

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division***ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
DECEMBER 3, 2008**

Kings Park Library
9000 Burke Lake Road
Burke, VA 22015

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the December 3, 2008 Accotink Creek WAG meeting will be available online at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek.htm>].

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County opened the meeting, welcoming the Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) and members of the public in attendance.¹ Juliana Birkhoff, the facilitator, briefly reviewed the meeting objectives and the meeting agenda.² She noted that this was the first of a series of 4-6 meetings of the WAG. She briefly reviewed group expectations.

II. Fairfax County Watershed Planning Process: History, Purpose and Policy Recommendations

Mr. Rose gave the group a brief history of watershed planning in Fairfax County. He also reviewed basic watershed planning terms, such as Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), which is developed for water bodies considered “impaired.” Almost the entire main branch of Accotink Creek is under a TMDL for benthics, bacteria, and PCBs. Mr. Rose recounted that the county had been developing watershed plans since the 1970s, when it had created Master Drainage Plans. However, these plans were only designed to be effective until the county was built out, which had been projected to be in 2000. Currently, the county is about 80 percent built out. Mr. Rose noted it was necessary to develop new plans for a variety of reasons, including to take into account the new development, current regulations, and changes in the understanding of watershed management. He reviewed events since the 1970s for watershed monitoring and planning. He explained that the Accotink Creek WMP is part of the second round of watershed plans. The first round of plans was started in 2003 and encompassed 50 percent of the county’s land area. He explained that the Board of Supervisors had passed a one-penny real estate tax as evidence of the county’s commitment towards watershed protection. This tax provides an average of \$20 million a year for the past four years for stormwater programs.

Mr. Rose informed the group that during the first round of watershed plans, the County had collected approximately 300 policy recommendations, which it is working on characterizing. About a third of those deal with education and outreach. Policy recommendations will be dealt

¹ The list of meeting participants is attached to this meeting summary.

² The meeting agenda is attached to this meeting summary.

with through a concurrent, but separate, planning process then the second round of watershed plans.

Following the presentation, WAG members asked Mr. Rose and other Fairfax County staff questions. The following points were made:

- Currently, there are no official TMDL plans implementation plans for Accotink Creek. The County and the State had considered using the watershed plans being developed as surrogates but decided against it due to legal requirements for approval.
- There is an implementation plan underway for Four Mile Run to deal with bacteria. However, a study found that the majority of the bacterial problem was caused by geese and other wildlife, making it hard to control.
- There is a strong push from the County Board of Supervisors to get projects implemented. The watershed plan that the WAG will help develop will include projects that will be implemented
- In the last watershed planning round, there are many policy recommendations focused on outreach and education, which do not require as much funding but will lead to water quality improvements.

III. Overview of Watershed Planning Process: Timeline for Accotink Creek Plan

Danielle Wynne, Fairfax County, briefly reviewed the timeline for the watershed planning process for Accotink Creek. She said that after the Draft Accotink Creek Watershed Plan was developed and reviewed by the WAG, it would be presented at a second public forum. She encouraged members to attend the Forum and help reach out to members of the community. She noted that the plans have to be completed by December 2009 to meet the County's 2010 deadline under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

IV. Role of Watershed Advisory Group and Participation Guidelines

Dr. Birkhoff then briefly reviewed the Watershed Advisory Group Participation Guidelines that were included in the meeting handouts.³ She asked WAG members to check in with their constituencies and other organizations outside of the meetings to identify other problem areas, issues, and values not represented on the WAG. She noted that because of the size of the Accotink Creek watershed, the planning process for this watershed might take all six possible meetings to complete. She informed the WAG that their role was advisory only. Because there are competing priorities between different watershed plans in the County, the final plan may not include every thing the WAG recommended.

In response to members' questions, Dr. Birkhoff added that the WAG meetings would be located around the watershed, and that the members will be provided clear guidelines for when meetings are cancelled due to inclement weather.

³ For a copy of the Participation Guidelines, please contact Debbie Lee at dlee@resolv.org.

V. Review Current Information on Watershed Characteristics

Bill Frost, KCI, reviewed the characteristics of the Accotink Creek watershed, which were used to develop the Watershed Workbook.⁴ He noted that Accotink Creek has the second largest watershed in Fairfax County. To study the watershed, it was divided up into Watershed Management Areas, and then further divided into subwatersheds.

He noted that because the County was almost completely built out most improvements would come from retrofitting. After reviewing each watershed characteristic, he also provided some conclusions and basic recommendations on how to deal with specific problems in the watershed, and with the watershed as a whole.

Mr. Frost noted the following problems identified during the Issues Forum:

- Overflowing sewers in the watershed, which are potentially a source of bacteria impairment;
- Construction of the Hot Lanes on the west side of the watershed, and issue that needs to be addressed as soon as possible because of construction impacts; and
- Roads flooding in heavy rain, an issue that will be addressed with hydraulic monitoring.

The WAG members asked questions. They discussed the following points:

- The ranking developed for different subwatersheds was land-based. Land use, water quality modeling results, and imperviousness were taken into account.
- Each individual subwatershed was treated individually. The modeling and ranking were concerned with what was occurring in that parcel of land, rather than how that parcel of land affected other areas.
- The County and Fort Belvoir are working closely together to ensure each knows about land use changes and developments.
- Flooding has not been incorporated into the model yet. Mr. Frost invited WAG members to provide specific information on flooding (e.g., date, storm, quantity) to help with the model.
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) systems should be taken into account in the models. Runoff calculations and measures of imperviousness were based on mapping of roads, buildings and parking lots. Water quality calculations incorporate land use and imperviousness.
- County by-right regulations could conflict or negate state stormwater regulations that require Conservation Design. Fairfax County was trying to address that by creating incentive programs for developers, but it will take awhile.
- Traffic engineers should be encouraged to build paths, roads, and parkways that minimize impervious surfaces.
- Silt from erosion upstream can cause buildup downstream. Silt has to be controlled through stormwater management or filters. Erosion can sometimes be dealt with by spot restoration. The goal is to try to balance flow and sediment in the stream to prevent erosion and silt buildup.

⁴ The Watershed Workbook is available online at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek.htm>.

VI. Identify and Discuss Other Watershed Problems

Throughout the meeting, WAG members identified problems and issues in the Accotink Creek watershed. These include:

- Springfield Mall is planning to redevelop. As the Mall is hoping to get zoning permits by January or February, this is an issue that cannot wait for the Watershed Plan to be completed.
- Part of the bacterial problem in the watershed could be addressed by exposing (day lighting) parts of the stream currently in storm drains.
- There is a light industrial area on Port Royal Road that has auto repair operations that could affect the water quality. The Shenandoah Dairy located there has had spills, which go into the waterway.
- VDOT should participate in the watershed planning process. Several WAG members offered to provide names of possible VDOT contacts.
- Street trees have a role in slowing storm water.
- Replanting riparian buffers will not necessarily control stormwater because of the storm drain system.
- The new bridge on Old King Mill Road has sediment problems, even before construction began on the bridge.
- Any stormwater management should also include measures to address water temperature. Shading is one of the possible ways to cool off runoff. Green roofs may be another.
- There has to be means to connect to and engage the general public.

VII. Watershed Planning Next Steps

The next WAG meeting will probably be around February. The Public Involvement Team and the Fairfax County staff will contact members to schedule this meeting. In the meantime, Dr. Birkhoff requested that members continue to provide the Team with information on specific problems and issues in the watershed.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI INC serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact [<Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov>](mailto:Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov) or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Accotink Creek Watershed Plan Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) Meeting #1

December 3, 2008

Kings Park Library

9000 Burke Lake Road, Burke, VA

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/library/branches/kp/>

Agenda

Purpose: Set the stage and begin involving the WAG in the watershed planning process for Accotink Creek, including having the WAG:

- Become aware of the big picture of the watershed planning process;
- Understand their role in the process;
- Develop a common understanding of the current watershed characteristics;
- Identify and discuss problems in the Accotink Creek watershed.

6:30 pm ***Check-in and Light Refreshments***

7:00-7:10 **Welcome and Introductions**

Welcome from Fred Rose

- Participant and team introductions
- Review meeting purpose
- Review agenda
- Review group expectations and participation

*Fred Rose, Fairfax County
Juliana Birkhoff, CBI*

7:10-7:20 **Fairfax County Watershed Planning Process: History, Purpose and Policy Recommendations** *Presentation*

Fred Rose, Fairfax County

7:20-7:30 **Overview of Watershed Planning Process: Timeline for Accotink Creek Plan** *Presentation*

Danielle Wynne, Fairfax County

7:30-7:45 **Role of Watershed Advisory Group and Participation Guidelines** *Presentation and Facilitated Discussion*

Juliana Birkhoff, CBI

- Watershed Advisory Group List
- Watershed Advisory Group Participation Guidelines
- Timeline and potential topics for WAG meetings

7:45-8:30 **Review Current Information on Watershed Characteristics** *Presentation and Facilitated Discussion*

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies

- What do we know about Accotink Creek Watershed
- What problems have been identified (by prior studies, at forum)
- What are the different approaches to preserving and restoring watersheds?

8:30-8:55 **Identify and Discuss Other Watershed Problems** *Facilitated Discussion*

*Bill Frost and Juliana Birkhoff
Watershed Advisory Group*

8:55-9:00 **Watershed Planning Next Steps**

Juliana Birkhoff, CBI

- KCI to complete review of any new issues raised at meeting
- Next meeting in February/March

9:00 **Adjourn**

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek.htm>



Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711

www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds



Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED PLAN
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
DECEMBER 3, 2008**

Meeting Participants

Jim Dewing*
Patty Dietz*
Tom Foley
Johna Gagnon*
Susan Jewell*
Chris Landgraf*
Jim McGlone*
Julie Melear*
Peter Millard*
Paul Makowski*
Duane Murphy*
Don Waye*
Steven Woodbury, AICP

Fairfax County Government Staff:

Fred Rose
Russ Smith
Danielle Wynne

KCI Staff:

Bill Frost
Roger Windschitl

Public Involvement Team:

Juliana Birkhoff, Consensus Building Institute
Jennifer Hicks, Positive Force Consulting
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

***WAG Member**

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division***ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
MARCH 12, 2009**

Oakton Library
10304 Lynnhaven Pl
Oakton, VA 22124

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the March 12, 2009 Accotink Creek WAG meeting will be available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the second meeting of the Accotink Creek Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda.⁵

II. Presentation of Fairfax County Goals

Danielle Wynne, Fairfax County, reviewed the county's goals and objectives for the Watershed Management Planning effort.⁶ She noted there were three overarching goals:

1. Improve and maintain watershed functions in Fairfax County, including water quality, habitat, and hydrology.
2. Protect human health, safety, and property by reducing stormwater impacts.
3. Involve stakeholders in the protection, maintenance and restoration of county watersheds.

For each goal, there are specific objectives that define how to accomplish the goal. The objectives are categorized into hydrology, habitat, stream water quality, drinking water quality, and stewardship. A set of quantifiable indicators will be used to measure how well the objectives are met. Ms. Wynne asked WAG members to let her know if they thought there were any goals or objectives missing from the list.

Ms. Wynne reviewed expectations for the next advisory group meetings. She told the group that the next few WAG meetings will focus on project identification and prioritization.

In response to a question, Ms. Wynne stated that the Watershed Management Plan is not the same as the TMDL implementation plan, which is being developed at the same time for a portion

⁵ The list of meeting participants is attached to this meeting summary. A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm.

⁶ A copy of the Fairfax County Goals and Objectives is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm.

of the Accotink Creek mainstem. She added that the two are separate plans with different goals and that one is not meant to replace the other.

III. Problem Areas and Subwatershed Ranking

Bill Frost, KCI, identified common problem areas across the watershed and reviewed subwatershed rankings results. He explained how the county's goals and objectives related to watershed impact indicators and source indicators, both of which were inputs for the ranking procedure. He reviewed how several indicators in the Accotink Creek watershed were measured and showed maps that categorized subwatersheds by indicators

The WAG broke to look at detailed maps of the watershed.

IV. Restoration Approaches

Mr. Frost explained the stages the county would go through to develop watershed restoration projects. First, KCI will investigate each problem site, then they will evaluate them for possible feasibility, and finally they would take the highest priority projects to a concept design. He briefly reviewed some restoration approaches and the benefits from each. He also reviewed the criteria used in the evaluation stage to determine priority sites. He noted that in past watershed plans, many potential sites have been dropped because the construction impacts from the restoration project cause more harm than the benefits from the restoration.

He discussed stormwater management retrofits, adding that sometimes the planner can implement a "treatment train"; when there is a series of onsite retrofits and downstream ponds. In many cases, the upstream facilities can be rebuilt for water quality and the downstream ponds can be rebuilt for retention.

The group asked questions and discussed the presentation. During the discussion, participants made the following points:

- A question was asked about the impact of the pending economic stimulus package. The watershed management plans from the second round would not be complete in time to receive money from the stimulus. Some projects from the first six watershed plans, however, were submitted for the stimulus package.
- Culvert retrofits can be designed so they would not be a fish barrier. Most culvert retrofits are on smaller intermittent or ephemeral channels.
- Stream restoration usually requires a wide right-of-way or easement in order to work. If a streambank is close to a property line, stabilization rather than restoration is usually done.
- The initial investigation resulted in potential projects in at least a third of the land area of Accotink Creek watershed. These projects will be scattered across the watershed unless the county and the WAG think a triage approach is better and focus projects in one area.
- The county may want to consider retrofitting culverts using openings at different elevations, with a small baseflow opening and higher floodplain openings. This reduces or eliminates sedimentation in the culvert and a clear "hungry" water discharge that can induce erosion downstream.

Greg Hoffman, Center for Watershed Protection, discussed the preliminary analysis of restoration and preservation opportunities. The Center started with a list of 400 ponds, outfalls, culverts, impervious areas, schools, churches, and other public properties. They narrowed this list down to 300 sites for field reconnaissance. Mr. Hoffman reviewed why those were opportunities for project sites and what the benefits were.

The group asked questions and discussed Mr. Hoffman's presentation. During the discussion, individuals made the following points:

- The county may want to consider a policy recommendation for a green roof tax credit.
- Restoring the biota to the watershed is the ultimate goal, but in order to reach that point, the county must first restore the water flow and water quality to create habitat. It will take years to have a healthy benthic community again.
- A series of reference stream surveys in Prince William Park may offer as close to an intact watershed system as possible.
- There are tradeoffs. The WAG and the county should discuss if it is better to restore areas that are truly impaired or try to maintain pristine areas in order to maintain a population reservoir.

V. Subwatershed Strategy

Mr. Frost discussed approaches to the subwatershed prioritization strategy for Accotink Creek. He offered three examples for discussion:

- Subwatersheds with improvement potential;
- Retrofit sites with highest feasibility; and
- WMAs with best turnaround.

The WAG discussed the tradeoffs that must be made to decide on sites. Members suggested other criteria for determining project sites:

- Focus on preserving pristine areas first, move to the really impaired areas where restoration would be most effective, and finally to some areas in the middle. One member argued that once the really pristine areas are degraded, it would be nearly impossible to restore them.
- Identify very impaired subwatersheds (black on the map) for which only one factor is causing such a poor ranking. If that one factor is addressed, that subwatershed could be improved enough to move into another ranking.
- Identify areas where future development will be unlikely so that any work done in those subwatersheds would not be undone once developed.
- Identify project sites with a high degree of visibility and opportunity for education, such as churches and schools.
- Identify locations which are slightly impaired, which can be restored and expand the population reservoir.
- Identify hotspots using unified subwatershed and site reconnaissance (USSR) and unified stream assessment (USA) protocols.

- Identify other capital improvement projects that are planned that could negatively impact watershed health (e.g., paving of the cross-county trail along the stream). If the county could stop the project or find alternatives, that would be better.
- Identify areas where shared easements for trails are a possibility (e.g., Sewage Authority land).
- Identify areas slated for development. However, county staff informed the WAG that this could be difficult. The county has an opportunity to work with developers during rezoning applications but does not usually know of development plans until the application is submitted.

One WAG member suggested looking at the zoning regulations in the parts of the watershed that are good, and working to maintain those as a preservation strategy.

During the discussion, Ms. Wynne informed the group that many policy recommendations from the first six watershed plans included incentives to encourage communities to build more sensitively. This is something the county will explore for feasibility. She added that the county also has a shared permit with the school system, so there is an opportunity there to work with the schools to implement new and innovative technologies. The school system includes watersheds and stormwater in its curriculum; county staff already gives talks to high schools every year and every middle school is required to have a meaningful watershed experience.

One WAG member suggested the county consider daylighting outfall pipes back about twenty feet and installing a detention box, which can dissipate water. That along with plantings along the bank would go a long way towards reestablishing the biota. By daylighting an existing pipe, the county has no need for an environmental permit because no natural streams or wetlands would be disturbed.

VI. Next Steps

The WAG will next meet in mid-April. In the meantime, the consultants are going to perform additional field reconnaissance and start prioritizing sites. The county promised to send the members PDFs of the maps displayed at the meeting, and asked that the members look over them in more detail and provide any comments on proposed project types.

A few WAG members requested a field visit for photographs of retrofits, and an idea of successes and failures.

Prior to the next meeting, the county will send the WAG members a list of possible project sites to review and for discussion at the meeting.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI INC serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED PLAN
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
MARCH 12, 2009**

Meeting Participants

Jim Dewing*
Courtney Gleason
Susan Jewell*
Susan Jones *
Chris Landgraf*
Phil Latasa*
Peter Millard *
Don Waye*

Fairfax County Government Staff:

Craig Carinci
Danielle Wynne

Engineering Staff:

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies
Greg Hoffman, Center for Watershed Protection

Public Involvement Team:

Juliana Birkhoff, Consensus Building Institute
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

***WAG Member**

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division***ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
MAY 14 & 28, 2009**

Kingstowne Library
6500 Landsdowne Centre
Alexandria, VA 22315-5011

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the May 14 & 28, 2009 Accotink Creek WAG meetings will be available online at

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the third meeting of the Accotink Creek Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda.⁷ This third meeting was divided into two parts: the first on May 14th, and the second on May 28th. Both meetings have been included in this meeting summary.

II. Subwatershed Strategy

Bill Frost, KCI, summarized for the group how the county developed the Subwatershed Strategy. At the second WAG meeting, members had provided the county with three criteria for determining which subwatersheds to focus effort on:

- Focus on preserving pristine areas first. Once degraded, it is nearly impossible to restore them. Follow with improvements to highly impaired areas, then to those in between.
- Identify locations which are only slightly impaired, which could be restored to expand the population reservoir.
- Identify highly impaired watersheds where only one factor (indicator) is causing the poor ranking and address the single cause.

Based on those criteria and the county's own goals and objectives, KCI developed the following four preservation/restoration strategies to identify target subwatersheds:

1. Preservation of pristine areas by focusing on subwatersheds with less than 50 percent urban land cover;
2. Restoration of areas that are only slightly impaired by focusing on subwatersheds with ten to 25 percent total impervious area;
3. Retrofit poorly ranked areas by focusing on subwatersheds with a composite score of less than 83 (the worst 40 percent of the subwatersheds);

⁷ The list of meeting participants is attached to this meeting summary. A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm.

4. Retrofit high priority problem areas by focusing on subwatersheds with an indicator worse than the 80th percentile values.

There are subwatersheds that fall into more than one of those areas.

Mr. Frost took the WAG through a demonstration of a particular subwatershed in Long Branch Central, AC-LB-0005, to illustrate how the project team looked at each of the flagged subwatersheds.

III. Potential Retrofit Sites

Mr. Frost explained how the county identified potential retrofit sites using four groups of indicators to help identify problem areas. These four groups were:

- Stormwater runoff impacts, which looked at stream degradation;
- Flooding hazards, which looked at flooding;
- Habitat health, which looked at terrestrial and riparian habitat; and
- Drinking water quality, which looked at the quality of runoff water.

Data for the four indicator groups came mainly from monitoring, field work, mapping, or watershed modeling.

Mr. Frost used AC-LB-0005, as an example of how KCI determined what types of retrofit projects might be appropriate in a subwatershed.

WAG members discussed and asked questions about the presentation. During the discussion, the following points were made:

- Permeable pavers are one option for replacing the surface of parking lots.
- The county will try and retrofit culverts for storage at dry or ephemeral portions of the stream so fish passage would not be an issue. At some point, though, the county will try to look at fish migration routes being blocked – this is usually indicative of a series of things that need to be fixed.
- To retrofit a dry pond to a wet pond, the channel is removed and replaced with a meandering flow path, and the bottom is graded with differing elevations. A good solution is to convert the dry pond into a marsh with a ten foot wide safety buffer and vegetated over completely. This would allow for the ecological benefits of the wetland to treat stormwater by sediment settling and nutrient uptake.
- There are jurisdictional issues between Fairfax County and VDOT when retrofits overlap with VDOT roads. It is an issue that is currently being discussed. The question of who maintains the site is another issue.
- In order to have an impact on the wider scale, the projects have to be more systematic or programmatic.
- Long-term maintenance of projects is included as part of the county's plan.
- The county does partner with groups, including the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District, as much as possible.
- KCI has not looked at potential road crossing projects yet.

One WAG member noted that culverts have traditionally been designed to follow design standards that did not allow for low flow to pass through, which may lead to sedimentation, flooding, and degradation downstream. Ecological design acknowledges that culverts should have passages of varying heights. Retrofitting culverts is a fix that can have significant downstream impact without having to gain access to those downstream areas for restoration projects.

Most culvert projects in Fairfax would be under VDOT's jurisdiction, and in order to do those, the county would need to partner with VDOT, which is constrained by money at the moment. For VDOT, if there is no need to retrofit a culvert for safety reasons, it would not be a priority. One county representative stated that VDOT design standards would need to change for ecological designed culverts to become the norm, and that is slow process. The county can note the need for a policy change in the watershed plan to address culvert design standards, and partnering with VDOT to address culvert retrofits as culverts come up for maintenance or repair.

IV. Stream Restoration

Mr. Frost briefly reviewed the procedure for identifying potential stream restoration sites. KCI stream restoration designers used data and field photos from the Stream Physical Assessment to identify potential project sites. Public input from the Issues Forum and WAG meetings also played a part in site selection. The list was narrowed down based on feasibility, which was determined by field assessment of the sites.

V. Breakout Sessions

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed depicting potential projects. Individuals offered the following comments:

1. Daniels Run Elementary School would possibly be open to a project at the school
2. At Kay Court and Winterset Drive, a storm drain outfall is badly eroded but should be fixable. The houses downstream are in danger from the erosion.
3. There are two large storm water ponds that could be retrofitted, but they are not on the list of potential projects.
4. In AC-LA-0085-R04, there are no labeled potential retrofits but there is a new high rise building being built that could be addressed with retrofit opportunities.
5. Near the main steam, Crestwood Elementary School would be receptive to working with the county on retrofit opportunities.
6. The county needs to look at institutional sites at the next round more programmatically. Large parking lots should be a priority.
7. The redevelopment of Springfield Mall would be a huge opportunity for retrofits. The mall parking lot drains into Long Branch.
8. There are abandoned industrial sites that should be looked at. Why is the property not being used? In that same area, there are reforestation strips which show potential for further restoration.
9. The Richard Byrd Library is being renovated and is a year away from being completed. There may be some potential retrofit opportunities there.

10. The county needs to work with VDOT on retrofitting culverts to better enhance water quality. Large culverts that were designed because of VDOT safety standards should be retrofitted to handle low-flow, which will allow for fish passage and reduce flooding.
11. The county needs to work with VDOT to address the impact of the HOT Lanes of I-495.
12. There is a remnant magnolia bog near the headwaters. That is an important preservation opportunity on park land.
13. There is a stormwater outfall from Springfield Plaza which is causing scouring. There is no evidence of any life downstream.
14. In AC-AC-0210-S01, there is severe erosion that needs to be addressed. It is also a dumping site.
15. AC-AC-0085-R03 details a project to save trees south of the golf course. Those trees are already gone.
16. In AC-AC-0070, there is a homeowners association ready to channelize the stream to address flooding. It would welcome public partnerships and guidance on how to better implement a project to prevent flooding. That HOA also has a vacant lot it is willing to turn over to the county. This area is adjacent to parkland.
17. In AC-AC-0145 and AC-AC-0160 in the eastern part of the Accotink Mainstem 6, there is HOA land and the HOA is supportive of having projects on its land. The community is very concerned about erosion.

VI. Next Steps

Fred Rose, Fairfax County, noted that he believes there will be significant change in requirements within the next five years because of pressure from multiple sides. He is hopeful that the county can require and enforce better treatment and that regulation and standards would have shifted to be ecological. Mr. Frost added that Virginia's new stormwater regulations will be among the best in the country. He noted that in the next five years, redevelopment would greatly improve stormwater management because developers would put in stormwater controls where there are not any and update existing controls.

The WAG will next meet in early July. Because of the changing library hours, county staff asked WAG members to provide alternate meeting locations if possible.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED PLAN
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
MAY 14 & 28, 2009**

Meeting Participants

Jim Dewing*
Johna Gagnon
Courtney Gleason
Susan Jewell*
Susan Jones *
Chris Landgraf*
Phil Latasa*
Julie Melear
Paul Makowski
Peter Millard *
Don Waye*

Fairfax County Government Staff:

Fred Rose
Russ Smith
Danielle Wynne

Engineering Staff:

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies
Bill Medina, KCI Technologies

Public Involvement Team:

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

***WAG Member**

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division***ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
APRIL 13, 2010, 6:30-9:00 p.m.**

West Springfield District Supervisors Office
6140 Rolling Road, Springfield VA

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the April 13, 2010 Accotink Creek WAG meeting is available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, the meeting facilitator, opened the fourth meeting of the Accotink Creek Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.⁸

II. Process Update

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Mr. Rose reported the progress of the overall watershed planning process to WAG members, indicating that the process is well on the way. The County will send the final plan to the Board of Supervisors by the end of the year. Mr. Rose highlighted the county's watershed management system (WMS) database, which will help the County use resources efficiently. The County will use the system to track project implementation progress.

Following Mr. Rose's process update, WAG members asked questions. During the discussion, Mr. Rose made the following points in response to participants' questions:

- Each watershed management plan has a unique project list. The WMS is flexible to maximize coordination with other watersheds and watershed plans.
- Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) are a state responsibility. There is uncertainty whether or not regional priorities (such as the Chesapeake Bay) will supersede individual watershed management goals; however, the water quality goals in the Watershed Management Plan (WMP) are generally consistent with the ones that are expected to be required in the TMDL plans.
- TMDL implementation plans are separate from WMPs. However, it is anticipated that the WMP recommendations will work in concert towards an effective overall watershed strategy.
 - The Accotink Creek Benthic Macroinvertebrate TMDL is expected to be approved in May 2010

⁸ The list of meeting participants is attached to this meeting summary. A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm.

III. Project Prioritization Process

Structural Projects

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies Inc., summarized how the County developed its project prioritization process, how KCI identified the list of potential projects, and how composite ranking scores, along with WAG feedback, will lead to the finalized project rankings for the 10-year and 25-year project lists.

Mr. Frost explained the preliminary project ranking process. KCI performed project site visits to narrow down the initial list of over 510 potential project sites. Projects which were deemed low priority or not viable were removed from the ranking.

KCI then ranked the remaining projects using a composite ranking score. This score was developed from five individual scoring factors with weighted percentages:

- effect on subwatershed impact indicators (30%)
- effect on subwatershed source indicators (30%)
- location within priority subwatersheds (10%)
- sequencing - upstream or downstream (20%)
- implementability (10%)

KCI adjusted the final composite rankings using Best Professional Judgment (BPJ) to account for non-quantifiable variables. Mr. Frost gave WAG members examples of those variables including; channel morphology, number of road hazards, residential and non-residential building hazards, channelized/piped streams, and stream bank buffer deficiency. Finally, KCI consolidated projects together that require coordination and have a planning level minimum cost of \$80,000. The final list has 224 projects; 131 to be included in the 10-year implementation plan and 93 for the 25-year implementation plan. KCI used GIS mapping technology to plot the projects that made the 25-year cut. These maps are available through a *Google Maps*⁹ interface and static maps are available on the county's website.¹⁰

After discussing the completed steps listed above, Mr. Frost discussed the final steps KCI will take to adjust the project rankings.

1. Include WAG input from this meeting to adjust the project prioritization rankings.
2. Secondary field visits to collect concept-level design information.
3. Estimate benefits for each project.

After explaining the structural project prioritization process, Mr. Frost handed the presentation over to Greg Hoffman of the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) to discuss non-structural projects.

Non-structural projects

Mr. Hoffman discussed how non-structural projects are being included in the project

⁹ Accotink Creek North: <http://is.gd/bznHt> Accotink Creek South: <http://is.gd/bznJ6>

¹⁰ http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

prioritization process. He informed the group that CWP will group and prioritize the 545 potential non-structural projects separately from the structural projects. Mr. Hoffman clarified that non-structural projects are fundamentally different from structural projects; in general, they do not have an exact location or construction burden. These types of projects often have an area focus and area wide impacts. Mr. Hoffman reported that CWP used two surveys to identify non-structural projects: the Neighborhood Source Assessment and the Hotspot Site Investigation. He concluded his presentation by describing impairments and project types to WAG members.

Facilitated Discussion

Following the presentations, WAG members asked questions. During the discussion, the presenters and County representatives made the following points in response to participant questions:

- Area wide drainage improvements include projects that use stormwater management throughout a particular area, such as tree boxes, inlet filters, or custom bioretention in the utility strip. Most of these projects focus on quality control. Some of these types of projects can also improve quantity control (i.e., tree boxes).
- Downspout disconnections are projects that redirect water onto a lawn or a buffer area, instead of directly from a roof to a driveway, then to the street and storm drain system. This approach focuses on treating runoff at the source.
- Street sweeping is a state responsibility on state roads.
 - A participant voiced concern that the type of sweeper is critical and that some street sweepers are not an effective water quality control mechanism. While they effectively remove large debris from roadways, they cannot collect fine sediment which is a major contributor to poor water quality.
- A participant voiced concern over roadside maintenance operations that have the potential to spread the seeds of invasive species. This was recognized by the County staff, who stated that before purchasing maintenance equipment, the County evaluates the equipment's impact on the spread of invasive species.
- The watershed management plan will include both structural and non-structural projects.

Juliana Birkhoff concluded this segment of the meeting by conveying the importance of WAG members' input to assist the project team in refining the project rankings for the final implementation plans.

Project Comments: Breakout Groups

Participants divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed depicting potential projects.¹¹ The project ranking list¹² distributed to the WAG lists the project ID number, proposed action before site visit, final action after site visit, brief description of the project, scores for each of the five factors, composite prioritization score, the project rank, and which schedule (10-year/25-year) the project falls into. KCI identified projects using alphabetical subletters to indicate grouped projects (ex; AC-AC-0270-R04A). County representatives asked participants to focus their feedback during the breakout session on non-structural projects, which

¹¹ These project maps can be found online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

¹² The project rankings can be found online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

are currently not available using the mapping feature online. Juliana Birkhoff informed the group that the County will accept additional feedback for two weeks following this meeting.

Participants offered the following general comments:

- County Coordination:
 - A participant recommended that the park authority enforce a policy on fertilizers and herbicides on park property to avoid water quality degradation.
 - One WAG member noted that the County could use road salt distribution data to identify areas that require street sweeping or focused efforts in the warmer seasons.
 - Future redevelopment projects should be coordinated with County watershed management activities to increase their impact throughout subwatershed/watershed areas.
 - The participant noted a need for increased communications between the County department of planning and watershed management offices.
- Outreach and Education:
 - Participants approved of outreach programs and would like to see these programs expanded once there is measurable project or program success.
 - Participants emphasized the importance of keeping non-structural projects in mind when collaborating with community groups.
 - Participants suggested using all the Fairfax County schools for projects. These projects should be paired with education/outreach programs; schools are more likely to result in changes, and children are more accepting.
 - WAG members suggested a coordinated countywide media campaign announcing the watershed plan's approval and highlighting specific projects and/or project types.
 - A WAG member suggested that the County label stormwater drains near hotspots as no charity car-wash areas.
 - Stream corridor "no dumping" signs should be changed to read "no dumping including lawn clippings, Christmas trees, or leaves"

Individuals offered the following location specific comments:

- AC-AC-0105-R03 – The parking lot north of this location has rust colored staining from the building to the storm inlet.
- AC-AC-0145-R01A / AC-AC-0145-R02 – This stream corridor is owned by Daventry Community Association and the park authority. Good place for conservation and preservation activities.
- AC-AC-0160-S01 – Daventry Community Association owns this property, which is a permanent conservation area. This would be a good place to do habitat restoration or preservation activities.
- AC-AC-0240-R03 – This project is one very large outflow pipe. A participant noted that this would be good; however, it only drains a portion of the whole neighborhood. The County should consider the outflow for the whole neighborhood when designing this project.

- A participant noted that the Daventry Community Association owns the streambed south of *Hunter Village DR*. The participant suggested this would be a good location for retrofit or treatment projects.
- Green Springs Gardens Park is a conservation area, and good place for conservation practices in a natural wildlife setting.
- Lake Accotink:
 - A participant expressed a need for more projects in the headwaters of Lake Accotink, near project AC-AC-0235 R01. This is currently marked as an area wide project, but should be replaced with location specific projects.
 - A participant noted that dam restoration activities have resulted in poor water quality downstream. The participant suggested that the park authority should enforce construction management practices, including sediment control.
- Parks regularly mows the *Nottoway Park field*, which is rarely used. A participant suggested planting or reforestation as an alternative to mowing.
- A participant noted that the owner of the Cardinal Forest Shell station on *Old Key Mill and Rolling Road* hosts charity car washes and power washes the station's driveway. All of the runoff flows into one storm drain next to the service station.
- A VDOT representative noted that the green area *between Fort Belvoir and Gerardia CT* will no longer be coded "green." This area will be used for ramp expansion resulting in a drastic change to the landscape.
- A VDOT representative described a right of way on *Commerce Street*, which could hold a stormwater pond if the County would fund the project.

Participants felt KCI should rank the following projects higher:

- AC-HB-0005-R01 – The paved parking lot at this location is underutilized. Tree islands or other stormwater management in and around the parking lot would have a direct impact on Hunter's Branch.
- AC-HB-0025-R03b – Participants thought this was a good project location adjacent to Park Drive, and is natural park land near headwaters. However, participants noted that this area does not drain well, and would not be a good location for bioretention projects.
 - There is a large duck population in the area.
 - One WAG member suggested buffer expansion projects.
- AC-AC-0160-R02A – This school is a good place outreach and educational programs. One WAG member noted that the PTA is very active with knowledgeable parents who are likely to participate in watershed outreach/education initiatives.
- Projects that breakdown impervious surface for replacement with pervious surface.
 - A participant noted that breakdown of concrete stream channels cement swales is a project type requiring limited resources in return for a big impact.

Projects participants disapproved of or thought would not be viable:

- AC-LA-0050-T01– Look for BRAC redevelopment.
- AC-LC-005/6-R01 – The mosaic district will be redeveloped.
- AC-LA-0075-N01 – Redevelopment is imminent, however the current developer recently pulled out.
- AC-AC-0375-R01 – The Dewberry community is currently being redeveloped.
- Lewin Park is currently being re-developed.

Participants noted the following mapping concerns;

- One WAG member requested that the County post maps with project numbers overlaid on a street map should be posted online.
- A participant suggested that the map legend should explain the alphanumeric code associated with each projects site.

Next Steps

WAG members were encouraged to share the online resources with their communities. The County will accept feedback until May 3, 2010. Please send additional feedback (including the project ranking and ID number) to Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org). KCI will consider WAG member feedback and refine the 10-year and 25-year plans. We will distribute the final ranking to WAG members before the next meeting in July. The meeting will provide an opportunity for WAG feedback on the draft watershed plan. The County will distribute the draft plan in electronic/CD format, and also make the plan available in public libraries and supervisor's offices in the Accotink Creek watershed.

The final public meeting will be in late August or early September to introduce the final plan to the public for feedback. WAG members are encouraged to begin considering targeting members and groups in their communities to attend the public forum. The County will also use a targeted postcard campaign to attract participants to the public meeting.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED PLAN
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
April 13, 2010**

Meeting Participants+

Rose Bourrie
Martin Chang SWPD
Patty Dietz*
Lauren Diperna
Jim Dewing*
Johna Gagnon*
Susan Jewell*
Susan Jones *
Phil Latasa*
Jim McGlone*
Julie Melear*
Kris Unger
Paul Makowski*
Don Waye*

Fairfax County Staff

Fred Rose
Russ Smith
Danielle Wynne

Engineering Team

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Greg Hoffman, Center for Watershed Protection

Public Involvement Team

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Jason Gershowitz, RESOLVE

*WAG member

+ If you attended the meeting and are not listed as attending, please inform Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org) and he will add you to the list.

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
SEPTEMBER 13, 2010

Fairfax High School – Classroom J136
3501 Rebel Run | Fairfax, VA 22030

I. Welcome and Introductions

[The presentation from the September 13, 2010 Accotink Creek WAG meeting will be online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, opened the fifth meeting of the Accotink Creek Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.¹³

II. Watershed Planning Update

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Government, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and helping the county develop the draft watershed management plan. He encouraged WAG members to stay involved as the County finishes the draft watershed management plan and begins to implement projects. Mr. Rose explained that the overall watershed planning process is almost finished. The county will send the final plan to the Board of Supervisors by the end of the year or early in 2011. Mr. Rose said the County would use a new tool to prioritize and select projects County-wide as they implement the 13 watershed plans. This tool will help the County to identify the most effective projects to use resources efficiently, meet budget needs, meet regulatory requirements, and achieve watershed objectives.

Mr. Rose emphasized that the County is adopting an adaptive management approach to track progress against TMDL regulatory requirements. Individual projects will contribute to meeting TMDL pollutant reduction targets for the Chesapeake Bay and other impaired waters.

III. Overview of the Draft Watershed Management Plan

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies, Inc. summarized the organizational structure and components of the draft watershed management plan.¹⁴ He reviewed the following components of the draft plan:

i. Executive Summary

1. Introduction to the Watershed

The introduction includes background information for the Accotink Creek watershed and current plans for watershed management.

¹³ Meeting participant list - attached to this meeting summary. A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

¹⁴ The complete draft watershed management plan and appendices are available on the County website. Information for submitting comments is also available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

2. Watershed Planning Process

Mr. Frost informed WAG members that this section introduces watersheds and watershed planning. This section also includes County goals and objectives, along with the indicators used for scoring, the sub watershed ranking procedure, and the watershed modeling procedure. WAG members can also find information regarding the public involvement plan in this section.

3. Summary of Watershed Conditions

This section includes a summary of the watershed workbook, which provided an overall assessment of watershed characteristics. The workbook included analysis of land use, existing treatment, data from the County's physical stream assessment, upland reconnaissance of pollutant sources, and watershed modeling to identify and rank issues and problems throughout the watershed.

4. Summary of Watershed Restoration Strategies

This section summarizes watershed management strategies in relation to County goals and objectives. Mr. Frost informed WAG members that the descriptions of each project type (both structural and non-structural) are in this section. This section also includes a master list of proposed projects and the project selection and ranking process.

5. WMA Restoration Strategies

Mr. Frost informed WAG members that this section includes project lists by Watershed Management Area (WMA.) He informed WAG members that they could find individual project descriptions for structural and non-structural projects in both the 10-year and 11-25-year lists in this section. This section also includes a map of project locations by WMA. Project fact sheets for the 10-year projects are also available at the end of this section.

Mr. Frost reviewed a project fact sheet with WAG members. Each fact sheet includes the project's location, land owner(s), costs, control type, drainage area, and receiving waters. The fact sheets also include a description of the project, its benefits, design considerations, a detailed project area map, and an aerial photo of the project area. Project designs are limited to concept level considerations, and do not include specific design details.

6. Benefits of Plan Implementation

This section includes results of project modeling including existing conditions, future conditions without projects, and future conditions with projects by WMA and watershed. The section also describes the overall cost estimate for implementing the plan.

Appendices

Mr. Frost reviewed the appendices. The appendices include; A: *Watershed Workbook* with information and modeling results from the beginning of the planning process, B: *Technical Documents* describing sub watershed strategies, priorities for potential projects, and the model data collection, and C: *Public Involvement* records and summaries.

IV. Process Recap

Mr. Frost reviewed the project selection process. KCI started with over 500 potential project sites. Project staff conducted field reconnaissance to assess feasibility and constraints to select projects for the watershed management plan. KCI consolidated individual projects with a cost

under \$80,000 into grouped projects. He reviewed the project evaluation process, which included WAG input on potential project sites. Mr. Frost also reviewed the project prioritization process. He indicated that the draft plan includes 120 projects for 10-year implementation, 97 projects for 11-25 year implementation, and 28 non-structural project opportunities.

V. General Discussion and Project Comments: Breakout Groups

General Discussion

WAG members asked questions and discussed general aspects of the draft watershed management plan. Staff participated in the discussion highlighting several key points:

- Project staff have not consulted private property owners at the concept level. KCI identified the best locations for projects regardless of property ownership. As the County selects and funds projects, staff will consult landowners as a customary part of the design process.
- The County mailed over 9000 postcards to landowners of properties with proposed projects, and landowners of adjacent parcels, informing them of the potential projects near their properties and the opportunities for public comment on the draft plan.
- County staff exhibited interest in increasing inter-agency communication to help agencies identify and act on opportunities for projects during construction and development. For example, a VDOT representative expressed interest in identifying project opportunities during the funding phase of VDOT project planning. He indicated that once the funding phase has passed, it is difficult for VDOT to add in additional project aspects.
- The County's public comment system sends automated notifications when the website has received comments. County staff will contact members of the public for clarification if necessary.
- Although KCI identified specific locations for non-structural projects in the draft watershed management plan, going forward, the County will group non-structural projects into County-wide programs. Many WAG members exhibited interest in collaborating with the County on a demonstration project. County staff informed WAG members that these locations might be good for this purpose. The County is excited about opportunities for community participation during plan implementation. Please contact Danielle Wynne with suggested partnerships and project opportunities (Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov.)
- Several members of the public identified a sediment control problem at Lake Accotink. County staff agreed to pass on this concern to the appropriate project manager.
- The County will integrate project and watershed data with their enterprise GIS database. This database will assist other County departments such as Planning and Zoning in identifying project opportunities related to proposed developments under review.
- A WAG member commented on the potential for spreading invasive species during construction. As part of the design process, the County will consider native species and best practices to prevent invasive species spreading as they develop more detailed project plans.

Project Comments: Breakout Groups

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed with potential projects. Comments Included:

- AC9225 – This project has significant tree removal. One WAG member suggested limiting tree removal as much as possible during all project construction.
- WAG members liked maps that include road listings and buildings on the 10-year project fact sheets.
- County staff encouraged WAG members to submit corrections for any address errors found in the project fact sheets.
- Projects coded in red on the map are 10-year projects, and have project fact sheets. Projects coded in black are 11-25-year projects and do not have fact sheets at this time. Section 5 of the Draft Plan summarizes the 11-25-year projects.
- A VDOT representative pointed out a lack of culvert-retrofits in the lower portion of the watershed. He shared that culvert retrofits are easy partnership projects for VDOT.

VI. Next Steps and Draft Plan Forum

Danielle Wynne, Fairfax County, reviewed the next steps for finalizing and implementing the draft watershed management plan. The County will accept comments on the draft watershed management plan during a 30-day public comment period. The comment period will begin at the Public Forum on September 21, and last until October 21. WAG members should contact Juliana Birkhoff (jbirkhoff@resolv.org) if they would like any assistance in reaching out to their communities to attend the public forum. If WAG members have additional feedback they should note the project ID number (if applicable) and send comments to Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org) or County staff (watersheds@fairfaxcounty.gov.)

KCI will review comments and feedback from an interagency review and revise the draft watershed management plan.

Public opportunities for submitting comments include:

- at the Public Forum on September 21 at Fairfax High School
- via the County's [Accotink Creek](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov) website
- via mail to the Stormwater Planning Division at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 449 Fairfax VA 22035
- via email to watersheds@fairfaxcounty.gov
- Or by Fax 703-802-5955 or Phone 703-324-5500, TTY 711.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact [<Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov>](mailto:Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov) or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
JULY 21, 2010**

Meeting Participants+

Patty Dietz*
Robert Iosco*
Susan Jewell*
Chris Landgraf*
Philip Latasa*
Jonathon Saums
Michael Sollosi
Kris Unger

Fairfax County Staff

Fred Rose
Russ Smith
Danielle Wynne

Engineering Team

Bill Frost, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Greg Hoffman, Center for Watershed Protection

Public Involvement Team

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Jason Gershowitz, RESOLVE

***WAG member**

+ If you attended the meeting and are not listed as attending, please inform Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org) and he will add you to the list.

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division***ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED WORKSHOP
OCTOBER 7, 2008****West Springfield High School
6100 Rolling Road
Springfield, VA 22152****I. Welcome and Introductions**

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County opened the meeting, welcoming the members of the public in attendance. He noted that the County had planned to complete the development of its watershed management plans in two rounds. Each round would encompass 50% of the County's land area. In the first, already completed, round, plans were developed for eleven of the County's thirty watersheds. In the second, ongoing, round, the County plans to develop seven plans to cover the remaining 19 watersheds. Mr. Rose said that while the plans in the first round was completed consecutively, in the second round the plans would be completed concurrently to meet the 2010 deadline set by the Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

Mr. Rose noted that tonight's meeting was the second public forum for the second round. He reassured meeting participants that the County has allotted funding for this program and the development of the watershed management plans would continue.

Mr. Rose then introduced Penelope Gross, the Mason District Supervisor and chair for the Fairfax County Environmental Committee. Ms. Gross started out stating there was a lot of work to do, adding that the work would be both time consuming and expensive. She recounted how the first watershed plans developed by the County had a 25-30 year timeline, which while needed, was too big to handle. The current watershed plans will provide short term recommendations.

Ms. Gross then informed the group of the County's strong environmental commitment. In June 2004, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the first ever 20-year Environmental Vision plan for Fairfax County. In 2007, the County led the nation in developing the Cool Counties Program, which was presented at the National Association of Counties annual conference and adopted by counties nationwide.

Ms. Gross argued that the key to improving the Chesapeake Bay was to improve the health of the local watersheds which people care about, which is why Fairfax County's work in developing watershed management plans is so important. She said she looked forward to hearing the comments of the meeting participants, eventually seeing the Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) recommendations, and getting projects going on the ground.

Mr. Rose then introduced Juliana Birkhoff, the public forum facilitator. She reviewed the meeting agenda and introduced the teams of Fairfax County staff, technical consultants, and facilitators.

II. Slide Show

Watershed Primer: An Introduction

Danielle Wynne of the Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division then gave a background presentation to the group. She gave the group the definition of a “watershed” and informed them that the Accotink Creek watershed was nested within the Potomac River watershed, which was nested within the 64,000 square mile Chesapeake Bay watershed. She then noted that for the purpose of data collection, Accotink Creek watershed was divided into eighteen watershed management areas of 2-4 square miles, which were then further broken down into parcels of approximately 100 acres each.

Ms. Wynne stated that watershed planning consists of stormwater management and public education. As Fairfax County was developed, the amount of impervious surface increased. These impervious surfaces increased both the volume and the velocity of stormwater runoff. Stormwater management attempts to mitigate this extra volume and velocity using a variety of tools and techniques, including a stormwater drainage system or installation of dry and wet ponds.

Watershed plans are developed in order to restore and protect bio-natural resources, and to positively impact the quality of drinking water, human health, and the health of the environment.

Ms. Wynne then listed the five main steps of the watershed planning process:

- Evaluate the data to determine the state of the watersheds;
- Identify the issues the plan will address;
- Establish a vision for the watershed and goals that improve, enhance, and protect the watershed;
- Develop specific actions to achieve the goals; and
- Create a framework and timeframe for implementation.

Watershed Workbook

Bill Frost of KCI then presented a brief overview of the watershed characterization of Accotink Creek watershed. He listed the following three watershed goals for Fairfax County:

- Improve and maintain watershed functions in Fairfax County, including water quality, habitat, and hydrology.
- Protect human health, safety, and property by reducing stormwater impacts.
- Involve stakeholders in the protection, maintenance and restoration of county watersheds.

Mr. Frost then gave a brief overview to the steps taken to develop the Accotink Creek Watershed Workbook through mapping, field assessment and monitoring, and computer modeling. In the Watershed Workbook, every studied subwatershed of Accotink Creek was found to be degraded, poor, or very poor. In the field assessments, surveyors found that most of the creek was still suffering active erosion and widening of the stream bed. Mr. Frost noted that there were a lot of areas along the Creek with unstable banks. He also observed that because most of the watershed

was developed before stormwater management, much of the opportunity would be for retrofitting existing structures rather than trying to affect new development.

There was a short question and answer session following Ms. Wynne's and Mr. Frost's presentations. During the session, members of the public made the following suggestions:

- The Fairfax County Park Authority should be on the WAG.
- Because of the impact of the construction of the I-95 Hot Lanes in the central part of the watershed, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) should participate in the WAG.

In response to concerns raised about the expansion of I-495, Mr. Rose informed the group that the County has been working with VDOT to try and bring attention to stormwater management issues. Some sections of the Hot Lanes would be in areas with completed watershed management plans that identified issues. While the County has been reassured that the state stormwater management controls are being implemented, the County is trying to achieve measures beyond state controls. The County has also been meeting with the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation to coordinate and strategize how the state should respond to some of these concerns.

Juliana Birkhoff of the Consensus Building Institute provided a brief overview of the public involvement process, noting that the WAG would consist of 12-20 members representing a diverse set of interests and types of people. The WAG would meet over six sessions to identify problems and possible solutions. Following, there would be another forum where members of the public can offer improvements and suggestions to the Draft Plan. Comments on the Watershed Workbook would be accepted by the County through the Web site at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek.htm.

III. Open House

Dr. Birkhoff then invited meeting attendees to participate in break out sessions based on their location in the Accotink Creek watershed – North, Middle, or South – to identify locations of concerns in the watershed.

Individuals identified the following items during the break out sessions:

North Accotink

- 1) A homeowner near the headwaters for Dale Lestina is having flooding in his house. The stormwater pond there frequently overflows. There is also a new elderly care center being built across the street, increasing impervious surface.
- 2) The stormwater pond in front of the movie theater at Merrifields needs to be retrofitted.
- 3) There is construction in Hunters Branch north of Route 50. This is on a floodplain. There is also an attempt to build a parking lot near there, but the area is muddy and floods.
- 4) The Army-Navy Golf Club in the City of Fairfax has had an expansion plan approved which involved clearing trees.

- 5) At Old Lee Highway across from the Golf Club, a new development is planned.
- 6) There is a retrofit opportunity for stormwater at the (County-owned) Court Complex in the City of Fairfax. In that area, there were tremendous amounts of silt in the headwaters of the Accotink last year during the construction.
- 7) On Chambridge Rd, residents are removing “no mow” signs on public land on the north side of the creek, throwing the signs into the creek, and mowing the grass.
- 8) The Ridgelea Community Association has an erosion problem. A cinderblock wall and a community trail is being undercut by erosion.
- 9) At the storm drain next to Pickett Rd, there is trash coming from the industrial park and erosion from the storm drain outfall.
- 10) At Hunters Branch, there is a severe fish obstruction.
- 11) At Daniels Run in the City of Fairfax, the stream restoration project at the Army-Navy Country Club, planting has transformed this area positively.

Middle Accotink

- 1) There is severe stream erosion beginning at Turkey Run in the Truror area near Wakefield Chapel.
- 2) At the intersection of I-495 and Little River Turnpike, the cross-county trail gets wiped out by the creek during periods of intense rain (two years ago and again during Hurricane Hanna). This was happening even before the tree removal. (A volume issue)
- 3) Downstream of item 1 at the Willow Woods Homeowners Association, there is stream erosion from the increased volume and velocity of the culvert discharge.
- 4) Under Holburn Avenue at the culvert downstream from items 1 and 2, there is also high velocity due to the culvert. This has destroyed the bridge between Wakefield Swim & Racquet to Chapel Square West. The county creek runs through private lands and there is a “private lake” with a dam constructed. Turkey Run is eroding.
- 5) At 8308 Kay Ct, Annandale, East of the North End where Whitman intersects, there has been massive erosion over the last four years, reaching 4-500 feet deep. Bank collapse is typical of the problem. This erosion has happened since Accotink was dredged. The creek is 2-3 feet deeper than before and has even changed course. There is increased volume and velocity.
- 6) In Rutherford Park, there is an opportunity for stream buffer restoration. Increased efforts are already underway.
- 7) The construction of the I-495 Hot Lanes would cut down trees and involve minimal stormwater controls. Mitigation is in the form of check to Cedar Run wetlands bank. There are sediment control issues.
- 8) At the Turkey Run reservoir, there is an opportunity for retrofitting below the reservoir to mitigate stormwater.
- 9) Cook Creek was good fish habitat before the I-495 Hot Lanes.
- 10) Redevelopment infill rezoning (where?)
- 11) At the Ravensworth Shopping Area, there is erosion from runoff.
- 12) Near Fairfax Hospital, the stream banks of the first tributary downstream from Woodburn are cut very deep exposing a sewer line. There is also erosion around a manhole and frequent algae growth at that location indicates a possible leak.
- 13) Pine Ridge Park plans to redo all its ball fields, presenting an opportunity for retrofitting.

South Accotink

- 1) There are overloaded sewers throughout the watershed.
- 2) Where the County is paving section of cross-country trail particularly in Accotink Park, they are cutting down trees that will cause significant erosion that will raise the water level.
- 3) There are over flowing sewers at Fort Belvoir that are creating breeding grounds for mosquitoes.
- 4) Lake Accotink Park has a litter and dog poop problem; this causes significant water quality problems.
- 5) Due to BRAC, the county is over the limit for development and the restrictions are out dated.
- 6) There is an error on the map with the Dogue and Acctoink drainage area.
- 7) Around the Army EPG is a very nice area with a beautiful stream with turtle habitat and nests.
- 8) Acctoink Bay has a significant siltation problem.
- 9) Throughout the watershed area, citizens noted that yard waste is being dumped down steep slopes.
- 10) Acctoink Park has a lot of goose poop.
- 11) Throughout the watershed, people are concerned about construction of the I-95 Hot Lanes.
- 12) On several bridges in the sub-watershed there is flooding on the crossings.
- 13) Throughout the lower watershed area, there is trash and large debris in the stream, including log jams.
- 14) There is a proposed channel – realignment from bridge to railroad. There is a need to coordinate with the Army on the construction contract and on 7100 highway extension.
- 15) In many places there are exposed sanitary sewers. In some the lid has broken off in the middle of the creek.

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Accotink Creek Watershed Community Workshop

*West Springfield High School Cafeteria, 6100 Rolling Road
Springfield, VA 22152*

Tuesday, October 7, 2008 6:30-9:00 pm

Agenda

- 6:30 p.m. **Watershed Registration – Sign in and find your watershed address**
- 7:00 p.m. **Welcome** by Fred Rose, Chief, Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County

Supervisor Penelope Gross, Mason District
- 7:15 p.m. **Slide Show:** Introduction to the watershed and planning Process
- 8:00 p.m. **Watershed Input Sessions** – attend a breakout group and note locations or concerns for the watersheds
- 9:00 p.m. **Adjourn** (*turn in any comment sheets*)

Visit the Virtual Forum at:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek.htm>



Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711

www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds



Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED WORKSHOP
OCTOBER 7, 2008**

Meeting Participants

Larry Ayers

Accotink Bluffs Association
lfayers@cox.net

Heidi Bonnaffon

hbonnaffon@mwcog.org

Clint Boschen

Tetra Tech

Mike Brennan

Patricia Brennan

patriciabbrennan@cox.net

Flavia Buttars

John Casana

john.casana@gmail.com

Pamela Couch

pamela.couch@us.army.mil

Lynn Daft

l.daft@verizon.net

Jim Dewing

jddewing@verizon.net

Marilyn Drucker

druckerm@verizon.net

Greg Fleming

greg.fleming@us.army.mil

Christine Fullman

cfullm@fairfaxcounty.gov

Johna Gagnon

Tom Gilding

tgilding@verizon.net

Penny Gross

Frankie Hull

gsfrankie@cox.net

Susan Jewell

naturewrite@yahoo.com

Chris Landgraf

Fort Belvoir
christopher.landgraf@us.army.mil

Philip Latasa

steward@accotink.org

Paul Makowski

Duane Murphy

Friends of Accotink Creek
coordinator@accotink.org

William Murphy

wilewah@yahoo.com

Laura Stephens

laura.e.stephens@us.army.mil

Hemanth Thippeswamy

hemanth.thippeswam@fcps.edu

Marcus Wadsworth

marcus.wadsworth@fairfaxcounty.gov

Don Waye

don.waye@verizon.net

Rachel Wiese

Tetra Tech

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division**ACCOTINK CREEK DRAFT WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC FORUM****SEPTEMBER 21, 2010****Fairfax County High School****3501 Rebel Run | Fairfax, VA 22030****I. Welcome and Introductions**

[Please note that the presentation from the September 21, 2010 Accotink Creek Draft Plan Forum will be available online at: http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm]

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, opened the Accotink Creek Draft Plan Public Forum by welcoming the public and County officials in attendance. Ms. Birkhoff reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.¹

II. Welcome and Process Update

Fred Rose, the Branch Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and participating in developing the Draft Plan. He reviewed the watershed management planning process, which began with a comprehensive assessment of the County's streams a number of years ago, followed by watershed quality assessments as part of each plan. The County developed a Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) as a resource to assist the County in the planning process.

The impetus for creating Watershed Management Plans (WMP) for Fairfax County watersheds was an inventory taken ten years ago which showed that seventy percent of the County's watersheds were impaired. Financial support for restoration projects began in 2005-2006 by dedicating a penny from the property tax rate for stormwater initiatives.

During the watershed planning process, almost 3,000 projects have been identified to restore the County's watersheds. The County is prioritizing these projects into ten-year and twenty-five-year plans. These are working plans, giving the County the flexibility to move projects between the two plans. Additionally, the projects are conceptual, meaning implementation is not guaranteed and the technology or scope of the project may change.

Mr. Rose emphasized the objective of the watershed management process is to use an adaptive approach to solve watershed quality problems. The watershed management plan is dynamic and will reflect County-wide needs. Mr. Rose explained that it was possible the County may need to adopt other watershed objectives to meet the federal Chesapeake Bay TMDL requirements, which EPA will release later this year. Fairfax County's watershed management program will support the federal Chesapeake Bay initiatives from a local level.

John C. Cook, the Braddock District Supervisor, highlighted why the County needs WMPs and what the EPA's Chesapeake TMDL regulations will mean for the County. Mr. Cook emphasized that this watershed

¹ Twenty-eight members of the public and approximately ten members of the staff team attended the meeting. A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

process ranks as one of the most important County government activities. He provided background on the effects of rapid development over the last decades in Fairfax County. This development has prompted the County's effort to fund the improvement of critical watershed infrastructure.

Linda Q. Smith, the Providence District supervisor, emphasized the importance and value of community involvement in this process. Erosion, flooding, and stormwater management are important events affecting residents' backyards. The watershed planning process gives the County and its residents options for finding solutions, and community input is a valuable formal component of the WMP.

III. Introduction to Watershed Concepts

Danielle Wynne, Ecologist in the Fairfax County Watershed Planning & Assessment Branch, reviewed terms and concepts behind watershed planning. She explained that Fairfax County has thirty watersheds but only thirteen Watershed Management Plans because they combined some smaller watersheds into one plan. The watershed planning process categorizes each watershed into Watershed Management Areas (WMAs), defined as a three to five square mile area with similar land use and development characteristics and a common drainage area. WMAs allow watershed planners to focus project proposals and are further broken down into sub-watershed units for planning purposes.

Ms. Wynne gave a brief overview of stormwater management (SWM) and the different types of stormwater structures proposed in the WMP. Each structure addresses stormwater needs such as runoff, sediment control, and high volume management. In Fairfax County, the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff are a primary cause of watershed and stream impairment.

The Draft Plan includes a ten-year and twenty-five-year prioritized list of proposed projects. The County will use a comprehensive plan to address the financial implications, recreational opportunities, property value, and other County-wide issues. The County has currently completed watershed plans for approximately fifty-seven percent of Fairfax County. The County will complete the final watershed management plans by next year.

IV. Overview of the Draft Watershed Management Plan

Bill Frost, Engineer with KCI Technologies, summarized the organizational structure and components of the Draft Plan.² He reviewed the following components of the plan:

i. Executive Summary

The executive summary includes background information for the Accotink Creek watershed and a summary of each of the Draft Plan sections. The executive summary includes non-structural, ten-year, and twenty-five-year master project lists (by project number, type, WMA, and location). Mr. Frost emphasized that participants should use these lists to identify projects and find them on the map.

1. Introduction

Mr. Frost provided a brief overview of watershed basics and the County's current watershed plans.

2. Watershed Planning Process

This section includes the criteria and objectives for the watershed planning process. Mr. Frost reviewed the indicators used to measure and compare existing and future conditions. A map of the Accotink Watershed displays the condition of the watershed; green is the best condition and red is the worst. The section also reviews stormwater modeling techniques and the County's Public Involvement Plan.

² The complete draft watershed management plan is available on the County website. Information for submitting comments is also available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm

3. Summary of Watershed Conditions

This section is a summary of information first presented in the Watershed Workbook, including information on each land use, imperviousness, area, and subwatershed stressors. A map indicates where the various conditions are present in the Accotink watershed.

4. Summary of Watershed Restoration Strategies

Mr. Frost reviewed the County's goals, restoration strategies, project prioritization, and the development of the master project list. He highlighted the difference between structural and non-structural projects, the latter being non-capital projects such as community outreach. Mr. Frost highlighted restoration strategies with photos and examples of non-structural projects. KCI prioritized projects based on an objective and quantitative process, using monitoring data, geographic information, and modeling results information to calculate an overall score for each subwatershed.

5. WMA Restoration Strategies

The section reviews WMAs and how proposed projects will help meet watershed restoration objectives. Mr. Frost explained how to use the fact sheets prepared for each proposed project. Each fact sheet includes the project's location, land owner(s), costs, control type, drainage area, and receiving waters. The fact sheets include a description of the project, its benefits, design considerations, and an aerial map of the project area.

6. Benefits of Plan Implementation

Mr. Frost highlighted the overall benefits of the Draft Plan for the Accotink watershed, in terms of material improvements and reduced pollutants.

Appendices

Mr. Frost reviewed the appendices. The appendices include (1) *Draft Watershed Workbook* with information and modeling results from the beginning of the planning process, (2) *Technical Documents* describing subwatershed strategies, priorities for potential projects, the model data collection, and (3) *Public Involvement* records and summaries.

V. Comment Period

Danielle Wynne emphasized the County's interest in receiving public comments on the plan for specific projects and general topics. The one-month comment period began September 21, 2010 and will end October 21, 2010. The County will incorporate comments to finalize the plan. The County will send the final plan to the Board of Supervisors for approval. Once the Board approves the plan, project implementation will begin.

Following the presentation, there was a brief Q&A session. During this discussion, Fairfax County officials and Bill Frost noted the following:

- County staff completed an initial stream assessment in 2003. KCI Technologies has noted many changes since then, and any updates from the public are welcome.
- The public is encouraged to submit comments about the status of projects on specific sites. Some of these projects may already be in the County's queue and may not be included in the Draft Plan.
- Maintenance considerations are unique to each project, depending on the degree to which it is a public, private, or partnership venture. The County will often negotiate easements to access private property for site maintenance. Public-private partnerships are an attractive option

because of the County's budget concerns and interest in community involvement.

- Stream buffers share characteristics with structural projects but are listed as non-structural projects. The public is encouraged to submit comments on funding, prioritization, and suggest pilot sites for stream buffer projects.
- The Accotink Draft Plan gives priority to projects entirely located on public land because their implementation is not complicated by land ownership and access agreements. If a community can demonstrate their commitment to providing resources for a project, the County may increase prioritization for that project. The ten-year and twenty-five-year plans are conceptual and have a great deal of flexibility. Public-private partnerships can be extremely important and effective mechanisms.

VI. Breakout Session

During the breakout session, participants were able to locate Accotink Creek watershed projects on sub-watershed maps and review corresponding fact sheets. Participants noted comments on specific projects and the plan in general.

Project Specific Discussions

- Project # 9222: The eroded bank is a safety concern and threatening backyard landscaping. The creek also has suds and foam. This discharge could be from a nearby business and the pollution source should be determined. This project could be an opportunity for partnership.
- Project # 9211, 9212, and 9213: On Turkey Run, a resident group may be interested in a partnership with the County.
- Project # 9218: Erosion at the site has gotten worse in recent years, threatening the older trees that a resident does not want removed.
- Project # 9500: Two projects have the same code – one in the ten-year plan and one in the twenty-five-year plan. The ten-year plan project has no profile sheet. This may be an error.
- Project # 9957: This project is listed on both the ten-and twenty-five year project lists, but should be listed on the ten-year project list.
- Project # 9913: There are obstructions and dump sites that will be revisited to determine what is needed for clean up.
- The intersection of Prosperity Avenue and Accotink Creek has major flooding problems.

General Discussions

- A resident wanted to know where to procure a hard copy of the Draft Plan. While the County is not providing hard copies, it is available for review in County libraries and Supervisors' offices.
- Generally, non-structural improvements will be County-wide projects.
- Construction sites and recent developments are good candidates for small-scale bioretention retrofits, such as islands in medians and parking lots. These strategies are options in the County building code.
- A resident suggested it would be useful to add tributary names to the maps.
- Participants discussed the following concerns around George Mason Woods:
 - There is significant erosion at the head waters where GMU has a construction site;

- They would like to be informed of County-funded projects;
 - They were advised that ample notice would be given before the project begins, including preparatory measures; and
 - The responsibilities for Riparian Protection Areas are in a brochure from the Virginia Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
- Stream buffer restoration projects should be self-maintaining.
 - The County is addressing project designs that are two decades old, or older, which were not originally designed to address water quality. Now, they are seeking site-specific retrofit projects such as Low Impact Development (LID) structures that can treat water quality before stormwater reaches the conveyance system.

Next Steps

Danielle Wynne informed participants that the County will accept comments on the Accotink draft watershed management plan for a 30-day comment period, ending October 21. Comments can be submitted via the County's [Accotink Creek](#) website, via mail to the Stormwater Planning Division at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 449 Fairfax VA 22035, or via Phone 703-324-5500, TTY 711.

Juliana Birkhoff encouraged participants to spread the word about the plan and encourage their communities to provide feedback.

The Accotink Creek watershed is severely degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. KCI Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact [<Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov>](mailto:Danielle.Wynne@fairfaxcounty.gov) or visit <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/>

“The opinions represented herein do not necessarily represent those of Fairfax County or its agents.”

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

**ACCOTINK CREEK WATERSHED
DRAFT WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN FORUM
SEPTEMBER 21, 2010**

Forum Participants*

L. Holtgrieve	Charles Kackley
Rochele Radish	Mike Sours
Bruce B. Davis	Kenny Shealy
Jane Ellen Saums	Fran Wallingford
Beth Forbes	Joanne Richeneek
Geof Ballard	Sherell Williams
Chris Landgraf	Lydia Estes
Tena Bluhm	Rob Mooney
Philip Latasa	Patrick O'Brien
Faith Hurley	Lynn Daft
Robert Iosco	Linda Daft
Karl Kellar	Ed Putnam
Rosemary Ryan	Jim Dewing
J. Tahan	Monica Cameron

*If you attended the forum and are not on the participant list, please contact Tim Sandusky, tsandusky@resolv.org.



Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Accotink Creek Draft Watershed Management Plan Forum

*Fairfax High School
3501 Rebel Run
Multi Purpose Room
Fairfax, VA 22030*

Tuesday, September 21, 2010 6:30-9:00 pm

Agenda

- 6:30 p.m. **Watershed Registration – Sign in**
- 7:00 p.m. **Welcome** by Fred Rose, Chief, Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County

Supervisor John C. Cook, Braddock District
- 7:15 p.m. **Slide Show:** Introduction to watershed concepts and overview of the Accotink Creek Draft Watershed Management Plan
- 8:00 p.m. **Watershed Input:** Learn about the plan comment period and timeline and attend breakout sessions to view watershed maps and provide feedback for proposed projects
- 9:00 p.m. **Adjourn** (*turn in any comment sheets*)

For more information:

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm



Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711

www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

