

Falling River TMDL Implementation Plan

Combination Agricultural and Residential Working Group Meeting

Campbell County Extension Office Building: September 25, 2007

Attendees

Theresa Buckles, DCR
James Puckett, Jr, Citizen, Farmer
Brian Stokes, Campbell County
Dave Sandman, RELSWCD
Don Yancy, NRCS
Steve Simpson, DOH
Ruby Shipman, DOH
Scott Reiter, VA Cooperative Extension
J.D. Puckett, Board Supervisor; Farmer
Brandon T. Schmitt, Farmer
Jim O'Hara, Farmer
George L. Jones, Farmer
Larry Dalton, Citizen
Kelly Hazlegrove, DEQ
Michael Hudgins, Citizen
Gerald Hornal, Citizen
Rod Bodkin, MapTech
Kelly Hitchcock, Local Government Council

Meeting Summary

Theresa Buckles, DCR, began the meeting by thanking all those that were in attendance and outlined the role of the Agricultural and Residential workgroups. She indicated that the Agricultural Workgroup – roles and discussion of the provided fact sheet would be the initial focus of the combined meeting.

Agricultural Working Group

Theresa provided a general overview of the 42 practices that are administered and eligible for cost share within the DCR programs. Only a select few will be included in the implementation plan that provide bacteria source reductions from pasture, hay and cropland areas. She noted that the role of the Agricultural Workgroup would be to assist in reviewing the many programs and determining which best management practices would be important for this area in meeting the TDML goals and to talk about potential obstacles to implementation and utilization of the best management practices and participation in programs. She noted that this area had benefited from participation by

the RELSWCD in utilizing WQIF dollars for a part-time position for the purposes of implementing cost-share programs within TDML watersheds.

Theresa provided an overview of the primary practices utilized through the TMDL Cost Share. She noted that these specific programs were provided at a 75% cost share, 25% local land owner ratio. There are many other programs within the 50% cost share contribution. A brochure of practices developed by Dave Sandman, REDSWCD, was provided for the purposes of discussing practices. She indicated that there were three main issues for discussion:

1. What are the existing constraints for participation and utilization of BMPs
2. What are the fanatical constraints for utilization of practices; and
3. What are cultural constraints for participation

Comments on constraints included:

- Was there the possibility for more cost share for digging wells. It was noted that this was a considerable costs if a deep well was necessary; with one well in the area being 600 feet. Suggested that the cost share for a well be on a fixed cost to a certain depth and then a per foot cost after fixed cost depth.
- A question was asked about the turn around cost for reimbursement. It was noted by NRCS and RELSWCD that repayment had been quick; this was confirmed by a participant.
- One person felt there needed to be more explanation of how conservation easement and cost shares were similar and what the differences where in terms of requirements and participation.
- A key cultural constraint is the fear of losing control over the property. Theresa noted that the programs are voluntary. It was noted by Don Yancy, NRCS, that the only obligation of the landowner was to maintain the cost share practice for the design life – usually 10 years. He added that it is the intent that the practice will be maintained even if the land is used for a different use or even owned by a different owner; and the responsibility for the cost share practice commitment can be transferred to the new owner. He noted that this commitment could be released with repayment of the cost share funds.
- Another participant added that he thought the utilization of cost-share funds from the purpose of reseeded on slopes in a draught year should be considered. He noted that with the extreme drought there is little left on the soil to slow the rate of water into the streams and noted even with the 35 foot buffer there would be little protection. He noted that he felt the use of funds for re-seed should only be considered if the farmer agreed to other fencing or other program practices. It was noted by Don Yancy that the only re-seed program he was familiar with was through the EQUIP program which is a 50% match program.
- There was also a question about the program and intermittent streams and requirements for participation. Theresa noted this was an area of question and consideration in a number of areas and would need further discussion.

Theresa Buckles asked the participants if they could provide information on additional contacts or methods of increasing participation in the development of the IP, she asked if the location was a good one. It was noted that the local Agricultural teachers/FFA should be contacted. It was also felt that a meeting in Appomattox would be appropriate.

Rod Bodkin, MapTech, provided a summation of the analysis of stream fencing needs for Falling River. He noted that the estimates were based on the data from within the TMDL study and GIS analysis. Rod briefly discussed the fencing length figures and average costs from the SL-6 (grazing land protection) and WP-2T (stream protection) practices. David Sandman, RELSWCD, through the costs might be a little low for the area. It was agreed that Dave Sandman and Don Yancy (NRCS) would look at the average costs and come to the next workgroup meeting with figures. Some general questions about the program included the need to fence all pasture land at one time and additional cost assistance programs. Also, was it anticipated that lagoon construction be a cost share component.

It was noted that at the next meeting additional costs and practices would be reviewed.

Residential Working Group

Theresa Buckles provided a general overview of some of the primary practices that were considered from the residential side of the watershed loading. She noted the key practices considered were septic system repair, septic installation, alternative waster water treatment systems, septic tank pump outs.

Rod Bodkin noted that the residential costs estimates were based on information from the local health department and from utilization of an approved methodology for determining septic failure. The estimated costs for practices in the area were:

Septic system installation	\$4,000
Septic system repair	\$3,500
Alternative waste treatment	\$15,000
Septic tank pump out	\$250

Steve Simpson, DOH, indicated that the estimated straight pipes was probably a little high. He felt the estimated number for the 2000 Census could be reduced by approximately 94%. He noted straight pipes are not a big problem in Central Virginia and may be a product of responding to the Census question incorrectly.

It was agreed to talk further about the key needs from this sector and on increasing participation and information from this sector at the next round of meetings.

Meeting adjourned.