

**FINAL Meeting Minutes  
Rivanna River Basin Commission  
Fluvanna County Informational Meeting**

March 15, 2010  
12 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.  
Fluvanna County Administration Office, former Board Room

---

**Attendance**

***Rivanna River Basin Commission (Commission) Members Present:***

Mr. Joe Chesser, Fluvanna County Board of Supervisors  
Mr. John Gooch, Fluvanna County Board of Supervisors, Treasurer  
Mr. Andy Wilson, Fluvanna County Citizen

***Others present:***

Ms. Leslie Middleton, RRBC Executive Director  
Ms. Rose Brown, RRBC Program Coordinator  
Mr. Roger Black, Fluvanna County (RRBC TAC)  
Mr. Darren Coffey, Fluvanna County (RRBC TAC)  
Ms. Pat Groot, Fluvanna County  
Mr. Bryant Phillips, Fluvanna County

**1. Call to order**

Two Commissioners, Mr. Chesser and Mr. Wilson, were present at the beginning of the meeting. Mr. Gooch arrived at 12:32 p.m., at which time a quorum was established, and Mr. Gooch 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 informal and informational and that participants would be welcome to ask questions in order to learn more about RRBC projects in Fluvanna County and to provide general feedback and suggestions about the workings of the RRBC.

**3. Determination of quorum**

A quorum was determined at 12:32 p.m.

**4. Report of the Executive Director: Fluvanna County information**

Ms. Middleton asked participants to share comments and questions. Mr. Chesser expressed concern about match funds listed on the handout, since Fluvanna County is facing a deficit and may not be able to provide match funds. Ms. Middleton replied that the match funds listed on the handout are being achieved with the stormwater management BMPs included in the design and construction of the new high school. Therefore, Fluvanna County will not be required to outlay any additional funds for this grant. Mr. Coffey stated that Fluvanna County also contributed, upon recommendation by the Board of Supervisors, \$12K for the Rivanna Area Land

Cover Map to cover costs for the portion of Fluvanna County that falls outside of the Rivanna watershed. Ms. Middleton stated that the RRBC does not want to over-burden county staff or Commissioners who assist with performing the NFWF grant. Mr. Coffey stated that administrative work has been heavy, but appropriate. Mr. Coffey has been involving Mr. Phillips in order to help with possible overload. Ms. Middleton asked if anything could be done better or made easier. Ms. Groot stated that the process is going very well and that she has been providing information as time allows. Ms. Middleton stated that she will request more information if she needs it.

Mr. Coffey stated that the RRBC would benefit from the participation of more Fluvanna County staff on the RRBC TAC, including Mr. Black. Mr. Black noted that it is very difficult to commit the time, especially when meetings are located in Charlottesville. Mr. Coffey stated that in future years, the County would benefit from distributing some of Mr. Black's workload so that he may attend RRBC TAC meetings.

**Land Cover Map.** Mr. Wilson asked about the availability of the Land Cover Map. Ms. Middleton said that the map layer is free and available to anyone who wants to have it, but that ArcGIS software is necessary to use the map layer. The RRBC and partners are discussing the best ways to distribute the map. In the first year, users will probably have to obtain the map through project partners, who will track updates and any possible problems. The consultant, World View Solutions, will retain housing of the master copy of the map for the first year during the warranty period. Chris Bruce (Project Manager for the map project on behalf of the partners) at The Nature Conservancy will be the main point of contact for using the map.

Ms. Groot asked if the map would be incorporated into the Fluvanna County GIS program. Mr. Coffey replied that it probably would not because a consultant would have to be paid. Mr. Chesser asked if Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) would have the map, and stated that TJPDC may develop a GIS capability that will be available to the whole region. Ms. Middleton stated that TJPDC will have the map and is working to make it available more broadly. The "map" is really a GIS layer and, as such, is not an interactive tool. RRBC wants to share the map with anyone who could make use of it. For example, Greene County is using the map as the basis of its Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Black asked if the map was made with leaf-off photography. Ms. Middleton replied that it was. Mr. Black stated that the map layer provides a snapshot in time, which will be useful in resource assessment. He noted that another way to produce imagery on an ongoing basis is to use aerial slide photography. He used to fly full coverage every spring and take color slide photography. The photographs can then be projected against tax maps or other maps, to demonstrate fragmentation of land ownership. Benefits to this process are that the photography is relatively cheap, and it is easy to choose when the photos are shot. Mr. Black said that he was able to rent a plane, shoot slides, and process them for approximately \$500. Ms. Middleton pointed out that tax maps are already a layer in GIS. Mr. Coffey stated that the aerial images in GIS could be overlaid on tax maps.

Mr. Black suggested that after this initial assessment process, in which RRBC will be able to identify broad areas for conservation measures, the aerial slide photography could be used to

focus in on a smaller scale. The USDA used this method to determine compliance on farms, and DOF has used it as a pest detection system. If USDA and/or NRCS still use this method, perhaps RRBC could purchase copies of the slides (which would still need processing and indexing). Ms. Middleton stated that the RRBC would keep this conversation alive. The RRBC TAC Modeling Subcommittee will be using the map to prioritize conservation recommendations. StreamWatch is using the map to correlate land use with stream health. The RRBC TAC will be using the map to examine the impacts of sediment in basin.

**NFWF Stormwater Grant.** Ms. Middleton described the components of the NFWF grant. The purpose behind pursuing the grant was to empower localities to deal with the major threat to the health of the Rivanna watershed: over-sedimentation as a result of altered hydrology. Task 1 provides some cost-share money to each of the localities for stormwater best management practices (BMPs) – in Fluvanna, this money is going projects that were already planned. In addition, RRBC will be installing educational signs for the BMPs at Fluvanna High School. Similar signs will also be placed at other BMP sites around the watershed. Each sign will provide information about stormwater, stormwater management, stream health, and BMPs. Ms. Middleton encouraged Fluvanna County staff to work with RRBC staff to develop content for the sign.

**NFWF Task 3: Inventory of retrofit Opportunities.** The Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) will be conducting an inventory on public properties of opportunities to retrofit sites with upgraded stormwater management BMPs. In order to meet stormwater management regulatory goals, Fluvanna County may have to redesign some older structures. CWP will work with Fluvanna County staff to identify and prioritize the sites for the study. CWP will produce a series of site drawings, identifying where retrofits could occur. The study can then be used to seek specific grant funding to implement these upgrades. Mr. Black noted that Fluvanna staff would define the factors to be used for prioritization.

**NFWF Task 4: Identifying Impediments to Implementing Stormwater BMPs.** This task focuses on identifying the many ways that stormwater management might be improved if impediments were removed. The process may look different in each County in the watershed. In some counties, RRBC will host workshops.

One example of an impediment that RRBC is working on with members of its TAC is the lack of statewide guidelines for use of harvested rainwater. The RRBC is working with DEQ, DCR, the Department of Health, and the Department of Community Housing and Development to determine rainwater-harvesting guidelines. Mr. Chesser asked if this would include building ordinances. Ms. Middleton stated that ordinances would flow out of the guidance provided by the state agencies. The International Plumbing Code has already been revised to accommodate rainwater harvesting, and this Code will be adopted as the State Code is updated. Virginia codes will enable more of these codes that allow and promote these provisions on the private level. Rainwater harvesting can be viewed as both a stormwater management BMP as well as a tool for water conservation.

Mr. Coffey stated that staff from RCS and UVA will be presenting their recommendations for updating codes to promote better water quality to the Fluvanna Planning Commission next week

and to the Board of Supervisors in May. Mr. Coffey would like to host a roundtable that includes developers reviewing these changes and identifying impediments.

Ms. Groot asked if buildings and grounds would be included in the upcoming trainings. Ms. Middleton replied that the Parks and Recreation nutrient management was not part of the original NFWF proposal, but the RRBC is trying to find a way to conduct this training for the staff of all watershed localities. Mr. Coffey stated that Fluvanna County might also invite school staff. Mr. Black stated that Fluvanna County struggles with properly maintaining existing county properties. Even basic nutrient training can save money and help to improve properties. Ms. Groot added that the trainings would also be helpful for future grant applications. Grantors want to see that the county has policies in place and is already implementing some measures. Ms. Groot said that many grant RFPs include environmental questions. Ms. Middleton said that it would be helpful to her to review some of these in order to design future programs. Mr. Wilson noted that a property owner at Lake Monticello recently won a contest prize of retrofitting the home with a rainwater harvesting system. However, the local water company prohibited the homeowner from making these retrofits because of the existing contract between the water supplier and Lake Monticello homeowners.

**NFWF Task 5: Developing Incentives for Stormwater BMPs in the private sector.** Ms. Middleton stated some of these ideas would likely emerge out of the developer roundtables. “Private sector” refers to anything other than public lands. Incentive programs will help people to go beyond the mandated measures.

**Healthy Waters Project.** Ms. Middleton described the Healthy Waters project, in which the focus is on identifying healthy stream segments in order to promote additional protection for these streams as opposed to the normal course of events, which involves attempting to clean up degraded streams. The methodology for identifying healthy streams is somewhat different than StreamWatch’s methodology, because sampling sites are chosen randomly. The RRBC is working with StreamWatch and VCU to produce a report and distribute the report to the community. The EPA is eager to see specific protective measurements in Comprehensive Plans, codes and ordinances to protect the streams that are still healthy.

**Chesapeake Bay TMDL.** Ms. Middleton provided background on the newly emerging Chesapeake Bay TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load), which has resulted because the largely voluntary Chesapeake Bay cleanup program has not succeeded in cleaning up the Bay. This is a massive TMDL, being developed on a scale never before attempted within a very tight timeline. Once the TMDL (or “pollution diet” of allowable amounts of sediment and nutrients) has been defined, Watershed Implementation Plans (WIPs) will identify pollution reduction goals throughout the Bay on the locality or small watershed scale. EPA is planning to fund pilot projects around the Chesapeake Bay watershed that will help inform the development of these WIPs.

RRBC has submitted a proposal for a Rivanna Regional pilot project that would include other organizations in the region as partners. If selected, the project would receive some cash (maybe \$5K) and up to 400 hours of technical assistance and facilitation services from contractors. DCR is interested in piloting the stakeholder involvement process on a regional level that can be

extrapolated across the Commonwealth in 2011, when local governments and watershed groups will be engaged. Mr. Chesser asked who is designing the pilot. Ms. Middleton replied that developing the proposal for the pilot project has been a team effort, including John Murphy (StreamWatch), Alyson Sappington (TJSWCD), and Steve Williams (TJPDC). If the Rivanna community is selected to be a pilot program, there will be a chance to define the program more explicitly. Ms. Middleton stated that DCR is the lead state agency for implementation plans.

Mr. Coffey noted that this is a good opportunity to change the paradigm of the past, but he is concerned about the scale. Ms. Middleton stated that the reason there is little to no money behind the pilot projects is that the timeline is so short. With pilot programs, communities will try to build the foundation of the “stakeholder process” by bringing together representatives from county governments, builders, farmers, etc. The Rivanna community will work through the process here, and then other areas may be able to learn from the lessons. The state will provide loads that are generated from a model. Tetrtech will look at those loads, as well as current Rivanna data, and help to identify what monitoring is needed. Mr. Chesser asked if the pilot program could focus on a segment of the basin rather than the entire watershed. This would allow careful testing of the process. Success comes from a smaller scale.

Ms. Middleton replied that it might be possible to craft the process in steps, bringing together representatives from each stakeholder group to provide input before bringing the issues to a larger group. The TJPDC, TJSWCD, CSWCD, RRBC, and other groups will all have to decide what role they want to play. Mr. Coffey noted that within the large expanse of the Chesapeake Bay watershed, the Rivanna area is actually quite a small area. Ms. Middleton stated that she would bring the idea of an even smaller test area before the entire group. If the Rivanna community is selected, the pilot project will last only 8 months, so it will have to be simple and achievable.

## **5. Other Information**

Ms. Middleton stated that staff would soon send a short survey to Commissioners asking about meeting times, frequency, etc. There will also be a monthly e-newsletter. Mr. Coffee stated that this meeting had been helpful, and asked how often the RRBC would hold these locality meetings. Mr. Chesser agreed that it gave the participants a chance to be more focused. Mr. Gooch suggested holding similar meetings twice per year, especially while there are so many changes occurring. Ms. Middleton stated that she would put this on the questionnaire. She will also add question about where to hold meetings.

## **6. Adjournment**

Mr. Chesser moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Wilson seconded. Mr. Gooch adjourned the meeting at 1:32 p.m.

### **Attachments:**

RRBC\_Fluvanna\_County\_handout\_10Mar15