Charlottesville Tributaries Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

January 30, 2015 at 9am

Attendees: Ashley Hall (VDOT/EEE), Ethan Strickler (UVA student), Anne Dunckel (Streamwatch), Gene Yagow (VT-BSE), Mary Butcher (RCS), Wood Hudson (TJPDC), Martin Johnson (TJSWCD), Jess Wenger (UVA), Kristin Carter (UVA), Kristel Riddervold (City of Charlottesville), Dan Frisbee (City of Charlottesville), Brian Wagner (Ecosystem Services), Lonnie Murray (TJSWCD), Summer Liang (UVA), Greg Harper (Alebmarle), Rich Parrish, Andrea Terry (RWSA), Julia Skare (Draper Aden), Craig Lott (DEQ-CO), Don Kain & Nesha Mc Rae & Tara Sieber (DEQ-VRO)

Tara welcomed everyone and kicked off the meeting by having participants introduce themselves. Gene Yagow gave a recap of where the project started and where we are today. He then summarized the MS4 regulated areas by landuse and watershed. The TAC determined that the City maintains all roads with the exception of the I-64 corridor and the bridge over the Rivanna River (which is out of the watershed of concern). A participant asked if Industrial Stormwater permits were cut out of the Bay TMDL Action Plans and if so, would they also be cut out here? Would these general permits be given a separate WLA? Biscuit Run State Park was the next topic since the area where the Park is proposed was included in the Census Urbanized Area (CUA) for Albemarle County in 2000 but was not included in the CUA for 2010. Jaime Bauer stated that the "once in, always in" policy has more to do with whether the locality has an MS4 permit. If the locality qualifies for an MS4 permit, it will always have a permit, regardless of whether regulated areas change. The County asked to talk again with DEQ – MS4 folks since this sounds a bit different from previous statements.

Next, Gene reviewed some of the changes in BMP post-processing procedures. Now, Gene will use actual installed projects instead of planned projects. He has graphed all implemented and installed projects and would like to review these numbers with a small workgroup. This date/time will be set up at a later date. A participant asked if the BMP accounting will follow the Bay TMDL rules as to what can be accounted for and what can't. This issue gets tricky because the Bay TMDL is for nutrients and this local TMDL will be for sediment, and Gene stated that he would like to be as consistent as possible. Attendees pointed out several issues to be aware of, including the lack of a quantitative metric to use in a model, and that runoff reduction calculations did not include sediment concentrations. One participant asked what assumptions have been made, and Gene responded that loading rates were varied by landuse but the TAC had reviewed these rates and could continue to do so. Discussion then turned to Future Growth calculations. No explicit Future Growth was built into the calculations except for a 1% assumption of growth for permits which was built into the overall WLA. The origin of this 1% estimation was determined to be the original TMDL and its associated TAC meetings back in 2012.

The next topic of discussion was the landuse distribution, which Gene began reviewing by jurisdictional boundary. This division was contentious because the landuse divisions are the

basis of the loading rates, which are the foundation of the loads and therefore, the TMDL. Discussion regarding MS4 WLAs and aggregation versus disaggregation continued. Jaime reminded folks that the MS4 TMDL Action Plans are based on a TMDL loads being aggregated among MS4s and no individual WLAs are explicitly written into an MS4 permit. Most TMDLs across the state have aggregated their MS4 WLAs, but the Rivanna River Sediment TMDL is a notable exception. Craig Lott from DEQ Central Office was asked if EPA requirements are going to change in the future. He answered that right now, MS4 allocations should be aggregated all together but percentage reduction recommendations were possible. There was some misconceptions amongst the localities, but Jaime reiterated that if MS4 permits were included in a TMDL, whether aggregated or not aggregated, then an Action Plan was required and the MS4 was responsible for reductions. It was also noted that the Bay TMDL aggregated its MS4s together and reductions were required from everyone, so this could be a chance for consistency between the Bay TMDL and local TMDLs. The question was raised, why not just separate out the MS4 loads – why not just disaggregate? Craig responded that a lot of mapping was required and the current policy of DEQ was to lump all MS4 loads together, as consistent with the Bay TMDL. Gene reviewed the separation of regulated land from non-regulated land and the impervious/pervious divisions within those defined areas. This helped the model figure out the loads. A participant reminded everyone that the CUA area was “unregulated” and MS4 permits were not required to address non-regulated land. Nesha reminded the group that the Moores Creek Bacteria IP showed that the ag-based voluntary basis did not have a great success rate but this project could still allow for some innovative nonpoint source practices. Would there be room to carve out for reductions from the load allocation side of things? This would avoid shifting responsibility solely to the permitted, point source community and maintain some equity and fairness. The question was asked if any land in the Moore’s Creek drainage has changed hands. No one thought there was a significant amount of change. Gene brought up that transitional land use was probably not needed in MS4 areas since that load was accounted for. The City will be finalizing their non-regulated land that does not drain through city conveyance in the next week and will have a final shapefile to Gene at that time. Jaime reminded folks that the 2018 MS4 permit will address TMDLs and BMPs between2013 and 2018. By next fall (2016), any TMDL that was approved between 2008 and 2013 will need an Action Plan.

Then Gene took the TAC through the necessary reductions needed in each watershed to achieve the TMDLs. It was great to see that due to the restoration projects completed, Meadow Creek has already met its reductions! The summary chart can be seen below. One concern that was raised was whether the definitions of the stormwater utility and MS4 permit were consistent and whether non-regulated lands could be regulated at some point.

A few data needs were highlighted:

- Waiting for finalized City regulated area map
- Remove harvested forest landuse from inner city Charlottesville
- MS4 Action Plans
- To Aggregate MS4s or Not To Aggregate…

- How to figure out BMP accounting and standardization (BMP Workgroup meeting scheduled)
- Ability to apply the same reduction calculations for both Action Plans and the local TMDLs
- BMP load reductions – use Bay TMDL Action Plan Guidance?
- Future Growth?
- Need an IP?

Tara thanked the group for coming and promised to send out an email with dates/times options for next meeting and for a BMP Workgroup GoToMeeting.

Impairment	TMDL	WLA		LA	MOS
	Sediment Load (tons/yr)				
Cause Group Code B28R-04-BEN					
Lodge Creek	51.7	46.75		0.0	4.9
VAV-H28R_XRC01A04		VAR040051 City of Charlottesville VAR040074 Albemarle County VAR040073 University of Virginia VAR040115 Virginia DOT	35.89 tons/yr		
		construction aggregate WLA	10.73 tons/yr		
		Future Growth WLA	0.12 tons/yr		
Cause Group Code H28R-02-BEN					
Moores Creek*	2,185.6	1,110.73		936.4	138.4
VAV-H28R_MSC01A00 VAV-H28R_MSC02A00		VAR040051 City of Charlottesville VAR040074 Albemarle County VAR040073 University of Virginia VAR040115 Virginia DOT VAR040108 Piedmont Virginia Community College	959.25 tons/yr		
		ISWGP Permits (VAR051960)	0.98 tons/yr		
		General Permits (VAG111032, VAG408447)	2.42 tons/yr		
		construction aggregate WLA	126.23 tons/yr		
		Future Growth WLA	21.86 tons/yr		
Cause Group Code H28R-07-BEN					
Schenks Branch	157.8	138.87		3.8	15.0
VAV-H28R_SNK01A02		VAR040051 City of Charlottesville VAR040074 Albemarle County VAR040073 University of Virginia VAR040115 Virginia DOT	132.73 tons/yr		
		General Permits (VAG110064)	2.97 tons/yr		
		construction aggregate WLA	1.6 tons/yr		
		Future Growth WLA	1.58 tons/yr		
Cause Group Code H28R-05-BEN					
Meadow Creek*	514.8	452.68		13.1	49.1
VAV-H28R_MWC01A00		VAR040051 City of Charlottesville VAR040074 Albemarle County VAR040073 University of Virginia VAR040115 Virginia DOT	366.19 tons/yr		
		ISWGP Permits (VAR051372, VAR050974) (VAR050932, VAR050876)	1.57 tons/yr		
		construction aggregate WLA	79.78 tons/yr		
		Future Growth WLA	5.15 tons/yr		

* Moores Creek excludes Lodge Creek; Meadow Creek excludes Schenks Branch.