

Upper Roanoke River Total Maximum Daily Load Implementation Plan (TMDL) Steering Committee Meeting

10 April 2013, 1:30 p.m., DEQ Roanoke Office

-Meeting Notes-

Welcome and Introductions

- Attendees: Mary Dail, Paula Nash and Kip Foster (DEQ), Carol Linkenhoker (Botetourt Co.), Christopher Blakeman (Roanoke City), Ashley Parks (EEE Consulting representing VDOT), Chris Burns (Balzer & Assoc.), Bill Tanger (Friends of the Roanoke River), Erica Moore and Staci Merkt (Mountain Castles SWCD), John Burke (Gay and Neel, Inc.), Mike Rigney (TU/Orvis), Nick Tatalovich, Djamel Benelmouffok and Erin Hagan (Louis Berger Group, Inc.), Gary Woodson and Anita McMillan (Town of Vinton), Shane Sawyer and Ed Wells (RVARC), Kafi Howard (Town of Blacksburg), Megan Daily and David Henderson (Roanoke Co.), Sarah Baumgardner and Mike McEvoy (WVWA), Heather Vereb Longo (DCR), David Burris (VDH), Tom Dale (Lumsden Assoc.)
- Steering Committee (SC) members introduced themselves and their hopes/expectations for the meeting. Hopes and expectations expressed by SC:
 - o Increased collaboration (MS4 permits and beyond)
 - o Project timeline
 - o Efficiency
 - o Discussion of project costs
 - o Knowledge of the process
 - o Opportunities for education/outreach
 - o Clean water
- Meeting Guidelines: There were no additions to the Meeting Guidelines.

Why are we here?

- Dail presented background information about the importance of healthy watersheds, water quality programs at DEQ, and Total Maximum Daily Load studies in the Upper Roanoke River watershed.
 - o Suggestion was made to be more specific as to what happens to the “TMDL Pie” (slide #5) between existing pollutant loads and the reduced, or TMDL, loads.
 - o Question regarding the inclusion of PCB TMDL into the Upper Roanoke watershed IP project was answered with an explanation of current activities related to the PCB TMDL. Implementation of the Roanoke River watershed PCB TMDL will be accomplished through the VPDES permitting process. VPDES permittees (with specific sector identification codes) are collecting and submitting low-level PCB data from their outfall(s) per [TMDL Guidance Memo No. 09-2001](#). Data will be evaluated with respect to facility Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) and facilities that don’t meet WLAs will develop a Pollutant Minimization Plan to address PCB problems.

- Dail and Benelmouffok presented information about the Implementation Plan (IP), specifically requirements and components of an IP, existing Best Management Practices (BMPs), potential new BMPs, stakeholder participation and timeline.
 - **Project Area:** North Fork and South Fork subwatersheds are not included in “phase 1” of the IP project. Those subwatersheds will be captured in a separate IP project next year.
 - Landuse adjustments that account for landuse changes from the time of TMDL development to the time of the IP (i.e. “updating” the landuse layers for the watershed) will not affect WLAs, but reductions by source category may change. Subwatershed factsheets were shared with the SC.
 - **BMP Discussion:**
 - Question about existing BMPs inventory (slide #17, “Existing BMPs – Stormwater) totals due to the fact that in some cases only inspected BMPs are reported. Final numbers will be available in October.
 - Louis Berger Group requested shapefiles for existing BMPs (where possible) and will send out a formal request following the meeting. Instructions for file transfer will be provided with the request.
 - Some BMPs do not qualify for cost-share and the question arose about a BMP list for use during IP project development.
 - The comment was made that BMPs need to be included in the IP in order to be eligible for funding. Cautionary tip about ensuring that BMPs are appropriate for the watershed (i.e. soils) and timeless so that they are still reasonable several years down the road.
 - **MS4 Discussion:** Question was asked about MS4 area and whether or not it encompasses the whole county or just the urbanized area. MS4 area is just the urbanized area (example: Roanoke County MS4 represents 2010 census urbanized area).
 - **Fact sheet Discussion:**
 - Concern was expressed that bacteria reductions are too stringent (example: >99% reductions called for in Tinker Creek). IP will have to address several levels of reductions, i.e. milestones, all the way to 0% violations of the water quality standards. Stakeholders can influence the timeline/milestones.
 - Allocations need to be expressed without the use of scientific notation for the public.
 - **Working Groups discussion:**
 - Additional working group suggested encompassing non-profit, commercial stakeholders. It needs to include all of the appropriate Chambers of Commerce, small businesses, churches, business associations, urban forestry, etc. DEQ requested input on what organizations to reach out to.

Next Steps and Feedback

- **Obstacles to Implementation?**

- Funding is a challenge. Cost-share is attainable for agricultural BMPs but not for urban/stormwater BMPs. Grant opportunities must be identified.
- Public's knowledge of water quality problems/solutions is a challenge.
- **Public participation discussion:**
 - SC recommends a slide depicting the sample jar (100 ml) used to collect bacteria samples and a Petri dish showing bacteria colony growth. The water quality standards/levels of pollution need to be user-friendly.
 - SC suggested presenting success stories, specifically any streams that have been delisted due to IP activities. The public needs to see the benefits of implementation.
 - Emphasize benefits of existing BMPs like cattle fencing, properly installed silt fencing, Low Impact Development. The intent is to have the property/BMP owner speak to the benefits of their project.
- **Outreach/Advertising Public Meeting(s)**
 - SC suggested making a recording of the meeting, posting on YouTube and re-running on local TV channel (RVTV)
 - Newspapers (Roanoke Times, Star Sentinel, Main Street)
 - Press Release
 - Newsletters, listservs for businesses, civic organizations
 - Facebook
 - Fliers
 - DEQ website will house project documents information:
<http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/WaterQualityInformationTMDLs/TMDL/TMDLImplementation/TMDLImplementationProgress.aspx>
- **Public Meeting**
 - Possible locations: Hollins College, Greenfield Center, Roanoke Civic Center (Roanoke City to help coordinate)
 - Meeting style discussion:
 - Café style with short, formal program in the early afternoon and repeat in the evening. Cafe style utilizes an open space with information booths. Participants can listen to the formal program and then visit the specific booths for detailed information.
 - Traditional public meeting (presentation, Q&A)
 - Open House style where several people staff informational booths throughout the day and people can come and go all day long (no formal program)
- **Next Steps**
 - **Arrange public meeting details (including date, time, location)**
 - **DEQ/Louis Berger will send out formal request for BMP information**
 - **DEQ will share meeting minutes and project updates**