

**Piedmont Regional Pilot Project for the Chesapeake Bay TMDL
Combined Group Dialogue Meeting Summary
February 16, 2011
8:30 am to 11:30 am at Municipal Arts Center, Charlottesville**

Executive Summary

Participants in this meeting included the sectors whose practices would likely be most affected by the reductions in nitrogen, phosphorous and sediment called for by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Most attendees at this meeting had participated in one of the “sector focus groups” hosted by the Piedmont Regional Pilot Project (PRPP) in 2010. The sectors were defined as: agriculture/forestry, development/building, point source permit holders (MS4 and wastewater), and local government (staff and elected officials). There was general agreement within the group about the following:

- Participants agree that a local response to locally identified problems would be appropriate
- Local cooperation may bring cost-efficiencies in areas such as water quality monitoring
- The different sectors share concerns about these issues:
 - The accuracy of the Bay model
 - Financial costs
 - Broad solutions that don’t reflect local conditions and that impose one-size-fits-all requirements
 - Unintended consequences, such as pushing growth to less dense lands
 - Inequitable burdens placed on any one particular sector
- Protecting local waters and the Bay is a worthy goal, and people are willing to bear their share of the burden if the effort is based on good science and equitably shared.

Detailed Notes

Welcome

Carl Schmidt, Greene County Board of Supervisors and member of the Piedmont Regional Pilot Project informal Steering Committee, welcomed participants. He noted that this meeting is the last meeting of the Pilot Project and has been planned in response to several sectors (notably building/development and agriculture) stating the desire to have “cross-sector” dialogue.

Facilitator Frank Dukes of the University of Virginia’s Institute for Environmental Negotiation reviewed the agenda. He noted that is a unique opportunity for everyone to hear from each other.

Update about the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and the Piedmont Regional Pilot

Ms. Alyson Sappington, staff to the Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation District, explained how the project began. The initiative started a year ago when the Rivanna River

Basin Commission coordinated a public meeting with Virginia DCR and DEQ to obtain information on the Bay TMDL. This resulted in a group forming to volunteer for an EPA-funded pilot project for Phase II (watershed implementation planning) for the Bay TMDL (to get an early start on Phase II). Those who decided to pursue designation as a pilot project did so with the hope that we could have more local control over the implementation of the Bay TMDL during Phase II. The PRPP was one of only two in Virginia selected by EPA as a pilot project. Ms. Sappington summarized the project.

- Five focus groups met between July and October 2010. These meetings were designed to identify concerns and to ascertain if there would be an interest in developing a local/regional Phase II planning effort.
- The focus groups were conducted by sector, defined as: agriculture/forestry, development/building, point source permit holders, and local government (staff and elected officials).
- Focus group common themes included the need for clear and accurate information, equity concerns, cost concerns, and interest in a local collaborative effort for moving forward.

Ms. Sappington acknowledged that the PRPP Steering Committee heard concerns that the make-up of the Steering Committee was not representative or balanced, and that no focus group was provided for environmental/conservation organizations. Ms. Sappington explained that the Steering Committee evolved from initial meetings of interested and self-selecting participants. The Committee decided early to focus on a process that would elicit feedback and information the key sectors whose practices would likely be most affected by the reductions called for by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. She said that if a group were formed to work together on developing a local/regional Phase II plan the makeup of that group would have to be diverse and representative.

Ms. Sappington also reported that the Commonwealth of Virginia submitted its final Phase I Watershed Improvement Plan (WIP) to EPA, and it was accepted and included in the final Bay TMDL with no “backstop measures.” Sixty percent of all required actions are meant to be in place by 2017, and 100% are to be in place by 2025.

Phase II WIPs are due from the states to EPA in draft form by fall 2011, with the final due in early 2012. These Phase II WIPs describe in detail and at the local level how pollution prevention and restoration will be implemented. Each locality will be given “target loads” (allowable discharges) for nutrients and sediment -- these are not regulatory, but more of a guideline. On the other hand, the Commonwealth has allocations for each major tributary, which are required by the Bay TMDL.

Ms. Sappington also reported on several legislative initiatives related to the Bay TMDL. Farmers will have to develop resource management plans; if these are acceptable, these farms will be considered in compliance. There are several bills for regulating non-agricultural fertilizer use and de-icing agents. Another piece of legislation sets priorities for when and how offsets can be used. There is expected to be enhanced cost-share and technical assistance for Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

The regulations for stormwater management (for new construction and redevelopment) are moving forward. A draft is expected this spring. Final implementation has been set to correspond with renewal for the General Permit for Construction in 2014).

At the time of the meeting, the national and Pennsylvania Farm Bureaus have filed suit against EPA. A resolution attached to the proposed budget passed the House of Representatives that would defund all activities related to the Bay TMDL.

Understanding Sector Needs, Interests

Frank Dukes reviewed the goals for the meeting: obtain current information; provide opportunities for each sector to increase understanding of the other sectors' perspectives; and to determine the interest in a regional approach if and when there is an opportunity to move forward with such an initiative.

Four individuals, one from each sector, were invited to present their own perspectives to begin the conversation.

Agriculture Perspective

Jim Riddell, former extension agent (retired) and farmer:

Farmers represent businesses in Virginia. We'd like to see our businesses survive, and we see this as an issue that can hurt us financially. We do know that we need fresh, clean water to support agriculture.

A major concern is the cumulative effect of different types of restrictions. Other concerns include the requirement for more stringent practices and an overall lack of trust. We have big questions about validity of some of the data and computer modeling. There is a discrepancy of 30% between USDA and EPA figures, in the amount of agricultural land and the amount of no-till practices. The numbers being used are critical, especially the amounts to correct and to mitigate the problem. We would like to see USDA and EPA clarify their data.

Also concerns about expertise (or lack thereof) in the agencies on agricultural issues. (He provided an example of federal agent mistaking a crop of sorghum for wetlands flora.)

Another big issue is the cost – where is the money coming from? We anticipate big cuts in the federal government in the next few years. Will the funding be dedicated and guaranteed?

We want valid, proven, science-based information. Every farmer would tell you that they think of these practices in terms of how they fit into the business/farm in the long range. House Bill 1830 has some real value in this area because it focuses in at the farm business level.

Other comments from the agricultural sector:

- It's important to determine the costs and impacts. Will farmers be forced to sell out? Many citizens now want locally grown food, and these (required) practices will put farmers out of business.
- Here's an example: a 200-acre farm will require \$30-\$75,000 to implement these changes. How do we pay for this? One of the best things we can do for our community is to keep our farms in place. Grassland is the second most efficient way of putting water in

the ground. We need to work with our farms and have programs to keep them in place. We need to work together. If the program (the Bay TMDL) is heavy-handed, we'll just lose our farms. The people can't afford to operate like that.

- This is the only completely market-driven sector. We have no way to pass on any expense whatsoever. Livestock industry in particular is extremely low margin, with no room for increased cost. Also, what about maintenance of these programs? Maintaining the fencing? What about amount of land you have idled? You're still paying taxes on idle land but not getting anything out of it.
- There are issues with being able to enforce these regulations, especially for "under the radar" small farms, which brings up the question of equitability.
- At EPA hearing in Harrisonburg, they said that farm operations contribute nitrogen. But they also said that 1/4 to 1/3 of nitrogen is from airborne sources, and farmers don't have control over that. If EPA can cut 10% of airborne, that would be a better solution than regulating farms.
- Research in done in Georgia showed that when you fence cows out of streams, the cattle would lay against that fencing to have shade. So they're leaving all deposits at that buffer line, and it will be flushed into the stream. Cows need a wood-line.

Development Perspective

Charlie Armstrong, Southern Development, Inc:

I have noticed that there are common concerns among sectors. The main concern from the development community is the accuracy of the science and computer models. We have concerns that data inputs are inaccurate. Also, there is a big concern about what this will add to cost of providing new housing. The increased cost will either decrease the value of land or increase the cost of housing. We have an affordable housing problem in Charlottesville already and don't want to exacerbate this.

Our sector wants to do our part but we need to see that the allocations are correct and based on the science. We are willing to step up to this as long as we are sure that the allocations are fair.

Another area of concern is requiring certain stormwater controls on development (new or re-development), especially in urban areas. Will this be a cost-effective way to control those nutrients? A major unintended consequence is discouraging dense, urban re-development and encouraging sprawl into rural areas, where it is significantly easier and less expensive to meet the requirements being proposed. This will push people out of the cities. Typically, urban land for dense development is the most expensive land and if you require more controls here (and it costs more), this may not be the smartest policy.

There may be an opportunity for a trading program, which might lessen the burden on multiple sectors.

Long-term maintenance is another major concern – the BMPs required to meet new standards are significant and technologically advanced. Long-term maintenance will fall on home or business owners or possibly localities. Will homeowners maintain them correctly? Will they be effective in the long term? How much will they cost?

We will be able to accept all of this if we feel the science is accurate, and we are convinced of the accuracy of the allocations. Until then, there is a lot of concern.

Other comments in this discussion:

- We know that we are a really easy target, because any kind of restrictions can be placed on us. And we either pay for it, or we don't and go out of business. We're a low margin industry also, and there is the fear of having to abandon development projects. We need to acknowledge that all sectors feel this way
- Agriculture feels that it is also an easy target, so it's interesting to hear developers say the same thing.
- We're in a short-term economic squeeze that maybe agriculture is not feeling as acutely. With falling property values, rising costs, and so on, it is important to find cost-effective strategies that may involve partnering with the agriculture community to change overall levels in order to get through the current period of decline in the residential economy.
- As you force small farmers out through restrictions, housing spills out into the country, and then you get fewer taxes out of residential rural communities. "Land use" land will be developed into two and four acre lots, with less tax revenue for counties.

Local Government Perspective

Kristel Riddervold, City of Charlottesville, Environmental Administrator:

Local government is often viewed as a point source. Charlottesville, part of Albemarle, UVa, and PVCC area all MS4 permit holders (municipal separate storm system operators). Charlottesville has an extensive network of old pipes underground, and we've struggled to find funding to even deal with the basics. There is a problem, because there is very little space to do much more, but there is an increasing expectation that cities play a greater stewardship role to take care of water.

EPA's threat for more oversight for stormwater will end up squeezing local government. DCR proposed in the WIP that MS4 permits would be used to ensure urban retrofitting. We need to understand what is the scope and scale of what that might mean. There isn't enough public land to clean the water running off impervious land in the community. Finding opportunities for retrofits is key, and this is complicated, challenging, scarce, and costly. Designing, permitting, maintaining, regulating – all of it will cost a lot. We'll have to raise fees from residents and businesses, which will be politically challenging.

Another issue is the requirement for nutrient management planning – not such a big deal in Charlottesville, more so for other jurisdictions. There is also an impact on local governments for the administration of stormwater regulations. Local government needs to promote development and redevelopment, but working with these regulations will be difficult and costly. Public projects for (re)development will also be required to achieve these performance requirements.

An EPA January 2011 fact sheet says that Phase II WIPs need to include a full description of each jurisdiction's approach – we'll have to establish baselines, and there is a technical capacity gap we'll be wrestling with. The target loads haven't been assigned, so we don't know if our current and planned approaches are sufficient or how close they are. We have a lot of unknowns. There are also big questions on the science, models, and data. How are we

going to report on a two-year basis if we don't know how we measure up to the expectations? There are questions raised about authority, enforcement, and responsibility, because much of what will need to be done will happen on privately owned land – how will government enforce this? In Charlottesville there is a focus on local control and responsibilities for our own waterways, and we're hopeful that existing TMDLs (plans to clean up locally impaired streams) will get us along way towards the requirements, but we just don't know at this point how far. We have to report once a year to DCR, and we're still on a local government learning curve in terms of quantifying our actions. How do we get to the point of being able to quantify?

Other comments in this discussion:

- Like agriculture and development, local governments have seen increased responsibility for programs that used to be funded further up, i.e. by the state or feds (a trend over the last decades). Now we have to turn to citizens to fund these things, and this is a political issue.
- Speaking for a rural county, half of our planning staff is sitting in this meeting. We have the issue of lack of staff capacity to deal with this.
- In Albemarle County, we are concerned that this will encourage sprawl. We've addressed this to the State, but never heard back. Over last 3-4 years we've lost close to half our staff, and now we're adding tasks. We increased our stormwater buffer regulations 2 years ago, and there's not enough time/staff to handle even this.
- We're the last point – we can't pass this onto anyone else. We've reduced our staff; we'll have to increase our local taxes or fees. This is a big concern.
- But, there is a unique opportunity here - we're all sitting here from these sectors with these same concerns. We all have to “buck up” and clean the water. We all have an interest in this, and happily we've not been ignoring this. This region is already aware and committed to clean water.
- At pesticide recertification class, I heard information that they are starting to do water testing. How much does it cost to do water testing? [The answer is that it varies considerably depending upon what sort of testing is done over what period of time.]

Wastewater Perspective

Tom Frederick, Executive Director, Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA):

This issue is the paramount and daunting issue that all of us are trying to deal with locally. I am hearing common themes that we share: concerns about the science; the desire to do the right thing and to do our share; and huge cost concerns. Wastewater treatment facilities have been the low hanging fruit. EPA knows where every output pipe is. We [RWSA] sample that pipe every day and are benchmarked against our permit. Wastewater treatment facilities have been heavily regulated for many years.

In Virginia, there we're strategies developed for the Bay in 1990s and early 2000s. A 2005 regulation passed to give all Virginia wastewater treatment plants allocations that you meet by advancing treatment or buying credits. We are a member of Virginia Nutrient Credit Association for point sources, where permit holders can trade credits for discharge of nitrogen and phosphorous. We have our own scientists that can challenge the data when necessary. We need to provide both clean water and a good economy.

The Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) is in the middle of a major renovation to the Moore's Creek facility. It is the biggest capital project we have ever undertaken and is more than twice the cost of the proposed Ragged Mountain dam. We will be treating wastewater to very low levels (5 parts per million N, 0.3 parts per million P). We will be selling credits to other agencies via the exchange. We are also asking for a 10% increase in wholesale price in order to pay for these refurbishments. There is no way to avoid this.

We want to be active in cross-sector discussions, but our regulations are pretty much already set. We were concerned that we were very far along on \$48 million effort, and then the EPA TMDL posed a revisiting of this. We were concerned that the numbers would change, and we'd have to start over. Fortunately, through DEQ support, we are able to maintain the allocations adopted in 2005 for the next 6 to 7 years. After that, there's a cloud of uncertainty. There is a DEQ study right now on the James that is re-visiting the question of the correct targets for the James. We want to do the right thing, but we need to have the right science. We need to know what causes harmful algal blooms on the James east of Richmond, for example.

Other comments in this discussion:

- I noticed a problem of algal bloom in trout streams – pure mountain water. How much of this is airborne nitrogen? We need to know what is the natural content of nitrogen in the water. What does it cost to sample this? Who samples and verifies? What would be the monitoring costs for farmers?
- RWSA: Our operators take the samples. We have our own laboratory and budget and three full-time staff. Some sophisticated tests are contracted out. The cost depends on what you're testing for. Now our lab is certified by Virginia to run our tests but not certified as a commercial lab so we can't take in others' samples. If there were a demand for this, we'd be willing to look into it but would have to go through additional certification process.
- Our consulting company gets asked to sample water quality seasonally and have found that you're paying for the technician, sampling, lab testing and may be \$100-\$200 per sample. For a 200 acre site (large farm pond), 10 sample locations, could be \$6,000-\$12,000 per year.
- We're more interested not in the cost but in the actual results on our farms. Do we in fact put in more than we take out?
- The expense for testing – it sounds like the farmer couldn't limit his cost by bringing you a sample? *Response from a participant:* If I wanted to do it myself, I could contact a lab directly to have them send me the equipment for me to collect and send back, then send the farmer the results.
- Is there a way to partner with wastewater treatment facilities to do this sampling?
- One way to frame this question that many of you share is: How do you get good knowledge for the region in such a way that is most cost-efficient?
- I applaud wastewater treatment facilities for their work in this area. But is it in our best interest to trade credits or to force others to do their share? *RWSA response:* That is a good question with a complicated answer. We can work together to find the right approach, and we're still solving that problem. Trading may not work for more localized protections (i.e., local streams).
- If we're getting it done in our area, why aren't others doing this? This is an equity issue.

RWSA response: It's true; I do get concerned that our urban treatment is subsidizing rural uses. Wastewater treatment facilities made the determination that we could come well under federal guidelines for some additional cost and then are able to sell credits. The trading between treatment plants is largely a factor of the limits of contractors to upgrade simultaneously. The other plants will eventually be upgraded also; it's just that RWSA took the leading edge for now. Credits will be in the short-term.

Also, there is an opinion that the most cost-effective way to meet our goal is to put the entire regulatory burden on wastewater treatment facilities and have everyone share the cost through credits, etc. This idea was not pursued statewide during Phase I because of the difficulty of equitable cost-share, but it may be worth revisiting.

More comments in this discussion:

- In Kentucky, there was a core of citizen volunteers to do the water testing. Virginia also has a citizen program.
- But will this not do much for local streams? *Response from PRPP Steering Committee member:* It depends – maybe, maybe not. One other issue is sediment, and wastewater treatment facilities plants do not discharge sediment. So sediment has to come through non-point source means. Stream buffers and BMPs can be very effective. For this we have to keep whole picture in mind. That aside, it does make sense to work together and trade effectively.

Facilitated Discussion

Participants spent the rest of the meeting addressing one another and discussing what is new, what they want to understand from the other sectors, and what they want the other sectors to understand about one another. Comments follow:

- **Air quality:** Large source of nitrogen is air deposition. No such thing as a free lunch in the air quality world either. U.S. has had an aggressive air quality program since the 70s, and it's been very effective. One of the greatest success stories in pollution is the air quality clean up in the U.S. The simple answer is there is probably some additional nitrogen that can be taken out of the air. EPA is putting forth standards to reduce nitrogen oxides (NOx), but reducing NOx from auto, power, homes, etc. is going to cost money on fuel, equipment, power, appliances, etc.
- On electric automobiles and power generators, are we just shifting the burden? Is there actually a net gain, given the costs of burning coal? *Answer:* That is an open question. Here in Virginia a lot of electricity is generated by nuclear, but regions where more power is coal-generated the answer is not a simple one.
- *Steering Committee clarification:* TMDL allocations are based on assumption that the federal government would reduce nitrogen by 30% through clean air act. So local numbers have that built in. This doesn't, however, address concern that we need baseline understanding of what the existing contribution is so that processes undertaken can be accurately measured.

- So, if the federal government doesn't meet the 30% reduction, do we have to pick up the slack? *Answer:* No, they're assuming that this 30% has been done, and we'll just have to take care of the 70%. No one has said we would have to pick up the slack.
- We need to identify the sources of the pollution. This has been done at the Bay level, but perhaps not at the watershed level. We need to do this so we can address it with the most cost-effective means. Wastewater treatment facilities may be most cost-effective, but may not be the largest polluter. On local level, what are the key sources? What are the most cost effective means? Who funds? Can we address this?
- I agree with the above. DCR's attitude is to use a computer model to generate where contaminants are coming from (livestock, wildlife, domestic, etc). They have not done any testing on any specific tributaries to individual streams. If you have one stream that is generating 50% of that load, then it makes more sense to use your resources to target that one area rather than spread across a wide area.
- I agree that we should find out what the sources are. From the DCR perspective, it can be difficult to point fingers at large landowners or whatever specific sources. From a process standpoint, it is hard for a state person to convince folks to implement voluntary practices by picking and choosing. We need to avoid finger pointing.
- We're all feeling sweeping changes coming, and we're all being targeted. Are we being targeted fairly? Is there a more cost-effective solution?
- The word "impaired" leads the public to think the stream is polluted. We're talking about N, P, and sediment – there is a need to distinguish TMDL and pollution. These are different sources of impairment.

[Note: "impaired" does mean that the stream is polluted with one or more pollutants that result in the stream not being able to support its intended use, such as recreational contact use or being supportive of aquatic life (bugs and fish).]

- Maybe we don't identify individuals, but there is more of a need to identify land-use types as the main sources. For example, is it stormwater?
- One of the challenges is that this is not a very exciting topic. We need to figure out how to communicate with the public about the sources. All of us are part of the problem. For decades we've been trying to figure out the right science and source, but there is not a single strategy that's going to fix the Bay. We need to collectively make changes. Stop waiting for someone to dictate to our community. We should come up with what we know is going to work in our community.
- If a farmer can prove that water coming in and out is "clean" (that the farm is not adding to the problem), then he/she should be able to be designated as a clean water farmer. Why should that person be subject to more regulation? This is a concern with one-size-fits-all impositions.

- We need individual responsibility. Focus on accountability and enforcement and make sure the right people/businesses/sources step up to the plate. I don't agree with credit exchange approach unless it takes place near a locality. In Greene County, we like to be responsible for our community, and we like you to be responsible for your community. Don't pass it downstream to someone else. If we all did what we needed to do in our locality, this wouldn't be an issue. To make this work, we need to know what the numbers are so we can deal with accountability locally.
- What about natural occurring sediment and phosphorous? Rain events have contributed a lot, such as floods in '68, '72, '85, and hurricanes in the 1990s. We have phosphorous rock in the mountains. No one is taking this into consideration. Iceland sent out a huge amount of air pollutants through its volcano. A landowner should not be held responsible for natural occurrences.
- It is not so much about assigning blame for natural occurrences, as it is a question of who can do something about this. I imagine there is interest in Virginia and other states in calling senators and congress to make sure the Clean Air Act and EPA aren't dismantled. Don't cut federal funding.
- There is a bill [in the state legislature] regarding non-agriculture fertilizer. Professional landscapers are very responsible in using fertilizers and pesticides. Nonprofessional lawn care guys are a big problem because they put on excessive fertilizer so they can cut more often. Who is missing from the table [in this discussion and in regulations]?
- Let me play devil's advocate. Usage of agricultural fertilizer has gone down. I'd like to hear someone from homeowner or developer side to know if homeowner usage really is skyrocketing.
- What do the data say about the impact of an educational program on use of domestic fertilizers on suburban areas? Should we consider this as a strategy? Homeowners are completely unregulated. How big is this load?
- A startling and verifiable statistic is that turf grass in the Bay area is the fastest growing crop/land use. I echo the questions of what are we doing about this?
- The fertilizer bill is designed to create an education and certification process for professional applicators of non-agriculture fertilizers (including golf maintenance). We will be taking non-agriculture fertilizers for lawn maintenance that contain phosphorous off the shelves by 2013. This bill has come about via a cross-sector study and is recognized as one of the easiest regulatory actions we can take.
- What are they going to do as far as a sound recommendation to maintain growth of grass and avoid sediment run-off? *Answer:* There will be alternative fertilizers. Question: What else will work as well? *Answer:* the bill doesn't limit phosphorous fertilizers for lawn start-up, just maintenance fertilizers. Where is the data that show lawn fertilizer maintenance usage? This is a question we need to answer. What are the real sources, agriculture, lawns, and septic systems?

- I believe the Bill is for taking generic fertilizers off the market. You can document that you need phosphorous with a soil test – but this raises questions about enforcement.
- On the issue of water quality above [upstream] and below [downstream from] a farm, it is key to employ a nutrient management plan to meet the guidelines. Also, we need to educate the public as to what they're doing after the development is complete. Citizens are applying too much fertilizer per year, five times more than farmers. Also, communities and sectors are not using innovative practices to come up with solutions. What about using plants to absorb nutrients? Over-regulation keeps us from innovation. They're telling us what to do, but they don't have any common sense about what they're dictating or how to make it happen. Farmers are not going to do anything that will hurt their land. Developers are doing what engineers are telling them to do to meet their guidelines. We have criteria, so let's educate the public and put out guidelines for them.
- We have not talked about stormwater events. How can we prevent massive releases from municipal, farms, everywhere? Can we ameliorate consequences of floods or droughts?
- There is a huge problem in the decrease in development of farm ponds because of the mitigation and cost of getting the right to do this. It is \$500-700 per linear foot of stream that you're impacting. To develop a pond, you may have to pay \$15,000 before you even break ground. Everyone is tying your hands on this, even though they are a good solution for stormwater management and drought. This is a Catch-22.
- We need local solutions to locally identified problems.

Looking Forward

Participants were asked to comment about their interest in working together to present a local plan. All who spoke endorsed the idea. Specific requests also included:

- We would like to see the State legislators work with localities in meetings such as this. Let's use common sense in establishing testing and monitoring. You don't need all this regulatory cost. Let's let our legislators know what we need. Let's work with the State rather than EPA.
- I would like clarification on what will be voluntary vs. what will be enforced.
- It would be helpful to have guidance on how to do the baseline data.
- I support the idea of having State Delegates involved. We should provide them with input from these meetings so they come prepared. Communicate our concerns and issues and ask them to feed into it. Bring DEQ and DCR into the conversation as well.
- I echo the concern about mitigation fees and lack of commonsense in relation to developing ponds/lakes on farmland.

- I am concerned about the training and competency of people in the agencies with regard to relevant, practical matters. We need people who know it from the grassroots, ground up – not just an environmental science class.
- Is there a possibility of getting volunteers or youth to come out and help farmers do testing and build that baseline locally?

The PRPP Steering Committee then offered their thoughts about the meeting and the prospects of working together for local solutions.

- TJPDC had an event in November where we brought together a cross-sector panel and members of legislature to educate them. They appreciated that, and it is important to continue speaking to them because we have a lot of legislators from our region who chair the key committees. The Steering Committee did go to Richmond to meet with DCR and DEQ. This State engagement process has begun already.
- I am “absolutely thrilled” with this group and the level of understanding of TMDL. There is the genesis here for an effective regional response. I am glad to hear the sentiment echoed, “We want to do the right thing.”
- I second those accolades to this group. I understand the concern about the science, data, process and implementation. I sense a willingness to think outside the box, and that’s the only way we’ll get there. We have a strong voice because we’ve done this pilot project and you all have come together. There will be openness by the State if we want to craft something different.
- In terms of monitoring, there is already a tremendous core of monitoring in the Rivanna and other areas, and it can be expanded. There is willingness in the community to provide volunteer monitoring. We will have to think it through, coordinate, and fund it well. It will be good to craft this as a regional response for efficiency.
- With respect to monitoring, when you get these volunteer groups, you need to be extremely careful because you can get slanted data if there is bias. We need quality control to ensure an impartial analysis.
- What we’re doing is unique in the whole watershed. I do offer a slight concern about “devolving” into blaming the state. The Steering Committee deliberately did not invite the State because we wanted to have the sectors face each other. Let’s focus on taking a local approach rather than blaming the State.

Meeting Evaluation

The group offered ideas for any follow-up meetings identifying pluses (what we liked) and delta’s (what we would change):

- Plus – having different sectors present, diverse people present
- Delta – who could represent the group that communicates to the public?
Newspapers? Educators?

- Delta – we’re working in a vacuum because we don’t have the data. There is a lot of support around the table for increased monitoring. We’re not happy with the modeling, so perhaps we can provide on the ground monitoring.
- Delta – get DEQ people to explain what the monitors have to know to have their data accepted. (Note: this is on the DEQ monitoring website: <http://www.deq.state.va.us/cmonitor/guidance.html>)

Closing

Nelson County Supervisor Connie Brennan thanked participants for a wonderful meeting. She noted two items that have come up: 1) Education – how we as a group can come up with a set of information for our citizens? And 2) the need for an effort to look at all the innovative means of managing stormwater, agriculture practices, etc. There is a need to consider and compile innovative ideas that are out there.

We need more information and to know what scale we will be working on (regional, local, etc). Local government is anxious about not knowing what our role is going to be, and we want to ensure that no one goes out of business. I’m hoping that each of you will go back and talk to your respective networks about what we’re doing to work together to find solutions. There is so much misinformation or lack of information, so please go out and help to spread the word. Also, we haven’t talked much about septic, and we need to clarify where that will fit in.

She noted that the Steering Committee doesn’t know whether this will continue. The group didn’t get a grant to continue but may continue to meet informally. As the EPA and Virginia implement their plans, we hope that we can still work together on a regional basis, even as we drill down into developing plans for each locality.

Attendees

| | | |
|---------|-----------|--|
| Tamara | Ambler | Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority |
| John | Anderson | Nelson County Regional STP |
| Charlie | Armstrong | Southern Development |
| Ken | Boyd | Albemarle County BOS |
| Glenn | Brooks | Community Development, Albemarle County |
| Tommy | Bruguiere | Nelson County BOS, farmer |
| Timothy | Castillo | Central Area, Lake Monticello Sewage Treatment Plant |
| Joe | Chesser | Fluvanna County BOS |
| Barry | Clark | Greene County Administrator |
| Tony | Edwards | Neighborhood Development Services (Charlottesville) |
| Tom | Eick | Virginia Department of Health (Nelson) |
| Tom | Frederick | Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority |
| Mike | Gaffney | Gaffney Homes |
| E.N. | Garnett | Southern States Cooperative |

| | | |
|---------|------------|--|
| Mark | Hartman | VDOT Environmental Section, Water Quality Permitting |
| David | Holtzman | Director, Community Development, Louisa County |
| Joe | Jones | Albemarle Farm Bureau |
| James | Kean | TJSWCD Director, Louisa County farmer |
| Chris | Lee | Piedmont Virginia Companies |
| Jeff | McDaniel | VDH - Charlottesville office |
| George | Rhodes | Williamsburg Environmental Group |
| Jim | Riddell | Virginia Cooperative Extension, ret. |
| Kristel | Riddervold | Environmental Administrator, City of Charlottesville |
| Bob | Roberts | Greene County farmer |
| Massie | Saunders | Saunders Surveys, Inc. |
| Ed | Scharer | VA Farm Bureau |
| Frank | Stoner | Milestone Partners |
| Bart | Svoboda | Planning Director, Greene County |
| Szakos | Kristen | City Councilor, Charlottesville |
| Charles | Thornton | Soil Scientist |
| Matt | Weaver | Planner, Fluvanna County |

Piedmont Regional Pilot Project for the Chesapeake Bay TMDL
Steering Committee Members

Connie Brennan, Nelson County Board of Supervisors

Bill Kittrell, The Nature Conservancy

Carl Schmitt, Greene County Board of Supervisors

Rick Parrish, Southern Environmental Law Center

Sally Thomas, CBP Local Government Advisory Committee

Leslie Middleton, Rivanna River Basin Commission

(434) 971-7722 middleton@rivannbariverbasin.org

Alyson Sappington, Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District

(434) 975-0224 Alyson.Sappington@vaswcd.org

Greg Wichelns, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District

(540) 825-8591 gregw@culpeperswcd.org

Steve Williams, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission

(434) 979-7310 x110 swilliams@tjpd.org

All meeting and presentation materials from the Piedmont Regional Pilot Project can be found at:

http://www.rivannariverbasin.org/chesbay_tmdl_pilot_project.php.