

James River bacterial TMDL Implementation Plan Government/Urban Work Group Meetings (1 & 2) Highlights

Brainstorm Session (11/16/10):

Note: *Action Items are in italics, status included.*

- 1. Reviewed the TMDL development background related to Government/Urban Working Group (GUWG) Responsibilities:**
 - TMDL pollutant reductions for IP (Non Point Sources),
 - Summarized existing relevant bacteria point source permits in the watershed,
 - Summarized status of Chesapeake Bay TMDL,
 - To collect and document status of local BMP maps/data for bacteria, but additionally seek Stormwater BMP maps/data if available (both existing and proposed). Received commitments from all present stakeholders: HENRICO, Richmond, Chesterfield Co., and Powhatan.
 - *MapTech will compile data as much as possible before next meeting for distribution.*
 - To identify additional measures needed to reduce the bacteria load that the implementation plan can address.

- 2. Discuss implementation measures that will result in reductions in urban loads.**
 - Listed BMPs: green roofs, bioswales, retention and detention ponds, permeable pavement, trees, riparian buffers, etc,
 - Discussed bacterial removal efficiency problem
 - *Greely and Hansen will provide bacterial efficiency data translated from nitrogen and phosphorus efficiency data.*

- 3. Recommend review Lynchburg TMDL IP when available.** *DEQ distributed link after meeting.*

- 4. WG requested updated modeling scenarios for Reedy Cr and Upstream of James Riverine section.**

1st Government Urban WG Session (12/9/10):

- 1. Reviewed James R. Richmond area bacterial TMDL reductions and BMPs available:**
 - a. WG expressed concerns over bacterial BMP efficiency data available and economics of spending money without returns or evidence of them. DEQ described IP process and use of best available estimates of bacterial efficiency levels to use developing recommendations, advise technical and fiscal pragmatism and prudence when applying. Each BMP should be specific to watershed's needs and should reflect appropriate planning. *Requested efficiency data from participants including international database supported by EPA, web links to several sites were distributed.*
 - b. WG questioned accuracy of livestock, related reductions, and other data in TMDL (Bernards Ck, Almond Ck, Powwhite Ck), DEQ and MapTech *checked on Bernards Ck*

dairy downstream of Rt 711 and recommend add monitoring, evaluating other data accuracy with MapTech,

- c. WG questioned how money for a pet waste education program would be spent and how to measure success, DCR, DEQ, and Richmond described successful efforts,
 - d. WG discussed most effective BMP would be to remove one of if not the largest source which is failing septic, by extending sewers,
 - e. Cost estimates for Richmond area questioned for BMPs *and asked to be updated, being done by MapTech and DEQ.*
- 2. Discussed recent EPA Stormwater memo and mentioned potential relevance to TMDL, IP and MS4 permitting.**
 - a. DCR and DEQ described some potential effects,
 - b. DCR described IP (NPS pollution) and differences from MS4 permitting (PS pollution).
 - 3. Lynchburg draft IP was reviewed and discussed.**
 - 4. WG asked about the potential incorporation of Tuckahoe Ck IP into this one. *MapTech and DEQ are evaluating the appropriateness of inclusion.***