

Chesapeake Bay Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) Phase III Region 2000 (PDC 11) Non-Agricultural Sector Stakeholder Meeting 1

August 23, 2018, 2:30 pm – 4:30 pm
Lynchburg Public Library Community Room
2315 Memorial Ave., Lynchburg, VA 24501

Meeting Summary

Attending:

Jonathan Wooldridge, RELSWCD

Ashley Hall, Stantec for VDOT

James Moneymaker, DEQ

Anne Marie Roberts, RELSWCD

Dylan Bishop, Amherst County Planning

Tonya Bapties, Lynchburg Community Development

Brian Stokes, Campbell County

Clay Ross, Bedford County

Amy Seipp, Accupoint Surveying

Barbara White, DOF

Megan Sommers Bascone, DEQ

Kelly Hitchcock, Region 2000 LGC

Kate Miller, City of Lynchburg

Michael Bryant, Hurt & Proffitt

Andy Klepac, Hurt & Proffitt

Tim Mitchell, City of Lynchburg

Trent Warner, Hurt & Proffitt

Patrick Proffitt, Hurt & Proffitt

Rick Butler, Appomattox County, DOF

Joe Seiffert, Citizen

Erin Hawkins, City of Lynchburg

Tracy Culbertson, POSWCD

Gary Christie, Region 2000 LGC

Kelly Hitchcock welcomed everyone and began the meeting with an overview of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. She explained that every state is required to develop a Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP). The WIP presents how each state will meet EPA-mandated nutrient reduction targets through a suite of best management practices (BMPs) that will collectively meet Chesapeake Bay and tributary reduction target by 2025.

A brief overview of the WIP three phase development timeline was presented, noting that the program is currently working on Phase III, where there is focus on creating sustained local strategies and seeking local input. The WIP three phases being:

- Phase I: completed in 2010 and focused on agriculture
- Phase II: used Phase I assumptions to meet 2017 and 2025 goals
- Phase III: local strategies to meet 2025 goals

The Phase III WIP process focuses on engagement with stakeholders at the local level to provide the opportunity to review, evaluate, and refine local strategies. Additionally, that the Phase III WIP is being developed along two-tracks: 1) the PDC-area process focus is on unregulated urban, septic and remaining forest nutrient reductions, does not include regulated MS4 areas, and is led by Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ); and 2) A Soil & Water Conservation District-led effort focuses on Agriculture, and some forested reductions and is being guided by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR).

DEQ is providing an Input Deck, a selected menu of BMPs and reduction strategies that will meet the Local Area Planning Goals (LAPGs) reduction loads for the PDC-area unregulated urban and developed lands. An additional tool, the Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (CAST), is used by DEQ.

An overview of Phase III WIP goals and the specific actions that the Local Government Council must accomplish by December 15, 2018 was presented. **The LGC has agreed to, with local stakeholders:**

- Convene at least three stakeholder meetings. Stakeholders will review the BMP input deck that reflects the selected menu of BMPs that meet the LAPGs for the PDC-area unregulated urban and developed lands (Permitted lands (MS4s & CSO) are not included);
- Identify gaps in capacity and funding needs;
- Develop descriptions of local co-benefits achieved through programmatic actions (e.g. economic development through enhanced outdoor recreation, flood control); and
- Hold a joint meeting with SWCD representatives, locality government staff and local stakeholders to discuss each input deck development effort.

Attendees were provided an overview **Why Participation Matters.**

- You care about your local waterways;
- The Commonwealth will submit BMP data and strategies with or without local-area input;
- Without input future policies, funding decisions, regulations may not reflect local conditions or interest; and
- Participation in the planning does not represent commitment to implementation for localities or partners; and
- Implementing water quality BMPs can support other local planning goals.

A Draft Meeting Schedule:

Meeting #2: September 20 from 1:30 – 3:00

Meeting #3: October 26 from 10:00 – 12:00

Meeting #4: TBD

Hitchcock noted that dates can be adjusted, these were just a starting off point. It was mentioned that Central Shenandoah PDC is having their next meeting September 20. Some participants are required to attend all the meetings. After some discussion, it was agreed that a Doodle Poll for meeting time would be sent, especially for the 3rd meeting.

Hitchcock outlined those local stakeholder groups that were directly invited to the meeting and asked Who is missing from this process? Kelly asked participants to provide input. Hitchcock noted that information about the process will be on the website and appreciated groups sharing with your network.

Hitchcock provided an overview of the BMP input deck, with an explanation of each of the columns. The group will thoroughly review the input deck at the next meeting. Participants will receive a copy of the Input Deck via email prior to the 2nd meeting. Additionally, presented Programmatic Action Template, that allows local stakeholders to share specific programs, funding, capacity gaps and the Additional Benefits to record value-added results of water quality planning and implementation.

After the presentation there was an open discussion period. The following records key discussion points, questions, and follow up actions to prepare for Meetings 2 and 3, that will be work sessions.

Question: Will the input deck be broken down by locality?

That information can be provided to localities if requested by the PDC

For agriculture, the input deck was broken down by district. Information from individual districts is compiled into an Area SWCD input deck.

Programmatic action template: A place to document funding needs and staffing needs

Kelly concluded the presentation and offered an opportunity for questions.

Question: Does the 2017 Progress BMPs capture everything done up to June 2017?

DEQ wants to know that everything is correct. BMP numbers are being pulled from Stormwater Clearinghouse and BMP Warehouse

A dash for 2017 indicates that perhaps the BMP was not available at that time.

Comment: What is the incentive for localities to do this?

This process will help document the need for funding or staffing. Several programs arose out of the Phase II WIP process. Perhaps VCAP could be expanded.

Question: Will going outside of the regulated area change the defined regulated area?

Localities do not get credit for activities outside other their areas and do not want to be required to implement BMPs outside of the permitted area.

DEQ Response: NO. The WIP III is a planning process focused on the unregulated (non-M24) areas.

Question: Can the input deck be broken down by locality?

Yes – we can provide locality specific input decks for the region. The request to expand the Input Deck to a locality-level will be provided to DEQ. It will be a goal to have the updated Input Deck by Meeting #2.

Question: Can credit be taken for purchased nutrient reductions?

Discussion: New development versus redevelopment. New development should be net neutral. Focus should be on redevelopment?

DEQ Response: If nutrient credits are purchased and retired, yes. However, if nutrient credits are purchased to offset increased loads elsewhere or to meet permit requirements, No.

What other stakeholders should be here?

- Public service authority staff

Hitchcock thanked all of the participants and noted that a follow up email with meeting details would be distributed.