

## **James River and Tributaries TMDL Implementation Plan – Lynchburg Area**

### **Governmental/Urban Working Group Meeting**

Local Government Council Office  
828 Main Street; 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Thursday, May 6; 2:30 – 4:30 pm

#### Attending

Mike Damron, Campbell County Utilities & Service Authority  
Elizabeth Watson, Peaks of Otter Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD)  
Terri Bollinger, Peaks Otter SWCD  
Paula Nash, Dept. Environmental Quality (DEQ)  
Dan French, Amherst County Service Authority  
Kevin Leamy, Bedford County  
Paul Harvey, Campbell County  
Brian Stokes, Campbell County  
James Talian, Lynchburg City  
Jeff Scaroni, Lynchburg City  
Megan Sommers Bascone, Dept. Conservation Recreation (DCR)  
Jordan Mitchell, Bedford County  
Steve Simpson, Dept. of Health  
Jim Kern, Map Tech  
Aarron Bowman, Map Tech  
Kelly Hitchcock, Region 2000 LGC

#### **Meeting Summary**

##### 1. Introduction/Meeting Goals

Kelly Hitchcock began the meeting by providing a brief overview of the James River TMDL IP and the purpose of the meeting. Introductions of the Government Workgroup members followed.

Jim Kern, Map Tech, provided a more detailed overview of the tasks of the Governmental Working Group and its role in providing recommendations and suggestions for implementation tasks to be included within the James River and Tributaries TMDL IP. The Governmental Working group will provide its recommendations to the IP Steering Committee.

Key elements to be achieved during the meeting were:

- Review pollutant reductions that the IP must meet;
- Discuss preliminary estimates of implementation measures that will result in reductions in the urban loads;
- Document existing efforts underway to address bacteria in urban areas of the watershed; and
- Identify additional measures that should be included in the IP to reduce loads.

##### 2. Overview of Existing Local Programs/Actions

Kern led a discussion of some of the local programs and actions that should be noted within the IP. Current watershed activities noted included:

- Lynchburg has a pet waste disposal program. It was noted while a program is in place, little enforcement or education related to the program currently exists;
- Lynchburg has developed implemented a number of engineering solutions within the stormwater program to remove solids from stormwater prior to entering the storm drain system.
- A green roof has been installed on the new Lynchburg Juvenile & Domestic Relations Courthouse building.

- The city, as a component of the CSO work, installed porous pavers and rain gardens within the Riverfront Park improvements.
- Amherst County has adopted a 100% reserve drain field requirement.
- Amherst County has also, within the Harris Creek Watershed, the area north of Route 130, has adopted 75 foot stream buffers. Also, within this area the Agricultural BMP program pays 75% cost share and Amherst County pays the additional 25%.
- Lynchburg has a street sweeping program and also has a leaf removal program in fall. City has detailed information on the number of curb miles covered etc.
- Peaks of Otter SWCD and Robert E. Lee SWCD both have good participation in the cost share programs and working well with many local farmers.

### 3. Discussion of Obstacles and Areas that require further investigation

Discussion of local obstacles and opportunities that should be considered for inclusion within the IP. Key observations included:

Concerns and obstacles associated with local septic system/sewage programs included:

- Amherst County is the only location that has requirement beyond the state requirement and only locality with a 100% reserve requirement;
- Has any locality successfully implemented a pump out program? It was noted Bedford County did not approve a mandatory 5-year pump out program;
- Simpson noted that a better system to track septic instillation has been developed;
- It was questioned if any locality has a system that ties septic system maintenance or information to property transfer;
- It was noted that the definition of septic failure is often a source of confusion noting that a failure is often noted as ground evidence or back up in a house;
- It was agreed that some comparison of the cost of implementing a pump out program verses the cost of sewer system extension to areas should be considered;
- It was noted that with DOH all alternative septic systems will have tracking requirements.
- It was agreed that there needed to be more coordination with local housing programs that provide septic system/plumbing/ and housing improvements. Some suggestions included Lynchburg Community Action Group and Southeast Rural Community Assistance Program.
- Peaks Otter SWCD has worked with a number of families providing septic pump out

Ensuring program importance and value is translated to policy boards

- It was noted that outside of the immediate Lynchburg fringe area, concerns associated with erosion, sediment, stormwater simply does not register with policy makers;
- There is concern and some misunderstanding of the implications of stormwater regulations and connection to limiting development
- To address program value and importance it was noted that a presentation to locality boards should be made during the plan development

### 4. Potential measure to address urban sources of bacteria/stormwater volume

Jim noted a substantial component of the pending IP will be to look beyond traditional stormwater and bacteria removal best management practices. Kern noted the opportunity to utilize non-traditional or new low impact development stormwater practices was especially relevant in this region given the high percentage of the watershed in urban/suburban land development. Some practice discussion included:

- Difference between rain gardens and bio retention ponds – Jim noted that for the purpose of the IP a bio retention basin is an engineered device and the rain garden refers to a depression area with specific plants designed to handle periods of moisture.
- There was a question on the use of rain barrels as an implementation method for bacteria IP. Should there be a different name for a device that includes holding water with a slow discharge to

allow for ground seepage and reduction of water flow. The term “Roof Runoff Structure” was suggested as an alternative to “Rain Barrel” to indicate the distinction.

- It was noted that the University of Virginia worked on a Green Infrastructure Project with the City. The document provides recommendation for possible buffer ordinance. Document also highlights other green infrastructure practices.

Jim noted that MapTech will look at a variety of practices and associate a reduction value to the practices and that the information will be shared with the Working Group to assess practice inclusion suggestions with the IP

#### 5. Action Items

A summation of action items to be completed prior to the next meeting includes:

- Hitchcock contacts Amherst County to see that the impervious layer information is provided to MapTech;
- Hitchcock provide MapTech contact information for Dave Owen, Director of Public Works to obtain information on street sweeping, leaf pick up program, and any other programs that should be noted within plan;
- Hitchcock send a list to all the working group participants and see if there are any other persons that should be included within the working group or provided an opportunity to comment on plan;
- Hitchcock provide a copy of the Green Infrastructure document developed by UVA to MapTech;
- Hitchcock, contact each locality to look for opportunity to provide a project overview to policy boards;
- Jeff Scarano will provide information, where available, on storm sewer and combined sewer drainage areas.
- Jeff Scarano will provide information on existing stormwater treatment (*e.g.*, porous pavement, and solids removal).
- Map Tech develop summation of potential activities and practices for working group review and consideration
- Mr. Dan French will serve as the Governmental Working Group representative to the TMDL IP Steering Committee. In this role, French will present the recommendations/suggestions/etc from this working group to the Steering Committee.

#### 6. Next Meeting

A date and time of the next Governmental Working Group Meeting was not set at this meeting.