APPENDIX C

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT MINUTES

C-1 Advisory Committee Meetings

C-2 Public Meetings

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

C-1 Advisory Committee Meetings

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Advisory Committee Meeting
John Marshall Library, Alexandria, Virginia
November 20, 2003

Advisory Committee Members in Attendance:
Diane Davidson, Lake Barcroft Association
Don Demetrius, Fairfax County Stormwater Division
Susan Ellicott, Huntington Community Association
Phyllis Evans, Huntington Community Association
Robert Glass, Braddock District Supervisor's Office
Bill Hicks, Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Bob Jordan, Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
George Madill, Bren Mar Civic Association
Mack Rhoades, President, Huntington Community Association
Harry Shepler, Huntington Community Association
Kevin Shunk, City of Alexandria
Michael Wing, Supervisor Connolly/Providence District

Project Team Staff in Attendance:
Dipmani Kumar, Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Amanda Peyton, Horne Engineering Services, Inc.
Fred Rose, Fairfax County DPWES
Nancy Roth, Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore, Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland, Versar, Inc.

The Cameron Run Watershed Plan:

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds

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

Meeting Purpose*:*

Attendees of the meeting were individuals invited by project team staff to serve on the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the Cameron Run Watershed and discuss the overall watershed planning process. The overall goal of the Advisory Committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed. This process is also being implemented in other watersheds in Fairfax County, providing a consistent basis for watershed decision-making

Key Decisions and Outcomes:

- Advisory Committee Meetings will be held:
    - Once per month
    - At different locations within the watershed
    - On an alternating Tuesday-Thursday schedule
    - All meetings will be at 7:00 PM.
- The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be held on December 16, 2003 at 7:00 PM. A meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The next meeting will include a brief primer on watershed concepts and how streams become degraded.

Action Items:

- Project staff will prepare a brief primer on watershed concepts and how streams become degraded for presentation at the next meeting.
- Project staff will search for information on projects identified by committee members as concerns in the watershed and will present findings to the Advisory Committee.
- Committee members will identify other individuals or groups that should be invited to participate in the Advisory Committee.
- Committee members will prepare general thoughts about issues to be addressed by the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan, for discussion at the next meeting.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Rose of DPWES welcomed attendees to this initial meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. It was emphasized that this committee will assist the County in the development of the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Through this committee, Fairfax County and the

community will form a partnership that will result in a plan that is not only good for the environment, but good for the community as well.

Mr. Kumar of DPWES gave attendees an overview and status of the county watershed planning process. Fairfax County has 30 designated watersheds, or natural drainage areas. The stream networks within these watersheds were assessed during a recently completed (October, 2003) countywide study. The assessment considered habitat and geomorphic conditions and inventoried problems such as deficient stream buffers and accelerated in-stream erosion as indicators of problems facing watersheds within Fairfax County. Of the 30 watersheds within Fairfax County, six have initiated the planning process: Cub Run, Bull Run, Popes Head Creek, Difficult Run, Cameron Run, and Little Hunting Creek.

Ms. Shore of Versar, Inc. initiated an introduction session between committee and project staff members. Ms. Roth, also of Versar, presented an overview of the Cameron Run watershed and an introduction to the watershed planning process. The presentation covered the following topics:

- Background information about Fairfax County watersheds
- Steps for creating a Watershed Management Plan
- A "Visual Tour" of the Cameron Run watershed
- Public involvement in watershed planning process

A watershed is an area of land that drains either directly, or through tributary streams into a particular river or water body. Fairfax County has designated 10 watersheds, representing 60% of the area in the county, as Phase I watersheds where planning has begun or will be initiated soon, including Cameron Run. Cameron Run, one of the largest watersheds in the county, measures a total of 44 square miles (33 square miles in Fairfax County) and includes several tributary systems (Holmes Run, Tripps Run, Lake Barcroft, Backlick Run, Indian Run, Turkeycock Run, and Pike Branch).

A watershed plan is a tool that uses available watershed data to assess and manage the watershed. These plans provide goals and objectives for achieving management actions and recommending actions to prevent further watershed problems. In addition, these plans provide a benchmark against which the County can measure the progress of watershed solutions in the future.

Fairfax County is undertaking development of Watershed Management Plans because 70% of the streams within the County are either in fair or poor condition as characterized by biological indicators (as assessed in the County's Stream Protection Strategy baseline survey). Development of a plan will help Fairfax County meet Federal and State water quality standards, and help Virginia meet commitments in the Chesapeake 2000 agreement. Plans currently used by the County are outdated and do not take advantage of available stormwater management technology. Finally, a management plan will ensure that a comprehensive approach is taken to address regulations, commitments, and community needs.

Cameron Run has a long history of urbanization with many impervious areas that create a large stormwater problem for the watershed area. Within the watershed area, two streams are located on the Environmental Protection Agency's list of impaired waters. Under Section 303(d) of the 1972 Clean Water Act, states, territories, and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of impaired waters that do not meet established water quality standards even after point sources of pollution (e.g., water treatment plants) have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. The law requires that these jurisdictions establish priority rankings for waters on the 303(d) list and develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for these waters. A TMDL specifies the maximum amount of a pollutant that a body of water can receive and still meet water quality standards, and allocates pollutant loadings among point and nonpoint (e.g., fertilizer runoff from yards) pollutant sources (Environmental Protection Agency 2003).

The Cameron Run watershed comprises primarily residential land uses with few patches of forest. Urbanization has resulted in substantial physical impacts to the watershed including, but not limited to, erosion, flooding, and stream channel alteration. The County's 2001 *Stream Protection Strategy* report listed Cameron Run as a Watershed Restoration Level II watershed. A Restoration Level II watershed is a watershed that is characterized by high development density, significantly degraded in-stream habitat conditions, and substantially degraded biological communities (DPWES 2001). A watershed management plan for Cameron Run will be designed to prevent further degradation to the watershed, improve water quality to meet Chesapeake Bay Program standards, as well as standards set by Federal, state, and local jurisdictions.

Ms. Roth next explained why Fairfax County is interested in engaging the community during the development of the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Community feedback will aid the County in pinpointing local problems (e.g., flooding or erosion) and then helping to facilitate solutions for those problems. Through the plan development process, the community as a whole will become more educated about the watershed and will be able to make more informed decisions. These decisions will ensure that the final management plan is effective in meeting water quality standards mentioned above, and that the watershed community can implement the plan.

The Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan is in the early stages of the development process, i.e., in the data gathering and analysis phases. This meeting commenced the public involvement component of plan development. By involving the community in the planning stages, Fairfax County can ensure that a community supported plan can be developed in a timely and efficient manner.

The planning process will be conducted in the following manner:

- Develop Goals and Objectives (public involvement is being initiated at the beginning of the planning process and will continue throughout the development of the plan)
- Evaluate Alternatives (e.g., public infrastructure improvements, regulatory changes, and voluntary measures)
- Develop Implementation Strategy (e.g., costs, schedules, and standards)

Ms. Roth presented an overview of overall stream quality for the Cameron Run watershed. The Cameron Run watershed has very few natural buffers (56% of streams lack riparian buffer areas) and the aquatic habitat is very poor. Cameron Run also has numerous urban stressors (e.g., impervious surfaces) that result in noticeable streambank erosion in the majority of the watershed area (Tripps Run and the southeastern portion of the watershed do not have as great an erosion problem). Twenty-nine sites within the watershed have exposed utilities.

During this part of the presentation, committee members raised a number of concerns that project staff will research and report findings to the committee. These concerns include the following:

- Proposal in Falls Church to remove vegetation along waterways that could transmit more runoff downstream.
- Woodrow Wilson Bridge construction and the impact of construction on stormwater overflow in the community. This is especially timely after the recent rain events in the area and has implications for the trail extension.
- House flooding and its affect on the watershed (e.g., upper Tripps Run). Supporting data will be provided to project staff by Fairfax County for analysis.
- Impact of EPA cleanup project at Indian Run (old Atlantic Research site).
- Results of U.S. Geological Survey National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII) project and integrating this into the watershed management plan.

Ms. Roth continued her presentation by giving an overview of the public involvement approach and the role of the Advisory Committee in the plan development process. The public involvement approach includes (1) forming an Advisory Committee whose members represent different groups within the watershed community; (2) conducting public workshops to inform the community about watershed plan development, to solicit feedback, and to provide an avenue for the community to find information on the progress of the watershed plan; and (3) utilizing a project website to distribute information about the plan and to solicit feedback. The Advisory Committee has the highest level of involvement with Fairfax County for developing a management plan for the Cameron Run watershed. The role of this committee is as follows:

- Advise project team members about watershed and community issues on which to focus and additional sources of information concerning those issues
- Advise project team members about community outreach including additions to the advisory committee and groups and individuals to invite to workshops
- Help develop agendas for public workshops to maximize relevance and applicability to the watershed area
- Conduct outreach to constituency groups (e.g., civic associations)
- Provide suggestions on the topics and formats for public education materials and publicity
- Review and comment on various drafts of the watershed management plan

There will be four public workshops conducted to solicit feedback from the community. These workshops include:

- An Issues Forum: Discuss and prioritize key watershed issues for the plan to address

- A Community Watershed Forum: Present draft approaches for plan development to key stakeholder groups
- A Draft Plan Review Session: Gain input on the proposed plan
- A Final Plan Review Session: Present the final plan to the community

Dr. Southerland of Versar opened a discussion for committee members to voice their thoughts on the overall watershed planning approach.

One committee member suggested that a list of resources be sent to committee members prior to committee meetings so that members could become familiar with issues facing the watershed and feel more prepared for meetings. Dr. Southerland emphasized that not all committee members need to be familiar with every issue facing the watershed (e.g., biological indicators). The committee was designed to include members from a mix of backgrounds (e.g., civic, scientific, housing) to ensure that the plan addresses all community issues. Dr. Southerland suggested presenting at the next meeting a 20-minute primer on how streams become degraded to familiarize committee members with watershed concepts. The group concurred with the suggestion.

Another committee member asked how the Advisory Committee will engage members of the business and development community in the plan development process. Project staff agreed that this involvement was important and asked that specific suggestions from Committee members be forwarded to the project team. The Baileys Crossroads Beautification Alliance was mentioned as a possibility. The member noted that it was important for that the business community be encouraged to follow recommendations rather than simply following current Fairfax County regulations, which are sometimes outdated. Mr. Rose stated that through the activities of the watershed planning process, updating current outdated County requirements and regulations will be considered.

In reference to retrofits, one committee member suggested that the management plan provide recommendations for using green roofs to reduce the impact of urban stresses on the watershed. The committee member explained what a green roof was and gave examples of green roofs in the watershed community. Mr. Rose indicated that the County is already evaluating the efficacy and practicality of green roofs. In general, committee members expressed an interest in exploring the possibility of recommending such management techniques, and other Low Impact Development measures, in the management plan.

The committee decided that committee meetings be held once a month, including this December. Meetings will be held at different locations within the watershed, to balance the travel demands on committee members, and will be held on an alternate Tuesday-Thursday schedule. All meetings will be held at 7:00 PM. The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be held on Tuesday, December 16, 2003 at 7:00 PM. A meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.

Dr. Southerland closed the meeting by asking committee members to (1) come up with additional individuals or groups that should be invited to participate in the Advisory Committee and (2) identify issues that the watershed management plan for Cameron Run should address.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under this page, visitors can access the 2001 *Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study*. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents for the watershed, a meeting and event calendar, and meeting minutes for the Advisory Committee. The Cameron Run website also contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may also be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or called into the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Advisory Committee Meeting

Woodrow Wilson Public Library, Falls Church, Virginia
December 16, 2003

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Lee District Board of Supervisors
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Eric Eckl – Citizen
Phyllis Evans – Huntington Community Association
Richard Hartman – Citizen
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
George Madill – Bren Mar Civic Association
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District
Mia Musolino – Citizen
Russell Rosenberger – President of Madison Homes
F. Wyatt Shields – Assistant City Manager City of Falls Church
Bob Slusser – Virginia Tech / Watershed Resident
Moe Wadda – Falls Church Engineer

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Fred Rose -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Nancy Roth -- Versar, Inc.
Steve Schreiner – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Brian Feeney – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.
Helene Merkel – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty-watersheds.net.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purposes of this advisory committee meeting was to identify any additional groups, agencies, or organizations that should be represented on the committee and to discuss key issues facing the watershed for inclusion in the watershed management plan. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee identified additional community groups, agencies, organizations, and academic institutions that should be represented at committee meetings (see *Advisory Committee Representation* below).
- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee identified watershed issues that should be addressed in the watershed management plan (see *Watershed Management Plan Issues and Solutions* below).
- Email is the best method for relaying information to advisory committee members.
- The next meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee will be held on January 13, 2004 at 7:00 PM. The meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The Public Issues Forum will be held on February 12, 2004. Content for the Issues Forum will be discussed at the next meeting of the advisory committee along with proposed meeting locations.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will generate a list of proposed venues for the February 2004 Public Issues Forum and present this to the committee at the January 2004 meeting.
- Project staff will research issues identified by committee members as concerns in the watershed, along with issues identified through other background research, and will present findings to the advisory committee.
- Project staff will prepare a presentation discussing results of baseline studies conducted on the Cameron Run watershed.
- Committee members will prepare ideas about issues that should be discussed at the Public Issues Forum, as well as how to publicize the meeting to the community.
- Project staff and committee members will identify contacts for the groups, agencies, and organizations that were identified as additional representatives on the advisory committee.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introduction

Ms. Shore of Versar opened the advisory committee meeting by initiating an introductory session between committee and project staff members. During this introduction, Mr. Rose of DPWES, re-iterated

the advisory committee role, which is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that is based on community needs and sound water quality management practices. Cameron Run is the third watershed in Fairfax County that is in the process of developing a watershed management plan. Ms. Roth, also of Versar, closed the introductory session by calling attention to the many handouts that were available to meeting attendees. These handouts included the following:

- Cameron Run Advisory Committee Agenda for the November 20, 2003 Kick-off Meeting
- Fact Sheet on Five Reasons for Developing Watershed Plans in Fairfax County
- Cameron Run Advisory Committee Roles and Ground Rules
- Versar's November 20, 2003 presentation entitled, *Cameron Run Watershed Plan: Overview for Advisory Committee Kickoff Meeting*
- Cameron Run Advisory Committee Agenda for the December 16, 2003 Meeting
- Article from the March 1994 issue of the *Mt. Vernon Gazette* entitled, *Restoring the Ecology of Cameron Run Stream*
- Map showing the boundaries of the Cameron Run watershed
- Scope of work for the development of watershed management plans
- Versar's December 16, 2003 presentation entitled, *General Impacts of Urbanization on Streams*

Of these handouts, she highlighted the scope of work for the project staff, and discussed the role Versar and Horne Engineering will play in the development of Cameron Run's Watershed Management Plan. Also highlighted was a 1994 article in the EarthWatch Alexandria section of the *Mt. Vernon Gazette* that discusses the history of Cameron Run and the need to restore watershed health to pre-development standards. Ms. Roth noted that many of the issues in this article are still relevant today.

Stream Degradation

Ms. Roth presented an overview of how a stream can become degraded through urbanization and the challenges faced in managing urban watersheds. The biggest stressor facing the Cameron Run watershed is non-point sources of pollution (e.g., runoff from parking lots and lawns). Examples of watershed degradation include (1) physical impairment through such practices as channelization or sedimentation;(2) loss of streamside vegetation such as riparian buffers or forests; (3) poor water quality from increased nutrient loads, such as fertilizers, and an increase in bacteria or pathogens, such as fecal coliform; (4) changes in natural hydrologic flow, or water flow, from an increase in impervious surfaces such as buildings, parking lots, and roads, which causes destabilization of streams through erosion and increased sedimentation; (5) biological impacts such as a decline in the number and diversity of aquatic species; and (6) a tendency for streams to become repositories for community trash. Streams that are degraded through urbanization tend to have poor water quality (excessive nutrients and toxic substances, and poor clarity), poor water quantity (faster runoff speed, more frequent high flow rates, and more erosive power), and overall poor stream health (increases in bank erosion, reduced aesthetics, less diverse and vital aquatic community). Stream restoration and sound stormwater management practices can reverse the negative impacts caused by excessive urbanization and improve the health of the watershed. Some examples of management tools that could improve watershed health include, but are not limited to, community education, using conservation landscaping and Low Impact Development (LID), and restoring riparian buffers along stream banks.

At the conclusion of Ms. Roth's presentation, one committee member raised the question of how do environmentally friendly stormwater retrofit practices such as underground retention ponds, compare to traditional urban stormwater retrofits such as curb and gutter. The committee member also asked what

studies have been conducted and are available to support environmentally friendly urbanization. Dr. Southerland of Versar stated that there are several good analytical studies that have been conducted and that discuss solutions to urban watershed stressors. Dr. Southerland also noted that having the right knowledge is one step in the watershed management planning process; the other is having the right mix of people present to develop the plan.

Advisory Committee Representation

Dr. Southerland led a committee discussion about community representation on the advisory committee. He queried the group and indicated that there was already a diverse representation of stakeholder as shown by the present members below:

- Academic Sector – 1 member (7%)
- Business Sector – 1 member (7%)
- Citizen Groups – 4 members (27%)
- Community Citizens – 2 members (13%)
- Elected Representatives – 2 members (13%)
- Government Sector – 4 members (27%)
- Non-profit Organizations – 1 member (7%)

He asked which groups, agencies, or organizations, in addition to committee members present at this meeting, should be represented on the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. Advisory committee and project team members suggested that a representative from the following community groups, agencies, organizations, and academic institutions attend future advisory committee meetings:

- Commercial/Residential Real Estate
- County Water Conservation Office or other Stream Monitor Group
- Fairfax County Park Authority
- Heavy Industry
- Metro and Railroad
- Nature Advocacy Group(s)
- Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority
- Recreation Groups (e.g., hunting and fishing advocates)
- Stream Ecology and Fisheries Biology Experts from George Mason University
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
- Contractor from Woodrow Wilson Bridge Construction Project

One member strongly suggested that a member from the contractors constructing the Woodrow Wilson Bridge be present to address overall community concerns and the impact the bridge system will have on the Cameron Run watershed. Even though the actual bridge is outside of the watershed management area, entrance and exit ramps will be within the watershed area, and therefore, the committee should assess both aesthetic and water quality impacts. Project staff has reviewed a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) developed for the Woodrow Wilson bridge construction project.

Another member presented lessons learned from the Little Hunting Creek Advisory Committee who did not engage VDOT at the beginning of the watershed management planning process. VDOT manages the majority of roads in Fairfax County and their input is important to developing a watershed management plan for implementation in the Cameron Run watershed. The VDOT representative can also address committee questions about determining which streams will be impacted during transportation construction.

Another member also voiced that the Fairfax County water and park authorities should be included in the advisory committee since they own and manage the majority of parkland and water in the Cameron Run watershed. Input from these groups would be invaluable for developing a management plan.

Mr. Rose advised the committee to limit representatives from government organizations and other groups to only those that would be active participants in the watershed management planning process. Many of these representatives have busy schedules and would only be able to attend a meeting or two at best and the advisory committee should be composed of active community members who have a desire to promote sound watershed management processes. Dr. Southerland supported Mr. Rose by stating that the ideal advisory committee would consist of watershed "champions" and have 15 to 20 active members dedicated to developing a sound watershed management plan for Cameron Run.

Watershed Management Plan Issues and Solutions

Dr. Southerland led a group dialogue discussing key issues and solutions that should be addressed in the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Key issues discussed by the committee included the following:

- Identify solutions for urban vs. suburban communities within the watershed. Management of each area will be different based on land use constraints.
- Evaluate current jurisdictional coordination.
- Review and revise County development building ordinances, codes, and subdivision regulations, and develop a mechanism for enforcing ordinances, codes, and regulations.
- Incorporate watershed management practices into the Fairfax County Master Plan.
- Minimize or eliminate current stormwater waivers.
- Decrease the amount of impervious surfaces in the watershed area to minimize runoff to watershed streams.
- Reduce erosion and sedimentation from headwaters of the watershed and reduce urban runoff. Sediment from headwaters of the watershed, as well as urban runoff, are major issues for Cameron Run.
    - This could become a regulatory issue once tributary strategies are finalized.
    - Programs such as street sweeping and using trash booms should be encouraged to reduce contributions of sediment and trash into streams.
    - Lake Barcroft is a good example of a private lake within the watershed community that receives a great deal of sediment and trash via runoff from other parts of the County. The community has to bear the burden of removing excess sediment and trash from the lake, because Fairfax County does not manage private lakes within the county.
- Resolve the conflict between flood conveyance requirements and water quality requirements.
- Identify bacteria and pathogen issues.
- Increase opportunities for public access to streams and rivers.

Potential solutions proposed by the committee to resolve some of the issues facing the watershed include:

- Encourage public behavior modification through engagement and education.
    - 90% of the public does not know what a watershed is, or which watershed they reside in.
    - The public is also unaware of stresses affecting a watershed, and how their actions add to those impacts.
    - In terms of overall watershed health, Cameron Run is one of the poorest watersheds in Fairfax County.
- Teach children at the grade school level about environmental stewardship.
- Identify and then reach out to members of the landscaping and grounds maintenance community to educate them on environmentally friendly techniques.
- Develop an incentive program for developers and landowners to adopt environmentally friendly practices.
    - Tax incentives for homeowners who use conservation landscaping or LID techniques, or who buy properties with these features.
    - Incentives for developers to design and build using environmentally friendly practices.
- Renovate or expand school grounds to include LID techniques, or conservation landscaping.
    - Benefits the school by providing better stormwater management.
    - Areas could be used to educate students about watershed health.
    - Provides a demonstration project for the community on practices that could improve stream and watershed health.
- Develop innovative approaches to current urban infill practices using creative environmentally friendly techniques.
    - Fairfax County performed a pollution prevention study in 2000 that addressed infill vs. non-infill issues.
    - Update the existing stormwater manual, or develop a new stormwater manual.
- Evaluate and improve designs for failing infrastructure by using techniques such as daylighting (practice that exposes previously buried rivers, streams, or other waterways).
- Use the public sector to set the example for environmental stewardship in the watershed.

Mr. Rose reminded committee members that fostering solutions for inclusion in the watershed management plan is a group effort, and that it is up to the committee to come up with solutions that can be implemented using Fairfax County resources. Fairfax County has limited resources so solutions will have to benefit the entire community.

Meeting Adjournment

The committee decided that the next meeting be held on Tuesday, January 13, 2004 at 7:00 PM. A meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting. The committee also set a date of Thursday February 12, 2004 for the first community public meeting – the Issues Forum.

Dr. Southerland closed the meeting by asking committee members to begin developing ideas for the Issues Forum that will be held in February 2004. Specifically, committee members were asked to think about (1) Cameron Run watershed issues that should be discussed at the public forum, and (2) how best to publicize the forum to the community at large. Content for the Issues Forum will be determined by the committee in January.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty-watersheds.net. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents for the watershed, a meeting and event calendar, and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. The Cameron Run website also contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may also be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or called into the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Advisory Committee Meeting

Woodrow Wilson Public Library, Falls Church, Virginia
January 13, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Dave Eckert – Falls Church Stream Stewards
Eric Eckl – Citizen
Phyllis Evans – Huntington Community Association
Richard Hartman – Citizen
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Allan Hudson, Baileys Crossroads Revitalization
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Russell Rosenberger – President of Madison Homes
F. Wyatt Shields – Assistant City, Manager City of Falls Church
Peter Silva – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Fred Rose – DPWES
Gayle England -- DPWES
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty-watersheds.net.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purposes of this meeting of the advisory committee was to discuss overall stream quality conditions in the Cameron Run watershed based on analysis of water quality data collected by Fairfax County. The advisory committee also began identifying priority issues that should be addressed in the watershed management plan. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee will tour areas of the Cameron Run watershed on Sunday, February 29, 2004. Project staff will contact committee members for an appropriate group meeting location and time during the week of February 19, 2004. A finalized meeting location and time will be sent to Committee members prior to the tour.
- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee identified priority watershed concerns that should be addressed in the watershed management plan (see *Watershed Management Plan Priority Issues* below). These priorities will be discussed further at the February meeting.
- The next meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee will be held on February 12, 2004 at 7:00 PM. The meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The Public Issues Forum will be held in March or April 2004. Content for the Issues Forum will be discussed at the next meeting of the advisory committee along with proposed meeting locations.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will generate a list of proposed venues for the March/April 2004 Public Issues Forum and will present this to the committee at the February 2004 meeting.
- Project staff will research issues identified by committee members as concerns in the watershed, along with issues identified through other background research, and will present findings to the advisory committee.
- Project staff will research more stream quality data and present this to the committee.
- Project staff will contact committee members regarding the February 29, 2004 watershed tour during the week of February 19, 2004 to discuss group meeting locations and times. Project staff will inform committee members of the finalized meeting location and time prior to the tour. Potential tour sites include the Lake Barcroft debris catcher area, the Poplar Heights area, and a heavily impacted area in Tripps Run.
- Project staff will also investigate inviting a member of the press to join the advisory committee on the watershed tour in February.
- Committee members will give contact information for the groups, agencies, and organizations that were identified to project staff. Project staff will then contact these individuals for inclusion on the advisory committee.

- Committee members will prepare ideas about issues that should be discussed at the Public Issues Forum, as well as how to publicize the meeting to the community.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introduction and Overview of Committee Activities to Date

Ms. Shore of Versar opened the advisory committee meeting by initiating an introductory session between committee and project staff members. Following the introductory session, Dr. Mark Southerland of Versar, presented an overview of advisory committee activities to date. In his presentation, Dr. Southerland gave a brief overview of the following:

- The watershed basics presentation presented by Nancy Roth at the November meeting
- Steps for developing a watershed management plan
- An introduction to the Cameron Run watershed
- Roles of the advisory committee
- General watershed issues of concern, as raised by advisory committee members
- Advisory committee representation
- Outcomes and action items from the November and December meetings of the advisory committee.

During the advisory committee representation overview, committee members suggested specific individuals be contacted from the Northern Virginia Park Authority, the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District, and from a local beautification alliance community group. Contact information for all of these individuals will be given to project staff. Project staff will then contact these individuals for inclusion on the advisory committee.

Upcoming Schedule for the Advisory Committee

The Public Issues Forum will be held in either March or April 2004 as opposed to the original February 12, 2004 date. Fairfax County decided to reschedule the first of three public meetings after advisory committee membership has been finalized, and once the committee has determined what priority issues will be included in the watershed management plan. In an effort to facilitate finalizing priority issues for inclusion in the plan, the committee will be conducting a tour of the Cameron Run watershed to see first hand some of the problem areas and issues facing the watershed. The committee decided that the tour would be held on Sunday, February 29, 2004. Project staff will contact all members of the advisory committee to discuss potential meeting locations and times.

Condition of Cameron Run Watershed

Dr. Southerland presented an overview of data findings and overall water quality conditions in the Cameron Run watershed. Cameron Run has a long history of urbanization with a high amount of impervious surfaces. Intense urbanization has placed substantial stress on the watershed, including, but not limited to, physical impacts, increased erosion, flooding, and channel alteration. Overall, stream quality for Cameron Run is poor, as determined through the Stream Protection Strategy (SPS) and Stream Physical Assessment (SPA) analysis conducted by Fairfax County in 2001 and 2002. Specifically, the Cameron Run watershed area was found to have very few natural buffers, poor aquatic habitat, and degraded fish and benthic communities, as a result of the numerous urban stressors that have affected the

watershed through development. Water quality is so poor in some areas that two reaches of the watershed (Backlick Run and the Cameron Run mainstem) have been included on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s list of impaired waters for fecal coliform contamination. As the land in the Cameron Run watershed continues to be developed, the potential for further water quality decline is very likely. Fred Rose of DPWES supplemented Dr. Southerland's observations by stating that older, densely populated areas in the eastern regions of Fairfax County generally have poorer water quality than those in the western regions because of the rate of development. There are pockets of problems in the western regions of the county because of increasing development. The Cameron Run watershed is one of the most degraded watersheds in terms of water quality in Fairfax County. The following list provides an overview of water quality conditions for the major tributary subwatersheds in the Cameron Run watershed:

- **Tripps Run:** Covers 10.3% of the Cameron Run watershed and includes the city of Falls Church. Tripps Run is the oldest and most developed tributary in the watershed and is the most degraded. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with very poor Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI), habitat, and fish taxa richness scores. Thirty-two percent (32%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 35% imperviousness. Future imperviousness is based on current zoning permits. There is always some uncertainty with future planning and zoning allocations; and estimates of future imperviousness are generally high.
- **Upper Holmes Run:** Covers 27.2% of the Cameron Run watershed and includes part of the Lake Barcroft community. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with a very poor IBI score, a poor habitat score, and a variable fish taxa richness score. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 45% imperviousness.
- **Lower Holmes Run:** Covers 5.0% of the Cameron Run watershed and includes the majority of the Lake Barcroft community. Lower Holmes Run also includes some portions of the city of Alexandria. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with a fair IBI score, a very poor habitat score, and a low fish taxa richness score. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 33% imperviousness.
- **Turkeycock Run:** Covers 27.2% of the Cameron Run watershed and includes the Mason District Park area. The overall subwatershed condition rating was poor, with a very poor IBI score, a fair habitat score, and a low fish taxa richness score. Twenty-three percent (23%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 35% imperviousness.
- **Indian Run:** Covers 9.9% of the Cameron Run watershed and includes the headwaters near Little River Turnpike. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with a fair IBI score, a poor habitat score, and a very low fish taxa richness score. Twenty-seven percent (27%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 35% imperviousness.
- **Backlick Run:** Covers 20.6% of the Cameron Run watershed, is the most industrial area of the watershed, and includes the I-95/495/395 "mixing bowl" area. Backlick Run was included on the EPA list of impaired waters for fecal coliform contamination. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with a poor IBI score, a very poor habitat score, and a low fish taxa richness score. Thirty percent (30%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 42% imperviousness.
- **Pike Branch:** Covers 6.1% of the Cameron Run watershed and drains the southeastern portion of the watershed. The overall subwatershed condition rating was very poor, with a fair IBI score, a very poor habitat score, and a very low fish taxa richness score. Twenty-five percent (25%) of the subwatershed is impervious with a future estimate of 32% imperviousness.
- **Cameron Run and Direct Tributaries:** Covers 6.7% of the Cameron Run watershed, receives flows from the remainder of the city of Alexandria, and is near the Wilson Bridge and the

proposed Huntington Stream Valley Trail along the Cameron Run stream. This area was not included in the 2001 SPS analysis conducted by the county, but data collected from the city of Alexandria, the Virginia Department of Health, and national water quality data were used to characterize stream conditions. Many of the streams in this area are buried or channelized thereby disconnecting them from the floodplain. These waters have been listed on the EPA list of impaired waters for acute ammonia and fecal coliform contamination. Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) have been found in fish tissues and prompted the Virginia Department of Health to issue a health advisory.

One committee member stated that over two cubic yards of silt, sediment, and debris flows from Tripps Run into Lake Barcroft on an annual basis. The burden of cleaning up the lake falls on the community. The lake has also become a repository of trash from the northern regions of the watershed area collecting trash items such as Styrofoam coffee cups, tennis balls, and plastic grocery bags.

Another member brought to the attention of the group that the Tripps Run subwatershed truly starts at an area north of I-66 called Falls Hills, but some of the subwatershed has been buried by development. An inquiry was raised about how the county came to the 32% impervious surface estimate for Tripps Run because the subwatershed includes the city of Falls Church, which is heavily developed. Dipmani Kumar of DPWES addressed this question by stating that Fairfax County did not assess the Falls Church area of the subwatershed, but instead made estimates on impervious surfaces based on national data.

Another member suggested visiting the Popular Heights area located at the headwaters of Tripps Run, because the streambanks in this area are severely eroded. Project staff will coordinate with this member to determine the exact location of this area and its potential to be included in the group watershed tour. This same member attended a conference by the National Park Service concerning water quality. The member discovered at this conference that the number one issue facing watersheds is sedimentation and the number two issue is overall water quality. To his dismay, the accumulation of trash in our waters was ranked at number 13.

Another member suggested an additional area in Tripps Run be visited that is heavily affected by debris and damming. This area is located around a highly industrial area. Project staff will coordinate with this member to determine the exact location of this area and its potential to be included in the group watershed tour.

Another member asked if there was any type of stream configuration data available for the Cameron Run watershed area. Project staff will research this and present findings to the committee.

Another member raised the concern of not seeing the degree of chemical contamination in the data Dr. Southerland presented to the committee. This member was particularly interested in finding out the impact of chemical spills to the watershed. Project staff is looking into water quality issues via chemical impacts. In the meantime, Dr. Southerland indicated that chemical impacts are reflected in the biological indicators, which act as integrators of cumulative impacts (of all types) over time. Comprehensive chemical testing is expensive and impractical because it varies temporally more than biology. Currently, streams are only tested for hydrocarbons based on odor and/or color of water.

Another member was interested in finding how many miles of stormdrain pipes and the resulting number of stormwater inlets and outlets are in the watershed. This member indicted that these numbers can be easily determined using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data layers. Through the committee discussion, it was determined that there are 300 stormwater outfalls along nine miles of the 4-mile Run area, and that there are generally 450 inlets per square mile in Fairfax County. Mr. Kumar indicated that complete stormwater infrastructure maps are available but not yet completely digitized.

Another member would be interested in finding out how many miles of inadequate riparian buffers are found on private vs. public lands. Project staff will research and give estimates to the committee once determined.

Another member was interested in how the SPA study was conducted, particularly how the data was gathered. Mr. Kumar and Dr. Southerland informed the committee that all data was gathered from physical assessments performed at the stream. Fairfax County personnel physically walked the entire area of the Cameron Run watershed and noted physical impacts and other stressors as seen visually.

Another member raised the question of how did the assessors know the exact number of exposed utilities in a particular area of the watershed. Mr. Kumar addressed this question by stating that if an exposed utility was found during the physical assessment of the watershed, the exposed utility was marked. All exposed utilities in the watershed have probably been noted, but whether or not they are active is not known.

Another member stated that PCB and ammonium found at the Cameron Run stream and surrounding tributaries is actually located further down the stream than in the Cameron Run watershed area. Project staff will coordinate with this member and validate this statement.

A copy of Dr. Southerland's presentation can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website under Cameron Run.

Watershed Management Plan Priority Issues

Dr. Southerland developed a "Strawman" list of priority issues identified through analysis of baseline data. Advisory committee members commented on the list, combining some issues and adding others. The committee was then asked to vote on those issues that they considered a top priority for discussion in the watershed management plan. Each committee member was asked to vote five times (for one or more issues) they individually thought were a priority to address in the watershed management plan. The list of priority issues as identified by the committee is as follows:

1. Sediment loss into streams of watershed – 9 votes (16%)
2. Impervious surfaces (paved land cover) – 8 votes (15%)
3. Loss and/or degradation of habitats and biological communities – 7 votes (13%)
4. Bank erosion including infrastructure impacts and channel instability – 6 votes (11%)
5. Polluted runoff/non-point sources of pollution, including inorganic toxins – 6 votes (11%)
6. Peak flow issues – 4 votes (7%)
7. Riparian buffer loss along stream banks – 3 votes (5%)
8. Bacteria and pathogens – 3 votes (5%)
9. Flooding – 2 votes (4%)
10. Direct inflow from stormwater systems into streams within watershed – 2 votes (4%)
11. Trash/Dump sites along and within streams in watershed – 2 votes (4%)
12. Channel alteration of streams in watershed– 1 vote (2%)
13. Low flow of streams in watershed– 1 vote (2%)
14. Obstructions in streams – 1 vote (2%)
15. Nutrients/organic loading into watershed from urban and non-urban sources– 0 votes (0%)

16. Fate of wetlands in watershed – 0 votes (0%)

At the February meeting, the committee will discuss voting findings and finalize the list of priority issues that will be included in the watershed management plan. Dr. Southerland also asks the committee to think of specific places in the watershed that epitomize the issues on the priority list. The project team will endeavor to include these examples in the watershed tour.

One member raised a concern regarding how activities in other watersheds can overwhelm beneficial efforts employed by the Cameron Run watershed community in the watershed management plan (e.g., on the Chesapeake Bay). Mr. Rose addressed this question by stating that the advisory committee is developing a watershed management plan for the benefit of the Cameron Run watershed community. The committee will address this concern further in future meetings of the advisory committee.

Meeting Adjournment

The committee decided that the next meeting be held on Thursday, February 12, 2004 at 7:00 PM. A meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting. The committee also set a date of Sunday, February 29, 2004 for a tour of the Cameron Run watershed.

Dr. Southerland closed the meeting by asking committee members to begin developing ideas for the Public Issues Forum that will be held in either March or April 2004. Specifically, committee members were asked to think about (1) Cameron Run watershed issues that should be discussed at the public forum, and (2) how best to publicize the forum to the community at large. Content for the Issues Forum will be determined by the committee in February. The committee will also finalize membership for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee at the February meeting.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty-watershed.net. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents for the watershed, a meeting and events calendar, and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. The Cameron Run website also contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may also be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or called into the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Advisory Committee Meeting

Ellen Coolidge Burke Branch Library, Alexandria, Virginia
February 12, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Than Bawcombe – Fairfax County Stormwater Planning
Glenda Booth – Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Vince Cusumano – Pinecrest HOA
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Don Demetrius -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES SWPD
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District
Moe Wadda – Falls Church Engineer
Norine Walker – Woodrow Wilson Bridge Project

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Fred Rose – DPWES
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Julie Tasillo -- Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purpose of this meeting of the advisory committee was to finalize the list of stakeholder groups and their corresponding representatives that should be invited to future committee meetings. The committee also identified specific problem sites within the watershed that exhibit one or more of the priority issues of concern identified by the committee at the January 13, 2004 meeting. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- Due to current weather conditions, the Cameron Run watershed tour will be conducted sometime during the spring. Project staff will contact committee members for potential meeting dates, locations, and times prior to the tour.
- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee identified problem areas specific to the individual subwatersheds within the Cameron Run watershed (see *Problem Areas Specific to Subwatersheds* below). These areas will be further discussed at the March committee meeting and will be considered as areas to visit during the spring watershed tour.
- The next meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee will be held in late March (committee members will be queried for dates that will be best attended), again at 7:00 PM. The meeting date, location, and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The Public Issues Forum will be held in April 2004. Content for the Issues Forum will be discussed at the April advisory committee meeting along with a finalized meeting location.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will continue to summarize background studies, will research issues identified by committee members as concerns in the watershed, and will present detailed findings to the advisory committee at the March meeting.
- Project staff will contact committee members during the remainder of February reminding them to either forward contact information for the groups, agencies, and organizations that were identified for inclusion on the advisory committee, or to contact these stakeholder groups themselves.
- Committee members will identify additional ways to bring more stakeholder representatives to future advisory committee meetings.
- Committee members will prepare ideas about issues that should be discussed at the Public Issues Forum, as well as how to publicize the meeting to the community.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introduction and Overview of Committee Activities to Date

Ms. Shore of Versar opened the advisory committee meeting by initiating an introductory session between committee and project staff members. Following the introductory session, Dr. Southerland of Versar presented a brief overview of advisory committee activities to date. He indicated that this meeting would focus more on group discussion and interaction and less on presenting data. Dr. Southerland reiterated the overall purpose of the advisory committee and the roles assigned to the committee. The roles of the advisory committee are as follows:

- Advising the consultant team about community outreach including additions to the advisory committee, and groups and individuals to invite to workshops.
- Helping to formulate agendas for public meetings to maximize relevance and applicability to the local watershed.
- Conducting outreach to their own constituency groups (e.g. neighborhood associations, civic and church groups, Chamber of Commerce, etc.).
- Advising the consultant team about key watershed issues on which to focus and additional sources of information.
- Providing suggestions on the topics and formats for public education materials and publicity.
- Reviewing and commenting on various initial and final drafts of the watershed management plan.

One member stressed that committee members should not take their roles lightly and that the review and comment role is especially important to the development of the Cameron Run watershed management plan. The review and comment role is more than simply reviewing the draft plan. It also means that committee members make recommendations on plan content.

Dr. Southerland made the following announcements concerning scheduling of future activities for the advisory committee:

- The watershed tour has been postponed from the original February 29, 2001 date due to the potential for inclement weather and to allow more time for the committee to study the issues facing the watershed.
- The next meeting of the advisory committee will be in late March (committee members will be queried for dates that will be best attended), again at 7:00 PM. The meeting date, location, and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The advisory committee will prepare for the Public Issues Forum at the April committee meeting.
- The Public Issues Forum will be held in late April 2004. A finalized location will be discussed at the April advisory committee meeting.

Finalization of Advisory Committee Representation

Ms. Shore asked each committee member to identify which stakeholder group they represented in order to open a dialogue about committee stakeholder representation. To re-cap, during the December 16, 2003 advisory committee meeting, committee members developed a list of stakeholders groups whose representatives should have a voice in the watershed plan development process. These stakeholder groups were as follows:

- Academic sector

- Business sector
- Citizen groups
- Community members
- Elected representatives/officials
- Woodrow Wilson Bridge construction project staff
- Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
- Northern Virginia Park Authority
- Government/Public sector
- Non-profit organizations
- Commercial/Residential real estate
- Heavy industry
- Metro/Railroad
- Recreation groups
- Nature advocacy groups

Of all the members present at this meeting, more than fifty (50%) percent were in the government/public sector. At least one representative from each of the stakeholder groups above has attended an advisory committee meeting to date, with the exception of the heavy industry, business sectors (except real estate developers) , and VDOT. To date neither project staff nor committee members have been able to get a representative from these stakeholder groups to attend a meeting.

One member raised the point that the groups and individuals who have been attending these meetings thus far have been concerned about the environment and the overall health of the watershed. Members from the heavy industry and business sectors may not see the benefits of participating in the planning process, though decisions could results in greater costs to them. They may not understand that development of a watershed management plan not only benefits the community environmentally but can also directly benefit citizens and businesses economically (e.g., by increased real estate values).

Mr. Rose of DPWES concurred by stating that business representatives do not understand the role of the advisory committee and how their input will shape the Cameron Run watershed plan. He suggested that project staff and committee members employ a different outreach approach for contacting stakeholder groups that are not represented at the advisory committee. Thus far outreach has been limited to phone calls by project staff and committee members and word of mouth. Mr. Rose suggested that a fact sheet or brochure describing the Cameron Run watershed and the purpose and roles of the advisory committee be developed for distribution to stakeholder groups without a representative on the advisory committee.

Another member supported Mr. Rose's comments by begging the question, "What can improving the Cameron Run watershed do for me?" This member suggested developing a message specific to each stakeholder group. A message for nature advocates might focus on watershed health and aesthetic benefits, while a message for business advocates might focus on economic benefits.

This same member also asked how the health of the Cameron Run watershed could be improved without spending a massive amount of money and raising tax dollars? The watershed is over-developed, in poor health, and not aesthetically pleasing. How can the committee convey both tangible and less tangible benefits of improving the watershed to the diverse stakeholder groups within the watershed and develop a plan that ties all of these benefits together? This member is specifically interested in aesthetically

improving the Cameron Run watershed, but members of other stakeholder groups may not share this view. How will the committee meet the challenge of conveying the connection between environmental and economic benefits of improving the Cameron Run watershed to the community ?

Mr. Rose addressed this member's concern by stating that the committee will have to find the connection between environmental benefits and everyday life of watershed community members. This will be a challenge because members of the community may be preoccupied with day-to-day activities and not see the big picture. The Public Issues Forum is a vehicle for the advisory committee to discuss watershed issues and potential solutions while educating the public on the environmental and economic benefits of improving the Cameron Run watershed.

Another member reminded the committee that one of the roles of the committee is to make recommendations for improving the health of the watershed, not to make recommendations for the cost of improvements. The purpose of the advisory committee is to help develop a plan that will improve the overall health of the watershed. The costs of implementing this plan are beyond the scope of this committee and should be addressed as a separate issue.

Another member suggested that a representative from George Mason University would be appropriate for the academic sector because George Mason University is in Fairfax County. This representative would have a good handle on the issues facing the watershed and could provide insights on possible solutions.

Another member stated that the City of Alexandria would like to have a representative attend future advisory committee meetings. The previous representative can no longer attend the meetings and the city is in the process of finding a new representative.

Likewise, another member stated that representatives of the Braddock area want to be informed of all committee activities, but are unable to consistently send a representative to committee meetings because of other issues facing the area.

Another member stressed the importance of having a member from the business sector attend future advisory committee meetings. This member suggested that current committee members go to their respective community groups and make an effort to reach out to the business community.

Another member suggested project staff contact a specific individual employed at Recreational Equipment Incorporated (REI) who is connected to a diverse array of environmental and nature groups. This member will provide contact information for this individual to project staff.

Another member strongly suggested that the committee contact representatives from heavy industry and implore them to attend future advisory committee meetings. This same member also suggested that a representative from the Alexandria Chamber of Commerce attend meetings.

Another member suggested that the committee invite principals from various schools to future advisory committee meetings. Utilizing school groups to plant riparian forest buffers along streambanks would help get the community involved in improving watershed health.

Another member suggested inviting members from community religious groups, and members from different ethnic communities. Having a representative present from different religious and ethnic groups opens the door to educating a larger audience in the watershed community. This member offered to give project staff contact information for various community centers.

Another member noted that while it is good to ask representatives from all of these groups to attend future advisory committee meetings, we need to ask, what will bring those representatives to the meetings? What can project staff and committee members tell stakeholder representatives to encourage them to attend committee meetings?

Another member responded to the above question by stating that the advisory committee is helping influence policy change by helping Fairfax County develop regulations that could impact the community in the future.

In response, Mr. Rose stated that the committee and the watershed community are tasked with not only influencing policy change, but with finding solutions to improve the watershed as well. The advisory committee is not a government function, but a group composed of community stakeholder groups who have come together to develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run.

Another member asked project staff what documents or studies are available to use as reference points when talking with representatives from other stakeholder groups. Should committee members use old county watershed management plans as references when discussing the tangible benefits of a new watershed management plan?

Dr. Southerland addressed this question by stating that while the old county management plans are available to the public and could be used as an initial reference point during outreach efforts, they are outdated. New regulations that specifically address watershed health have been passed, and new technologies have been developed to improve watershed health since the old plans were developed. The project team will provide summary materials on the condition of Cameron Run watershed at the March meeting.

Another member stated that the Little Hunting Creek watershed management plan is in draft form and could be used as a reference point for committee members when reaching out to other stakeholders.

Another member suggested that once specific issues have been identified for the Cameron Run watershed, that the committee develop a vision statement for the improvement of the Cameron Run watershed. The vision statement should be flexible enough to be applied to other watersheds in the County.

Dr. Southerland stated that the goal of the committee is to develop a watershed plan that makes Cameron Run a more livable watershed for the community. Each watershed community has issues specific to their watershed and these should be included in the vision statement if it is to have much utility. For example, developing a watershed management plan can improve the aesthetics of the watershed and increase recreational opportunities for the entire community.

Problem Areas Specific to Subwatersheds

In an effort to begin preparations for the April Public Issues Forum, Dr. Southerland asked committee members to identify specific problem areas within the Cameron Run watershed. Committee members were asked to identify problem areas in various subwatersheds that exhibit one or more of the priority issues of concern identified by the committee at the January 13, 2004 meeting. Issues were ranked by priority as determined by committee members at the January committee meeting. A specific problem area could represent more than one priority issue, and these areas will be considered as sites the committee could visit during the spring watershed tour. Discussion results are as follows:

- **Sediment inputs and sedimentation**
  - Cameron Run mainstem along I-495
  - Stormwater settling within corrugated pipes located in Falls Church
  - Lake Barcroft dump sites

- **Impervious surfaces (paved land cover)**
  - Baileys Crossroads area, Eisenhower Avenue and Van Dorn Street in Alexandria
  - Cities of Falls Church, Alexandria, and Annandale
  - Seven Corners area, I-395, I-495, and mixing bowl

- **Biological and habitat degradation – examples of good areas**
  - Lake Barcroft area past Columbia Pike (Holmes Run subwatershed)
  - Winkler Pond (Holmes Run subwatershed)

- **Bank erosion and channel instability (with infrastructure impacts**)
  - Tripps Run in Poplar Heights area
  - Inside Mason District Park
  - Backlick Run in the Brookhill area

- **Toxic polluted runoff**
  - Edsall Road Industrial Park
  - Falls Church cement plant
  - Eisenhower trash cogenerator in Culmore
  - See impervious surface category above

- **High and flashy peak flows**
  - Backlick Run area

- **Riparian buffer loss**
  - Mason District Park

- **Bacteria and pathogens**
  - Dog parks on Eisenhower, Duke Street, and Cameron Station
  - Backlick Run area

- **Flooding**
  - Falls Church
  - Lower/upper Tripps Run
  - Backlick Road

- **Direct storm inflow**
  - Specific example not given, but members indicated that the city of Falls Church demonstrates all problem issues

- **Trash/dump sites near streams**
  - Culmore area
  - East Telegraph road
  - Lake Barcroft area

- **Channel alteration of streams**
  - Upper Tripps Run just before enter Falls Church

- **Low flow of streams**
  - See direct storm inflow above

- **Obstructions in streams**
  - Lake Barcroft area
  - Mainstem obstructions via several dams eastward to Holmes Run

- **Wetlands loss and degradation**
  - Wetlands are virtually non-existent in Cameron Run watershed
  - Could be loss of wetlands downstream of Alexandria in the Belle Haven watershed

One member mentioned that when the Lake Barcroft community annually dredges out accumulated sedimentation in the lake, the community does not have a designated disposal site for the dredged material. This is particularly problematic during extremely wet years because the lake must be dredged more frequently. This member is concerned about sedimentation from areas north of the Lake Barcroft community and the burden placed on community members to keep the lake healthy.

Another member addressed this concern by stating that the City of Alexandria gives dredged materials to the VDOT for use in their ongoing projects in the metro area.

Mr. Kumar of DPWES addressed the concern of the member above by stating that between forty (40%) and seventy (70%) percent of the sedimentation in a water body originates in the stream channels connected to it. Most sedimentation comes from the stream channels and not over the land surrounding the water body.

Another member suggested that the committee should look at an urban diversity study that Virginia Tech released in March 2003. This study was distributed to the Committee via email and will be incorporated in the summary materials on the condition of Cameron Run watershed to be distributed by the project team at the March meeting.

Another member mentioned that a condo complex in Appleton has a "green roof," and that this might be a good site for the group to visit during the watershed tour.

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland closed the meeting by asking committee members to continue to identify problem areas within the watershed that demonstrate the priority issues of concern identified by the committee., He also asked members to finalize their ideas on the content for the upcoming Public Issues Forum. Content for the Issues Forum will be discussed by the committee in the March and April meetings.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds . Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents, a meeting and events calendar, and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee. The Cameron Run website also contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may also be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902.

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 5

Richard Byrd Branch Library, Springfield, Virginia
April 1, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Than Bawcombe – Fairfax County Stormwater Planning
Todd Benson – Fairfax County Park Authority
Glenda Booth – Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Citizen
Don Demetrius -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Phyllis Evans – Huntington Community Association
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
Steven Lester – Poplar Heights Civic Association/Center for Health, Environment and Justice
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
Janice Martin – President, Poplar Heights Recreation Association
Jim McGlone – Department of Forestry
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office
Francoise B. Renard – Venice Street Homeowner
Russell Rosenberger – President of Madison Homes
Larry Sexton – President, Falls Hill Civic Association
Peter Silvia – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Moe Wadda – City of Falls Church

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County DPWES SWPD
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES SWPD
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES SWPD
Margaret Clark – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Julie Tasillo -- Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the Committee to the Cameron Run Watershed Workbook, as a summary of work to date and a tool for new and continuing members to use for this project. In addition, the workbook was used to (1) identify and new or refined issues of concern in the watershed and (2) discuss possible solutions and how they would contribute to a vision for the watershed's future. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee added to and refined the list of issues of concern in the watershed.
- The Cameron Run Advisory Committee created a list of possible solutions to issues identified in the watershed workbook (see *Development of Vision for Cameron Run Watershed* below).
- The next meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee will be held during the week of April 26, 2004 at 7:00 PM. The meeting location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The advisory committee decided that conducting two public meetings by June 15 was too optimistic (especially holding the Public Scoping Meeting in early May). Therefore, the committee will decide on a public meeting schedule at the next (late April 2004) committee meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will update the advisory committee member contact list and distribute it to committee members via email and add it to the workbook.
- Project staff will research issues identified by committee members as concerns in the watershed, along with issues identified through other background research, and will present findings to the advisory committee.
- Project staff will contact committee members during the week of April 5, 2004 to confirm the date for the next committee meeting (week of April 26).
- Committee members will draft vision statements for the watershed for discussion at the April 2004 meeting.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introduction, Agenda, and Overview of Ground Rules

Ms. Shore of Versar convened the advisory committee meeting by introducing the project team and advisory committee members. Following the introductory session, Ms. Shore and Dr. Southerland of Versar distributed a detailed agenda (similar time-structured agendas will be used at future committee meetings) and introduced Margaret Clark of Versar who will act as the advisory committee meeting facilitator at this and future meetings. The revised agenda included topics of discussion, timeframes,

discussion leaders, preparation required by committee members, and projected outcomes of discussions. Ms. Shore and Dr. Southerland reintroduced the following ground rules that the advisory committee will operate under:

- One person represents each organization. If there are two people, one is designated as an alternate.
- Comments will be recorded but not attributed to particular individuals.
- The committee will operate through consensus. All views will be captured and recorded in the meeting minutes posted to the web.
- All meetings of the Cameron Run Watershed Advisory Committee are open to the public. The public may attend advisory committee meetings as 'observers' and public meetings as 'participants.'

Review the Roles of the Advisory Committee

Dr. Southerland reviewed the roles of the Advisory Committee for the benefit of those members who were attending their first advisory committee meeting. Committee roles are as follows:

- Advising the consultant team about community outreach including additions to the advisory committee, and groups and individuals to invite to public meetings and workshops.
- Helping to formulate agendas for public meetings to maximize relevance and applicability to the local watershed.
- Conducting outreach to their own constituency groups (e.g. neighborhood associations, civic and church groups, Chamber of Commerce).
- Advising the consultant team about key watershed issues on which to focus and additional sources of information.
- Providing suggestions on the topics and formats for public education materials and publicity.
- Reviewing and commenting on various initial and final drafts of the watershed management plan.

Discussion of the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Workbook

The Draft Cameron Run Watershed Workbook was sent to advisory committee members prior to this meeting. Dr. Southerland described the purpose of the workbook and gave a brief overview of its contents. The Cameron Run Watershed Workbook was created as a tool for the advisory committee to use during the watershed planning process. The workbook summarizes committee activities to date and includes an analysis of historical and County assessment data. Dr. Southerland encouraged committee members to use this workbook as a tool to help them dream, study, and plan for the future of the Cameron Run watershed. The Draft Cameron Run Watershed Workbook includes the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Overview of the watershed
- Chapter 2: Our watershed plan – Introduction to watershed planning
- Chapter 3: Issues in the watershed – e.g. bank erosion and sedimentation
- Chapter 4: State of the watershed – Overall condition of the Cameron Run watershed and its subwatersheds
- Chapter 5: Vision for the watershed – Options to address issues and potential benefits to the watershed

- Glossary

During the discussion, one member suggested that the most recent committee member list and contact information be included in the workbook so that committee members can contact each other to discuss issues. This member also suggested that the committee member list be emailed to all committee members as well.

During the workbook discussion on Chapter 4, Dr. Southerland distributed a workbook insert with a GIS map depicting future imperviousness in the Cameron Run watershed based on the new Fairfax County calculations. The imperviousness numbers included on this insert supercede values included in the earlier Stream Protection Strategy report.

During the Chapter 5 discussion, one member stressed that the committee needs to develop a clear vision statement and map out overall goals for the watershed management plan so that everyone is in concurrence when the final product is distributed. A clear vision and goals will also indicate when the committee has completed its task.

Dr. Southerland briefly described how the watershed modeling component of this planning process will identify the flows and pollutant loadings occurring in small watersheds (ten or more within each of the eight subwatershed used for assessment) as a means of refining the identification and problems and solutions. One member was interested in finding out how the model will be calibrated and whether it will use field monitoring data. Mr. Kumar of DPWES addressed this member's concerns by explaining that the water quality component of the model uses established values for different County land use categories. When all is said and done, the model will correlate qualitatively with raw field data. There are six sites in Fairfax County used to determine water quality conditions in the model, two of the six are located within the Cameron Run watershed.

The workbook will be edited to address committee comments and will be posted on the County website.

Watershed Issues Identified in Draft Cameron Run Watershed Workbook

Margaret Clark of Versar introduced herself to the committee and explained how future advisory committee meetings would be held. Items discussed during a committee meeting that do not directly pertain to an agenda item will be noted and tracked in the 'parking lot' for discussion later during the meeting or at a future advisory committee meeting. In addition, all action items will be documented as they occur throughout the meeting. Ms. Clark proceeded to lead a group discussion concerning the watershed issues listed in Chapter 3 of the watershed workbook. Watershed issues were based on those identified by the advisory committee in earlier meetings.

10 Primary Issues	**16 Component Issues Identified by Advisory Committee**
Bank Erosion and Sedimentation	• Bank erosion including infrastructure impacts and channel instability • Sediment loading to watershed and accumulation in streams
Paved Surfaces	• Impervious surfaces and increased runoff
Loss of Stream Habitat and Stream Life	• Loss or degradation of habitats and biological communities
Irregular Stream Flows	• Higher peak flows • Lower low flows • Direct inflow from stormwater systems into streams

Loss of Riparian Buffer and Wetlands	• Loss or degradation of riparian buffers along streams and shorelines • Loss of wetlands in watershed
Pollution	• Discharge or runoff of toxic pollution into streams and lakes • Nutrients loading into watershed
Bacteria	• Bacteria and pathogens in streams and lakes
Flooding	• Flooding of property
Stream Channel Alteration	• Channel alteration of streams • Obstruction to flow and fish passage in streams
Trash	• Dumping and accumulation of trash in streams and lakes

Ms. Clark asked committee members to review the table above and identify issues of concern not captured in this list. Issues identified by committee members and the discussion of these issues were as follows:

- Development of new homes and commercial property. Tearing down smaller homes and building larger homes ("McMansion" analogy) or commercial property thus increasing imperviousness throughout the watershed.
- Flooding is an issue for all who reside in the watershed community, not just for those who reside in the floodplain. Responsibility for controlling flooding should be shared equally among watershed community residents. Several members felt that flooding should be ranked higher on the issue list.
- Include lawns as a contributor to flooding. Lawns are also relatively impervious and constitute a high percentage of non-pervious (80-95%) surfaces on residential properties. Forested yards absorb more rainwater and help reduce flooding.
- Control of Invasive (non-native) species. .
- Loss of terrestrial and aquatic species.
- Loss of tree cover resulting in an increase in imperviousness
- Impact of stormdrains as incubator for bacteria and as a habitat for rats, raccoons, feral cats and other animals that defecate in the stormdrains and pollute streams.
- Some of the issues listed above are causes and others are effects (e.g., bank erosion is a result of flashing flows caused by impervious surfaces). Members suggested identifying which issues are causes and which are effects and maybe separating the two categories in the final product.
- Improving quality of life by increasing recreational opportunities in the watershed. This can also be seen as a goal for the watershed management plan.
- Creating opportunities for retrofits on older communities that do not have latest stormwater management technology.
- Underutilization of stream valleys.

- Making monies available to finance development and implementation of watershed issue solutions.
- Educate those who reside upstream in the watershed about the effects that their actions have on the watershed and the impact on those who reside downstream in the watershed. Increase the involvement of the public in watershed management.
- Increase tree cover with species that are native to the watershed.
- Thermal impacts.
- Inherent conflict between improving water quality (e.g., increasing riparian buffers would slow runoff) and reducing flooding (e.g., riparian buffers could increase the width of the floodplain).
- Enforcement of current stormwater management policies (e.g., violations within Resource Protection Areas (RPAs)).

One member said that including the loss of tree and shrub cover throughout the watershed is important because it influences all the other issues with the exception of paved surfaces and possibly trash.

Members suggested changing the *Paved Surfaces* issue category to *Impervious Surfaces* with subsets of paved surfaces and infill.

Members ultimately decided that assigning priorities to the list of watershed is not as important as identifying solutions to these issues, and assigning priorities to these solutions.

Development of Vision for Cameron Run Watershed

Ms. Clark led a committee brainstorming session on developing a vision for the Cameron Run watershed. Committee members were asked to give their ideas of what they would like the Cameron Run watershed to look like after the management plan is implemented. Ms. Clark also asked committee members to discuss specific solutions to achieve their "vision."

Committee members discussed the differences between a vision for the watershed and more specific goals or objectives needed to achieve this vision. Members concluded that a discussion of goals and solutions to watershed problems would be more useful. Goals identified by the committee members included the following:

- Decrease flooding in the watershed, especially in homes.
- Reduce sediment loads to natural levels.
- Make the watershed swimmable and fishable by decreasing bacteria levels.
- Reduce the number of homes in the floodplain.
- Ensure that water quality downstream is comparable to water quality upstream.
- Provide Countywide street sweeping.
- Reduce silt from upstream areas of the watershed.
- Maximize green cover not only around streams but throughout the watershed.
- Ensure that watershed management is a priority with both policy makers and residents.
- Promote a healthy ecosystem through sound watershed management.

- Ensure solutions are equitable and that all watershed community members are held accountable for management implementation.
- Decrease impervious surfaces on both commercial and private property (e.g., by implementing Low Impact Development techniques to reduce stormwater runoff).

Based on the goals identified above, committee members have been asked to draft vision statements for discussion at the next committee meeting.

To meet the goals above, committee members identified the following solutions:

- Plant native vegetation around streams (not restricted to riparian buffer) and stop cutting down trees.
- Ensure there is enough County and city staff available to implement final watershed plan.
- Ensure that provisions in the management plan are implemented and enforced.
- Increase recycling awareness programs to encourage less littering in the watershed.
- Make responsible behaviors (e.g., recycling) easier for community members (i.e., eliminate counterproductive regulation).
- Update County building codes to include pervious driveways both for new development and replacement projects.
- Allow for hazardous waste material recycling through satellite collection areas.
- Limit development until impacts to the watershed are assessed (i.e., through a mini-NEPA assessment).
- Encourage public involvement and input for all publicly funded projects. All affected parties should be notified in writing prior to and well before extensive and/or expensive studies are conducted. Notification should be given to the entire community, not only to those property owners in the adjacent area.
- Provide equitable solutions that hold the watershed community equally accountable.
- Transparency of the true intent of publicly funded projects (i.e., community projects funded to address local issues, but that really address long-term future County or state development projects). Ensure that public can track project progress.
- Encourage Low Impact Development in management plan.
- Reduce geese population in the watershed community.
- Promote “friends of …groups” in the watershed.
- Address watershed issues as close to problem source as possible – encourage local solutions.
- Reduce pesticides through Integrated Pest Management practices.
- Encourage inter-jurisdictional coordination between watershed communities.
- Strengthen County policies and update land use, zoning, road development, waste disposal, stormwater, and building code policies as well as the County Master Plan.
- Coordinate with the State for regulating utilities in the watershed.

Mr. Kumar informed committee members that the public can track the progress of publicly funded projects through the LDS net tracking system. This system will allow community members to track projects in real time.

One member stated that in certain communities, developers do not have to notify adjacent residents of when a house will be demolished or the impact the demolition will have on them. When obtaining a wetland permit, developers have to notify the public 90 days in advance of any activities that could affect the wetland. This same policy should apply to demolition projects.

Another member addressed this concern by suggesting that the County use the Mount Vernon District Committee as a model for public notification by the County. The Mount Vernon District Committee informs community residents of projects before they are implemented. The committee acts as an education forum for community residents and as a catalyst for public involvement.

Schedule for Advisory Committee Activities

Ms. Shore presented the proposed schedule for future committee activities and encouraged committee feedback. The suggested committee schedule was as follows:

- Next advisory committee meeting: April 26 – 29 (date to be selected)
- Public Issues Scoping Forum: Either May 4 – 6 or May 11 – 13 (6 to 9 in the evening)
- May advisory committee meeting: May 26 – 27
- Public Community Watershed Forum: Saturday June 5 or 12 (full day)

Ms. Shore will send an email to all committee members to finalize meeting dates. Draft informational flyers publicizing the Public Issues Forum will be presented to committee members at the April meeting for approval and distribution.

Committee members were concerned that the timeframe for the public meetings was too short. Committee members were against the idea of having the Public Issues Scoping Forum in early May because they did not feel that they are ready to go to the public, nor did they feel that there is enough time to publicize the meeting. They argued that the earliest time the Public Issues Scoping Forum should be held is either the end of May or early June. Members reasoned that it is premature to conduct a public meeting before the committee has developed a clear vision statement, and concrete ideas about plan development and implementation. Members were also concerned because neither an advertising scheme nor an agenda have been developed in preparation for this first public meeting. In addition, members suggested that more than one Public Issues Scoping Forum meeting be held to increase the likelihood of a good turnout. They felt that a single meeting would not draw attendance from the other half of the watershed. Separate meetings in the northern and southern areas of the watershed, for example, would result in better public attendance. Committee members voiced concern about advertising the public meetings as the Cameron Run Watershed, as many citizens associate with other waterbodies located in the watershed (e.g., Holmes Run, Lake Barcroft).

Committee members agreed with project staff that conducting the Public Community Watershed Forum during the summer is unrealistic because it would be poorly attended. The committee members felt the process would not lose momentum by holding this meeting sometime during the fall.

A committee member also inquired about the watershed tour that was discussed at earlier committee meetings. This member also requested briefings on Low Impact Development and Best Management Practice techniques.

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland, Ms. Shore, and Ms. Clark closed the meeting by identifying agenda items for the April advisory committee meeting. Agenda items include setting a schedule to prepare for the Public Issues Scoping Forum and discussing a vision for the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Project staff also asked committee members to draft vision statements for discussion at the April 2004 committee meeting. Content for the Public Issues Scoping Forum will be discussed in the committee meetings prior to the public meeting.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902 or toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 6

Mason District Governmental Center, Annandale, Virginia
April 28, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Glenda Booth – Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Florence Cavazos – Tripps Run Resident
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Ken Kopka – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
George Madill – Bren Mar Civic Association
Jim McGlone – Department of Forestry
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office
Donald Peterson – Co-Chairman, Bren Mar Park-Lincolnia Park
Aaron Rodehorst – Citizen
F. Wyatt Shields – Assistant City Manager City of Falls Church
Tom Wasaff – City of Alexandria

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES SWPD
Margaret Clark – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purpose of this meeting was to begin coordinating the content, logistics, and public outreach strategy for the June Public Issues Scoping Forum. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- The next meeting of the Cameron Run Advisory Committee will be held on May 26, 2004 at 7:00 PM at the George Mason Regional Library (7001 Little River Turnpike, Annandale, VA 22003-5975).
- The Public Issues Scoping Forum will be held at the Mason District Governmental Center at 7:00 PM on June 17, 2004. The final agenda will be developed during the May meeting of the advisory committee.
- The advisory committee decided that it would be beneficial to meet over the summer months to plan for the September Community Issues Forum and conduct a watershed tour.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will poll committee members to determine the next meeting date, proposed dates are May 24 - 27.
- Project staff will ensure that the Mason District Governmental Center is available for use on the evening of June 17, 2004 by the committee for the Public Issues Scoping Forum meeting.
- Project staff will develop a promotional flyer based on input from the committee and send to Fairfax County for review by May 5.
- Project staff will draft a public service announcement for local newspapers and submit to Fairfax County for approval.
- Project staff will send both 20 hard copies and an electronic copy of approved flyer and newspaper announcement text to committee members. These documents will also be placed on the Cameron Run Watershed web-page.
- Committee members will inform project staff if they need additional flyers for distribution within their communities.
- Project staff will produce the flyers requested by committee members in a timely manner.
- Project staff will develop a draft presentation to be presented at the Public Issues Scoping Forum for review by committee members during the May meeting.
- Project staff will propose dates for summer committee meetings and the watershed tour and then poll committee members for final dates.
- Project staff will contact committee members for a list of additional civic associations within the Cameron Run Watershed not represented on the proposed media strategy.

- Committee members are encouraged to contact civic associations they are associated with via phone to help publicize the June 17 Public Issues Scoping Forum.
- Project staff will place a complete list of home owner's associations and civic associations in the Cameron Run Watershed on the watershed web page.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introductions and Overview

Ms. Shore of Versar convened the advisory committee meeting by introducing the project team and advisory committee members. Following the introductory session, Ms. Shore and Dr. Southerland of Versar, briefly reviewed the agenda, committee roles and ground rules. Dr. Southerland stressed that the focus of this meeting was to discuss how best to utilize resources to maximize public involvement in the watershed planning process. The committee will designate voting members for each stakeholder group represented at committee meetings during the May committee meeting. Dr. Southerland stressed that once the advisory committee structure is finalized

- Only the designated voting member can vote for that particular stakeholder group
- In the event the voting member is not present an alternate member may vote
- Anyone can attend and participate in advisory committee meetings
- Committee members and project staff will solicit input from the community for watershed planning purposes

Dr. Southerland reviewed the purpose, structure and content of the watershed workbook that was distributed to committee members prior to and discussed at the April 1, 2004 meeting. To reiterate, the watershed workbook is a tool to be used by committee members to plan the future of the Cameron Run Watershed through the watershed planning process. Project staff revised material contained within the workbook based on committee comments at the April 1, 2004 meeting, and added additional materials for the benefit of committee members. Dr. Southerland stressed the benefits of including a sources of assistance and Best Management Practices (BMPs) section in the workbook. The watershed workbook contains the following revisions and updates:

- Revised Table of Contents
- Chapter 1: Overview of the Watershed
    - Revised content in Chapter 1
    - Insert: Summary of Existing Reports and Data Sources (sources of assistance)
- Chapter 2: Our Watershed Plan
- Chapter 3: Issues in the Watershed
    - Revised content in Chapter 3
    - Insert: Preliminary Problem Areas in Watershed
- Chapter 4: State of the Watershed
    - Insert: Projected Future Imperviousness in Cameron Run Watershed
- Chapter 5: Vision of the Watershed
    - Insert: Data Sources on Options for Addressing Urban Watershed Problems (BMPs)

- Glossary

Discussion on Public Involvement and Public Meeting Schedule

Ms. Clark of Versar and Dr. Southerland led a committee discussion pertaining to the upcoming Public Issues Scoping Forum that will be held in June. The Public Issues Scoping Forum is an evening meeting with the purpose of introducing the public to the watershed planning process and to gather input from the public on specific issues facing the watershed community as they pertain to watershed management. Specifically, the meeting is used to explain to the public why a watershed management plan is being developed for the Cameron Run Watershed community, why public involvement is important to the planning process, what the end product will be, and to encourage public participants to discuss issues within the watershed. During this meeting it is the goal of Fairfax County and project staff to gather any additional watershed issues from the public not addressed by the advisory committee and to validate the watershed planning process by involving the public early in the watershed management plan development process. Public input is desired prior to development of the draft watershed management plan. It is important to have this first public meeting because it demonstrates to the public that

- A committee exists which represents community interests
- This committee is actively involved in the planning process
- Fairfax County and project staff are coordinating with the community to develop an implementable plan for the Cameron Run Watershed.

Demonstrating community involvement in the planning process will generate interest in plan development and members of the community will be more likely to attend public meetings. The goal of the public process is to educate the community about watershed issues and provide solutions to correct those issues.

Committee members had a variety of questions and comments concerning the content and purpose of the Public Issues Scoping Forum, as well as ideas on how to conduct the public meetings. Some felt it is important to watershed management plan development for members of the watershed community to attend all four public meetings. The following is a summary of the discussion between Fairfax County, project staff, and committee members concerning coordination of the Public Issues Scoping Forum and the remaining three public meetings (the Community Issues Forum, presentation of the draft watershed management plan, and presentation of the final watershed management plan). The discussion can be grouped into the following three topic areas of discussion:

- Conduct all public meetings in a centralized location
- Conduct multiple public meetings on the same topic in distinct geographical regions of the watershed community
- Conduct the Public Issues Scoping Forum at multiple locations and the other public meetings at a central location
- Not conduct the Public Issues Scoping forum

The arguments for conducting all public meetings at one central location focused on cataloguing public input and the ease of molding input into one plan. By having meetings in two geographical areas, there is the potential for groups to create two distinct watershed management plans. The groups would not interact with each other and the plan would reflect this lack of coordination and discussion. By having multiple meetings, the plan may go in various directions thus de-emphasizing the value of the public process. The goal of the public meetings is to capture public input for plan development, not create regional watershed management plans. The pros of having all public meetings in a central location is to decrease the cost to the county for conducting meetings and to encourage repeat participation by the

public by having all meetings at the same location. The cons include a potential decrease in the level of public participation due to the large size of the Cameron Run Watershed. Members of one portion of the community may feel disconnected with those in another portion. To address this issue, some committee members suggested that the first half of the Public Issues Scoping Forum focus on issues in the different geographic regions of the watershed and that the second half of the meeting pull these geographic issues together and map out the overarching issues facing the watershed.

Arguments for conducting public meetings at multiple locations throughout the watershed focused on increasing public participation at public meetings by bringing meetings closer to the residents. For example, the issues facing residents in the Tripps Run portion of the watershed may differ from the issues facing residents who live near the Wilson Bridge region of the watershed. Areas of concern may differ due to geographic region. This group also warns that having one meeting in a central location might discourage public participation because of the potential, or fear, of attending a meeting with a very large, unmanageable group of people all trying to share their concerns in a short allocated amount of time. The watershed management plan should address issues from each region and stakeholder group within the watershed community. Therefore, public meetings would ideally include representatives from each region and stakeholder group within the watershed. The pros of having public meetings in multiple locations within the watershed are the potential for repeat participation by community members. Cons include an increase in the cost to the county and the potential for meeting participants to not interact with one another, thus causing the management plan to have multiple voices and focuses as opposed to a common focus and voice. This group suggests have meetings in the northern and southern regions of the watershed and by the Cameron Run tributary.

The third group agreed with the second group's arguments for conducting the Public Issues Scoping Forum at multiple locations within the watershed to encourage participation and spark community interest, but suggested conducting the other three public meetings at a central location to mold the management plan together. The pros of this option are that public participation will be encouraged at the Public Issues Scoping Forum and community members may have enough of an interest to attend the other public meetings. The con would be the increased cost to the county for conducting multiple Public Issues Scoping Forum meetings.

The last group of members questioned whether or not it is necessary for management plan development to conduct a Public Issues Scoping Forum. This group was concerned about the timeframe between the April meeting and the June Public Issues Scoping Forum meeting and whether committee members and project staff have enough time to publicize the meeting to the community. Dr. Southerland and Mr. Kumar of DPWES addressed this group's concerns by stating that the county developed a process for conducing public outreach which included four public meetings to discuss watershed issues and present the draft and final management plans. The county also encourages conducting the Public Issues Scoping Forum before the start of the summer season so that project staff can continue to move forward with the management plan development process.

Once all arguments were presented for the four groups discussed above, Ms. Clark initiated a vote to determine how public meetings will be conducted in the Cameron Run Watershed. Members voted to conduct all public meetings at a central location. Members further decided that the Public Issues Scoping Forum will be conducted on June 17, 2004 and the second public meeting, the Community Issues Forum, will be conducted in September. This will give community members enough time to become interested in the process, but not enough time to forget about the planning process. The committee decided that a good way to curtail forgetfulness in the planning process is to advertise the Community Issues Forum throughout the period between the Public Issues Scoping Forum and the Community Issues Forum using various media.

Public Outreach and Encouraging Public Involvement

Ms. Peyton of Horne Engineering initiated a discussion on public outreach and presented a draft media strategy for committee discussion. The media strategy included sending articles to local newspapers, to civic associations and homeowners associations for placement in their respective newsletters, and to non-profit organizations to be placed in newsletters and web pages. The strategy also suggests drafting public services announcements for local radio stations and cable channels, crafting flyers and brochures for distribution in local community centers and businesses. This strategy also encourages committee members to not segregate members of different ethnic groups, but rather to ensure that all messages can be easily translated and distributed to members of these communities. The proposed draft media strategy included a list of newspapers, home owner's associations and civic association groups to target. Ms. Peyton stressed that this was not an exhaustive list, but rather a starting point for groups to target and will be updated based on committee input.

Committee members suggested adding City of Alexandria and Mount Vernon newspapers to the list of papers to target. Upon further investigation, project staff discovered that the Mount Vernon area is out of the Cameron Run Watershed area and thus will not be targeted for public involvement. Another member suggested contacting the local farmer's market as another means for advertising public meetings.

One committee member emphasized that, on average, only four to six percent of targeted audience will come to a public meeting, regardless of the advertising strategy. Another member suggested adding local churches to the media strategy target list. This member also voiced a concern that articles submitted to local newspapers might reach readers outside of the watershed area. This member suggested relying more on flyer and brochure distribution as opposed to newspapers.

Another member suggested developing an advertising approach that focuses on issues that affect community members such as flooding. The flyers and brochures could have a catch phrases such as "do you have drainage problems?" The catch phrase should be tied to an issue that immediately impacts the community resident.

Committee members were concerned about the lead time for advertising to the public prior to the Public Issues Scoping Forum. Some civic and home owner's association newsletters are not distributed on a monthly basis, but rather on an every other month schedule. The lead time for advertising is six weeks and this may not be enough time to advertise the first public meeting. Dr. Southerland addressed this issue by committing project staff to developing and distributing flyers and newsletter advertisements to committee members via email within one week of this meeting. There will not be enough lead time to send material to every source listed in the strategy, but those sources will be targeted during summer months to advertise for the September Community Issues Forum. The flyer will include a map of the watershed area to give meeting attendees a reference point for discussion. It was also suggested that flyers be produced in a bright background color so that they catch the attention of the targeted audience.

Project staff will also draft an advertisement for distribution in local homeowners and civic associations.

One committee member suggested advisory committee members sit in on their local civic association meetings to discuss watershed management plan development for the Cameron Run Watershed community. This member suggested that the best way to speak at these meetings would be to come prepared with a presentation about the watershed planning process.

Advisory committee members are champions for advertising public meetings to the community. Outreach is not wholly dependent on community members for success, but members are encouraged to spread the word to their stakeholder groups. Committee members are also community members and thus will know how to communicate the watershed area and the issues facing the watershed in ways the Cameron Run Watershed community will understand. Community members may not realize they are part of the Cameron Run Watershed, but they will relate to issues that affect the tributary near to them (Tripps

Run, Holmes Run, etc.). It was noted that it would be more effective for committee members to call their local homeowner's and civic associations as opposed to sending an email to ensure contact. One member will provide a list of civic associations to project staff and committee members.

Advisory committee members are encouraged to attend the Public Issues Scoping Forum to show their support, but it is not essential that committee members be present. Dr. Southerland recommended that one or more committee members give a brief statement to the public on why they are interested in developing the plan. This will "bring home" the project by highlighting personal motivations. A few members of the committee volunteered to be present at the Public Issues Scoping Forum to perform this function. It will be essential for a number of committee members to be present at the September Community Issues Forum.

To prepare for the Public Issues Scoping Forum, project staff will develop a draft presentation to be presented at the public meeting. This presentation will include the purpose of public meetings and public involvement, the laws and regulations that are either being violated or could be violated, Chesapeake Bay initiatives, and some of the issues of concern within the watershed. The presentation will also highlight monitoring activities that will be conducted by project staff during the summer months. Committee members suggested using language from the watershed workbook for the presentation. This presentation will be presented at the May advisory committee meeting for committee review. Members also suggested distributing handouts of the presentation at the Public Issues Scoping Forum meeting so that meeting attendees can easily follow along with presentation content.

Watershed Vision

Dr. Southerland briefly reviewed primary goals identified by the committee when discussing a watershed vision at the April 1, 2004 meeting. The goals could be grouped into the following five groups:

- Increase natural cover
- Decrease imperviousness
- Decrease flooding
- Decrease sedimentation
- Achieve a fishable and swimmable watershed

Committee members noted that if natural cover is increased and imperviousness decreased, the other three goals can be achieved.

Members who crafted vision statements that could not be discussed at this meeting because of time constraints, should forward their statements to project staff for discussion via email or at the May committee meeting.

Schedule for Advisory Committee Activities

Ms. Shore reviewed the schedule for upcoming committee meetings as decided by the committee at this meeting. The upcoming schedule is as follows:

- Next advisory committee meeting: Sometime during the week of May 24, 2004 (now set for May 26). This meeting will focus on preparing for the June 17, 2004 Public Issues Scoping Forum
- Public Issues Forum: June 17, 2004 at the Mason District Governmental Center from 7:00 PM to 9:00 PM or longer.
- The advisory committee will convene at least once over the summer months and the watershed tour will be conducted during this time

- Community Watershed Forum: Tentatively scheduled for September 2004

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland, Ms. Shore, and Ms. Clark closed the meeting by identifying agenda items for the May advisory committee meeting. Agenda items include revising and approving the public meeting presentation, setting dates for the remainder of the public meetings, and developing a vision statement for the Cameron Run Watershed (if time permits).

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the county website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 7

George Mason Regional Library, Annandale, Virginia
May 26, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Stacey Sloan Blersch – USACE Baltimore District, Planning Division
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Don Demetrius – Fairfax County DPW
Dave Eckert – Falls Church Stream Stewards
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office
Heather Melchior – Fairfax County Park Authority
James Mottley – Falls Church Resident
Donald Peterson – Co-Chairman, Bren Mar Park-Lincolnia Park
Aaron Rodehorst – Citizen
Russell Rosenberger – President of Madison Homes
Peter Silvia – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.
Mark Mobius – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside within the Cameron Run watershed community. The purpose of this meeting was to prepare for the upcoming June Public Issues Scoping Forum. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- The Public Issues Scoping Forum will focus on obtaining input from attendees and avoid including too much technical and planning detail.
- The Cameron Run watershed tour will be held on July 24, 2004. A meeting location and time will be sent prior to the tour.
- Next advisory committee meeting will be held during the week of August 23, 2004. A meeting date, location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The next public meeting, the Community Watershed Forum, will be held September 18, 2004. The agenda for this meeting will be discussed during the August advisory committee meeting.
- The third public meeting, the Draft Plan Review, is tentatively scheduled for January 12, 2005. An agenda for this meeting will be discussed during the fall.
- The fourth public meeting, the Final Plan Review, is tentatively scheduled for April 20, 2005. An agenda for this meeting will be discussed after the Draft Plan Review.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will revise the draft presentation to focus on gathering public input on issues/problems faced by those in the watershed community and will describe how public input will steer management plan development (see *Public Meeting Presentation Discussion* below).
- Project staff will develop supplemental materials (e.g., handouts, power point slides) for distribution at the Public Issues Scoping Forum for those public attendees who might want more information.
- Project staff will send out a list via email to committee members of things that need to be done prior to the meeting.
- Project staff will contact those committee members who volunteered to contribute at the public meeting to verify that they are still willing and available.
- Project staff will provide meeting facilitators recognized facilitation methods and ground rules.
- Committee members will notify project staff if they are available to attend and/or help prepare for the public meeting.
- Committee members are encouraged to contact civic associations they are associated with via phone to help publicize the Public Issues Scoping Forum.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introductions and Overview

Ms. Shore of Versar convened the advisory committee meeting by initiating an introductory session between project staff and advisory committee members. Ms. Shore also introduced Clem Rastatter as the new advisory committee meeting facilitator. Following the introductory session, Ms. Shore and Dr. Southerland of Versar briefly reviewed the agenda, as well as advisory committee roles and ground rules. Dr. Southerland stressed that the focus of this meeting was to prepare for the June 17 Public Issues Scoping Forum.

Public Meeting Presentation Discussion

Dr. Southerland briefly gave committee members an overview of the draft presentation that would be given during the first 45-minutes of the Public Issues Scoping Forum. The presentation would discuss watershed management planning goals, an overview of the watershed management planning process, and educate the public on some of the issues/problems facing the Cameron Run watershed community and overall watershed water quality. Dr. Southerland explained that through the presentation the public would gain an understanding of the watershed planning process. Specific presentation topics would include

- Fairfax County Watershed Planning
- Watershed Basics
- A "Virtual Tour" of the Cameron Run Watershed
- Steps in Developing a Watershed Management Plan
- Community Issues of Concern

At the conclusion of his overview, Dr. Southerland initiated a discussion to obtain committee member feedback on the presentation. While there were many thoughts and comments on the presentation, the following four main issues kept surfacing during this committee discussion:

- Purpose of Public Issues Scoping Forum
- Meeting Presentation Content
- Keeping Focus of Meeting on Public
- Public Meeting Structure

Purpose of Public Issues Scoping Forum

Committee members were concerned with clarifying not only the purpose of the public meetings in the watershed management planning process, but also the purpose of the Public Issues Scoping Forum. Project staff addressed committee member concerns by stating that the purpose of the public meetings is to educate the public on the state of the Cameron Run watershed, inform them of the issues and problems facing the watershed, and then to ask the public for input. Careful evaluation of public concern is key to developing an implementable plan. To obtain public buy-in it is imperative that the public understands that they are a vital part of the planning process.

Project staff also stressed that planning is an on-going process and the public should be aware of the role that the advisory committee plays in representing their interests in the process of management plan development. The issues identified by the advisory committee are good starting points for the public discussion of problems that concern the public in their subwatershed communities. While the Public

Issues Scoping Forum is the first step in the planning process, it should be realized that it is only one piece in a larger process. The public should know up-front what their role is in the planning process as well as the role of the advisory committee representing them. The focus of this first public meeting should be on letting the public know what their role is in the planning process and what the benefits and costs will be of developing and eventually implementing the plan.

Meeting Presentation Content

Since the Public Issues Scoping Forum will be a shorter meeting (two hours compared to the half day proposed for the Community Watershed Forum), committee members felt that the information presented at this meeting should be concise and only touch on a few points. For greater detail, the public should be directed to the project website where they can find more information. Project staff agreed with this suggestion and carried the recommendation a step further by suggesting that more detailed information be on hand in the event an attendee wants more information. Since not all community residents have access to the internet, this information can be in the form of handouts or fact sheets, overhead transparencies, or power point slides that include the project hot-line number in addition to the project website. Copies of the watershed workbook that was developed for advisory committee members will also be brought to the public meeting.

Committee members suggested that the draft presentation be revised because the current presentation is too long and far too technical for the purposes of this meeting. The focus of the presentation should be geared towards gathering public input on issues and describing how their input will steer management plan development. Committee members advise project staff to determine what three ideas they want the public to walk away with at the conclusion of this meeting. They suggest that three of these ideas be to obtain an understanding of where the Cameron Run Watershed is, who is included in the watershed community, a brief status of the state of the watershed, and a brief overview of the planning process. Technical detail should be limited because it can be overwhelming to meeting attendees. Committee members strongly encourage project staff to shorten the draft presentation because it is too technical and could give the impression that the public meeting is being held to tell the public about the status of the planning process rather than involving the public in the planning process. Another reason the presentation should rely less on presenting technical detail is because these details will be presented at the September Community Watershed Forum (the first half of this forum will be spent on presenting technical information to the public). The presentation portion of the Public Scoping meeting should be as short as possible, maybe only 15 minutes in length, and focus on the purpose of the public meetings. Otherwise, project staff may run the risk of intimidating the audience and thus receive no feedback from them. Also, if the presentation includes too much detail at this early stage in the public process, then there is a risk of shifting the focus of this meeting from an issues gathering and discussion meeting, to that of identifying solutions to issues already identified by project staff and committee members. Project staff agreed with committee members on these points, but stressed the importance of at least introducing the watershed modeling component of this project since most of the project funding is directed at modeling.

Committee members stressed the importance of grabbing the attention of public meeting attendees up front and capturing their interest in the watershed management planning process. It is very important to encourage public meeting attendees to talk about the issues and problems they are facing in their communities and the presentation should be tailored to encourage this dialogue. Committee members warned that subject experts sometimes tend to talk down to their audience when presenting ideas or data. To avoid alienating the audience, the material presented at this public meeting should be brief and concise and should be used to encourage a dialogue between project staff, committee members in attendance, and public attendees. The meeting facilitator should take care not to disregard or discard any of the issues brought up by meeting attendees. Each issue should be discussed to completion with other meeting

attendees before the next point is discussed. This will let meeting attendees know they are being heard and that their input is valuable.

Focus on Public

Committee members stressed that the presentation needs to emphasize why the public should care about the watershed management planning process. Meeting attendees should leave the meeting with an understanding of their role in the planning process, and of how the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan ties to both local and regional concerns (e.g., flooding basements and/or restoration of the Chesapeake Bay). Public attendees will be interested in learning what they can do to improve the watershed and help Fairfax County meet their planning goals, as well as what the county will do to improve the watershed. Ultimately, meeting attendees will be concerned with the quality of life in the watershed once the management plan is implemented.

Committee members also reminded project staff that the reason members of the public attend this type of meeting is because they have something to say and want to be heard by the county. These attendees have a desire to voice their opinions in order to influence policy changes that will improve their communities. Project staff and committee members agreed that they should encourage public attendees to talk about their issues, thus ensuring that the public knows they have a voice and a stake in the overall planning process. Committee members agreed that even if the public raises issues or problems that have been already recognized by project staff and committee members that this is okay because it reinforces the importance of these issues and problems. This will give the public a stake in the planning process by making the county and the public accountable for implementing solutions to those issues and problems. Project staff stressed the importance of community involvement in developing strategies for resolving watershed issues.

Public Meeting Structure

Project staff and committee members also discussed the structure of the first public meeting and whether or not the meeting should be driven by the discussion that follows the brief presentation. Project staff suggested structuring the meeting into two one-hour parts. The first hour of the meeting will begin with a few short remarks by Fairfax County followed by a 15-minute presentation introducing Cameron Run and the planning process and a 45-minute general discussion about the process and any overarching issues attendees might have. During the first 45 minutes of the second hour, public attendees will break into groups to discuss issues specific to their communities, after which project staff will bring all the groups together to discuss overarching issues.

The majority of committee members agreed that it would be a good idea to break into smaller groups as long as either a project staff member or a committee member were available to facilitate and keep groups on track. Committee members who did not agree with breaking into smaller groups warned that project staff and committee members may run the risk of public attendees losing sight of the meeting purpose and becoming confused about their role in the planning process. They also noted that large, open forums generate more discussion because outspoken members of the group, or an outspoken group, will have less of a chance of forcing their agenda, thereby making other attendees feel either uninformed or intimidated. Facilitators should be able to keep groups on track and will dissuade the same individuals or groups from dominating a discussion. The committee meeting facilitator, Ms. Rastatter, advised that breakout groups should be no larger than 10 to 15 people. If groups are any larger, there is a risk that good discussion will not take place. Group facilitators will also have to be comfortable with keeping groups on track and addressing any questions or concerns they may have.

Public attendees can either be organized into smaller groups by subwatershed or issue, or randomly assigned to a group. Breaking out groups by subwatershed could encourage the formation of community

watershed groups and foster stewardship in those communities. However, it was noted that the same residents do not know which subwatershed they reside in and determining localities for a group breakout session could take away from group discussion. Likewise, public attendance might be strong in some subwatershed regions and weak or nonexistent in others. If public meeting attendance is low, there will be no need to break the attendees into discussion groups. Consequently, project staff and committee members agreed to keep the matter of format open until the meeting begins. Regardless if attendees are broken out into groups or discussion remains an open forum, each attendee should be provided a copy of the Cameron Run watershed map indicating where the subwatersheds and tributaries are located in relation to each other.

Committee members also suggested that project staff distribute 3”x5” index cards to attendees so they can record issues and problems. This would promote discussion within subgroups in an open format. Another value of the index cards is that project staff can see what issues are of most concern to the public. For example if 10 of 20 cards list flooding as a major issue in the watershed, then project staff can focus the plan on addressing flooding issues. The use of index cards to list issues may also obviate the need to break public attendees into groups.

Other Issues

Committee members stressed that project staff need to clearly show that Cameron Run is one of the many county watersheds developing a watershed management plan in Fairfax County. It should be made clear that Tripps Run is outside of the Fairfax County dataset for water quality monitoring, and also therefore water quality data is not available for this tributary. This does not mean that Tripps Run does not have water quality issues. Tripps Run lies within the city of Falls Church and has a great deal of issues facing it. Project staff also emphasized that many of the issues and problems that community residents and the county are combating today are due to current planning allowances and planning ordinances. This is very important because most community members do not make the connection between planning and water quality. If fact, most residents do not realize that stormwater from developed areas will eventually enter streams and tributaries and affects water quality in the watershed. Staff also stressed that the feedback obtained in this meeting will gauge activities during the summer months because this is the only public meeting where this type of on-the-ground input of specific issues and problem areas will be obtained.

One committee member expressed a dislike for rain barrels, noting that they are more trouble then they are worth. This same individual suggests that cisterns are a better option as a Best Management Practice. Ms. Rastatter suggested that including this as an example of a best management practice in the management plan can promote dialogue between project staff, committee members, and public meeting attendees.

Action Items

Project staff identified some of the key action items that will need to take place prior to the Public Issues Scoping Forum. These items included

- Revising the draft presentation to fit the focus and goals of the public meeting, but having additional materials available for public attendees who want more information. Committee members will trust project staff to revise the presentation based on the feedback received at this meeting.
- Committee members will inform project staff of availability to either attend or contribute at the public meeting.
- Project staff will send committee members a comprehensive list of actions that need to be completed in preparation for the public meeting.
- Project staff will send committee members who volunteered to facilitate at this public meeting a list of recognized facilitation methods and ground rules.

- Project staff will develop and distribute public meeting minutes to committee members.

Schedule of Advisory Committee Activities and Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland, Ms. Shore, and Ms. Rastatter closed the meeting by reviewing the schedule of upcoming committee meetings as decided at this meeting. The schedule is as follows:

- Cameron Run watershed tour will be held on July 24, 2004. A meeting location and time will be sent prior to the tour.
- Next advisory committee meeting will be held during the week of August 23, 2004. Meeting date, location, and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting. The Cameron Run Watershed vision will be developed at this meeting, as well as a discussion of watershed modeling findings from activities conducted during the summer months.
- Community Watershed Issues Forum: September 18, 2004, meeting location and agenda will be discussed at August advisory committee meeting.
- Draft Plan Review: Tentatively scheduled for January 12, 2005.
- Final Plan Review: Tentatively scheduled for April 20, 2005.

One member announced that Yorktown Square in Cameron Run will be hosting a rain garden installation project. This member will send an email about the project for project staff to distribute to committee members.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the county website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 8

Mason District Government Center, Annandale, Virginia
August 25, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Glenda Booth – Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Florence Cavazos – Tripps Run Resident
Diane Davidson **–** Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Dave Eckert – Falls Church Stream Stewards
Davis Grant – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
George Madill – Bren Mar Civic Association
Jim McGlone – Department of Forestry
Liz McKeeby –Mason District Board of Supervisors/Supervisor Gross
Donald Peterson – Co-Chairman, Bren Mar Park-Lincolnia Park Trails Association
Tom Wasaff – City of Alexandria
Bruce Williams -- Citizen

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES Ecologist/Public Involvement
Vishnu Seri – Fairfax County Stormwater Planning
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the stream and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to finalize the advisory committee voting member list, discuss a vision for the Cameron Run Watershed, and begin preparations for the upcoming Community Watershed Forum. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- Advisory committee decisions will be made by consensus whenever possible. In the, hopefully rare, cases where a vote is required, only designated committee voting members (one from each organization) will vote. If a voting member is unable to attend a meeting, he or she will either (1) send an email to project staff designating who their alternate will be, or (2) send his or her vote to project staff prior to the meeting.
- The committee crafted a draft vision statement for the Cameron Run Watershed (See *Cameroon Run Watershed Project Approach and Vision and Goals* below).
- Next advisory committee meeting will be held either during the week of September 13th, or September 20th. A meeting date, location, and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- The Community Watershed Forum is scheduled for Saturday, October 23, 2004. The agenda for the forum will be discussed during the September advisory committee meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will send committee members an email with the new flyers for distribution to their colleagues, once the site for the Community Watershed Forum is set. These documents will also be placed on the Cameron Run Watershed web-page.
- Committee members will request the number of hardcopy flyers that the project staff should mail them for distribution within their communities.
- Project staff will produce the requested flyers in a timely manner.
- Project staff will send flyers to Supervisors' staff.
- Project staff will poll committee members to determine the next meeting date. Proposed dates include September 13th, 14th, and the week of September 20th – 24th.
- Project staff will simplify issues identified by the committee and public at the Public Issues Scoping Forum (i.e., re-wording "dechannelization" to "restoring natural stream shape and flow") prior to next committee meeting.
- Project staff will develop a list of programmatic concerns to be discussed by the committee in September.
- Project staff will develop a draft presentation to be presented at the Community Watershed Forum for review by committee members during the September meeting.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introductions and Overview

Ms. Shore of Versar convened the advisory committee meeting by introducing project staff and advisory committee members. Following the introduction, Ms. Shore briefly reviewed the agenda, advisory committee roles, and ground rules. Materials distributed to committee members included the following:

- Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda
- Approach to Solutions for Cameron Run Watershed Plan
- Vision Statement Options (including handouts distributed by committee members during discussion)
- Consolidated Issues of Concern for Cameron Run Watershed Plan
- Master Advisory Committee Member List (color coded to indicate group affiliation)
- Cameron Run Community Watershed Forum Strawman Agenda

Finalize Voting Members of the Advisory Committee

Prior to the advisory committee meeting, project staff sent committee members an email concerning designation of voting members for each group represented at advisory committee meetings. Committee members were asked to respond if they were willing to be the voting representative for their respective groups. By the time of the meeting, eight individuals had agreed to serve as voting representatives.

Dr. Southerland of Versar opened the discussion by asking members how voting should be structured for development of the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. During this discussion, Ms. Rastatter of Versar suggested that committee members decide whether the voting structure should be consensus-based or voting-based (majority rules). In a consensus-based structure, every member of the group must either agree with the decision or "live with" the decision by compromising. When agreement cannot be reached, the issue is either dismissed or the project manager makes the final decision. Consensus-based voting generally gives members a sense of ownership in decisions, and often produces better plans because members work as a team. A consensus-based structure can be time consuming because the group cannot move forward until a compromise is reached. In contrast, a voting-based structure requires less discussion prior to the vote, allowing decisions to be made more quickly.

During this discussion, committee members raised concerns about the voting process and the reasoning behind designating voting members. A few members pointed out that the advisory committee for the Little Hunting Creek Watershed Management Plan used consensus-based voting to develop 70% of the recommendations in their Plan, and relied on a voting-based structure for the remainder of the recommendations. Questions raised by various committee members included the following.

- Why are there voting and non-voting members when all members were selected and contacted by project staff to be a part of the advisory committee?
    - The reasoning behind designating voting members is to ensure that each group is equally represented during the decision making process. For example, when multiple members of a homeowners association attend a committee meeting, the group can cast only one vote, thereby ensuring that all groups have an equal say in management plan decisions. Designating voting members will also provide an incentive for attending future advisory committee meetings. Either the voting member or an alternate will be present at meetings ensuring that all watershed groups are equally represented.

- Why should I attend advisory committee meetings if I'm not a voting member?
    - All attendees, whether a voting member or not, are encouraged to speak up during discussion sessions. The committee will discuss an item prior to a voting session, and non-voting members can help to influence voting members by bringing up new ideas or points during the discussion of an item. Advisory committee meetings are open to the public and the public is encouraged to attend and serve as advisors to the voting members. Again the majority of decisions will be reached by consensus.
- Would Fairfax County have a vote?
    - The advisory committee was created to advise the County and project staff during the watershed management plan development process. Therefore, the County staff working on this project will not have a vote. On the other hand, a representative from the Board of Supervisors should be a voting member because the Board represents a broader constituency and will allocate funds to the County for plan implementation.

Committee members decided that the structure of voting by designated committee members should be voting/majority rules-based. More members had concerns about the consensus-based process than the voting/majority rules-based process. Members did specify that a vote will not be taken when an item is brought to the floor. Voting will only take place after an item has been discussed by the committee as a whole. The project staff facilitator will use a consensus-based approach as necessary during the discussion process before designated members can vote on any item. Project staff will also inform committee members (both voting and non-voting members) prior to a meeting if a voting decision will be made during the meeting. In turn, committee members will inform project staff if they are unable to attend a meeting and will either cast their vote at that time, or inform project staff that an alternate will be voting for them. If an alternate member will be voting, the designated voting member will inform project staff prior to the meeting that an alternate will be voting for them, and they will identify who the alternate will be.

The list of voting members (subject to new members being added) is as follows:

- Michael Aho -- Providence District Board of Supervisors
- Glenda Booth -- Fairfax County Wetlands Board
- Diane Davidson -- Lake Barcroft Association
- Jonathan Daw -- Poplar Heights Civic Association
- Dave Eckert -- Falls Church Stream Stewards
- Davis Grant – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
    - Alternate – Pete Silva
- Richard Hartman – Huntington Association
    - Alternate – Phyllis Evans
- Bob Jordan -- Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
- Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
- Patrick Lucas – Friends of Tripps Run
- George Madill – Bren Mar Park Civic Association
    - Alternate – Donald Peterson

- Liz McKeeby – Mason District Board of Supervisors
- Donald Peterson – Bren Mar Park-Lincolnia Park Trails Association
- Russ Rosenberger – Real Estate Developer
- Bruce Williams – Sleepy Hollow Citizen Association
    - Alternate – Nick Byrne

Cameron Run Watershed Project Approach, Vision, and Goals

Dr. Southerland presented a brief overview of the project approach and plans for future advisory committee activities (see Approach to Solutions for Cameron Run Watershed Plan handout). To date, most committee meetings have focused on identifying issues and problems within the watershed. Dr. Southerland encouraged the committee to change its focus from identifying problems to formulating the vision and goals for the watershed that would lead to identifying solutions. Ideally the advisory committee could present their vision and example solutions to the issues identified from the Public Issues Scoping Forum to the public at the Community Watershed Forum.

Ms. Rastatter began the discussion by defining a vision as a short, concise statement to lead committees or groups towards a goal. Committee members decided that the Cameron Run vision would be a vision for the watershed itself and not be a mission statement of vision for the watershed management plan. The committee developed a list of items that should be conveyed in the watershed vision statement. These items included ensuring that the watershed

- Is a valued community asset
- Supports a healthy ecosystem
- Supports recreational activities
- Meets water quality standards
- Supports improved habitat
- Supports a healthy Chesapeake Bay
- Is fishable and swimmable as defined in the Clean Water Act
- Supports biodiversity
- Is protected against pollution

Committee members also wanted watershed management plan implementation to encourage

- Early public involvement and awareness
- A multi-pronged strategy
- Transparency in County policy and programs
- Transparency of public actions
- Protection and restoration of resources
- Integration of environmental management, natural resources protection, and community goals
- A method for tracking chemical pollution and biological diversity (i.e., using chemical sensors that are strategically placed throughout the watershed)
- A method for rewarding those who report watershed polluters

- Integration of County policies (e.g., zoning, tax administration, permit code enforcement) with environmental sanitation and urban forestry for better coordination of environmental retrofitting activities

The overall goal of the watershed management plan is to help Fairfax County meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act, and the commitments that the State of Virginia made by signing the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. After detailed discussion, committee members crafted a consensus draft vision for the Cameron Run watershed. The following two options are edited versions of this draft for adoption as the next advisory committee meeting:

- Option 1: Revive Cameron Run and its tributaries to a fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse condition, and then protect this community asset so that it supports a safe and vibrant environment for people and property.
- Option 2: A fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse Cameron Run Watershed that supports a safe and enjoyable environment for people and property.

Upcoming Community Watershed Forum

The purpose of the Community Watershed Forum is to educate the public about Cameron Run Watershed issues and the watershed management planning process, and obtain their input on the best solutions to include in the plan. Based on this input, stream characterization, and modeling, the project staff and advisory committee will develop the draft watershed management plan. The advisory committee agree to moving the Community Watershed Forum to October 23, 2004 to allow for more discussion and additional advertising time. Project staff will begin advertising the Community Watershed Forum the week of August 30, 2004.

In preparation for the upcoming public meeting, committee members suggested project staff do the following:

- Simplify issues identified by the committee and from the public at the Public Issues Scoping Forum by rewording terms to make them understandable to the average person (i.e. re-wording “dechannelization” to “restoring natural stream shape and flow”). Use plain English.
- Clearly explain watershed issues of concern and identify corresponding County policies.
- Ensure that the watershed management planning process not only involves the development of a list of County public works projects, but provides recommendations for County programs as well.
- Present not only issues, but suggested solutions for those issues.

Committee members strongly recommended that project staff considers County policy and how current policy either causes or reduces current watershed problems. Project staff and committee members will identify current County policies and determine how they impact the watershed. Mr. Kumar of DPWES informed committee members that the County is analyzing current policies with the intent of updating and consolidating policy. The County is looking at policies County-wide, and not just policies that affect the Cameron Run watershed.

Dr. Southerland reminded committee members that other watershed groups (e.g., Little Hunting Creek Watershed) have analyzed County policy, so that our discussions should build on what they’ve learned. He suggested that the committee and project staff invite a County representative to a future advisory committee meeting to explain the rationale behind current policies and how those policies will be updated. This will allow the committee to focus on feasible solutions top the most important watershed issues.

Project staff will nail down a location for the Community Watershed Forum and email committee members the revised flyer for advertising the meeting. Committee members will tell project staff how many hardcopy flyers they need for distribution within their communities. Project staff will also send flyers to the County Supervisors' offices.

DISCUSSION OF PARKING LOT ITEMS AND MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Project staff suggested that the committee hold one more meeting before the upcoming Community Watershed Forum. Furthermore, it was suggested that the agenda for the next meeting consist of the following Parking Lot items from this meeting.

- Format and content of Community Watershed Forum
- Discussion of logistics and feedback from Public Issues Scoping Forum
- Role of dissenting views in the finalized watershed management plan
- Policies and procedures for developing the watershed management plan
- Determining what types of items committee voting members should seek consensus on and what items should be voted on
- Discussion of a conceptually different approach to stormwater management

Project staff will poll committee members regarding a date for the next meeting. Suggested dates include: September 13th, 14th, or during the week of September 20th. One committee member informed project staff that the National Low Impact Development Workshop will be conducted from September 21st – 23rd. Therefore, it may not be in the best interest of the committee to schedule a meeting during those dates.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 9

Mason District Government Center, Annandale, Virginia

September 20, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Florence Cavazos – Tripps Run Resident
Diane Davidson **–** Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Davis Grant – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Bob Jordan – Fairfax Trails and Streams/Potomac River Greenways Coalition
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office
Donald Peterson – Co-Chairman, Bren Mar Park-Lincolnia Park Trails Association
Peter Silva -- Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Robert Taylor – Poplar Heights Recreation Association
Bruce Williams -- Citizen

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Fred Rose -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES Ecologist/Public Involvement
Than Bawcomb – Fairfax County Stormwater Planning
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Julie Tasillo – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to finalize a vision statement for the Cameron Run watershed and to prepare for the October Community Watershed Fforum. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- Committee members finalized a vision statement for the Cameron Run Watershed (See *Finalize Vision for Cameron Run and Voting Members for the Committee* below).
- Next advisory committee meeting will be held during the week of November 8th. A meeting date, location and agenda will be sent prior to the meeting.
- Project staff will send out a notice prior to each meeting to see which voting members will be in attendance and to determine if enough will be in attendance for an official committee vote.
- Email will be used prior to and between committee meetings to promote discussion between project staff and committee members and to ensure that plan development momentum is not lost.
- Project staff will present chapters for the management plan to committee members as they are developed for review and comment.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will present a draft outline for the watershed management plan at the November advisory committee meeting.
- Project staff will poll committee members to determine the next meeting date. The proposed date is during the week of November 8th.
- Project staff will develop supplemental materials (i.e. handouts, power point slides, etc.) for distribution at the Community Watershed Forum to public attendees who might want more information.
- Project staff will revise the draft Community Watershed Forum presentation based on committee member feedback.
- Project staff will extract appropriate sections from the LHC plan for review by committee members.
- Project staff will develop a glossary and acronym list for public meeting attendees.
- Project staff will develop a “laundry list” that marries the list of watershed issues with proposed solutions. This list will also be included in the presentation and made into a poster.
- Committee members are encouraged to help publicize the Community Watershed Forum by contacting civic associations with which they are associated..

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introductions and Overview

Ms. Shore of Versar convened the advisory committee meeting with an introductory dialog between project staff and advisory committee members, followed by a review of the meeting agenda. Materials distributed to committee members included the following:

- Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda
- Revised Cameron Run Community Watershed Forum Strawman Agenda
- Proposed presentation for the Community Watershed Forum

Finalize Vision for Cameron Run and Voting Members for the Committee

Ms. Rastatter of Versar presented committee members with two versions of the vision statement developed by committee members at the August meeting. The two versions were:

1) *Revive Cameron Run and its tributaries to a fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse condition, and then protect this community aspect so that it supports a safe and vibrant environment for people and property.* (draft statement from August committee meeting)
2) *A fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse Cameron Run watershed that supports a safe and enjoyable environment for people and property.* (edited version of #1)

Ms. Rastatter opened a discussion of the two vision statements above, and then asked committee members to choose a final vision statement. Through the discussion, committee members clarified that the terms fishable and swimmable carry the same meaning as used in federal and state water quality standards. Members also discussed that the vision statement is a broad statement that conveys overarching goals for the Cameron Run Watershed. Committee members agreed that vision statement number two (2) would suffice as the vision statement for the development and implementation of the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Ms. Rastatter asked committee members if they agreed on the specified voting members and their alternates. Robert Taylor will be added as an official voting members and will represent the Poplar Heights Recreation Association.

Discussion of Parking Lot Items from August Advisory Committee Meeting

At the August advisory committee meeting, project staff and members decided that the parking lot items would help drive the agenda for this meeting. Parking lot items from the August meeting include:

- Format and content of Community Watershed Forum (see *Community Watershed Forum* below)
- Role of dissenting views in the finalized watershed management plan (discuss at future committee meeting)
- Policies and procedures for developing the watershed management plan
- Determining what types of items committee voting members should seek consensus on and what items should be voted on
- Discussion of a conceptually different approach to stormwater management (discuss at future committee meeting)

Ms. Rastatter began this discussion by recapping the committee decision made at the August meeting for appointed members to vote on issues raised by project staff. She also emphasized that project staff will seek consensus from the committee on items to be voted on by voting members.

Committee members and project staff had a long discussion on the policies and procedures that should be employed for developing the watershed management plan. Dr. Southerland suggested that committee involvement in plan development and implementation be more proactive as opposed to reactive. This could mean that the committee would either have to meet more than once per month, or communicate more via email. Committee members agreed that involvement in plan development should be more proactive, but that email should be used to generate discussion and to help the committee prepare for upcoming meetings. The committee also agreed that the County will use the watershed management plan as guidance for watershed management.

Mr. Rose of DPWES encouraged committee members to avoid creating unrealistic expectations for the management plan. He informed committee members of the status of the Little Hunting Creek (LHC) Watershed Management Plan. The final LHC plan has been presented to the County for review and approval. Currently, the County is consolidating comments for the project consultant, and reviewing the policy changes that were recommended by the LHC watershed committee. The County is in the process of trying to separate policy- and project-related solutions. The committee should use the LHC plan as a guideline for setting priorities. The County does not have the budget to fund all the projects in each of the watershed management plans under development, nor can the County afford to develop and implement all of the proposed policy changes. Changing County policy will involve an additional Countywide process, while funding can begin to be obtained for individual projects immediately. This is not to say that the committee should not address policy changes in the plan because the County will be basing policy decisions on the policy changes proposed in the 30 watershed plans. The LHC committee spent 60% of their efforts on evaluating current policy and making policy recommendations. Therefore, the committee should use the LHC plan as a guide for suggesting policy updates. This committee can build on the work of the LHC committee, thereby focusing its efforts on projects specific to Cameron Run. Mr. Rose suggested that this committee look at not only the policy recommendations made by the LHC committee, but the specific projects suggested in the plan as well. Project staff will extract the appropriate sections from the LHC plan for review by the Cameron Run Advisory Committee.

Ultimately, County policy makers are looking to each of the 30 watershed advisory committees in Fairfax County to help them prioritize projects and policy revisions. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee is tasked with helping the County focus on projects pertaining to the Cameron Run watershed, and to suggest those policies that will ensure the watershed continues to be a resource for the community. The committee, through project staff, will present solutions to the County that include both policy changes/updates and projects specific to the Cameron Run watershed. The committee has opportunities to improve the watershed by identifying projects to be implemented by individuals and by the County, and by updating and changing policy. The committee should prioritize projects such as (1) government capital projects, (2) activities by individuals, and (3) changes/updates in County policy. Examples of projects include stream restoration and the use of low impact development in new developments or as retrofits. Prioritizing projects in this manner will help the committee and the County achieve the vision developed by the committee. It was decided that the committee will continue to address procedures for developing the management plan at the November committee meeting. Project staff will send a proposed plan outline to committee members for review via email in preparation for the meeting. Once the outline is finalized, project staff will either send via email, or distribute at meetings, draft plan chapters for review by the committee as they are developed.

Community Watershed Forum

Dr. Southerland presented a strawman agenda and the proposed presentation for the October Community Watershed Forum. The purpose of this public meeting is to educate the public on the condition of the watershed and to gather ideas/solutions from the public. In addition to the presentation by project staff, two (2) watershed experts will be asked to speak at the meeting. The presentation will educate the public on the following:

- Overview of the watershed planning process
- The condition of the Cameron Run watershed
- What can be done to improve the watershed

After his brief overview, Dr. Southerland asked the committee for recommendations on the agenda and presentation. Committee members recommended that project staff clearly define what computer modeling means and how it is performed. . Members also suggested that project staff provide meeting attendees with presentation slide handouts, and make the background of the slides lighter to improve readability.. It was also suggested that the staff presentation had too many slides based on the time allotted on the strawman agenda. Committee members recommended that the number of slides be reduced to allow ample time for the public to ask questions before they are asked to break into groups and discuss ideas/solutions. Public meeting attendees will also be provided with a glossary of terms and acronyms. Finally, committee members suggested that project staff present the flow chart for management plan development at the beginning and end of the presentation as opposed to just the end of the presentation. Project staff will distribute their presentation along with those to be delivered by the invited experts.

Project staff and committee members agreed that it might not be realistic to ask the public for solutions to for the watershed's problems because the public they may not possess the required watershed knowledge. On the other hand, the public should be involved in the process and engaged in formulating solutions. Committee members suggested that the breakout session will provide opportunities for the public to identify opportunities for improving the watershed, and propose some solutions to the issues raised at the Public Issues Scoping Forum. Project staff will distribute a "laundry list" that marries the current list of watershed issues with some suggested solutions to meeting attendees. This same list will be included in the presentation and displayed on a poster. Mr. Rose reminded committee members that the ultimate goal of the public meeting is to query the public for ideas/issues that lead to solutions for the watershed.

Members of each breakout session group will be randomly selected as they were for the Public Issues Scoping Forum. Breakout session members will identify (1) specific places within the watershed and practices that may address issues, (2) projects within the Cameron Run watershed and throughout the County, and (3) criteria for evaluating solutions. Therefore, the public will help project staff and committee members develop a list of specific places with realistic solutions, thereby converting issues or problems into goals that correspond to the Cameron Run vision. Ultimately, the list of projects/solutions that will be recommended in the plan will be based on stream characterization data and computer modeling. The public meetings provide a venue for the public to identify additional opportunities beyond those identified in the computer modeling.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Southerland adjourned the meeting by asking committee members to advertise the public meeting to their colleagues. The next committee meeting will be held after the Community Watershed Forum during the week of November 8, 2004. Project staff will poll committee members regarding a date for the next meeting during the week of November 8th.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically

dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 10

Versar Headquarters, Springfield, VA

November 10, 2004

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
Patrick Lucas – Tripps Run Resident/Fairfax County Police
Jim McGlone – Department of Forestry
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc.
Mark Mobius – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

The Cameron Run Watershed Plan

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds.

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

Meeting Purpose

Attendees of the advisory committee are individuals who represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run (CR) watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to establish a process for developing Cameron Run policy recommendations. The overall goal of the advisory committee is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for the Cameron Run watershed that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

Key Decisions and Outcomes

- The date of the next meeting will be determined via email exchanges.
- Committee members will review Little Hunting Creek (LHC) recommendations and respond off-line.
- CR policy recommendations will be finalized in a future meeting.

Action Items

- Project Staff will prepare map and tables of land use (including public lands) and areas with stormwater controls for the next meeting.
- Project staff will distribute an email asking committee members to vote on options for goals/strategies to help set plan priorities.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Ms. Jennifer Shore opened the meeting with an overview of the agenda, and she suggested that member introductions were not necessary since the committee members were already well familiar with each other. The committee agreed to move directly to the meeting material without introducing themselves.

Dr. Mark Southerland took the floor and stated that project staff would start drafting the draft plan shortly, and would try to have the draft available sometime in January 2005. Dr. Southerland proceeded to explain the handouts that had been provided to each committee member. Handouts distributed include:

- Meeting Agenda
- Advisory Committee Meeting 10 Presentation
- Summary of Policy Recommendations from Little Hunting Creek
- GIS Maps for Watershed Handbook
- Email Memo from Committee Member

Dr. Southerland reminded the committee of their Vision Statement for the Cameron Run Watershed:

"A fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse Cameron Run watershed that supports a safe and enjoyable environment for people and property."

In discussing the tools that committee members will have to make the watershed vision a reality, Dr. Southerland referred members to the stream characterization maps on the walls around the room, and mentioned that modeling data would be ready for distribution soon.

Dr. Southerland continued by outlining general approaches to improving a watershed, such as preserving better areas, protecting vulnerable areas, restoring degraded areas, and reducing adverse impacts to the watershed as a whole. He then reviewed a list of Cameron Run watershed problems consolidated from previous advisory committee meetings, as well as from the categorized list developed by project staff that divides potential solutions between physical (local) and programmatic (regional) solutions.

Dr. Southerland then discussed the policy recommendations presented in the Little Hunting Creek (LHC) plan. He stressed that these recommendations were a very good collection of ideas and recommendations from which the committee members could draw suggestions. One committee member asked if, since time is critical, the group should use LHC recommendations as a base and build off of them. Along the same lines, another member asked if there were any items from the LHC document that would not apply to Cameron Run. Ms. Clem Rastatter responded by stating that some items in the LHC might need to be modified for direct application to Cameron Run. After some discussion concerning which of the LHC policy recommendations to adopt, the committee finally voted to review the recommendations off-line and respond with comments via email. Cameron Run recommendations will be finalized at a future meeting. The benefit of starting the process off-line, said Ms. Rastatter, is that non-critical items can be identified prior to committee meetings, thereby increasing the efficiency of in-person committee meetings.

While on the topic of future meetings, Dr. Southerland raised the question of how many additional committee meetings were required to complete the planning process. Mr. Kumar stated that one member thought that once a draft plan was in place, the group would need four meetings to solidify things. Dr. Southerland queried the group on whether or not some items could be addressed using email, or through web meetings,, or if the group should meet in-person to complete the planning process. There were mixed responses from the committee, with general agreement that some things could be done via email, but that others would require in-person committee meetings.

Dr. Southerland next queried committee members on whether to use the December meeting for programmatic or physical solutions. One committee member replied that the December meeting should focus on physical, site-specific, solutions so that project staff has time to incorporate them into the draft plan. This member pointed out that programmatic/policy solutions don’t require that kind of technical input.

Identifying Solutions:

Dr. Southerland proposed four steps for identifying solutions to watershed problems. The first step is to identify problem segments using stream characterization maps, modeling results, and local knowledge. The second step is to diagnose segment problems using individual stream characterization variables such as bank erosion or embeddedness. The third step is to look both at the site and upstream to identify specific causes. The final step is to identify opportunities to address these causes. Much of the meeting discussion revolved around these four steps.

Discussion turned to the identification of problem segments and areas where physical solutions would have the most impact. Dr. Southerland stated that the idea is to break the watershed into subwatersheds, and identify problems within each. When identifying problem areas, one has to look upstream. Aerial imagery can be viewed and a site visit performed. Next, identify opportunities for solutions. He used the example of Pike Branch, with a particular degraded stream segment. By looking at the aerial imagery upstream of the problem segment, it was possible to identify large areas of impervious surface at a shopping area. A visit to the site could reveal opportunities for managing water flowing off

the site. Dr. Southerland also discussed the importance of assigning priorities to solutions based on a number of parameters such as contribution to regulatory compliance, ease of implementation, location, and public interest.

The committee asked a number of questions regarding the stream characterization maps. One committee member asked who had mapped the conditions. Dr. Southerland replied that the County had mapped a variety of different variables in an effort that was completed in the spring of 2002 or 2003, and acknowledged that stream condition assessments could change over time. Mr. Kumar, responding to a question about which streams were assessed, stated that streams with drainage areas of 50 acres or more were assessed. Another committee member asked about the gaps in stream characterization maps. Dr. Southerland answered that those gaps represent areas where the stream disappears (as into a culvert) or where a specific parameter wasn't measured for some reason. Mr. Kumar added that some rip-rapped areas weren't assessed.

Another committee member inquired about how riparian buffer were assessed in the study. Mr. Kumar stated that a stream segment was said to have a good riparian buffer if it had good quality cover extending outward by 100 ft. on both sides. This brought up the subject of improving stream buffers, and one member asked how adequate buffers could be added to those areas rated poorly, e.g., would land be "taken" from landowners? Mr. Kumar noted that all buffer deficiency recorded by the SPA occurred in a Resource Protection Area (RPA), so that planting would be enforceable even on private land. He added, however, that it would be easiest to start with buffer improvements on public lands.

Another committee member asked for a definition of embeddedness. Dr. Southerland explained that when silt fills in the spaces between rocks in a streambed, leaving no habitat for organisms, the stream is considered embedded. Mr. Kumar noted that concrete stream sections were not rated for embeddedness in the original assessment.

In discussions about where to implement potential solutions, one committee member expressed doubt about being able to contribute due to a limited geographic familiarity with the watershed. This member questioned the utility of piecemeal anecdotal information in formulating overarching watershed policy. It was suggested that perhaps people felt too much pressure about being experts, when they should be more concerned about expressing values. Dr. Southerland agreed, reassuring the committee that additional inputs would only improve the plan. Ms. Rastatter added that Versar staff would help match solutions to identified problems in order to meet the committee's watershed goals.

Mr. Kumar recognized the need to view problems from a watershed-wide perspective first. Land use information is important to determining the allocation of projects. This land use info, he continued, would be shared with all parties during plan development. Committee members agreed that land use information would enable them to make more informed project and policy recommendations. One member commented that both land use information, and traditional impervious surface management information is key to focusing plan development efforts. Another member thought that a map depicting land uses on public and private lands would enable the committee to view those areas where it would be easiest to implement solutions. Dr. Southerland offered to provide such a map for the next meeting.

One committee member asked about the main stem of Cameron Run, and expressed concern that if watershed management plan implementation efforts were not coordinated with watershed efforts taken by the City of Alexandria, there is a risk of wasting both County time and money. Mr. Kumar addressed this concern by stating that there is only so much that the committee can do for the main stem. The County has entered into an agreement with the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, the City of Falls Church, and the City of Alexandria to improve the CR watershed. Dr. Southerland added that the committee could include recommendations for the main stem in the CR plan even though they couldn't enforce them on the other side of the stream.

Plan and Watershed Goals

Ms. Rastatter asked committee members each to come up with two goals, which she said should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. The following is a list of goals proposed by the committee:

- Keep the public involved at all levels, prior to planning, funding, etc.
- Maximize LID
- Educate Public on RPA
- Identify what solution will provide the greatest impact in different areas
- Assimilate all information. Establish methodology for determining where you get biggest bang for buck
- Identify low cost/convenient solutions
- Make Cameron Run boatable with trails
- Reduce imperviousness
- Increase forested buffers
- Address fish passage issues
- Incorporate a water-flow reduction plan in major transportation projects
- Control invasive species
- Reduce peak flow in upstream concrete channelizations to improve habitat downstream.
- Encourage private landowners to mitigate RPAs
- Educate realtors about RPAs
- Identify specific retrofit projects for older neighborhoods.
- Implement at least one LID project per subwatershed
- Choose projects that can be completed or have an impact within the next 5 years
- Create responsibility for runoff from new development

Ms. Rastatter asked committee members to distinguish between programmatic and project items within the goals discussed above. She then asked members whether each goal is specific for the CR watershed, or for the management plan. Ms. Rastatter stated that programmatic items would be addressed in the management plan after specific watershed projects were discussed. Following this informal categorization, some of the items were briefly discussed further. There was discussion about which neighborhoods needed retrofitting. The older ones would benefit most because they don't have any current management measures in place. Members also discussed the benefits of reducing peak flows and bank stabilization. Dr. Southerland noted that bank stabilization really only transports erosion problems downstream.

He asked the committee how they wanted to weight the proposed goals. One member asked how the committee could determine which goals/projects were more important. It was proposed that project staff present a general list of project solutions, with corresponding benefits, to demonstrate what types of projects/solutions address general issues found within the watershed. Another member disagreed, stating that the committee's job is to develop a list of problems or problem areas that they want to improve, and project staff would indicate what would work best for each item. The committee finally agreed to let

project staff compile the list of goals, and to revisit the issue once everyone had had the chance to review the list off-line.

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland adjourned the meeting by asking committee members to rank or prioritize the broad list of goals/strategies discussed during this meeting. The list will be sent to committee members via email for review. Likewise, the date of the next committee meeting will be determined via email as well. Any questions or concerns about the goals discussed during this meeting will be addressed at the next committee meeting.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 11

Woodrow Wilson Public Library, Falls Church, Virginia

January 12, 2005

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Michael Aho – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Stacey Sloan-Blersch – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Baltimore District Planning Division
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Diane Davidson **–** Lake Barcroft Association
Chris and Tracey Eller -- Citizens
Davis Grant – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
Joan Maguire – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Robert Taylor – Poplar Heights Recreation Association
Tom Wasalf – City of Alexandria
Cynthia Wilson -- Poplar Heights Civic Association
Emael and Maura Yasin -- Citizens

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England -- Fairfax County DPWES Ecologist/Public Involvement
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Julie Tasillo – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

The Cameron Run Watershed Plan

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds.

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

Meeting Purpose

Members of the Advisory Committee (AC) represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run watershed. The goal of the AC is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources within the watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and suggest potential solutions, or projects, for issues identified in Tripps Run, Upper Holmes Run, and Lower Holmes Run.

Key Decisions and Outcomes

- Notification of the next AC meeting will be sent via email once the date, location, and agenda have been set.

Action Items

- Project staff will poll committee members to determine a meeting date for March.
- Project staff will send out a notice prior to each meeting to see which voting members will be in attendance and to determine if enough voting members will be present.
- Project staff will complete maps of candidate solutions and make them available on the project web site. Individual hardcopy maps will be sent to AC members that request them.
- Project staff will draft chapters for the management plan and distribute them to committee members for review and comment.

Meeting Discussion

Introductions and Project Overview

Dr. Southerland of Versar convened the AC meeting with an introductory dialog between project staff and AC members, followed by a review of the committee ground rules and the meeting agenda. Materials distributed to committee members included:

- AC Meeting Agenda
- Consolidated List of Problems (to be placed in watershed handbook)
- Physical and Programmatic Solutions (to be placed in watershed handbook)
- Potential Projects (Management Alternatives) for Cameron Run Watershed (to be placed in watershed handbook)

Dr. Southerland then gave a brief overview of the project approach for watershed management plan development and reviewed the vision developed by the committee for the Cameron Run watershed.

Schedule for Plan Development

Dr. Southerland presented the following proposed schedule for final plan development:

- Committee review of candidate solutions for the subwatersheds of Turkeycock Run, Indian Run, Backlick Run, Pike Branch, and Cameron Run – February 2005 and via website

- Committee finalization of policy recommendations and public meeting preparations -- March 2005
- Public meeting to present Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan – April 2005
- Committee review of final plan and public meeting preparations – May 2005
- Public meeting to present Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan – June 2005

PROCESS FOR IDENTIFYING CANDIDATE SOLUTIONS

Dr. Southerland gave a brief overview of the consolidated list of watershed problems as identified by committee members and the public. The consolidated list of problems includes:

- Loss of forest cover along streams in the watershed
- Increase of impervious surfaces
- Rapid stormwater delivery system
- Sources of point and non-point source pollution resulting from:
  - Lack of riparian buffers
  - Loss of instream habitat
  - Bank erosion and sedimentation
  - Irregular flows in streams
  - Channel alterations
  - Pollution
  - Bacteria
  - Flooding
  - Trash

Upon review of the above list, project staff divided the potential solutions into two categories, namely physical and programmatic solutions. A strawman list was developed based on recommendations presented in the Little Hunting Creek management plan. The list of solutions included:

- Physical solutions
  - Decrease impervious surfaces
  - Restore natural shape to culverts and eroded channels
  - Preserve or add trees and open spaces
  - Sweep streets and low cost solutions
  - Capture storm flows and sediments
- Programmatic solutions
  - Decrease trash and pollution
  - New regulations and policies
  - Tighter enforcement
  - Increase public awareness and transparency of government projects

In December 2004, project staff sent committee members an electronic poll to determine preferences for identifying solutions to watershed issues. Committee members were asked to vote on five items to determine what types of solutions or projects would be listed in the plan. Results of the poll are as follows:

- Protect most vulnerable places was first choice, but all four rated similarly
- Target solutions by site-specific and cumulative problems, rated nearly even
- Select solutions that provide greatest benefit regardless of time, rated slightly over projects within 5 years
- Riparian planting, LID, Stream restoration, Retrofits, Recreation, and New ponds, rated in that order
- 100% chose modifying allocation based on benefit

Based on these results, the project team decided to allocate projects among subwatersheds based on acres adjusted for uncontrolled imperviousness (see below).

Several committee members voiced concerns about implementation of the final watershed management plan and integration with other County plans and policies. Mr. Kumar of DPWES reassured committee members that the County already has regulations in place to address this issue. He reminded committee members that through the planning process, the public working through the committee will assist the County in directing stormwater management and identifying future stormwater projects. Mr. Kumar also informed committee members that the Fairfax Department of Public Works is working with the Board of Supervisors to ensure that new and upcoming policies are consistent with the other County regulations and with the recommendations provided by this committee.

REVIEW OF CANDIDATE SOLUTIONS/PROJECTS FOR TRIPPS RUN, UPPER HOLMES RUN, AND LOWER HOLMES RUN SUBWATERSHEDS

Based on the results of the poll discussed above (i.e., the AC desire to allocate projects among the 8 subwatershed based on level of water quantity/quality control and/or intensity of land use for each subwatershed) and on watershed modeling, project staff proposed a draft list of projects for each subwatershed. Projects included Low Impact Development (LID), stream and wetland restoration, retrofits to existing ponds, creation of additional small detention ponds, and watershed-wide riparian and reforestation plantings. The proposed breakdown of projects per watershed is as follows:

- Tripps Run – 16 %
- Upper Holmes Run – 19 %
- Lower Holmes Run – 14 %
- Turkeycock Run – 4 %
- Indian Run – 6 %
- Backlick Run – 28 %
- Tributaries to Cameron Run – 8 %
- Pike Branch – 5 %

Project staff generated a map of issues and corresponding solutions or projects for each subwatershed in Cameron Run. The maps reflect issues and solutions identified by committee members and the public, as well as those recommended by project staff through analysis of aerial photos and watershed conditions. Each map includes an aerial photo, land uses, and proposed projects within the subwatershed. The goal of each proposed project is to remove water as quickly as possible since 80% of the stormwater in the watershed is uncontrolled.

Each committee member was asked to review the proposed projects identified on the subwatershed maps for Tripps Run, Upper Holmes Run, and Lower Holmes Run. Project staff and committee members agreed that the particular projects identified in the management plan should provide the greatest benefit to the watershed. Mr. Kumar reminded committee members that the County will focus its efforts on County-owned or -operated lands and properties since the County does not have the authority to mandate stormwater best management practices (i.e., installation of raingardens) on private landowners. However, the management plan can still contain recommendations for educating and encouraging the public to voluntarily adopt these practices.

Maps detailing proposed projects for Turkeycock Run, Indian Run, Backlick Run, the tributaries to Cameron Run, and Pike Branch will be prepared and posted on the website of committee review. The project team will continue to identify solutions and solicit committee input throughout development of the draft plan.

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland adjourned the meeting by informing committee members that Ms. Shore of Versar will contact committee members via email to determine a date for the February meeting. Committee members inquired about the availability of the maps that were presented at this meeting and the maps that will be presented at the February meeting. Project staff informed committee members that the maps presented at this meeting will be available on the watershed website by mid-January and the maps for the remainder of the watershed will be available in February.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee (AC) are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 12

Woodrow Wilson Public Library, Falls Church, Virginia

April 7, 2005

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Glenda Booth – Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Nick Byrne – Sleepy Hollow Homeowners Association (HOA)
Florence Cavazos – Tripps Run Resident
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Chris and Tracey Eller – Citizens
Davis Grant – Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District
Richard Hartman – Berkshire HOA/Huntington Community Association
Sally Henley – Tripps Run Resident
Bill Hicks – Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Kathy Joseph – Earth Sangha
George Madill – Bren Mar Civic Association
Joan Maguire – Providence District Board of Supervisors
Jim McGlone – Department of Forestry
Liz McKeeby – Supervisor Gross/Mason District Office
Erin Stevens -- Citizen
Robert Taylor – Poplar Heights Recreation Association
Tom Wasalf – City of Alexandria
Bruce Williams – Citizen
Emael and Maura Yasin – Citizens

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Gayle England -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) Ecologist/Public Involvement
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc.
Morris Perot – Versar, Inc.
Kris Sillett – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Amanda Peyton – Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

The Cameron Run Watershed Plan

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Members of the advisory committee (AC) represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run watershed. The goal of the AC is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources within the watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to present the selected projects for publicly-owned lands (Tier 1) in the Cameron Run Watershed, review programmatic recommendations, and discuss the proposed agenda for the upcoming public meeting on the draft watershed management plan.

Key Decisions and Outcomes

- Notification of the next AC meeting will be sent via email once the date, location, and agenda have been set.
- Notification of the Draft Plan Review public meeting will be sent via email once a final date and location have been determined (the June 16 date has been confirmed).
- Only Tier 1 projects (those on public lands and non-public projects with the highest priority) will be described in detail at the public meeting and included in the body of the watershed management plan. Tier 2 projects (most non-public land projects) will be included in an appendix of the plan (see *Review of Candidate Solutions/Projects for Cameron Run Watershed*).

Action Items

- Project staff will poll committee members to determine a meeting date during summer 2005.
- Project staff will draft chapters for the management plan and distribute them to committee members for review and comment.
- Committee members will submit comments on proposed solutions/projects, draft programmatic recommendations, and the draft plan table of contents to project staff.

Meeting Discussion

INTRODUCTIONS AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

Dr. Southerland of Versar convened the AC meeting with an introductory dialog between project staff and AC members, followed by a review of the meeting agenda. Materials distributed to committee members included:

- AC Meeting Agenda
- Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan Table of Contents
- Example Template for Cameron Run Watershed Plan Selected Projects
- Programmatic Recommendations from Cameron Run
- Draft Agenda for Draft Plan Review Public Meeting

OVERVIEW ON PLAN DEVELOPMENT/CONTENT

Dr. Southerland gave a brief overview of the watershed management plan development process and presented a proposed table of contents (TOC) for the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan.

The proposed TOC presented at this meeting has been revised from the TOC presented in the Cameron Run Watershed Workbook based on County and AC member input. Chapters 1-5 of the watershed management plan will focus on background and management plan development methods, while Chapter 6 will contain the actual management plan. The Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan will include the following chapters:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Overview of the Watershed
- Chapter 3: Assessing the Condition of Cameron Run Watershed
- Chapter 4: State of Cameron Run and Its Subwatersheds
- Chapter 5: Watershed Management Plan Development
- Chapter 6: Watershed Management Plan
  - Vision, Goals and Objectives
  - Policy, Land Use, and Programmatic Actions
  - Project Actions: *Location, Concept, Costs, Benefits, Priorities, and Monitoring*
  - Actions Summary
  - Implementation
  - Benefits Summary

Dr. Southerland explained to AC members that as a result of watershed management planning efforts thus far, Fairfax County has decided to review and update programmatic solutions for watershed management County-wide, rather than by watershed. At the conclusion of this discussion, Dr. Southerland reminded AC members that their input on the structure of the proposed plan is still welcome. All comments should be submitted to Ms. Jennifer Shore of Versar.

PROCESS FOR SELECTING PROJECT SITES

Dr. Southerland explained the process used for selecting projects to be included in the watershed management plan. Project selection was based on (1) the process described at the last AC meeting where staff conducted an exhaustive search for appropriate sites (based on stream characterization and landscape opportunities) and (2) the inclusion of sites identified by the AC and public. These approximately 600 sites were then grouped into land ownership categories (privately or public owned properties). Specifically, the staff identified candidate sites by reviewing stream condition and land use maps, and by relating proposed projects to AC and County management plan goals including:

- Reducing impervious areas in headwaters
- Identifying lots suitable for bioretention
- Identifying whether the topography and infrastructure are suitable for either a detention pond or retrofit to an existing pond
- Verifying available land (e.g., chapter 2 roads, schools, parks without trees)
- Identifying those streams that are degraded but stabilizing as restoration candidates

Dr. Southerland further explained that projects located on publicly owned lands will be identified as Tier 1 projects and a detailed analysis will be conducted on these projects to

- Examine the relative benefit for stormwater retrofit or LID project based on area to be treated and percent reduction in water quality pollution (watershed goal is a 10% reduction in pollution)

- Identify stream restoration sites based on the Stream Condition Index and projected stability after stormwater controls are implemented

Final selection of Tier 1 projects for inclusion in the watershed management plan will be based on each project's priority ranking. The priority ranking is obtained by applying the following formula to each project on the Tier 1 list:

Area	x	Relative Flow Reduction low = 1 moderate = 2 high = 3	x	Relative WQ Benefit low = 1 moderate = 2 high = 3	x	% Imperviousness - roads - roofs - sidewalks	=	Relative Project Priority

All other identified projects (i.e., those not on public lands and or with lower priorities) will be placed on the Tier 2 list and will be included in the watershed management plan as an appendix. A detailed analysis will not be conducted on Tier 2 projects by project staff unless requested by the County.

One AC member inquired about the method that will be used to determine whether the County is meeting their goal of a 10% reduction in water quality pollution. Versar will conduct modeling at the subwatershed level to determine the reduction in pollutant loading.

REVIEW OF CANDIDATE SOLUTIONS/PROJECTS FOR CAMERON RUN WATERSHED

Dr. Southerland clarified to AC members how each of the 247 Tier 1 projects was allocated in the Cameron Run watershed. The types of projects that will be included in the final watershed management plan are Low Impact Development (147 projects), stream and wetland restoration (34 projects), retrofits to existing ponds (42 projects), and creation of additional small detention ponds (24 projects). The allocation of projects per watershed would approximate the percentages in the goals (based on area of non-controlled impervious surface) as follows:

- Trips Run – 15.0
- Upper Holmes Run – 27.5
- Lower Holmes Run – 8.1
- Turkeycock Run – 11.3
- Indian Run – 6.1
- Backlick Run – 18.6
- Tributaries to Cameron Run – 6.1
- Pike Branch – 7.3

The watershed management plan will provide detailed descriptions of each proposed project that should be undertaken by the County. These descriptions will include a project type and concept, an aerial location map, a proposed cost estimate, benefits of the proposed project (e.g., reduction in stormwater flows), implementation schedule, and project prioritization. Not all projects will be initiated within the same year and the County has requested that project staff prioritize projects in five-year increments up to twenty years. Prioritization was based on how a particular project meets the following criteria:

- Direct contribution to regulatory obligations (i.e. Virginia tributary strategies, municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) storm water permits, etc.)
- Public support from the AC and affected residents (i.e. projects identified by the AC)
- Location in headwaters and effectiveness in reducing stormwater runoff and improving water quality through habitat improvements
- Ease of implementation (e.g., project complexity, land acquisition)
- County board-adopted categories, including political interest

Project staff generated maps of issues and corresponding solutions or projects for each subwatershed within Cameron Run. The maps reflect issues and solutions identified by AC members and the public, as well as those recommended by project staff through analysis of aerial photos and watershed conditions. Each map includes an aerial photo, land uses, and proposed projects within the subwatershed. Upon review of the maps for each subwatershed, some AC members expressed concerns that there were no projects specified to address dams, weirs, or designated resource protection areas. Dr. Southerland encouraged all AC members to send all comments and concerns to Ms. Shore of Versar. Maps of the proposed projects in each subwatershed are available on the Cameron Run Watershed page on the Fairfax County watershed plans website. Alternatively, AC members can request a printed map of their subwatershed from project staff (requested maps have been mailed). The project team will continue to identify solutions and solicit committee input throughout draft plan development.

Draft Programmatic Recommendations

Ms. Shore of Versar emailed the draft programmatic recommendations for inclusion in the watershed management plan to AC members for review and comment. The draft recommendations included three main goals to direct policy within Cameron Run:

- Goal 1: Reduce storm water impacts from impervious areas to help restore and protect the streams in the Cameron Run watershed
- Goal 2: Preserve, maintain, and improve watershed habitats to support native flora and fauna
- Goal 3: Preserve, maintain, and improve stream water quality to benefit humans and aquatic life

Dr. Southerland and Ms. Shore initiated a discussion of proposed programs and policies to be included in the watershed management plan. AC members stressed that additional programmatic recommendations are needed to fully address managing stormwater, maintaining habitat, or for addressing funding and project implementation. AC members were also concerned that more time was not allocated to discussing programmatic recommendations in a group setting. AC members were encouraged to meet outside the AC meeting schedule to discuss and revise the proposed recommendations as necessary.

County Buffer Restoration Initiative

Ms. Gayle England of DPWES announced that Fairfax County has undertaken a buffer restoration initiative where forty sites within the County will be restored by spring 2006. All forty of the sites are located on public lands and residents are encouraged to participate in restoration efforts. The first buffer planting restoration project will be at Luria Park in Falls Church on April 9, 2005. For more information on volunteering to restore a buffer area or to find out where other restoration plantings will be conducted, contact Ms. England directly or visit the buffer restoration webpage at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/stormwater/riparianbuffer/default.htm.

Project Schedule and Next Public Meeting

- Public meeting to present Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan – June 16, 2005
  - Meeting will be conducted from 7 – 9 PM at Mason District Building
  - Project staff encourage AC members to attend and participate in meeting break-out sessions
  - Public attendees will review revised Tier 1 project maps and factsheets (revisions based on feedback obtained from County and AC members)

  - Tier 2 projects will neither be illustrated in map format, nor discussed at the public meeting other than to inform attendees that a list of Tier 2 projects will be included in an appendix of the plan
  - Public attendees will be introduced to programmatic recommendations that will be contained in the final watershed management plan

- Committee review of final plan and public meeting preparations – Summer or Fall 2005
- Public meeting to present Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan – Fall 2005

Meeting Adjournment

Dr. Southerland adjourned the meeting by informing committee members that Ms. Shore of Versar will contact committee members via email to inform them of the finalized date for the next public meeting and to determine a date for a summer 2005 AC meeting.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Readers can access supporting documents from pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan.. A meeting and events calendar and AC meeting minutes are also available on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Advisory Committee Meeting No. 13

Mason District Government Building, Annandale, Virginia
June 8, 2006

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Hunt Anderson- Citizen
Glenda Booth– Fairfax County Wetlands Board
Florence Cavazos – Tripps Run Resident
Diane Davidson – Lake Barcroft Association
Jonathan Daw – Poplar Heights Civic Association
Pat Gushman- Barcroft Woods Citizens Association
Sally Henley- Citizen
Bill Herz- Lake Barcroft Environmental Board
George Madill – Bren Mar Civic Association
Pat Sanders- Limcolnia Park Civic Association
Maura Yasin – Upper Holmes Run Resident

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:
Dipmani Kumar – Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc**.**
Morris Perot – Versar, Inc
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Kris Sillett – Versar, Inc
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

Members of the advisory committee (AC) represent diverse stakeholder groups that reside throughout the Cameron Run watershed. The goal of the AC is to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources within the watershed. The purpose of this meeting was to inform AC on status of plan development, present the final project selection process for 100 high-priority projects on public-owned lands (Tier 1) in the Cameron Run Watershed, and review changes made to the plans programmatic recommendations that reflect input from the public and the County.

KEY DECISIONS AND OUTCOMES

- Notification of the next public meeting will be sent via email once the date and location have been set. September 2006 is the projected time period.
- Only Tier 1 projects (those located on public land that met specific criteria) will be described in detail at the public meeting and in the body of the watershed management plan. Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects (most non-public land projects) will be described in an appendix of the plan.

ACTION ITEMS

- Project staff will poll committee members to determine a meeting date during September 2006.
- Project staff will send out the summary of methods and the scoring table used to rank each project, and an electronic version of the revised programmatic goals and actions.
- Committee members will submit comments on proposed high-priority Tier 1 projects, and revised programmatic recommendations to project staff.

MEETING DISCUSSION

Introduction and Project Overview

Dr. Southerland of Versar convened the AC meeting with an introductory dialog between project staff and AC members, followed by a review of the meeting agenda. Materials distributed to committee members included

- AC Meeting Agenda
- Revised Programmatic Recommendations from Cameron Run
- Maps and fact sheets of 100 selected high-priority Tier 1 projects for review at breakout session

Overview on Plan Development and Content

Dr. Southerland gave a brief overview of the watershed management plan development process and presented the table of contents (TOC) for the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Dr. Southerland explained that a year had passed since the last AC meeting due to administrative delays and project work. The Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan is divided into six chapters. Chapters 1-5 of focus on background and management plan development methods, while Chapter 6 contains the

actual management plan. The Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan will include the following chapters:

Executive Summary

- Chapter 1 Introduction
- Chapter 2 Overview of the Watershed
- Chapter 3 Assessing the Condition of Cameron Run Watershed
  - -Stream characterization methods
  - -Modeling methods
  - -Public involvement
- Chapter 4 State of Cameron Run and its Subwatersheds
  - -Individual watershed subchapters
- Chapter 5 Watershed Management Plan Development
  - - Methods
- Chapter 6 Watershed Management Plan
  - -Vision, Goals and Objectives
  - -Policy, Land Use, and Programmatic Actions
  - -Project Actions
  - -Location, Concept, Costs, Benefits, Priorities, and Monitoring
  - -Actions summary
  - -Implementation tracks
  - -Benefits summary
  - -Length of stream improved
  - -Reduction in pollutants
  - -Reduction in flow velocities
  - -Extent to which plan meets Trib and TMDL goals
  - -Contributions to biodiversity and quality of life

Process for Selecting Projects

Dr. Southerland explained the process used for selecting projects to be included in the watershed management plan. Candidate sites were identified through the following: reviewing maps of stream condition and land use (in conjunction with aerial photographs); soliciting input from County staff, AC, and public stakeholders; and mapping and calculating area to be treated and percent reduction in water quality pollution. Through this process approximately 600 candidate projects were selected. Approximately 235 of the project sites are on public lands. Field visits were done at approximately 190 sites to develop site-specific restoration concept plans and identify site constraints.

Grouping of candidate projects into three rankings was described as follows:

- **Tier 1** – Best opportunities for County implementation, located on public land, and selected using SWMD prioritization framework and project distribution goals set by the AC (at present 100 sites)
- **Tier 2** – Other good opportunities either on public land that were beyond the distribution goals set by the AC, or on private lands that received support from AC or the larger public (at present 90 sites)
- **Tier 3** – Remainder of the approximately 600 sites that were identified a feasible through map analysis and initial public involvement (at present 407 sites)

Dr. Southerland gave a brief overview of how the projects would be laid out in the plan. Tier 1 projects have been described in full detail in project fact sheets; specific benefits and costs of each project will be included in the plan. Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects have been described in lesser detail but will be included an appendix; these projects may be implemented in the future by the County or the public as opportunities arise.

AC members had concerns over the project prioritization method for the Tier 1 projects and requested a summary of methods and the scoring table used to rank each project. Versar will send this information to the AC via email.

Dr. Southerland clarified to AC members that Tier 1 projects were chosen using the Fairfax County Project Prioritization Framework based on the following criteria:

- Direct contribution to regulatory obligations (VA Trib strategies, MS4 permits, TMDLs)
- Public support from advisory committee and affected residents
- Location in headwaters and effectiveness in reducing stormwater runoff and improving water quality through habitat improvements
- Ease of implementation based on project complexity, land acquisition, etc.
- Board adopted categories including political interest

Dr. Southerland presented the final allocation of Tier 1 projects (highest-priority) per subwatershed as follows:

Tripps Run	10
Upper Holmes Run	24
Lower Holmes Run	4
Turkeycock Run	13
Indian Run	10
Backlick Run	20
Tribs to Cameron Run	6
Pike Branch	10
Watershed-wide	3
	100%

The types of projects that will be included in the final watershed management plan are retrofitting existing SWM ponds, creating new SWM detention areas, low impact development (LID) projects, stream restoration, and drainage studies. Three of the Tier 1 projects are watershed-wide projects, and include instream debris jam evaluation and removal, community watershed restoration support, and a small watershed grant program.

Dr. Southerland emphasized that riparian planting and reforestation is a County-wide initiative.
Dr. Southerland and Dipmani Kumar explained that the County would also incorporate approximately 25 drainage projects into the plan based on drainage complaints from the public.

Dr. Southerland presented the layout of the Tier 1 project fact sheets that would be in the plan prior to a breakout session for the committee to review the projects that was lead by Morris Perot and Mike Klevenz. Maps and binders with the Tier I projects were provided to the AC for review. Each of the 100 high-priority Tier 1 fact sheets contains the following information:

Project Type and Concept
Location (aerial map)
Cost Estimate
Benefits
Reduction in stormwater flows
Reduction in pollutant loads
Increase in healthy stream length
Timeline (sequence of implementation)

AC members that needed more time to review the Tier 1 projects were able to keep the fact sheet binders for further review and comment.

Revised Programmatic Goals and New Programmatic Actions

After the first breakout session, Dr. Southerland presented the following revised programmatic goals and actions from Chapter 6 of the watershed plan, which incorporated input received from the public and the County:

- **Goal A:** Reduce storm water impacts on the Cameron Run Watershed from impervious areas to help restore and protect the streams
- **Goal B:** Preserve, maintain, and improve watershed habitats to support desirable native flora and fauna
- **Goal C:** Preserve, maintain, and improve the water quality of the streams to benefit humans and aquatic life
- **Goal D:** Improve stream-based quality of life and recreational opportunities for residents of and visitors to Cameron Run Watershed

- **Action A1.7:** Fairfax County should coordinate stormwater management activities with those of neighboring jurisdictions.
- **Action A4.2:** Involve the public early in the planning of watershed projects and maintain transparency between the County and the public throughout the process. Improve coordination with and early notification of affected residents at both the study and implementation stages of proposed stormwater projects.
- **Action B1.5:** Amend the County tree-preservation ordinance to expand existing woodland habitat and prevent further deforestation.
- **Action B1.6**: Provide dedicated funding for inspectors that enforce the County's Chesapeake Bay Resource Protection Area Ordinance to improve enforcement, training, and supervision of builders and developers.
- **Action D2.2:** Install signage at public facilities to explain the reasons and benefits of rain gardens, green roofs, porous pavement, and other LID features.

Dr. Southerland initiated a discussion of the revised programmatic goals and actions to be included in the watershed management plan. There were concerns from some AC members that the revised actions lack specificity. AC members also recommended that the policies be strengthened in the areas of forest protection, recycling, and enforcement. It was agreed that the project staff would email the revised programmatic recommendations for inclusion in the watershed management plan to AC members for additional review and comment, and that the power point presentation from the meeting be posted on the website. AC members were also encouraged to fill out the comment cards that were available during the breakout session. Comments received included specific problems noted by some AC members (particularly erosion) and a commendation to the Cameron Run Plan development team for an excellent job.

Project Schedule and Next Public Meeting

Dr. Southerland reviewed a draft outline of the agenda for the next public meeting, which included the following:

Brief Introduction to the Watershed Planning Process
--Power point presentation by Versar and County
Summary of Draft Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan
--Power point presentation by Versar
Programmatic Recommendations in Draft Final Plan
--Posted on walls
Projects Selected in Draft Final Plan
--Breakout groups by subwatershed
--Each station with map, facilitator, recorder, and AC member

- Public meeting to present Draft Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan –September 2006

- Schedule for Plan Development
  AC review of revisions to Draft Final Plan (selected projects and programmatic recommendations) – TODAY
  Draft Final Plan Public Meeting – September 2006
  Final Plan Approved by County

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Southerland adjourned the meeting by informing committee members that Versar will contact committee members via email to inform them of the date selected for the next public meeting. Versar will also email both policy recommendations handed out to AC and the project spreadsheet that shows project rankings.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxCounty.gov/watersheds. Readers can access supporting documents from pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan. A meeting and events calendar and AC meeting minutes are also available on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

C-2 Public Meetings

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Public Issues Scoping Forum

George Mason Government Center, Annandale, Virginia
June 17, 2004

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

Dipmani Kumar – Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
Gayle England – Fairfax County DPWES
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Julie Tasillo **–** Versar, Inc**.**
Amanda Peyton **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.
Mark Mobius **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE:

In addition to the project team staff, the meeting was attended by 40 members of the public, representing each of the eight subwatersheds in the Cameron Run Watershed.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this Public Issues Scoping Forum was to elicit and record input on the issues that most concern the citizens of the Cameron Run Watershed in Fairfax County, VA. The ultimate goal of the forum was to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and the implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

Welcome and Introduction

Mr. Fred Rose of DPWES welcomed attendees and introduced Fairfax County Supervisor, Penny Gross. Supervisor Gross offered a brief introduction to the forum before introducing Carl Bouchard, Director of the Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division, who reinforced the idea that the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan belongs to the people and that it should reflect the needs of the people of Cameron Run.

Dr. Mark Southerland of Versar, after briefly reiterated the purpose and goals of the forum, introduced Dipmani Kumar of DPWES. Mr. Kumar described what Fairfax County is currently doing in terms of watershed management. He explained that the County is currently working on a comprehensive stormwater management program to cover the 30 designated watersheds in the County. The County has set a 5-year target for developing management plans for all 30 watersheds. These plans, he explained, will not only help protect the watersheds, they will also fulfill commitments made by the Commonwealth of Virginia in signing the Chesapeake 2000 agreement.

Dr. Southerland then delivered a brief presentation to provide background for the forum participants. First he defined the concept of a watershed; then he outlined what a watershed management plan is and what it can do for the residents of Cameron Run watershed. Fairfax County, Versar, Inc., Horne Engineering Services, Inc., the Advisory Committee, and the Public are all involved in developing Cameron Run Watershed's management plan. Dr. Southerland described the geography of Cameron Run Watershed, and detailed some of the watershed's problems including altered flow, physical impacts, and water quality issues. Dr. Southerland then introduced the concept of computer modeling, and explained how it will be an important tool in understanding the watershed. He continued by explaining where planners are in the process of developing the management plan, reinforcing the idea that the process is following a *public involvement* approach. To conclude, Dr. Southerland pointed out that there was a wealth of additional information (i.e., fact sheets) available on the tables; this information, as well as the Cameron Run Watershed workbook and all Advisory Committee meeting minutes, are also available on the website. At that point, he returned to the issue of "why we are here."

Why we are here – concerns and issues from the public

Two committee members spoke to the forum participants about why they were interested in watershed management and what brought them to the forum. One Advisory Committee member related that their interest is derived from, among other things, an interest in marine conservation and an understanding that what Fairfax County does ultimately affects the ocean. Another Committee member became interested in watershed management because how the plan is developed with entail fairness issues on how flooding and backyard floodplains are addressed. Clem Rastatter of Versar, asked attending Advisory Committee members to share their reasons for becoming involved in the process. Among the responses were the following: flooding; endangered species; quality of life; the County should do a better job protecting the watershed; need for more info on the watershed management process; improve water quality; and the connection between Cameron Run and the Chesapeake Bay program.

Questions & Answers

Dr. Southerland put the issue into a regional context, describing the plan's development as a political and societal process that will help to improve water quality in the Chesapeake Bay. The County is developing plans to meet goals and commitments that Virginia agreed to by signing the Chesapeake 2000 agreement, a multi-state reaffirmation of a commitment to clean up the bay.

One public meeting attendee inquired about management plan implementation funding. In response, Fred Rose explained that supervisors may dedicate funds to developing and implementing County watershed management plans, including Cameron Run. The County will also be looking for alternate funding sources for implementation. Another participant urged the County to pursue all sources of funding because there is a mandate to improve water quality in order to avoid future implementation of Total Maximum Daily Loads (under Clean Water Act).

Discussion also focused on the status of the plan. Ms. Rastatter explained that there is currently no Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. Planners are currently soliciting feedback from the public and studying the watershed. Most streams in Fairfax County are rated poor to very poor, and it will be important to understand how watersheds within Fairfax County affect overall Chesapeake Bay water quality, and how development of this watershed management plan will affect Bay restoration efforts.

Brainstorming and Breakout Sessions

Meeting attendees were divided into three groups to participate in breakout brainstorming sessions. The purpose of the breakout sessions was to identify stakeholders' concerns with respect to the Cameron Run watershed rather than to discuss possible solutions to those concerns. At each session, a facilitator invited participants to relate what they felt were important issues in the watershed while another project staff member recorded items as they were put forth. Each group produced a long list of items that participants felt were *important to* or *of concern in* the Cameron Run Watershed.

Project staff facilitators encouraged participants to prioritize items of concern using a system called 10/4 voting. Each participant was allotted a total of 10 votes to cast for the items he or she felt were most important, and voters were allowed to cast from 0 – 4 votes for any single item. Those items receiving greater numbers of votes were assigned higher relative importance or priority than items receiving fewer votes. It was stressed to participants that this activity was not a final priority, nor was it intended to exclude any suggestions from an eventual plan. Rather it served to highlight items that each group felt were of greatest importance.

The following section details the five items that received the most votes from each group, and briefly summarizes other concerns identified in the breakout sessions.

Group 1:

Highest Priority Items	*Votes*
Quality of life improvements	13
Tighter enforcement by County government	7
Sedimentation	7
Imperviousness	6
Trash/Pollution	6

Many of the group's concerns were associated with policy and enforcement. Related items that didn't appear on the highest-priority list were transparency, reporting violations, down zoning, "enforcement funding" (fines, penalties, etc.) going toward restoration, decreasing urban sprawl/meeting increasing housing demands via infill of developed areas, and ensuring that the "rules" are followed by Federal, State, and local governments. Aesthetic stream design and shoreline restoration were discussed as well as Resource Protection Areas (RPAs), conservation easements, riparian buffers, and increasing vegetation in general. The group also thought that the engineers and planners should consider the overall watershed condition when designing transportation projects, and that seasonal snow removal methods play an important role in watershed health.

Group 2:

Highest Priority Items	*Votes*
Policy & Planning	5
Flooding	5
Recreation	4
Enforcement	4
Impervious surface	4

This group thought that Fairfax County's policies encouraged development without concern for how the development affects the environment. Waivers are granted too often for environmental regulations, and regulations between multiple agencies are not always consistent. For example, one regulation states that erosion controls should be placed in certain locations while another agency's regulation states that the erosion controls are not needed. Regulations that are in existence should be enforced and those developers that cause problems should be held accountable. This group recommends that impervious surfaces be retrofitted with Low Impact Development (LID) measures, that the County adopt an LID policy where County facilities use LID practices, and that incentives be given for the use of LID practices that preserve existing green space. In addition, areas should be set aside for recreational use, existing Trail systems should be interconnected to provide an alternative to vehicle transportation, and planting riparian buffers along streams should be encouraged.

Because there are numerous flooding problems throughout the County, Fairfax County should work with the City of Falls Church and the City of Alexandria to develop a monitoring program. This effort would provide useful data to identify where problems exist. Citizen participation and education should be encouraged.

Group 3:

*Highest Priority Items**	*Votes*
Dechannelizing Tripps Run	16
Loss of open space and cutting down trees	10
Trail enhancement	8
Periodic street sweeping and other low cost alternatives	8
Concrete and asphalt	8
Low public awareness	8

* Top 6 listed to include 4-way tie with 8 votes each

Group 3 also identified many items relating to policy, planning, or enforcement. Participants felt that County regulations should be brought more in line with good stormwater management practices, that the County could serve as a better role model in developing its property, and that there should be more coordination between zoning, permitting, and planning processes. They felt that it is important to ensure better erosion control/storm water management at construction sites, and to catch "midnight dumpers" who illegally deposit trash and debris in the watershed. The group also questioned the adequacy of County resources and their authority to deal with such activities.

Numerous items pertained to stormwater management: storm drainage on main roads needs to be improved, retention ponds for flood/stormwater control and sediment control aren't working (what can be done with the dredge spoils?), and there is poor water management within developments. The group noted that in addition to soils/suspended solids this runoff carries trash, bacteria, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, and they thought that, to the extent possible, decontamination of runoff should occur at the source. Participants also felt that small particulate matter and air pollutants could have significant impacts within the watershed.

Finally, the group felt that it would be important to identify potential terrestrial habitat for buffers and infiltration, identify soils amenable to recharge the water table, and restore streambeds to support aquatic life. Planners, they thought, should zone for open spaces. RPAs should be clearly designated and maximum flood depths should be marked along trails.

Forum Conclusion

The forum participants regrouped after the breakout sessions and the breakout session facilitators presented their groups' findings. Project staff thanked attendees for their participation and closed the meeting, remaining on-hand to answer additional questions.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the County website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Cameron Run Watershed
Community Watershed Forum

Holmes Middle School, Alexandria, Virginia
October 23, 2004

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:

***Dipmani Kumar* --** Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
***Gayle England* --** Fairfax County DPWES, Ecologist/Public Involvement
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES
Morris Perot – Versar, Inc.
Clem Rastatter – Versar, Inc.
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
***Julie Tasillo* –** Versar, Inc**.**
***Amanda Peyton* –** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc. prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this Community Watershed Forum was to educate the public on the current status of the Cameron Run Watershed, Fairfax County's planning and zoning process, benefits and application of Low Impact Development technology, and to elicit and record input from attendees of the issues that most concern them and proposed solutions for those issues. The ultimate goal of the forum was to help Fairfax County develop a watershed management plan for Cameron Run that incorporates community interests in the evaluation of problems and implementation of solutions for protecting and restoring the streams and other natural resources of the watershed.

Welcome and Introduction

Dr. Mark Southerland of Versar opened the Community Watershed Forum by introducing public attendees to the project team and the watershed vision developed by the advisory committee. Dr. Southerland then briefly reiterated the purpose and goals of the forum, and then turned the introduction over to Fred Rose of DPWES who discussed County goals and objectives for engaging the public throughout the watershed management plan process. Specifically, Mr. Rose stressed the importance of gathering public input to ensure that the finalized watershed management plan is not only compliant with current federal and state regulations, but that the plan addresses future impacts as well. Fairfax County has recognized that the Cameron Run Watershed is impaired, and with the assistance of the community, solutions will be found. Today's forum will help to raise community awareness and attendee input will help the County and project staff to understand all watershed impacts and will facilitate plan development.

Following Mr. Rose, an advisory committee member briefly discussed their interest in watershed management plan development. The agenda for this public meeting was to 1) go over basics of the Cameron Run Watershed, 2) review the development of the watershed management plan, and 3) to gather public input on issues and solutions. Dipmani Kumar, of DPWES, gave an overview of the Stormwater Business Area in Fairfax County and provided an update on the status of the Watershed Planning program countywide. Stacy Blersch of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) informed participants about a cost-sharing agreement between Fairfax County, the City of Alexandria, and the USACE to conduct a feasibility study for the Cameron Run watershed. The cost-sharing agreement will allow Fairfax County to participate in future cost-sharing arrangements with the Corps for implementing capital improvement projects that are identified by the final watershed plan for Cameron Run.

Materials distributed and made available to meeting attendees included:

- Community Watershed Forum Agenda
- Watershed Academy Presentations (including insert)
- Presentation of Fairfax County's Planning and Zoning Process
- The Countywide Policy Element of The Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County
- Flyer concerning the benefits of Raingardens
- Example Problems and Potential Solutions spreadsheet

Watershed Academy

Dr. Southerland conducted the watershed academy by discussing the current condition of the Cameron Run Watershed, which included an in-depth discussion on the definition of a watershed, urban stream ecology, and the stresses impacting the Cameron Run Watershed. Overall, the Cameron Run watershed has poor stream quality based on the Stream Protection Strategy conducted by the County. Dr. Southerland; Noel Kaplan, of the Fairfax County Department of planning and Zoning; and Larry Coffman, of Prince Georges County Maryland, discussed possible solutions for improving the watershed. Topics discussed included:

- Fairfax County Zoning and Planning process
- Using Low Impact Development techniques to reduce development impacts
- Effects of the watershed Management Plan on water quality
- Public role in watershed management plan development

Community Watershed Plan Input

Meeting attendees were asked to identify specific areas within the watershed that are impaired, and then to suggest solutions for those impairments. Prior to breaking out into groups, Mr. Rose assured public attendees that Fairfax County has already been initiating projects to address major watershed problems. Some of these projects include buffer replanting along streams, and identifying and cleaning up dumpsites within the County. Full implementation of County watershed managements plans can take up to several years due to policy revision and obtaining project funding. Through developing a partnership with USACE and by assessing capital improvements and maintenance funding, the County will be better able to implement watershed management plans. The County also informed meeting attendees that the County Board of Supervisors adopted an environmental excellence plan in June that encourages a proactive approach to addressing future issues. This plan encourages identifying and taking advantage of environmental and technological opportunities.

The following tables depict specified areas of tributary impairment and suggested solutions for those areas.

Northern Region: Tripps Run, Holmes Run Upper, Holmes Run Lower		
Location	**Problem**	**Solution**
Tripps Run & Tributary stream north on Sleepy Hollow Rd.	Excessive Channelization Elevated Stream sewer runoff Frequent Pollution/dumping	Fairfax County educate residents on: a) Plantings b) Stormwater controls c) Pollution monitoring equipment d) Neighborhood watch and environmental groups e) Improving habitat conditions
Poplar Heights	Severe bank erosion Storm runoff	Provide additional stormwater controls in upland areas to reduce the magnitude and frequency of flows; apply bioengineering and natural stream channel design approaches to stabilize streambanks and bed, and improve habitat conditions. LID retrofits upstream.

Holmes Run Acres	High density housing on hill Erosion Habitat destruction Runoff Flooding	In new design, remove use of cul-de-sacs; make housing areas less dense, use swales, check dams, and increase riparian buffer along established trail.
Culmore Creek	High bacteria levels in stream	Find source
Jeb Stuart Stream Valley	Invasives	Remove invasives and re-establish riparian buffer
Marshall Property	Uncontrolled dumpsite	Clarification of zoning issues and inspection by the city of the dumpsite.
Fairfax County portion of Tripps Run	Stream channelization	Investigate retrofit opportunities and stream restoration
Custis Parkway	Stream erosion	Stream bank stabilization
Loeumans Plaza	Impervious surface Staging area for winter salting and de-icing	Require clean-up of salt and sand after release by dump trucks (street sweeping)
Valleycrest Drive	Stream bank erosion	Stream bank stabilization
"Barcroft Blight" Apartment Complex	Trash Undercut banks	Stream bank stabilization and remove trash
Tripps Run south of Holmes Run Road between Annandale and Sleepy Hollow	Abandoned sewer line that occasionally leaches out pollutants and other material	Clean-up old sewer line
Parcel A of Cloisters	Steep bank erosion	Stream bank stabilization
Shreve Road building site development	Erosion	Establish sedimentation controls during construction to minimize runoff from site
Glavis Property/Sleepy Hollow Rd.	Opportunity	Purchase Glavis property land for conservation easement. Opportunity to buy/save 10 acres of undeveloped woodland.
Opposite side of Tripps Run creek behind Bill Page Honda and US Post Office, Annandale Road and Route 50	Chemicals and trash in Tripps Run	Find chemical source and clean-up trash
Potters Drive	Sedimentation buildup	Stream bank stabilization and dredging of accumulated sediment.
Calvert Street	Severe erosion	Stream bank stabilization
JebStuart High School Parking Lot	Excessive runoff	Install pervious pavers and bioretention areas
Holmes Run Acres to Lake Barcroft	Lack of recreational opportunities	Extend bike trail
Broad street Multi-office building	Re-development of existing office building	Establish controls to minimize stream and habitat destruction

General Watershed-wide Issues
VDOT salt and sand removal procedures
Disconnect between city of Falls Church, City of Alexandria, and Fairfax County

General Watershed-wide Solutions
Integrate City of Falls Church into USACE agreement with City of Alexandria and Fairfax County
County-wide street sweeping program
Increase educational signage around county and make existing signage bigger and brighter (more noticeable)

Central Watershed: Backlick Run, Indian Run, Turkeycock Run			Contact Information
Location	**Problem**	**Solution**	
Lower reaches of Holmes- Van Dorn to Eisenhower Ave.	Cutting down all vegetation on stream bank. Mowing bottom 2/3 of berm. The berm is widened every few years. There is an agreement with the City of Alexandria and the ACOE.	Stop cutting vegetation/ plant riparian buffer	Gossett
Tributary off of Backlick Run (personal property)	Dump site, fenced off area, parked truck trailers (alleged group of people living in trailers)	Create a river edge park	Harry/Barbara Gossett
Predominantly industrial area/ boating companies	Collection of upstream trash	organize stream clean up	Harry/Barbara Gossett
Cameron Run mainstem	Channelized ditch	River edge park/ dechannelizing (ex. Four mile run is in the process of retrofits, contact Bill Hicks)	Harry/Barbara Gossett
Holmes Run Trail (below Barcroft Dam) Columbia Pike to Old Towne Alexandria to the Potomac River. ADC map 16/E13 is where the trail stops	The trail runs from below the Lake Barcroft Dam to the Potomac except where the trail ends around the private pool.	Extend the walking path	Harry/Barbara Gossett
Cameron Run mainstem	Non-operational weir. The sediment should settle out downstream of the weir. It was changed and now the water runs faster and sediment doesn't settle out.	Restore weir to original design	Ron Holder
Entrance of Tarrelton Park to end of asphalt	There are 14 tree stumps at the Western edge of the Resource protection area. He is unsure of why they were cut/who cut the trees. Are trees located in the resource protection area allowed to be cut?	punitive damages; 28 trees planted on the east side of the trail in the RPA	Ron Holder
S. Gordon St. Outfall (Mill Run)	Accumulation of trash (plastic netting buried in the 1950's or 60's for "erosion control" during building of warehouses)	Trash catcher/collector	Ron Holder
Canterbury Square Apts/Condos in flood zone A	Obstruction of flood channel	Take out bike underpass at Duke Street on the east side of Holmes Run. Move it to the West side of Holmes Run (make an extension of the overpass)	Ron Holder
Tributary to Cameron Run	No access to stream		
Wilburdale Park	Urbanized Stream	Earth Sangha - Stream planting project	Earth Sangha
Tarrelton Park	Runoff from park into neighborhood due to park being higher than properties. Rock/concrete outfall is 2ft too high. The outfall is not operating causing pooling of water and mosquito breeding.	8 inch high berm around park to slow runoff (put notches in berm for slow runoff)	Ron Holder

Turkeycock/Braddock Rd.	Dog walking. Look into golf course management. Lots of geese, bad water quality downstream of golf course	doggy mitts/cleanup	Harry/Barbara Gossett
Wooded lots below Holmes Middle School	Stream bank erosion and high flows within nice wooded areas south of Holmes Middle School	Stormwater control upstream to increase the good areas	Nick Byrne

South Watershed: Pike Branch, Tribs to Cameron Run			Contact Information
Location	**Problem**	**Solution**	
Pike Branch intersection with Cameron Run	Construction run off due to Wilson Bridge project		Meredith Upchurch
Jefferson Manor Neighborhood (and many others)	Trash, leaves, and runoff going down stormdrains (many times intentionally)	stormdrain stenciling	Meredith Upchurch
Jefferson Manor Park	Channelized stream	Dechannelizing/retrofit (ex. Four Mile Run is in the process of retrofits, contact Bill Hicks)	Meredith Upchurch
Telegraph Road	The proposed widening of Telegraph road will cause a major impact on Pike Branch		
Cameron Run between Holmes Run and Hunting Creek	Already identified as severe habitat	Add recreational remedies in addition to environmental. Light boating, kayaking could be readily accomplished in conjunction with the Northern Virginia Recreational Park	Richard Hartman
Cameron Run	Telegraph Road to Route 1 only access is by car	Create pedestrian walk along stream, across stream to Eisenhower Ave.	Meredith Upchurch

Forum Conclusion

Participants regrouped after the breakout sessions. Project staff thanked attendees for their participation and closed the meeting, but they remained on-hand to answer any lingering questions.

Information about Cameron Run and the Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the county website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Draft Plan Forum

George Mason Government Center, Annandale, Virginia
June 14, 2005

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:
Gayle England -- Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), Ecologist/Public Involvement
Dipmani Kumar -- Fairfax County DPWES
Fred Rose – Fairfax County DPWES
Beth Franks – Versar, Inc.
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc**.**
Morris Perot – Versar, Inc
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Kris Sillett – Versar, Inc
Deborah Slawson – Versar, Inc
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.
Shana Bullock **–** Horne Engineering Services, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this Draft Plan Forum was to elicit and record comments from the citizens of the Cameron Run Watershed in Fairfax County, VA, on the policy recommendations and watershed management actions in the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. The ultimate goal of the forum was to help Fairfax County refine the Draft Plan with input from the community.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name:	Organization:	Address:	PH:	Email:
Pete Walker	Lake Barcroft Assoc.	6404 Cavalier Coll Falls Church, VA 22044	703.354.9693	petewalker@cox.net
Jim McGlone		4534 Eaton Place Alexandria, VA 23210 **(NEW)**	703.822.9160	
A. Cambern		6364 Lakeview Drive Falls Church, VA		
George Madill	Bren Mark Park Civic Association	6322 Fenton Ct Alexandria, VA	703.354.4083	
Nick Byrne	Sleep Hollow Manor HOA	3109 Sleepy Holly Rd Seven Corners, VA	703.237.3055	Nicolaus.byrne@dhp.gov
Richard Hartman	Berkshire HOA Huntington HCA MUCCA	2109 Huntington Ave Alexandria, VA 22303	703.960.0296	Rs.hartman@verizon.net
Stacey Sloan Blersch	USACE, Baltimore	10 S. Howard Street Baltimore, MD 21211	410.962.5196	Stacey.s.blersch@usace.army.mil
Ronald Houder		238 South Jennings St. Alexandria, VA 22304	703.751.1272	
Diane Davidson	LBA	3538 Pinetree Terrace Falls Church, VA 22041	703.575.8187	DHD757@aol.com
David Grant	LBWID		703.820.1300	
Pete Silvia	LBWID		703.750.9440	
V. Moltheise			703.560.3704	
Bill Herz	Lake Barcroft	6538 Jay Miller Drive Falls Church, VA 22041	703.256.5533	billherz@gmail.com (Add to distribution list)
Nancy Goudreau	Huntington Com.	2325 Riverview Terrace Alexandria, VA 22303	713.329.2933	nagoudreau@yahoo.com
Florence Cavazos				

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Mr. Fred Rose of DPWES welcomed the group to the forum. He said that the Cameron Run Watershed Plan, which has been in the works for a year, is at a critical stage in its development. The plan is 50 to 60 percent complete and that the next step is to zero in on specific projects for implementation. The County has elevated the stormwater program to a higher priority and allocated an additional $18 million in

funding to Fairfax County Public Works to complete all of the watershed plans for the County and begin restoration projects. The County expects to have plans completed for all of its watersheds by 2009.

Dr. Mark Southerland of Versar reiterated the vision for the Cameron Run watershed, i.e., "A fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse Cameron Run watershed that supports a safe and enjoyable environment for people and property." He gave attendees instructions for filling out the comment cards that would be handed out during the second half of the meeting and went over the meeting agenda and handouts. Included in the handouts were the forum agenda, a CD containing the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Plan, a copy of the Executive Summary of the plan, a glossary of terms, the Cameron Run Watershed Plan Locator Map, the summary of projects from the plan, and the policy recommendations for the Cameron Run watershed.

Mr. Dipmani Kumar of DPWES presented an overview of the watershed planning process and discussed how the County proposes to implement the plans. As plans are being completed, the focus is shirting towards plan implementation. Two County-wide initiatives have been funded to support buffer restoration and dumpsite removal and a new County government branch has been created to oversee implementation of the watershed projects. Implementation projects to date have focused on parkland since access is not an issue. Mr. Kumar spoke about riparian buffer deficiencies throughout the County and highlighted a buffer restoration project initiated in March of 2005. The project used contractors and volunteers to remove invasive plants and install restoration plantings over about 20,000 square feet. The next steps in buffer restoration will include 12 volunteer plantings on parkland and up to 22 contracted plantings throughout the County. Dumpsite clean-up priority is given to high impact areas on parkland and on private lands where easements allow easy access. To date seven sites in Little Hunting Creek have been cleaned. Fourteen sites on parkland have been targeted for clean up in August of 2005. Regarding the Cameron Run watershed, $280,000 has been earmarked for watershed signage, buffer restoration, and scoping and design for low-impact development and best management practice (BMP) retrofit projects. In October 2004, Fairfax County entered into a cost-share agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the City of Alexandria to complete a comprehensive watershed study. The agreement will allow both jurisdictions to apply for federal cost-share funds for implementing watershed projects.

Dr. Southerland explained the characteristics of a watershed and discussed the condition of the Cameron Run watershed. He defined watersheds and differentiated them from subwatersheds, presented the common characteristics of a healthy stream, described good water quality indicators, described the types of degradation experienced by urban streams and discussed the effects of impervious surfaces on water flow. The Cameron Run watershed is 44 square miles and comprises eight major subwatersheds. The watershed is highly urbanized, with only 5 percent of the land vacant. Much of the land is impervious and the watershed is suffering the associated physical impacts including erosion, flooding, and channel alteration. Four reaches of the watershed are on the State 303d list of impaired waters requiring total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for benthic impairment, fecal coliform, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs). Overall, the Cameron Run watershed has very poor stream quality with few natural buffers, poor aquatic habitat, degraded fish and benthic communities, and significant erosion. More than half of the stream reaches in the watershed are considered moderately to severely degraded.

Mr. Mike Klevenz of Versar explained the purpose of the County's watershed management plans to serve as a tool for evaluating, assessing, and managing a watershed. He explained how the County is working with Versar, the Advisory Committee, and the public to create the plan. He described the public involvement approach and said that the final public meeting will be held in September of 2005 to present the Final Cameron Run Watershed Plan. The plan will recommend actions and policy changes to address the problems identified during the stream characterization and by the public during the scooping meetings. Mr. Klevenz went over the watershed goals identified in the plan and the model that was used to evaluate potential solutions to the Cameron Run watershed's issues. The model simulates runoff from land surfaces, stream water quality, and stream water quantity and identifies flooding and channel erosion problem areas, water quality problems, and other related factors affecting the watershed. The model takes

into account current and future land uses and benefits from BMPs. The model was used as part of the planning process in conjunction with stream assessments, field studies, and analysis of aerial photographs to identify the actions recommended in the plan. The plan recommends 235 actions under four categories including low-impact development, new stormwater ponds, stormwater pond retrofit, and stream restoration. Mr. Klevenz concluded by providing detailed examples of the types of actions that fall within the four broad categories.

Mr. Southerland wrapped up the introductory segment of the forum by explaining how the 235 actions are prioritized in the plan, how the project website can be used to submit comments on the draft plan, and who to contact with questions and concerns.

PROJECT AND POLICY REVIEW

After the opening presentations, the attendees moved to a break-out room where they had the opportunity to review and comment on the Project Actions included in the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Plan. The watershed was divided into three geographic watershed groups (northern, central, and southern) and each group was provided with a map, project list, and comment cards. The following table provides a summary of the comments that were collected during the breakout sessions:

Project Number	Comment	Name and Contact Information
Policy	Would like to see policy that states county policy on transparency.	Jonathan Daw 703.573.6353 Jehosachicken@yahoo.com
Policy	Would like to see a stated county policy on early public awareness and involvement.	Jonathan Daw 703.573.6353 Jehosachicken@yahoo.com
Policy	Urge County to develop incentives for developers/owners to put in roof gardens, pervious paving, etc.	George Madill 703.354.4083
New Policy	Disclosure of RPA and other environmental easements when buying a home.	Jim McGlone 703.822.9160 Mccrumb1@msn.com
Objective B1	Require disclosure of RPAs in all real estate transactions.	Jim McGlone 703.822.9160 Mccrumb1@msn.com
No Number, Tripps Run	***Need stream stabilization, restore riparian buffer, remove tree canopy invasive vines from Sleepy Hollow Rd, North along sleepy Hollow Park, and opposite shore.*** Implement projects CA9126, 9221, 9886, 9887, 9893, 9894, 9896, 9222 in the Sleepy Hollow area, along with the suggestion above.	Nick Byrne O: 202.344.1924 H: 703.237.3055 Nicolaus.byrne@dhs.gov
No number Northern-most headwaters of Tripps Run near 66	Pond at headwaters of Tripps Run could use some improvement to help with flooding downstream. Retention pond or rain garden on south side of 66 to reduce runoff from 66.	Jonathan Daw 703.573.6353 Jehosachicken@yahoo.com
CA9882	Break this project up into smaller pieces.	Bill Herz 703.256.5533 billherz@gmail.com
CA219	Strongly Support	Bill Herz 703.256.5533
CA9882	Break this project down so that it can be implemented in stages.	P.R. Walker 703.354.9693

Project Number	Comment	Name and Contact Information
		petewalker@cox.net
CA9882	Break this project up into smaller chunks – the $5 million price is too high; no lump sum but separate out the green roof and the ball field.	Diane Davidson 703.575.8187 DHD757@aol.com
CA9882	Break up CA9882 into several sub-projects so the big price tag does not kill the whole project at JEB Stuart.	Peter A. Silvia 703.750.9440 PASilvia@aol.com
No Number See Map Holmes Run Upper (2)	Between Arlington Blvd. and New Providence Drive – degraded stream with trash. Developer planning to remove all vegetation and build around stream.	V. Mottleissser (?) 703.560.3704
No number	Address drainage/trash/pollution in feeder watercourse east of south end of Glen Carlyn Drive (from Culmore (See projects CA9880 and 9881 for top end of Glen Carlyn Dr.)	Peter A. Silvia LBWID 703.750.9440 PASilvia@aol.com
CA9882	Please add shoreline stabilization to tributary that is below the main parking lot of the JEB Stuart high School.	Davis Grant 703.820.1300 dgrantlbwid@vacoxmail.com
No number #1:	Restoration of concrete streambed should have velocity reducing techniques if no restoration done.	Florence Cavazos 703.532.2554 Florence.cavazos@fairfaxcounty.gov
CA95A (Circled in map – Holmes Run lower)	When the Potterton Bridge was replaced (DOT) it was opened up and much rip=rap was removed – allowing more sediment/nutrients into Lake Barcroft. Can this be a retrofit project to reduce flow?	Bill Herz 703.256.5533 billherz@gmail.com
4A – Homes Run Lower	This private land unbuildable and the owner has tried to get rid of it in a way that he wouldn't be taxed. Could the County work out an agreement to take the property into a conservation trust Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District could/would adopt it and maintain it.	Diane Davidson 703.575.8187 DHD757@aol.com Pete Silvia 703.750.9440 PASilvia@aol.com
CA9105	In addition to this specific project, there should be additional strainers and retention ponds to filter debris coming into Backlick Run from the Beltway/Springfield interchange construction and normal Beltway runoff.	George Madill 703.354.4083 g.madill@att.net
CA9200	VISION #1: The Huntington Community would like to see a demonstration project along the south side of Cameron Run between Telegraph Road and Rte. 1 of a porous pavement for the approved Huntington Stream Valley Trail. VISION #2: Huntington proposes the creation of "Lake Cameron" between the Lower Holmes Run junction and Hunting Creek.	Richard Hartman 703.960.0796 Rs.hartman@verizon.net
CA9200	The increasing population in the Huntington area would relish development along Cameron Run that would capitalize on this waterway. The old growth trees and the new SWPs and a new dock – the dock from which to fish and to launch non-motorized boats.	Nancy Goudreau 703.329.2933 nagoudreau@yahoo.com

Project Number	Comment	Name and Contact Information
CA9200	The Huntington Association is concerned how the interchange development project for the Telegraph Rd. exit off the Beltway will affect Cameron Run. Also, it sees an opportunity for the extension and improvement of a bike trail to run from Telegraph Rd. to Route 1.	Nancy Goudreau 703.329.2933 nagoudreau@yahoo.com
CA9200	The development of a "waterfront" along a bike trail next to Cameron Run would greatly enhance the recreational opportunities for residents who would NOT have to drive to a rec. area.	Nancy Goudreau 703.329.2933 nagoudreau@yahoo.com

MEETING CONCLUSION

Project staff will inform meeting attendees and other stakeholders of when the draft plan will be available for review and comment. Once the draft plan is posted on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty-watersheds.net, meeting attendees and the public will have thirty days to provide comments. (The public comment period closed July 28).

Information about Cameron Run and the Draft Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the website. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers will be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the county website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902 or toll free at (886) 341-4599.

Cameron Run Watershed
Draft Final Plan Forum

Mason District Government Center, Annandale, Virginia
December 4, 2006

PROJECT TEAM STAFF IN ATTENDANCE:
Gayle England - Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), Ecologist/Public Involvement
Dipmani Kumar - Fairfax County DPWES
Fred Rose - Fairfax County DPWES
Don Demetrius - Fairfax County DPWES
Mike Klevenz – Versar, Inc.
Morris Perot – Versar, Inc
Jennifer Shore – Versar, Inc.
Kris Sillett – Versar, Inc
Mark Southerland – Versar, Inc.

THE CAMERON RUN WATERSHED PLAN

The Cameron Run watershed has experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the creek and its watershed. The Cameron Run Advisory Committee advises the Cameron Run Watershed Plan project team. Versar, Inc., prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies. Versar, Inc., and Horne Engineering Services, Inc. serve as facilitators for the public meetings. For more information, contact cameronrun@versar.com or visit http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/watersheds.

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

MEETING PURPOSE

The purpose of this Draft Final Plan Forum was to elicit and record comments from the citizens of the Cameron Run Watershed in Fairfax County, VA, on the Draft Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan. The ultimate goal of the forum was to help Fairfax County refine the Draft Final Plan with input from the community.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	Address	Phone	Email
Hunt Anderson	Lincoln Park C/A	4827 Virginia St. Alexandra, VA 22312	(703) 941-8089	volstream@hotmail.com
Bob Beverly		7402 Beverly St. Annandale, VA 22003	(703) 256-6772	JillBob58@Juno.com
Mike Bienvenu	Poplar Heights Recreation Association	7301 Pinecastle Rd Falls Church, VA	(703) 645-9242	bienvenu@speakeasy.net
Stacey Blersch	USACE Baltimore District Planning Division	USACE Baltimore District CENAB-PL-CPD 10 S. Howard St. Baltimore, MD 21201	(410) 962-5196	stacey.s.blersch@usace.army.mil
Glenda Booth	Fairfax County Wetlands Board	7708 Tauxemont Rd. Alexandria, VA 22308	(703) 765-5233	gbooth123@aol.com
Sandra Brown		5408 Backlick Woods Ct. Springfield, VA 22151	(703) 345-6704	Sandra.brown@troutmansanders.com
Nick Byrne	Sleepy Hollow C/A	3109 Sleepy Hollow Rd. Falls Church, VA 22042	(703) 237-3055	niclaus.byrne@dhs.gov
Danell Castro		2233 Arlington Terrace	(703) 740-3620	danell.castro@gmail.com
Ken Clare		3102 Marl Pat Dr. Alexandria, VA 22310	(703) 460-4079	kenclare@bellatlantic.net
Bill Cleveland	MUCCA	902 Neal Dr. Alexandria, VA 22308	(703) 780-9151	wcleveland@pobox.com
Colleen Coughlin	Pinecrest C/A	4514 Shoal Creek Ct. Alexandria, VA 22312	(202) 874-4465	president@thepinecrest.org
Diane Davidson	LBA	3538 Pinetree Terrace Falls Church, VA 22041	(703) 575-8787	DHD757@aol.com

Name	Organization	Address	Phone	Email
Pat Gushman	Barcroft Woods C/A	3607 Bent Branch Ct. Falls Church, VA 22041	(703) 941-8382	patgushman@aol.com
Phil Hartenstein		2244 Arlington Terrace Alexandria VA 22303	(703) 960-1890	philbjhart@yahoo.com
Sally Henley	Fairfax County Resident	2836 Raymond Ct. Falls Church, VA 22042		
Bill Herz	LBA	6538 Jay Miller Dr. Falls Church, VA 22041	(202) 256-9986	billherz@gmail.com
David Jones		3664 Tallwood Terrace Falls Church, VA 22041	(703) 256-7525	djones121@cox.net
David Lewis		5408 Backlick Woods Springfield VA	(703) 354-6704	davidalewis@verizon.net
Robert Mankin		5825 Telegraph Rd Alexandria, VA22310	(703) 960-9210	
Richard Mendenhall	LPCA	7401 East Moreland Rd Annandale, VA 22003	(703) 333-6166	rmendenhall@mannagrp.com
Richard McCormack		4112 Sleepy Hollow Rd. Annandale, VA	(703) 354-7460	Richard@manufacturingnews.com
Bob Morsches	LPCA	5263 Navaho Dr Alexandria VA	(703) 256-2726	morsches@mac.com
Marta Nammack	LCPCA	6404 Pima St Alexandria VA	(703) 750-2481	Marta.nammack@verison.net
Douglas Olmsted		5510 Sheldon Drive Alexandria, VA 22312	(703) 642-8305	cadao@patriot.net
Karen Pal		5104 Redwing Dr. Alexandria, VA	(703) 914-1738	Karen.pal@verison.net
Paul Phelps		2212 Martha's Rd. Alexandria, VA 22307		pbphelps@cupg.org
Ingrid Phillips	Huntington	2231 Arlington Terrace Alexandria, VA 22303	(703) 960-4889	
Richard Record	Huntington	5643 Fenwick Dr. Alexandria, VA 22303	(571) 278-5141	Rarecord@yahoo.com
Marie Reinsdorf	Bel Air Civic Assoc.	6709 Kerns Rd. Falls Church, VA 22042	(703)534-3234	kreinsdorf@cox.net

Name	Organization	Address	Phone	Email
Pat Sanders	LPCA	4924 RidgeWood Rd. Alexandria, VA 22312	(703) 354-8651	safedak@yahoo.com
Larry Sexton	Falls Hill C/A	7205 Gordons Rd. Falls Church, VA 22043	(703) 552-5559	LKS.LJS@cox.com
Rob Taylor	Poplar Heights	121 S. Oat Falls Church, VA	(703) 574-3535	rjtaylor@starpower.net
Jim Turbett	LPCA	6501 Waverly St Alexandria, VA		
Peter Walker	LBA	6404 Cavalier Corridor Falls Church, VA 22041	(703) 254-9693	petewalker@cox.net
Clay Williams	Huntington	3424 Arnold Ave Falls Church, VA	(703) 573-6224	claywill@aol.com
Maura Yasin		3426 Annandale Rd. Falls Church, VA 22046	(703) 207-0520	myestimator@yahoo.com

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Dr. Mark Southerland of Versar went over the forum agenda, which entailed how the Watershed Plan was developed, a review of what the Draft Final Watershed Plan includes, and the implementation plan. He reiterated the vision for the Cameron Run watershed, i.e., "A fishable, swimmable, and biologically diverse Cameron Run watershed that supports a safe and enjoyable environment for people and property." He gave attendees instructions for filling out the comment cards that would be handed out during the second half of the meeting and went over the handouts. Included in the handouts were the forum agenda, a summary of Tier 1 projects and Group 1 drainage projects, project maps, and the policy recommendations for the Draft Final Plan. There was also a sign-up sheet to request a CD of the Draft Final Plan.

Dr. Southerland explained the function of the watershed plan. He explained that it is a tool for evaluating, assessing, and managing a watershed. It provides goals and objectives for achieving management actions (e.g., to restore water quality, reduce flood frequency, or improve fish and wildlife habitats). He reviewed the groups involved in developing the plan, i.e., Fairfax County, Versar, Inc., the Advisory Committee, and the public. Overall, the Cameron Run watershed has very poor stream quality with few natural buffers, poor aquatic habitat, degraded fish and benthic communities, and significant erosion. More than half of the stream reaches in the watershed are considered moderately to severely degraded.

Dr. Southerland reviewed the steps involved in identifying project solutions, and the categories of projects included in the plan. He outlined the steps in selecting projects for the plan and how the projects are prioritized in the plan. Tier 1 project have been described in full detail (factsheets); specific benefits and costs of each project are included in the plan. Tier 2 and Tier 3 projects have been described in lesser detail and are included as an appendix (tables). Tier 1 projects include 100 stormwater pond retrofits, low impact development, and stream restoration projects recommended for County implementation, as well as 25 drainage complaint projects. The County will implement Tier 2 projects as opportunities arise. The

community may choose to implement Tier 3 projects. Dr. Southerland discussed the implementation of the plan and the next steps for the Plan review.

Mr. Southerland wrapped up the introductory segment of the forum by explaining the next steps involved in finalizing the plan. The Draft Final Plan will be posted to the project website for the 30-day public comment period. After revision, the Draft Final Plan will go before County Board for approval. The Final Plan will be posted to project website.

PROJECT AND POLICY REVIEW

After the opening presentations, the attendees moved into break-outs where they had the opportunity to review and comment on Tier 1 Projects, Group 1 Drainage Complaint Projects, and Policy Recommendations included in the Draft Final Cameron Run Watershed Plan. The watershed was divided into three geographic groups (northern, central, and southern parts of the watershed) and each group was provided with a copy of the Draft Final plan, maps, project lists, and comment cards. The following table provides a summary of the comments that were collected during the breakout sessions:

Project Number	Comment	Name and Contact Information
Project CA9609	Wrong vicinity map shown on project data sheet. Extend study area to include entire stormwater pond.	Colleen Coughlin (202) 874-4465 president@thepinecrest.org
Policy	Request that the County provide information on outreach resources available to citizens and homeowner associations for consultation on different projects. Use the Board of Supervisors newsletter to raise awareness of available resources and programs.	Maura Yasin (703) 207-0520 myestimator@yahoo.com
Project CA9600	The County needs to get involved in all new construction of buildings and parking lots to implement improvements to drainage by reducing the amount of runoff from impervious surfaces entering the Cameron Run watershed area.	Ingrid Phillips (703) 960-4889

MEETING CONCLUSION

Project staff said they would inform meeting attendees and other stakeholders of when the draft final plan would be available for review and comment. The tentative date was December 11th. Once the draft plan is posted on the Fairfax County watershed plans website at www.fairfaxcounty-watersheds.net, meeting attendees and the public would have thirty days to provide comments.

Information about Cameron Run and the Draft Final Cameron Run Watershed Management Plan can be found on the website. Under pages specifically dedicated to the Cameron Run watershed plan, readers are be able to access other supporting documents. A meeting and events calendar and meeting minutes for the Cameron Run Advisory Committee are also located on the county website. The Cameron Run website contains a message board that community members can use to share ideas and also comment on plan drafts. Comments may be sent to the watershed email address at cameronrun@versar.com, or by calling the watershed hotline at (703) 642-6902 or toll free at (886) 341-4599.