Meeting Summary for Johnny Moore Creek and Little Rocky Run
Watershed Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Little Rocky Run HOA Recreation Center #3,
February 22, 2010

Purpose:

The purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed project rankings for the two watersheds and to provide feedback. Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) members were asked to consider if the ranking was appropriate based on their local knowledge.

Project Schedule Overview:

Karen Firehock provided an overview of the schedule. After comments and final reviews are incorporated from this meeting, there will be one more WAG meeting to review the final draft watershed plan. The plan will be available for public comment for 30 days. This will occur simultaneous to other agency reviews of the plan. The public forum to review the final draft of watershed plan will likely be scheduled for June, 2010. The plan will be edited over the summer and presented to the Board of Supervisors(BOS) in fall 2010 for review and possible adoption. Ms. Firehock reminded the group that the projects in the plan would still need to be budgeted and would receive all requisite public review and notice before implementation.

Fred Rose provided a brief overview of the watershed planning process to date and assured everyone that the planning effort for Little Rocky Run (LRR) and Johnny Moore Creek (JMC) is in the final stretch and will be completed this year. Fred Wilkins, who is a project engineer with the county, was in attendance to participate in the planning process which will facilitate improved project implementation once the plan has been adopted by the BOS.

Mr. Rose explained that the delays in completing the final project list had to do with the need to create a consistent county-wide ranking system that allows all projects in each watershed to be compared. This took some time to develop and test but is now in place. Thirteen plans have been completed to date. The LRR and JMC plans are part of the second round of watershed plans.

A participant asked if, in light of recent county budget challenges, whether funds were protected and would definitely be available for plan implementation. Mr. Rose responded that there was a penny of the real estate tax that had been dedicated in the past to fund the County's stormwater management program. The program is now funded by a stormwater service district shown as a separate item on the real estate tax bill.

Another participant asked if projects had been deleted and for clarification concerning whether all the previous projects were still on the list. Mr. Rose explained that the original list of 120 projects had to be paired down to the top 80 projects. Mr. Breen noted that if a project costs less than $80,000 it could be combined with another related project, so some projects had been collapsed into a project suite, but were not deleted. He explained that, as of now, there are a total of 79 projects, but four of those are regional ponds so the project list under consideration for the WAG and the county is actually only 75 projects.

A participant asked for an example of a type of project that may have been removed from the list. Lynne Mowery explained that if a project did not yield a significant benefit for pollution removal or address a serious problem, then it could have been removed. One that had been removed was the multi-purpose court that was proposed by an HOA to become an area for water infiltration. It was removed because its current location does not allow it to treat a very large drainage area and it is not in a place where there is a significant problem that needs remediation.

Ms. Mowery noted that some projects were removed because the benefits accrued would be mitigated by the difficulty of implementation. A good example for this was for some stream channels where there is existing erosion but, due to the remote location within a woodland, a great deal of disturbance would be required to allow heavy machinery to access the site. In that case, more harm than good would occur in attempting to get to the site to remediate it. There were also some instances in which homeowners were not receptive to having a county stormwater project on their private property, so those projects also were removed from the list.

Presentation of Candidate Project Investigation and Ranking (for presentation content see slide show in documents section of project website)

Lynne Mowery provided an overview of how the projects were investigated and ranked. She referenced the "Attachment Seven, Scores and Rankings Spreadsheet" that was emailed to the WAG and also made available at the meeting. She explained that the "source indicator" refers to the cause of the problem, whereas the "impact indicator" refers to the effect of the project, or how well it mitigates or eliminates the problem. The engineering team has calculated the pollution removal potential for each project. Those that scored a five had a high potential to remove pollution, while those that scored a one, had a low potential. She indicated that the top 20 best ranked projects had all scored a five for pollution removal or problem mitigation of total suspended solids (TSS), total nitrogen (TN) or total phosphorus (TP).

Several participants asked whether and how cost was factored into the ranking system. The engineering team explained that they were instructed to evaluate projects for this round of ranking solely on their ability to address an environmental problem as well as the practicality for doing so, as explained earlier. However, county staff noted that the projects will be evaluated for cost in the next step of the ranking process. A few participants responded that they felt cost should be considered now in case projects that are cost prohibitive would still make the final list even though they may be too expensive. County staff explained that it was not practical to fully calculate costs for every possible project and so they had instructed the engineering team to evaluate that once the final list had been proposed. It is possible that some projects could then drop down or move up on the list due to cost.

Mr. Breen of the engineering team clarified that it was not accurate to say that cost was not considered at all in the first round of evaluation. He explained that the engineering team did apply their existing professional knowledge of likely costs when they evaluated whether or not projects would likely be feasible and practical. Mr. Breen added that the feasibility of doing a project was an important factor in the ranking process. For example, those ponds that are owned by the county tended to score a ranking of five since it is easy to get access to add additional pollution mitigation features on the county's own property.

Ms. Mowery explained that 20 percent of the project's score was added if the project was located in the headwaters of the stream since it had a high potential for positive impacts the higher up in the watershed it was located. Those projects that are located in the headwaters can mitigate sources and stressors of stream

problems that cause cumulative impacts downstream. For example, reducing the source of the problem, such as high flow velocities, can negate the need to repair eroding stream banks lower down in the watershed since the source of the problem has been abated. Staff also responded to a question that the degree of pollution removal, such as how much phosphorus could be removed, also was a factor in the ranking.

Review of Ranked Projects:

The group broke up to review the three watershed areas and the comments were noted on flip charts. Project #s refer to project # on maps found on the watershed web site at:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/johnnymoorecreek_docs.htm

Upper Little Rocky Run:

Representatives from this watershed expressed concern for the amount of debris that regularly piles up in the dry ponds located behind the Union Mills shopping center. Any conceptual level project design should include some measure to reduce floatables to these ponds if possible. Staff from AMEC researched this concern and let the representatives know that project LR9112 does include litter control at the shopping center.

Lower Little Rocky Run:

Three participants expressed concern about the Regional Pond shown on the map at Green Trails neighborhood. AMEC staff explained that that the regional pond was included as a project in order to compare the benefits to suggested alternatives. Green Trails HOA would like assurance that the regional pond will not be included as a project in the final plan.

North Hart Run HOA provided information on two areas of concern:

- Compton Road between Paradise Mill and Bay Valley - overland flow overtops road creating icy, dangerous conditions where several car accidents have occurred. This is likely due to recent re-grading of the adjacent property and an inadequate ditch along the road that regularly fills with debris causing overflows.

- An area along Little Rocky Run south of Laura Ratcliffe Court seems to be “wet and mucky,” perhaps due to drainage problems.

Johnny Moore Creek:

There was concern expressed about flooding near project JM9500.

There was a question about whether projects at road crossings fall under VDOT jurisdiction. Eric Forbes responded that county staff work with VDOT to address problems but they have to clearly delineate who is responsible when problems are within the VDOT right of way or a VDOT-maintained culvert.

There was positive feedback that the #1 ranked project in Johnny Moore Creek was the JM9202 stream restoration.

Next Steps:

1. Comments were requested from the committee by March 1, 2010.
2. AMEC will incorporate comments and prepare the draft watershed plan.
3. Next WAG meeting in May to discuss the draft plan and plan for public Watershed Plan Forum to be held in summer 2010 (likely in June).

Meeting Attachments:

- Watershed Management Plan on Project Ranking
- Watershed Scores and Rankings (attachment 7)
- Watershed Maps

Meeting attendees are listed on the page following.

The Little Rocky Run and Johnny Moore Creek Watersheds Management Plan:
The Little Rocky Run and Johnny Moore Creek Watersheds have experienced environmental degradation, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. AMEC Inc. serves as the technical team lead and prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information please contact <Eric.Forbes@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*

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

To Contact Staff:

Karen Firehock, Public Involvement Coordinator, karenfirehock@virginia.edu, (434)975-6700, #222

Lynne Mowery, Project Manager, AMEC, lynne.mowery@amec.com, (703)488-3773

Eric Forbes, Ecologist, Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
Eric.Forbes@fairfaxcounty.gov, (703)324-5717

Fairfax County Watershed Website: *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*
Use this site for meeting dates, workshops and to read meeting summaries and reports.

Watershed Plans Comment Email Address: *watersheds@fairfaxcounty.gov*

Little Rocky Run and Johnny Moore Creek Committee Meeting 2/22/2010

LRR	JMC	Attended	Group	Name	Title
x		no	Westfields Golf Club	Colin Gooch	Manager (acting)
x		yes	Friends of Little Rocky Run	Ned Foster	President
x	x	no	Occoquan Watershed Coalition	Jim Bonhivert	President
x	x	no	Springfield Supervisor Pat Herrity	Marlae Schnare	Staff
x		yes	Sully Supervisor Michael L. Frey	Meghan Kiefer	Staff
x	x	yes	Clifton Horse Society	Beth Giorgiana	President
x		yes	Little Rocky Run HOA	Jeff Hummel	President
x		no	Compton Village HOA	Joseph F. Cottone	President
x		yes	Green Trails HOA	Jay Hurst	Representative
x		yes	North Hart Run HOA	Sara Dyer	Representative
	x	yes	Cedar Knolls of Clifton HOA	Laurie Anderson	HOA rep
	x	alternate	Union Mills HOA	Gene Griffe	President
x		no	Compton Heights HOA	William Ballou	Vice President

Staff and Guests Attending

	Fairfax County Stormwater Management	Fred Rose	Engineer, Chief, Stormwater Planning
	Fairfax County Stormwater Management (Implementation Branch)	Fred Wilkins	Engineer
	Fairfax County Stormwater Management	Eric Forbes	Project Manager
	Fairfax County Stormwater Management	Heather Ambrose	Ecologist
	AMEC Inc.	Lynne Mowery	Project Manager
	AMEC Inc.	Matt Breen	Engineer
	AMEC Inc	Thomas Williams	Engineer
	AMEC Inc.	Karen Firehock	Public Invol.
Guest	Green Trails HOA	Kristin Girardin	President
Alternate	Green Trails HOA	Kevin Morely	
Alternate	Union Mills HOA	Mike Shipley	