

*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](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.<sup>1</sup>

**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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](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*<sup>2</sup> interface and static maps are available on the county's website.<sup>3</sup>

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 prioritization process. He informed the group that CWP will group and prioritize the 545

---

<sup>2</sup> Accotink Creek North: <http://is.gd/bznHt> Accotink Creek South: <http://is.gd/bznJ6>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek\\_docs.htm](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm)

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.<sup>4</sup> The project ranking list<sup>5</sup> 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 are currently

---

<sup>4</sup> These project maps can be found online at [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek\\_docs.htm](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm)

<sup>5</sup> The project rankings can be found online at [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek\\_docs.htm](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/accotinkcreek_docs.htm)

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](mailto: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](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 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](mailto:jgershowitz@resolv.org)) and he will add you to the list.