

James River and Tributaries TMDL Implementation Plan – Lynchburg Area

City of Lynchburg/CSO TMDL IP Meeting

Local Government Council Office
828 Main Street; 12th Floor
Monday, August 9; 1:30 – 2:30 pm

Attending

Timothy Mitchell, City of Lynchburg
Jeff Scarono, City of Lynchburg
Erin Hawkins, City of Lynchburg
Kent White, City of Lynchburg
Jim Kern, Map Tech
Aarron Bowman, Map Tech
Kelly Hitchcock, Region 2000 LGC

Meeting Summary

1. Meeting Goals

Review TMDL IP Stormwater/CSO components and establish consensus for incorporation of stormwater practices and City CSO program for the pending IP.

2. Stormwater reduction methods – impact on reducing bacteria, stormwater, and use within the IP

Jim Kern provided an overview of the various tables related to stormwater control methods and assumptions, as related specifically to the City of Lynchburg.

Jim noted that information developed is based on the City as a whole and does not include specific CSO sewersheds. He noted that having this information will allow for refining of data. Jeff Scarono indicated that he will provide the CSO sewersheds to MapTech.

ACTION: Scarano provide MapTech CSO Sewer Shed information.

There was a short discussion on the status of the City's Long Term Control Plan. The LTCP is currently under a reevaluation /rewrite.

Scarano noted that there were still a lot of unknown variables within the LTCP and that there is not a model in place at this time. He did note that preliminary discussions were leaning towards eliminating the CSOs in the impaired tributaries to the James River and then having complete capture (capture, storage, treatment) for the remaining CSOs along the James River.

Mitchell noted that he has been sitting in numerous talks with EPA related to the C'Bay TMDLs and has concerns on the impact of the TMDLs and the concern of providing specific practice allocation through the TMDL IP. His preference is to refer to the City's LTCP and state within the IP that it is this document that will guide the City's stormwater control practices.

A discussion on the stormwater method assumptions noted the following:

- Believe the cost/unit associated with Green Roofs is low. The City can provide costs associated with the building completed; Also, cost does not probably include cost of retrofitting building to handle weight of green roofs.
- Table 1 should technically take into account a column for Sanitary Sewer Overflows.

- Scarono noted a practice that holds water on a rooftop to provide temporary storage during peak flow periods. Bowman noted the practice was known as blue roofs. The practice could provide options within the City, is not as costly as green roofs, but does require ability of building to hold water. . Scarono mentioned the possibility of a modified blue roof. Scarono will forward information to MapTech.

Key general discussion points included:

- The need to ensure that the IP is worded to point out opportunities to utilize green infrastructure practices. There is concern that if a practice, associated cost, and use is noted within the IP, the City be bound to provide Green roofs on all structures.
- Mitchell noted the importance of the City’s LTCP being the guiding document on the utilization of CSO funds. The City cannot afford for the IP to present a contradiction to the LTCP or allocate CSO funding in a different manner. It was agreed that Scarano will forward language provided to EPA within the current LTCP.
- Scarano noted that the City is looking into opportunities to develop small bioretention/rain gardens to businesses in the CSO area as an offset of the rainleader disconnect reimbursement program.
- Hitchcock noted that mention of those type of programs and use of the GI practices could assist the City in applying for grants to offset some cost or develop pilot projects. Scarono said he would create some verbiage to work into the IP about the City’s ongoing efforts in dealing with stormwater upfront, using decentralized Green Infrastructure practices to mitigate CSOs.

ACTION: Scarano forward MapTech verbiage for inclusion into the IP...

1. referring to the LTCP as a guide for the city’s CSO management, and
2. describing the City’s efforts in Green Infrastructure.

ACTION: Scarano forward to MapTech info about the “blue roof” or riser pipe information.

ACTION: MapTech refine tables to reflect City comments and provide draft language for City review.

General IP discussion continued into the complete Governmental/Urban Working Group.

Summation of Follow Up Action Items

ACTION: Scarano provide MapTech CSO Sewer Shed information.

ACTION: Scarano forward MapTech verbiage for inclusion into the IP...

1. referring to the LTCP as a guide for the city’s CSO management, and
2. describing the City’s efforts in Green Infrastructure.

ACTION: Scarano forward to MapTech info about the “blue roof” or riser pipe information.

ACTION: MapTech refine tables to reflect City comments and provide draft language for City review.