

York and Small Coastal Basin Group Roundtable

October 2004 Discussion meeting synopsis

Eighteen participants, including representatives from the Counties of York, King and Queen, New Kent, and Louisa; staff from the Hampton Roads and Middle Peninsula Planning District Commissions; Virginia DCR; Virginia DEQ; Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD); and the Thomas Jefferson, Hanover-Caroline, and Colonial Soil and Water Conservation Districts attended the roundtable discussion meeting at the Aylett Fire House on 8 October 2004. A list of attendees is attached to the end of this meeting summary.

The facilitator engaged the group in a discussion of the ongoing efforts in the York River and Small Coastal Basin watersheds Point- and Nonpoint-Source Pollution Control. Each participant was given the opportunity to highlight what is currently going on in the community or region they represent. The following is a brief synopsis of what was presented:

- York County:
- undergoing BMP development
 - Stormwater Management Program (SWMP) in place
 - Septic pump out program in place
- Louisa County:
- Agriculture cost-share (has little funding)
 - Alternative wastewater management for a 100+unit development
 - Riparian easements in use
 - Shoreline management in place
 - Building partnerships in place
- Hanover and Caroline Counties
- Agriculture planning activities, funded through SWCD, are tracked and reported but easy to lose this info to expanding development
 - Looking at watershed-level planning; Low Impact Development (LID) is being examined
 - Has a strong SWMP
- New Kent County:
- New restrictions on private mass drainfields
- HRSD:
- Wastewater
 - New point-source restrictions need direct appropriation
- Middle Peninsula Localities:
- MPPDC said "No" to the proposed tributary strategy
 - Active in watershed planning (i.e. Dragon Run Special Area Management Plan (SAMP))
 - Citizen/Volunteer efforts underway

- Chesapeake Bay Act implementation
- Septic Pump-out programs in place in some communities

Colonial Soil and Water Conservation District (includes Williamsburg and the Counties of James City, Charles City, and York):

- USDA-funded environmental trading program is working to retain soil quality
- Performance standards for soil quality in place

The group then moved to a discussion about what should be done to improve the current Point- and Nonpoint-Source Pollution Control efforts:

The group emphasized that more projects, along the lines of the Dragon Run volunteer sampling and septic system repair programs, need to be implemented (“less talking and more doing”).

Stress was placed on the fact that without local government approval and support by the Board of Supervisors, these efforts will fail.

More geographic and regional cooperation is needed in this process. This includes involvement of the Agriculture sector, which is a group that actually implements the positive Soil and Water Conservation District practices.

Clear direction needs to come from the state. This should include a clear statement of the state’s priorities.

If goals are not met through voluntary efforts, new mandates to control pollution sources are likely to be implemented after 2010. It is important to know what these mandates will be and the status of funding to support planning and implementation. The SWCD’s accountability needs to be increased.

A centralized tracking and monitoring process should be established that is compatible across localities. There was a brief discussion on the inconsistencies of tracking mechanisms in use by local governments. There is no standardization across localities and it is currently impossible to look at the data across the geographic region. An on-line centralized database was suggested to store septic pump-out information. A schedule should be established to improve participation.

Compartmentalization of Agriculture and Urban sectors should be dissolved because small agricultural uses have urban impacts; the general end result is the same.

Outreach efforts are urgently needed. These should include stakeholder

education (including the general public) so that they are familiar with the terminology and mandates. Earlier forums included public component and this needs to be re-established. The media should be used to engage the public (consider public and private promotions).

The final portion of this roundtable discussion focused on identifying and prioritizing a list of actions that should take place and be used to build a case for securing financial support for tributary strategies. It was also noted that it is important to get endorsement from different stakeholder groups. These priorities are as follows:

- 1) Agricultural BMP's
- 2) LID
- 3) Tracking
- 4) Point-source regulationa and funding sources
- 5) Septic systems (i.e., alternative systems, pump out programs)

For the next meeting, the group will focus on ag BMP's and LID BMP's in the York River and Small Coastal Basins Watershed. The following participants were asked to prepare reports on the following to present at the next meeting:

Matt Criblez (DCR):

- Current Ag BMP and LID in the system

Matt Criblez and Sharon Conner (H-C SWCD):

- Potential funding improvements
- Local government buy in
- Timetable

Matt Criblez

- How DCR allocates basin funds

Wayne Davis (DCR)

- Investigate regions

Sharon Conner

- What is valuable to local governments?

Brian Noyes (H-C SWCD)

- USDA and new technological ways to reach BMP goals

The next meeting will take place January 7, 2005 at 9 am at the Aylett Fire House.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Lewis Lawrence	MPPDC
Alan Harrison	New Kent Co.
Josh Bateman	MPPDC
Tom Williams	Louisa Co.
Megan Gallagher	Facilitator
Claire Jones	HRPDC
Christine Breddy	King and Queen Co.
Connie Bennett	York Co.
Don Nelson	Thomas Jefferson SWCD
Wayne Davis	DCR
Will Hunley	HRSD
Kelly McDaniel	DCR
Sharon Conner	HCSWCD
Marian Moody	HCSWCD
Brian Noyes	CSWCD
Bob Ehrhart	DEQ
Dudley Pattie	RSA
Matt Criblez	DCR