

1. Call to order

Two Commissioners, Ms. Savage and Mr. Frydl, were present at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Schmitt arrived at 9:51am, at which time a quorum was established, and Ms. Savage called the RRBC meeting to order.

2. Roll call and Introductions

Introductions were made. Ms. Middleton welcomed everyone and stated that the meeting would be informational and that participants would be welcome to ask questions and gather more information about RRBC projects specifically in Greene County.

3. Determination of quorum

A quorum was determined at 9:51 a.m.

4. Report of the Executive Director: Greene County information

Mr. Frydl requested an elaboration on how the RRBC and Greene County can cooperate for the betterment of Greene County. Ms. Middleton then provided a summary of RRBC grants that include support to Greene County.

Through the NFWF grant, support includes providing assistance to Greene County staff by helping to build a volunteer base for planting days at Greene County Community Park (recruiting 4H, Master Naturalists, Master Gardeners, etc). The Park itself will undergo improvements that will improve stormwater management, including the installation of a bioswale downstream of the

Greene County Park soccer field. In addition, Greene County has received a small grant from Virginia DOF (VDOF) for plant materials to stabilize a critical slope. RRBC is providing volunteer assistance and coordination through a contract with the Rivanna Conservation Society. Additional funding from the NFWF grant will be directed, through a subcontract with Center for Watershed Protection (CWP), toward the design and installation of a large bioswale to capture runoff from the soccer fields. The original NFWF proposal included riparian buffer planting for the receiving stream below the soccer fields, but these monies are now directed towards the bioswale. RRBC is working with Greene County staff and VDGIF to obtain funding to restore the channel of the receiving stream once the stormwater is better managed. VDOF has indicated that there may be an additional \$10K available if Greene County receiving stream restoration funding from Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership (SARP).

Also under the NFWF grant, RRBC has contracted with CWP to review the Virginia Tech master plan for the park and add a stormwater plan component. This document can be used to help secure additional funding for stormwater practices as the park develops. Mr. Svoboda commented that these projects are all part of Phase 1 of the Greene County Park plan. Phase 2 will be addressed later. Dan Ratzlaff asked if the bioswale would be included in the stormwater management plan. Mr. Hirschman stated that the stormwater management plan would include possible implementation strategies for managing stormwater. The design of the bioswale is a separate engineering task that fleshes out a component of the stormwater master plan. The numbers are not final, so the total may not be exactly \$5K (as per the information sheet). CWP will also be contributing money to this project from two other grants to help with the bioswale.

Ms. Middleton gave an overview of the “Stormwater Retrofit Inventory,” in which CWP will assess the feasibility of retrofitting different sites to improve stormwater management. The sites will probably include: Greene County Administration building complex, VOTEC, Ruckersville HS, and the Elementary School. The Inventory will be a series of documents that will be provided to Greene County that will identify possible retrofits and provide preliminary designs for several BMPs. This inventory can be used by Greene County to seek specific grants to implement the recommendations.

Mr. Hirschman said that there might be regulatory and public relation reasons for Greene County to undertake retrofits in the future. The timing of adoption of the new VA stormwater regulations is now uncertain, but the Chesapeake Bay TMDL implementation is approaching. These retrofits would be a way for the County to demonstrate to the private sector that these kinds of projects are feasible. Mr. Svoboda added that Greene County wants to set example and also ensure that current buildings and additions are compliant and future additions are properly designed and placed. Mr. Wichelns asked if any of the campuses have nutrient management practices. Mr. Svoboda replied that there are no turf management programs and no fertilizer is applied to fields (with the exception of the community park fields, which might be fertilized once per year). Ms. Middleton stated that some of the NFWF funds might be used for staff training in nutrient management and turf management.

Ms. Middleton reminded participants of the CWP workshop on March 9 in Staunton. Mr. Wichelns asked if the workshops for planners, engineers, and developers have been planned (NFWF Task 4). Ms. Middleton stated that these workshops would likely be scheduled once the

timing of the stormwater regulations becomes clear.

Ms. Middleton stated that some of the NFWF funds might be subcontracted to TJPDC to assist Greene County with codes and ordinances updates. Mr. Svoboda stated that when the comprehensive plan is adopted, the county would have a better idea of where these funds should be directed. Ms. Middleton stated that the (Rivanna Regional) Land Cover Map is being used as a reference for existing conditions in the comprehensive plan update.

Ms. Middleton asked for general feedback about the RRBC meetings. Mr. Schmitt stated that meeting paperwork must be reduced. Mr. Frydl suggested giving the board a narrative on why a project is important, rather than the funding details of the grant. Mr. Schmitt stated that a strategic session is necessary. A good organization is driven from the top down *and* from the bottom up. Mr. Frydl added that the RRBC must have a full understanding of its mission, and then staff can further the goals of the mission. Mr. Schmitt stated that perhaps the Executive committee could deal more with the administrative issues, and then present them to the RRBC in an abbreviated version. Mr. Schmitt would like to see the RRBC as an agent for on-the-ground projects that will make a difference, not just acting as a think tank.

Ms. Middleton stated that managing the NFWF grant is a full-time task for one person, and asked whether the RRBC could be sustained by working solely on the NFWF grant for a couple of years. This would allow the RRBC and staff to focus on this grant and to manage it well. Mr. Svoboda offered that from the outside looking in, the main struggle is for the RRBC to not spread itself too thin; it must choose priorities and focus on them. Ms. Middleton stated that she would like to develop a watershed protection plan, which would place the Rivanna data into context and help to identify priority areas and actions.

Mr. Frydl stated that it might not be the best use of RRBC time to pursue TMDL grants. The localities will bear the burden of the TMDL, so perhaps the RRBC should focus on other priorities. Ms. Middleton suggested that the RRBC could support the localities in helping to name load levels early on, based on local data, rather than the Chesapeake Bay model. Ms. Savage stated that localities must ask if the increment between local data and a model is different enough to justify the amount of work of engaging early. Ms. Middleton stated that she has spoken with staff at DCR, who may nominate the Rivanna watershed as a pilot project. Such a project could be used to determine the differential between locally derived data and the assumptions of reference points that have been used in the model to generate pollution loads.

Ms. Savage stated that the RRBC must also define the Commissioners' roles and responsibilities and how they can best bring information back to their localities. Mr. Frydl stated that with just two supervisors on the RRBC, it is difficult to make decisions or make recommendations to the full Board of Supervisors. Some Commissioners do not have a lot of background in these areas. RRBC staff should focus on educating the Commissioners on different projects. Mr. Frydl suggested basic, specific education on issues like BMPs, focusing on how exactly they work, and the payoff of using them. Mr. Svoboda stated that there are similar struggles at the TJPDC's Rural Tech Committee meetings. From a project standpoint, the Community Park projects are a very helpful partnership with the RRBC. Without this support and funding, it would have taken much longer for the County to implement these projects.

Ms. Savage asked if the RRBC can ever really think on a watershed basis, or if Commissioners will always be representing their localities. Mr. Svoboda stated that the RRBC's "whole watershed approach" could help locality projects succeed. Mr. Frydl stated that it is important to survey the needs of locality staff, those who actually do the work that affects the watershed. Ms. Middleton replied that the NFWF grant proposal grew out of such a process, through significant input from TAC members (who are locality staff members, such as Stephanie Golon and Dan Ratzlaff). Ms. Savage suggested that this dialogue could be furthered by more communication between the RRBC and the TAC. Mr. Frydl added that more communication between Commissioners and locality staff would allow Commissioners to better support the staff.

Mr. Schmitt stated that the RRBC must seize opportunities that come along, like the NFWF grant. The RRBC can help localities to understand potential possibilities, and to bring localities together. Ms. Middleton stated that for this reason, the Chesapeake TMDL process must be seen as an opportunity.

Mr. Hirschman stated that since there are new Commissioners, it might be useful to focus on educational presentations, which would help bring the Commissioners onto the same level. Mr. Frydl added that the speaker can educate the RRBC and also highlight what the RRBC has done, what it can do, and what locality staff need. Mr. Schmitt suggested the use of a consent agenda to more quickly deal with administrative issues. Every meeting could involve a presentation or an agenda item that requires each Commissioner to explain what the locality is doing about a particular issue. Ms. Middleton asked if Commissioners would be willing to come to this type of meeting more than once per quarter. Mr. Frydl stated that if the meetings were productive, then commissioners probably would be more willing. Ms. Savage suggested allotting one hour of each meeting to administration with the rest of the meeting focused on other tasks.

Ms. Middleton noted that the TAC usually reports during RRBC meetings. Mr. Frydl said that the TAC provides lists of academic topics and data, but the RRBC needs procedures and activities to advance its mission. Mr. Svoboda suggested a short summary of TAC and RRBC issues from each meeting, rather than the full TAC meeting summaries. Mr. Schmitt said that if the RRBC could determine specific goals during its strategic planning session, each future action could be judged against these goals. Ms. Middleton reminded everyone that the RRBC is still a very young organization, and it has not yet developed strategic goals. Growing out of The Nature Conservancy, a science-based organization, the RRBC was historically driven by recommendations from its TAC, which was concerned with identifying the *major threat* to the watershed (altered hydrology). As the RRBC develops more concrete goals – through a watershed plan and/or a strategic planning process – the work of the Commission will be clearer.

5. Adjournment

Ms. Savage adjourned the meeting at 11:02 a.m.

Attachments:

RRBC_Greene_County_handout_10Feb24