

**MINUTES**  
**Cedar Run, Mine Run, Mountain Run, and Lower Rapidan River Implementation Plan**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> Community Engagement Meeting**

**WHEN:** June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2024 at 1:00 p.m.

**WHERE:** George Washington Carver Agricultural Research Center

**ATTENDEES:**

- Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
  - Kaitlin King – NPS Coordinator – Central Office/NRO
  - Ashley Wendt – Technical Reviewer
  - Karen Kline – Watershed Modeler
- Greg Wichelns, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
- Cheyenne Sheridan, Culpeper Soil and Water Conservation District
- Harrison Premen, Culpeper Planning and Zoning
- Emily Bourdon, Virginia Dept of Health
- Caleb Pellmann, American Climate Partners
- Michelle Edwards, Rappahannock Rapidan Regional Commission
- Clare Mangum, Virginia Dept. of Health – Environmental Health
- Eugene Triplett, Resident
- Roland Terrell, Small Farm Outreach Program
- Julie Norris, Virginia Dept of Health
- Vy Truong, Virginia Dept of Health
- April Harper, Friends of the Rappahannock

---

**Meeting purpose:** To get feedback on the proposed BMPs and associated timeline to implement to address the bacteria sources in Cedar Run, Mine Run, Mountain Run and Lower Rapidan River in Orange, Culpeper, and Spotsylvania counties. The goal of this is to have discussion with the community on the most reasonable timeline to stage BMP to reduce the bacteria sources in the watershed with best management practices, outreach/education and partnerships; and discuss next steps.

Kaitlin King (DEQ) gave a brief introduction of the meeting purpose, gave an overview of Virginia's water quality process, both the bacteria Mountain Run and Mine Run TMDL (approved in 2005) and the bacteria Rapidan River Basin (approved in 2007), what a Clean Up Plan is/is not and next steps/timeline to complete the plan. After the project overview the group discussed in detail through the data presented on septic, pet waste, and agricultural best management practices to reduce bacteria loads in the watershed.

The final public meeting (with the draft plan) is tentatively planned for September/October 2024. It is anticipated that the plan will be approved by EPA Winter 2024/Spring 2025 allowing potential applicants to apply to the Request for Applications (RFA) in Summer 2025 and accepted applicants receiving funds in Fall/Winter 2026.

---

## **Meeting Notes:**

### Slide 7

As of the draft 2024 Integrated Report the Rapidan River #4 segment in the project area has been listed as a supporting segment. However, it will still be included in the IP so the sub watershed it's located in will be eligible for 319 funding.

### Slide 8

Bacteria source assessment shows agriculture as contributing most of the bacteria load. Wildlife is contributing as well but the IP will only address BMPs that reduce livestock, human, and pet sources. With this being said, wildlife will still be addressed in its own section of the IP to discuss consideration of wildlife BMPs if they become available in the future.

### Slide 9

The question was raised about where the waste water treatment plant in Cedar Run is for possible sewer connection. The Mitchells community has a waste water treatment plant that serves the correctional facility and also expands into the community for possible sewer connection. The other is in the Town of Culpeper which serves part of the Potato Run-Rapidan River HUC. The question was raised about how the failing septic systems and straight pipes are estimated. Estimates came from the TMDL report and were updated to current housing numbers and ages.

### Slide 10

The estimates for percentages and the breakdown of the numbers was created based on the discussion and feedback from the previous community engagement meeting. RB-4s and RB-5s are high because of the soil that is not percolating in various watersheds.

### Slide 12

The project is implemented in stages to allow for water quality monitoring during implementation. We're looking for improvements after Stages 1 & 2. The group suggested that 10 years may be best for Stages 1 and 2, maybe even Stage 3. The costs shown back on slide 11 are total costs, not cost share. Question was raised about what happens if the Stage 1 water quality goals are not met. As long as there are impairments, and the implementation goals haven't been met, then Stage 1 continues. The length of each stage is not set in stone. They're just a means for tracking implementation and water quality milestones. Stage 1 is met when all the Stage 1 BMPs are installed.

### Slide 18

It was recommended that the narrow buffer BMPs to be increased to 15-20% of the total fencing BMPs.

### Slide 19

It was recommended to include farm ponds as BMPs. Based on the number of BMPs needed, the recommendation is 10 years for each stage.

### Slide 21

Suggestion that Wilderness Run be moved to moderate since there will be residential development in that watershed in the future (within next 10 years). Suggestion to move Mountain Run (maybe #1 or both #1 and #2) to high.

### Slide 22

If Stages are 10 years, recommended that one FTE for ag BMPs and one for residential septic and pet BMPs is good.

### Slide 24

The draft IP will be available for review before the final public meeting. The final public meeting will be in September or October.