

# TRC Conference Call Meeting Notes

July 25, 2016

## Attending

Area I:

Area II: Jay Frankenfield, Willie Woode,

Area III: Keith Burgess, Brandon Dillistin, Leslie Anne Hinton, Etta Lucas, Jim Tate, Kristal Evens, Stacey Heflin

Area IV: Sarah Tilson, William Peters

Area V: Dave Sandman

Area VI: Cole Charnock, Meaghann Terrien

DCR: Amy Walker, Barbara McGarry, Scott Ambler, Roland Owens, Jim Echols, Angie Ball

Others:

### **Webinar presentation regarding topo versus NHD layer**

Roland emphasized the importance of not using the streams NHD layer in the module for determining or considering stream perenniality. He gave a presentation showing examples of discrepancy between NHD maps and stream determinations on a USGS topo map.

Additionally, when using this layer in the module, all mapped streams appear as a solid blue line, regardless of perenniality. He suggested to turn this layer off in the table of contents in the module.

To see the presentation, click the “Stream Spatial Data and Perenniality” pdf file under the heading for this meeting at <http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/soil-and-water/rmp-trc-conf-call>

RMP regulations define a perennial stream as a stream mapped as a solid blue line on the USGS topo map or a body of water that flows in a natural or man-made channel year-round during a year of normal precipitation as a result of groundwater discharge or surface runoff. Such stream exhibits the typical biological, hydrological, and physical characteristics commonly associated with the continuous conveyance of water. A perenniality determination is made or confirmed by the RMP developer, but is subject to approval by the TRC. RMP regulations do not specify a method for making a perenniality determination; the RMP developer may use a USGS topo map to make a determination if the TRC agrees. If the stream is mapped intermittent, it is likely that the TRC should either do an on-site assessment or request other evidence to confirm that they agree with the determination. The regulations do not specify the evidence; it could be an assessment tool, local knowledge, photos, etc. If the TRC does not agree with the RMP developer’s determination, this should be stated as part of the plan review.

### **New Transfer of RMP Responsibility Form**

In the case in which an RMP has been developed by one RMP Developer, but the participant would like or needs to have another RMP Developer revise or conduct developer duties

associated with the plan, the participant must complete and submit this form to DCR. The form authorizes DCR to re-assign access to the plan in the module to the new plan developer. The form has been posted under the header “Resources for Plan Developers” at <http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/soil-and-water/rmp>

### **Statement of Ownership**

The following statement of ownership has been added to both the module and to RMP reports. I understand that I am accessing the module for this Resource Management Plan (RMP) on behalf of the owner or operator of the management unit and that in the event such owner or operator elects to select a different certified RMP developer DCR may, in accordance with the written request of the owner or operator and regardless of any contractual obligations between me and such owner or operator or any claims that may arise between the same, assign my access authority to this specific Resource Management Plan to such certified RMP developer and revoke my access to this RMP. I hereby consent to DCR's reassignment of access in such circumstance and waive any and all claims against DCR that may arise in connection with its handling of the RMP module access as described above.

The statement of ownership appears as a checkbox which must be acknowledged by the plan developer when a plan is created. The statement also appears on the cover page of the generated report.

### **Revised Plan Review Checklist**

The Plan Review Checklist has been revised and should be used for conducting plan review from this point forward. One change is the addition of a “missing/deficient” status for each item, with the status “not applicable” now only available for specific items. The “Description of water features” item has been expanded to require more detail from the RMP developer about stream perenniality determination. A statement has been added to which the TRC can respond whether they agree or do not agree with the RMP developer’s stream determination. The existing BMPs item has been expanded to ensure that voluntary BMPs and necessary component data and practice measures are included in the RMP. The soil conservation item was expanded to require a schedule item indicating a cropping system to meet “T”. Other small changes were made and can be viewed in a tracked changes document posted on the TRC webpage.

The revised form has been posted under the header “Resources for Soil and Water Conservation Districts ” at <http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/soil-and-water/rmp>. Both the final revised form and the “tracked changes” version are listed as documents for this conference call on the TRC webpage <http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/soil-and-water/rmp-trc-conf-call>.

### **Questions/Comments**