

## **Crab Creek TMDL IP Meeting – Agricultural & Residential Working Group Meeting #2 Notes**

March 13, 2014 6:30 – 8:30 pm Christiansburg Town Hall

### Attendees

John Burke – Town of Christiansburg  
Mary Dail - DEQ  
Robbie Graham – Peppers Ferry WWTP  
Diana Hackenburg - DEQ  
Ashley Hall –EEE (representing VDOT)  
Cynthia Hancock – Skyline SWCD  
Carolyn Howard – Draper Aden (representing Montgomery County)  
Stacey Horton – DCR  
Ryan Hendrix – Town of Christiansburg WWTP  
Emma Jones - DEQ  
Wayne Nelson – Town of Christiansburg  
Asa Spiller – NRV Save Our Streams  
Todd Walters – Town of Christiansburg

---

Diana welcomed the group to the meeting and attendees introduced themselves. Diana went over impairments, background of the TMDLs and Implementation Plans and the Crab Creek project specifically. Diana went over BMPs installed since 2004 and showed photos of some of the BMPs. Diana explained the handouts. Diana explained the Stage 1 and Stage 2 water quality goals. Stage 1 and 2 goals can be adjusted based on feedback from this meeting.

## **DISCUSSION**

### General

- Ashley Hall – asked about the projected land use comparison. The data is from the 2012 NASS Cropland Data Layer which is produced using satellite imagery for the crop-specific data as well as additional sources including the imperviousness and canopy data layers from the USGS National Land Cover Database 2006 (NLCD 2006).
- Carolyn – Question about plan funding. Diana explained that once the plan is finalized, the area will be eligible for grant funding. Section 319 funding can be available on a competitive basis for agricultural BMPs as well as septic system practices, pet waste education and stormwater BMPs.
- Questions asked about 319 funding. Discussion about application process and how it is now competitive.
- Question about numbers of practices – how limiting can they be? Diana explained that the numbers needed to be in the ballpark. Mary added that it is also important to not limit your watershed by leaving practices out. At this stage it's important to be inclusive with types of BMPs.

### Septic Systems and Straight Pipes

- Septic/Sewer Line Connections:

- Town of Christiansburg could run a report to see how many customers have water and not sewer to try and zoom in on eligible residents/areas to connect folks to public sewer.
- Connection to sewer costs can differ depending on how close the house is to an existing line. Attendees guessed that total costs of a sewer connection would be greater, perhaps closer to \$5,000. The costs listed on the handout represent the total cost of the practice (the sum of potential cost-share funding and the landowner's share).
- People will be opposed to the cost on their bill. As long as septic system is functioning, Town residents aren't required to connect to the sewer line. Cost-share availability may make it easier to get folks to sign up. Once sewer line is there, people will get their tanks pumped. Wayne says that haulers are good about notifying the Town of people requesting pump-outs.
- RB-5 should be with the Alternative On-site Waste Treatment System not FR-1.

### Pet Waste

- Pet Waste Composters – the group was open to this idea. Diana explained that they could be used in areas as a pilot project.
- Huckleberry Trail area – pet waste bags and receptacles; could target Homeowners Associations
- There was interest among stakeholders to create a dog park or “companion area” in the watershed. While not common in Virginia IPs, this could be an option if it helps reduce pet waste somehow (e.g. providing a central location of education and outreach, concentrating waste away from water sources). Town of Christiansburg has been entertaining the idea of establishing a dog park, but is looking for a suitable location.
- From a WWTP standpoint, flushing pet waste doesn't matter. However, Town regulations may frown against throwing pet waste in trash. This should be looked into as throwing waste away in the trash is usually a recommended disposal method.

### Other Practices

- Streambank Stabilization – need to determine if the units listed for streambank stabilization are meant for projects on all land uses or just for residential/urban land uses
- Stakeholders should think about if there are any known candidates for stabilization work within the watershed and how stabilization projects might be prioritized.
- Cynthia noted there are different variations on this practice. It can range from simple (live stakes) to complex (grading).
- Street Sweeping – Town will provide information, efficiency. They just upgraded equipment.
- BMP clearinghouse – John suggested listing all of the BMPs in the clearinghouse (i.e. green roofs) so that they recognized as strategies for reducing sediment and bacteria and so they are eligible for future funding.
- E&S Control – Town is looking at whether or not it can be enhanced. John is going to follow up with DEQ.

### Sewer Overflows

- Ryan believes it's unreasonable to expect 100% of overflows would be corrected in Stage 1. Getting to a 100% reduction in overflows could potentially be spread out over the life of the implementation plan (across both Stage 1 and Stage 2). The Town and WWTP are working on overflows and they are making progress which should be mentioned in the clean-up plan. The Town of Christiansburg noted that funding needed to address the problem is tight right now.
  - Diana would like from the Town of Christiansburg an estimate of the number of sewer overflows and the cost for preventing all future sewer overflows.

### General Questions

- What happens if the goals of the plan are not being met, will the rubber meet the road on making this a requirement? Diana explained that the monitoring will tell us how well the plan is working along with the numbers of BMPs installed.
- Impact of Norfolk Southern – has that been considered in the plan? It is recognized as a concern of the stakeholders, but strategies for the plan have not been made specifically with the railroad in mind. It would be worth reaching out to them. Wayne said they have a contact for Norfolk Southern.
- Diana tried to reach out to The Meadows Golf Course & Swim Club and will continue to do so. Ryan suggested that their property would be a good candidate for streambank plantings/stabilization and/or a nutrient management plan.
- Question about point sources. TMDL IP addresses NPS. Point sources each have an allocated load for applicable pollutants which can be found in the 2004 TMDL.
- John Burke mentioned that stream restoration needs to be added to the list. Carolyn agreed and emphasized that it needs to be separate from streambank stabilization. Restoration costs are estimated at about \$250-\$300/linear foot. Cynthia could provide recent data to estimate those costs for agricultural stream restoration projects.
- How does the current Diamond Hills stream restoration project fit into the needed MS4 reductions? It has not yet been integrated into the plan, but data is now available and it will be considered. It was noted that channel erosion load reductions are considered in the plan separate from the needed MS4 load reductions.

### Agriculture BMPs

- Livestock exclusion – Diana mentioned that the estimates are based on length of perennial streams. The option exists to add intermittent streams to the estimates. Cynthia mentioned that the wider the scope allows for more opportunities. Stakeholders generally agreed that intermittent should be included.
- Cynthia asked if the “Pasture Management” BMP in Table 7 corresponded with a specific cost-share practice. Diana thinks it corresponds with Grazing Land Management Systems as listed in Table 4, but will check with Karen.
- Diana shared assumptions used to estimate BMPs needed for pasture and crop land uses (% conventional tillage able to be converted to conservation tillage, percentage converted to crop cover, % cropland in conservation tillage). District personnel will consider the assumptions and estimates to make sure they are accurate and feasible in this watershed.

- Most Agricultural BMPs have cost share associated (100% for livestock exclusion right now, others are usually 50-75% cost-share).

#### Follow up Monitoring

- Asa Spiller provided information about Save Our Streams monitoring efforts in the Crab Creek watershed. Asa and John Burke (Town) may work together to re-site one monitoring location to better capture ongoing water quality efforts.
- Courtney Wait of the National Committee for the New River said they have monitoring resources available for the watershed.
- John Burke suggested that we build in funding for citizen monitoring (equipment, training, etc.). Emphasized the desire to have high-level (Level III) data because it can be used to assess stream quality.
- Cynthia Hancock coordinates monitoring with school-age kids (Christiansburg Middle School teachers); she noted the SOL for 6<sup>th</sup> grade ties into water quality.
- There are Radford University and CHS students working on Crab Creek. Diana is working on collecting more information about their efforts.
- Ryan mentioned that the WWTP has space along the creek for school groups (and they could tour the plant while they're there).

#### Funding

- Need partnerships to leverage funding! Grants are looking for partnerships, matching funds.
- SWCDs have money available starting July 1<sup>st</sup> for their cost-share programs.
- NRPDC expressed interest at a previous meeting in managing parts of the project.

Next meeting will be Steering Committee (open to the public). Need a volunteer to represent each the AWG and RWG on the Steering Committee. Draft plan will be presented at the Steering Committee meeting.