

Birch Creek and Dan River Watersheds TMDL Implementation Plan

Second Combined Agricultural & Residential Working Group

March 13, 2018, 6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Danville Regional Airport, Eastern Conference Room, Danville, VA

Attendees: Susan Lindstrom, Erin Hagan (Louis Berger Group); James Moneymaker, Paula Main, Ashley Wendt (Virginia Department of Environmental Quality); Rick Brown (Halifax SWCD); David Hoback, Leah Manning, Joe Bonanno (West Piedmont PDC); Hanna Lindsey, Amber Eanes (Pittsylvania SWCD); Bill McCaleb (Virginia Cooperative Extension); Raymond Cocke (Halifax USDA-NRCS)

- The meeting began at 6:00 p.m. with introductions
- James Moneymaker asked the group to think about the most common best management practices (BMPs) used in the area.

Review of Existing and Proposed BMP Memorandum:

Table 1: Existing Stormwater BMPs

- City of Danville submitted existing stormwater BMP GIS files to DEQ.
- LB was able to discern the BMP practices and was able to pull useful information out of the attribute tables.

Q: What is Filterra?

A: A Filterra system is a brand name manufactured bioretention BMP. Filterra systems are designed for use in developed sites such as parking lots, landscaped areas, etc. As stormwater runoff enters a Filterra system, the runoff flows through the proprietary media mixture contained in a landscaped concrete container.

- Ashley Wendt would like the category “Filterra” to be re-categorized into an existing category, such as “manufactured BMP”.

Table 2: Proposed Stormwater BMPs

- No comments
- James will reach out to some of the localities for feedback on the stormwater BMP numbers.

Table 3: Proposed Sewage Disposal BMPs

- In the original TMDL, the number of septic systems were estimated numbers.
- Louis Berger estimated the percentages of failures on those original numbers
- Louis Berger used the Roanoke River IP failure rates as a starting place for the Dan River failure percentage rates.
- James mentioned that he previously spoke with Dan Richardson (VDH), and Dan felt that the TMDL estimates for straight pipes were too high.
- Ashley felt that there may be a better way to estimate straight pipes.

- James felt that some of the sewer connections had already occurred and therefore would most likely not happen in the future. In general the sewer system is not expanding.
- RB-2 column should decrease. The number of public sewer connections seems too high.
 - James will reach out to the City of Danville and VDH to double check these numbers.
 - LB suggested to reduce these numbers by half.
- Ashley stated that she thought 319(h) money could not be used for sewer connection.
 - James explained that 319(h) funding can be used for public sewer connections; however, 319(h) funding cannot be used to extend the main line.
- Regarding the number of alternative systems, James will talk with VDH to see if this practice is used in this area and how often. The proposed numbers are already low.

Table 4: Proposed Pet Waste BMPs

- This table was generated based on estimates from GIS imagery.
- Perhaps we should add a table containing suggestions for possible pet waste station locations .
- Tobacco Heritage Trail- unknown if there are any pet waste stations.
- Berryville- there are no pet waste stations, but there is one near the parking lot.
- Edmunds Park Botanical Gardens, there is a pet station however people don't use it.
- James brought up the idea that pet waste stations can and have been vandalized in some areas across the state.
- Big Toby Creek-where is the river access location? Louis Berger explained that they examined GIS imagery to estimate where stations should be located.
- Virginia International Raceway and Birch Creek Motor Park locations were discussed for pet station location. Other possible locations include hunt clubs, kennels, and veterinarian offices.
- Ashley asked if pet friendly hotels and schools were the only buildings considered. Louis Berger's response was, yes.

Q: Should apartment complexes be considered?

A: Louis Berger responded most apartments that allow pets usually have their own pet waste stations, but maybe this should be considered.

- BMPs must be in the Implementation Plan in order for grant funding to be used for the practice.

Table 5: Existing Agricultural BMPs

- Data received from DCR BMP Tracking Program

Table 6: Proposed Cropland BMPs

- Pittsylvania County SWCD uses sod waterways, tree plantings, and SL-6 practices most often.
- There was discussion about why there are so many sediment BMPs included in a bacterial TMDL Implementation Plan. Ashley explained that there is research which states that bacteria attaches to sediment which can lead to higher bacteria loads. Ashley explained that the plan could state that the stream exclusion practices are a priority and the cover crop practices could be a secondary priority.
- Most tobacco land is already in no-till
- SL-1 should be higher for all of the watersheds.
- Rick Brown mentioned that the SL-15 practice usually has more acreage in the systems than the numbers in the table.

- SL-11 (Critical Area Planting) and FR-1 (Aforestation of Erodible Crop and Pastureland) should be added to the proposed cropland practices.

Table 7: Proposed Livestock Exclusion BMPs

- **Please include the units in this table.** Units should be expressed in “feet”.
- The group expressed that the stream exclusion estimates seem high especially for Dan River. It was suggested that we reduce the exclusion estimates for Dan River. Louis Berger explained that the estimates include footage for both sides of streams. Estimates were based on GIS NLCD data. LB explained that they used the NLCD land use layer to differentiate the type of land and estimated pastureland and what needed to be excluded. If the stream appeared to have a buffer, exclusion was not needed.
- There is not much CREP sign-up in this area. When participants start to compare federal programs to state programs, they realize that they do not have to plant trees with the state program and usually do not go the federal route.
- SL-6 practice has a grazing plan component incorporated into the practice.
- Add WP-4 (animal Waste Control Facility)
- There was discussion that this is sometimes on both sides of the river, which would technically reduce the miles exclusion.
- James explained that the IP process is broken up into a two or three stages, usually allowing 10-15 years for completion.

Q: Is North Carolina doing anything for this plan?

A: No

- VCE stated that it would be beneficial to both states if we could work together.
- James will reach out to NC and see if they are doing any work on Dan River clean-up
- DRBA may have information to share for the plan being that they work in both states.
- The Dan River Coalition was mentioned. Also a VA-NC Commission?
- Ashley suggested adding language in the plan stating what NC is doing towards clean-up
- James asked if the districts were using practices for 10Ft set-backs or only those using 35 feet?
- WP-2T should be reduced. Apply these reduced numbers to other practices such as SL-6 or LE-1T
- Halifax SWCD doesn't do any SL-6A, so this number should be reduced.

Table 8

- Increase the acreage for the SL-9 practice.
- Wet Detention ponds numbers seem high. These practices must be in the plan to meet the TMDL.
- LB also pointed out that the Wet Detention ponds number is representing acres treated, not actual acres within the pond.
- Stream Restoration BMP was missing from the list, does this Practice have a bacteria reduction component? LB doesn't have any bacteria reduction efficiency for this practice. The group felt like this should be added as a practice due to the fact that DRBA has done some stream restoration projects and may be willing to do future projects. Ashley is going to check literature for a bacteria reduction value in order for LB to be able to use in the reduction calculation.
- FR-3 needs to be reduced, suggested adding to the SL-9.

Table 5-x Dan River Subwatershed TMDL IP costs (LB needs to make sure that all the numbers from the actual BMP lists are carrying into this spreadsheet correctly)

- Rick Brown said that the SL-6 and LE-1T systems in his area are between \$25,000-\$35,000. Pittsylvania SWCD said that theirs are slightly higher than that.
- Vegetative Cover on Critical Areas (SL-11) should be reduced to \$2,500
- Aforestation on Erodible Crop and Pastureland (FR-1) should be reduced to \$200/acre
- Sod Waterway (WP-3) should be increased to \$2,500
- Septic Tank Pumpout (RB-1) should be reduced to \$175
- Pet Waste Station cost should be reduced to around \$300
- Pet Waste Digester – Doggie Dooley Model #3000 available for \$90.00 which includes starter bottle of tablets to break down waste.
- Rain Barrel costs should be reduced to \$80 (Virginia Clean Waterways)