Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN AND POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
MARCH 17, 2009

Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike
Great Falls, VA 22066-2634

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the March 17, 2009 Nichol Run and Pond Branch WAG meeting will be available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm.]

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting, welcoming the Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) and members of the public in attendance.[1] She briefly reviewed the meeting goals and the meeting agenda.[2] She noted that this was the first of a series of 4-6 meetings of the WAG. She introduced the members of the public involvement, engineering, and Fairfax County teams, and briefly reviewed the WAG group expectations.

II. Introduction to the Watershed Planning Process and Presentation of Policy Issues

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County, reviewed the history of watershed planning in Fairfax County. He recounted that the county had been developing watershed plans since the 1970s. Mr. Rose noted it was necessary to develop new plans to take into account current regulations, new development, and changing understanding of watershed management. He explained how the first set of watershed plans only addressed erosion and flooding. Now, the county wants to also address water quality in this newest series of watershed management plans, and include the community in the watershed planning process. He explained that the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watershed management plan is part of the second round of the current watershed planning process. The first round of plans was started in 2003, encompassed 50 percent of the county's land area, and developed a lot of policy recommendations. The county hopes that the second round can build on the first. The county has set a goal to finish all the watershed management plans by 2010, in order to comply with the deadline set by the 2000 Chesapeake Bay Agreement.

III. Timeframe of Watershed Plan and WAG Involvement Processes

Joe Sanchirico, Fairfax County, reviewed the timeline for the watershed planning process for Nichol Run and Pond Branch. He noted that the bulk of the six planned WAG meetings will be

[1] The list of meeting participants is attached to this meeting summary.
[2] A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm.

focused on candidate projects and restoration strategies specific to the watersheds. Once the projects are prioritized, with the help of the WAG, the county will draft the watershed management plan, present it to the WAG for review, and present it to the public for comment via a public forum and a public comment period. Once the plan is finalized, the county will submit it to the County Board of Supervisors for adoption, hopefully by January 2010. He explained that for modeling purposes, the watershed was broken down into watershed management areas (WMAs) and further divided into subwatersheds. Most of the information presented to the WAG will be at the subwatershed level.

IV. Introduction and Expectation for WAG Meetings

Dr. Birkhoff briefly reviewed the Watershed Advisory Group Participation Guidelines that were included in the meeting handouts.[3] She asked WAG members to check in with their constituencies and other organizations outside of the meetings to identify other problem areas, issues, and values not represented on the WAG. She also asked for help to identify other organizations that are not represented in the WAG so they could be invited.

V. Presentation of Watershed Characterization

Erika Tokarz, F.X. Browne, Inc., reviewed the characteristics of Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds, which were used to develop the Watershed Workbook.[4] She noted that almost the entire Nichol Run watershed and the entire Pond Branch watershed lay within Fairfax County (0.04 square miles of Nichol Run lay over the border in Loudon County). Both watersheds drain into the Potomac River.

Ms. Tokarz gave the group an overview of the different chapters of the Watershed Workbook, and how the data was gathered. She summarized major components of watershed characterization, sub watershed ranking, and the indicators that were used to determine the rankings. She noted that all the rankings were rolled into one composite score. She observed that based on future scenarios modeling, the watersheds would experience an increase in impervious surface area from an increase in estate and low density residential development.

Ms. Tokarz informed the group that three subwatershed ranking indicators are rolled into a single subwatershed ranking. These three indicators are:

- Watershed Impact Indicators;
- Source Indicator; and
- Programmatic Indicators.

The three indicators are compared to the county's goals and objectives, and help the county prioritize which subwatersheds to focus on.

Ms. Tokarz gave examples of types of candidate projects, both structural and non-structural.

---

[3] For a copy of the Participation Guidelines, please contact Debbie Lee at dlee@resolv.org.
[4] The Watershed Workbook is available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm.

The group asked questions and discussed the presentation. During the discussion, individuals made the following comments:

- In comparison with the rest of Fairfax County, the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds are in pretty good condition.
- In areas that are green (good condition), the county will focus on preservation. The lower ranked a subwatershed, the more the county will focus on restoration.
- Compositing can mask severe points. These were factored into the composite scores using best professional judgment.
- The majority of the county's streams were walked as part of the 2005 Stream Physical Assessment. The county performed a supplemental Stream Physical Assessment this past spring and walked across three miles of streams. The county also looked at streams without performing a formal "stream walk." In the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds, the county started at the Potomac River and walked the streams to the point where the drainage was 50 acres.
- Some of the indicators used to determine rankings were based on historical data, such as fish samples and benthic community surveys.
- The locations of where the surveyors stopped are documented, but are not included in the workbook.
- The subwatershed rankings are not cumulative, and do not take into account degraded subwatersheds upstream.
- The county collected water quality samples for surface water. Well water would be groundwater, and is not measured directly. There is some connectivity between surface water and ground water, but they are different systems.
- The country is trying to get to 80 concept projects in the watershed. Projects may be carried out by the county and citizens, depending on the project.
- The county's requirements for development, as laid out in the Public Facilities Manual, may not be as applicable to the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds as they are in the rest of Fairfax County (e.g., requirements for sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and lighting). The Stormwater Planning Division has been working to get low impact development (LID) practices adopted by the county, but it is a gradual process.

VI. Watershed Planning Next Steps

The next WAG meeting will probably be in mid- to late-April. In the meantime, Dr. Birkhoff requested that members look through the Watershed Workbook and continue to provide the Team with information on specific problems and issues in the watershed.

The county will look into planning a field trip or a list of local stormwater management projects so that WAG members can see different project sites.

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. F.X. Browne serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP
MARCH 17, 2009

Meeting Participants

Eleanor Anderson*
Ed Behrens*
Dena Bergstrom*
Wes Calendar
Bev Geserick*
Chuck Langrad, Jr.*
Aaron Larocca*
Jackie Taylor*
Elaine Tholen*

Fairfax County Government Staff:
Takisha Cannon
Fred Rose
Joe Sanchirico

F.X. Browne, Inc. Staff:
Erika Tokarz

Public Involvement Team:
Juliana Birkhoff, Consensus Building Institute
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

*WAG Member

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN AND POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
APRIL 28, 2009

Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike
Great Falls, VA 22066-2634

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the March 3, 2009 Nichol Run and Pond Branch WAG meeting will be available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun.htm.]

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, welcomed the Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) members to the second meeting of the Nichol Run and Pond Branch WAG.[1] She briefly reviewed the meeting agenda, meeting objectives, and group expectations. She asked the members to keep suggesting interested parties as they can be contacted at the end of the process to participate in the public review of the watershed plan.

II. Presentation of Fairfax County Goals and Objectives

Joe Sanchirico, Fairfax County, then reviewed the county's goals and objectives. He noted that in the previous round, each watershed had developed goals and objectives, which was time consuming. For the sake of efficiency, consistency, and evaluation purposes, the county had developed three overall watershed planning goals consolidated from the goals from the first round. Within these goals were more specific objectives, relating to one of five categories. Quantifiable and measurable indicators are used in the watershed ranking process and apply to goals and objectives, creating a direct relationship between what the county is attempting to accomplish and the data. Mr. Sanchirico pointed WAG members to the list of Fairfax County goals and objectives included in their meeting materials.[2]

Mr. Sanchirico briefly reviewed the WAG process expectations, highlighting that WAG time will be primarily devoted to project identification and selection.

In response to a question, Fairfax County staff noted that the county most likely did not have any specific data on pesticides or herbicides in the water. The county focuses more on controlling the source. The Park Authority, for example, tracks how much is applied and compares that to guidelines. One WAG member added that Audubon offers certification for golf courses for

[1] A list of the meeting attendees are attached to this meeting summary. A copy of the meeting agenda is available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/sugarlandrun.htm.
[2] For a copy of the Fairfax County's goals and objectives, please contact dlee@resolv.org.

property grass use, water usage, and fertilizers. Three Park Authority golf courses are Audubon certified.

III. Problem Areas Identified by Subwatershed Characterization

Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc., informed the WAG how the county identified problem areas using subwatershed characterization. She noted that the county can use predictive indicators to characterize future scenarios to identify areas that need preservation and evaluate the benefit of proposed projects.

Ms. Taibi reviewed the three groups of indicators used to determine the subwatershed rankings:

1. Watershed Impact Indicators, which provide information on the overall watershed condition;
2. Source Indicators, which provide data on the location of watershed stressors; and
3. Programmatic Indicators, which provide information on existing watershed management programs.

Ms. Taibi explained in more detail the watershed impact indicators, which are comprised of objective composite scores related to stormwater runoff, flooding hazards, habitat health, habitat diversity, stream water quality, drinking water quality, and storage capacity. The individual objective composite scores are summed into an overall watershed impact objective composite score, which provides an overall look at the subwatershed condition.

Ms. Taibi reviewed each of the objective composite scores. During the presentation, WAG members asked questions about the indicators used to develop the composite scores and discussed the data presented. Participants made the following points:

- The habitat diversity objective composite score heavily relied on surrogates because there were limited sites in the watersheds with data. These data were collected during the Stream Protection Strategy survey. The county also collects samples from random sites every year. USGS has four survey stations in the county.
- The county is aware of stream monitoring data collected by volunteer organizations like Audubon. The county supplements the data it collects with the stream monitoring data from Audubon but does not analyze the data from other monitoring groups.
- The county is currently focusing on pinpointing the areas that are degraded so it can identify potential project sites. It is not currently tracking sites to see if they are improving or worsening.
- The county had to develop some indicators using a Spreadsheet Tool for Estimating Pollutant Loads (STEPL) model.
- The maps in the presentation are colored relative to the watershed, not the rest of the county. Compared to the rest of the county, the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds are relatively pristine. The objective scores are relative to the rest of the county.

Ms. Taibi also briefly reviewed source indicators and programmatic indicators. The WAG will delve more deeply into the programmatic indicators when it discusses candidate projects. She reviewed the problems identified in the watershed based on data collected from field

reconnaissance, past surveys, public comment on the watershed workbook, and input collected from the public watershed forum.

IV. Preliminary Strategies for Watershed Improvements and Preservation

Ms. Taibi summarized three restoration strategies and gave examples of each. The three restoration strategies were:

- Reduce Flooding;
- Improve Water Quality; and
- Improve Habitat or Reduce Streambank Erosion.

One WAG member suggested that the county prepare a list of local places where restoration strategies were implemented, so that the group can visit some.

The group discussed the various restoration strategies. Individuals made the following points:

- The county has a parking lot sweeping program where machines clean up debris in parking lots once a year.
- Sand and sand/peat filters are typically used in more urban areas, as are other manufactured self-contained systems.
- Streambank stabilization has historically been very rigid, but the new model of streambank stabilization incorporates more naturalization techniques.
- Rain barrels are an easy way to collect water at the source and the county is encouraging residents to do it.

Ms. Taibi reviewed two subwatersheds as examples of how the County could apply the strategies given each subwatershed's descriptions and problem areas.

One WAG member pointed out an area across from the entrance to Great Falls National Park where developers were building mansions and stripping the land.

V. Watershed Planning Next Steps

Before the next WAG meeting, currently planned for late-June, the county will distribute a list of proposed projects to the members to review. In the meantime, the county will send out a list of local restoration projects and a draft list of policy issues compiled from the previous round of watershed management plans.. By the next meeting, the county will attempt to give a general idea of cost per project type, and plan a field trip to look at sites with implemented restoration projects.

The county will initially consider every potential project without taking feasibility into account. It will start paring down the list with WAG input and other criteria, such as easements.

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. F.X. Browne serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN AND POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
APRIL 28, 2009

Meeting Participants

Ed Behrens*
Dena Bergstrom*
Bev Geserick*
Brittany Geserick
Chuck Langrad, Jr.*
Aaron Larocca*
Robin Rentsch*
Jackie Taylor*
Thomas Wasaff*

Fairfax County Staff
Takisha Cannon
Joe Sanchirico
Darold Burdick

Engineering Team
Jon-Paul Do, F.X. Browne, Inc.
Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc.

Public Involvement Team
Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

*WAG Member

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
JUNE 30, 2009

Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike
Great Falls, VA 22066

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the June 30, 2009 Nichol Run/Pond Branch WAG meeting will be available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the third meeting of the Nichol Run/Pond Branch Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.[1] She noted that the bulk of the meeting is dedicated to providing input on the proposed projects in the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds. Joe Sanchirico, the project manager from Fairfax County, said that the group may continue to provide input after the meeting up until July 20th via email.

In response to a question from a WAG member, Mr. Sanchirico noted that there is not enough time for a second field tour, but that members were welcome to walk along Nichol Run or Pond Branch.

A second WAG member asked about the characteristics of the watersheds. Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc., acknowledged that Pond Branch is more eroded and hillier than Nichol Run. She added that some of that erosion can be attributed more to development than topography. There are similar projects in both watersheds.

II. Subwatershed Strategy

Ms. Taibi summarized how the county developed its Subwatershed Strategy. She listed the following steps in the project development process:

1. Identification of priority subwatersheds, which included those in moderate to poor condition and those in better condition with at-risk areas;
2. Identification of impairments and preservation qualities;
3. Develop improvement goals (e.g., restoration and preservation strategies); and
4. Identification of projects.

She also reviewed some of the possible types of projects for each strategy.

Ms. Taibi then went into more detail, using subwatershed NI-NI-0015 in Nichol Run as an

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

example of how the Subwatershed Strategy is implemented.

The WAG members asked questions and discussed Ms. Taibi's presentation. During the discussion, the following points were made:

- Rain gardens are included in potential projects under low impact development retrofits.
- The county will work in conjunction with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to implement some projects. The project list being discussed at this meeting includes the entire suite of identified potential projects. Any which require collaboration between the county and VDOT or private homeowners will be noted at a later date and included in the prioritization.
- There may be projects that are not feasible for some reason. The county does not want to take potential projects off of the list right now, but will take feasibility and funding into account when prioritizing projects.
- Projects situated on privately owned land may be more difficult to implement if a homeowner is not cooperative. Some projects may require the approval of multiple homeowners to move forward. However, these projects are still included in the potential projects list, though they may be prioritized lower.
- The county will include cost-benefit analyses to prioritize projects as well as to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Information on the TMDL process and individual loads are available at the Department of Environmental Quality website.
- The county's goals and objectives that the group had heard at a previous meeting are being implemented at individual sites and specific projects.
- The county has a larger effort to put together a comprehensive database of all the prioritized proposed projects to help the county compare the different watershed plans.
- The priorities cannot be pinpointed to one area because of the large number of factors. The county is considered as a whole, and all the projects within the county contribute to effects on the Chesapeake Bay.
- When people think of a retention pond, they think of a large multi-acre project, which is not the case. Education and outreach may be necessary for communities where a retention pond is proposed.
- Projects will be prioritized and possibly taken off the project list through public input, including from WAG members, cost-benefit analyses, feasibility, and field reconnaissance.
- The engineers are using an evolutionary model to anticipate how much erosion has occurred since the data was collected. Areas that are more severely eroded may get scored higher.

III. Project Comments: Breakout Groups

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed depicting potential projects. The project list distributed to the WAG lists the nearest address to each potential project site so members could visit the site if they wish. Some project sites had multiple potential projects; the engineering team has not yet determined which project would be best so included them all. The maps also showed sites where the county had received complaints. Ms. Taibi

noted that some project sites have multiple potential projects listed. At a later date, these multiple projects will be winnowed down.

Individuals offered the following comments:

- The prioritization process should take into account the ease of implementing projects. Projects located on parkland or vacant/underutilized parcels may be good (such as projects M17, M18, and M21 in NI-NI-005).
- Developers have to change their practices and become more aware of stormwater issues.
- Projects 20 and 21 in subwatershed NI-NI-0002 are located on park land. If that area is an established park, those projects may not have much impact.
- Projects 64, 66, and 70 in NI-NI-0010 may be good projects if they are near vacant areas.
- The proposed project type for project 105 in subwatershed PN-CL-0004 is no longer accurate. The original project was supposed to be a road crossing improvement, but the county has started stream stabilization. The socks and riprap placed by the county at that site have already been compromised.
- In subwatershed PN-MR-0008, the pond near project 303 and 277 is being filled in with sediment. There is increased flow into the pond, which needs to be slowed down, and silt collected before it reaches the pond. Homeowners need help with restoration, plantings; they hired a consultant who suggested dredging a private pond which he believed to be filled with construction waste from the Deerfield Homes.
- In subwatershed PN-MR-0008, a bridge near project 303 is about to collapse and fall into the stream.
- The following projects are sited on land that is vacant, open space, or parks:
    - NI-NI-0002, project 21
    - NI-NI-0005, project 17
    - NI-NI-0005, project 18
    - NI-NI-0005, project 21
    - NI-NI-0010, project 64
    - NI-NI-0010, project 66
    - NI-NI-0010, project 70

IV. Next Steps

The Nichol Run/Pond Branch WAG will next meet in approximately six weeks. WAG members may continue providing input on proposed projects via email through July 20. If members would like copies of the maps or informational brochures, they can request them from Dr. Birkhoff via email.

The county and the consultants will work on refining the candidate projects list prior to the next WAG meeting. This refined list will be the focus of the next meeting.

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. F.X. Browne, Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
JUNE 30, 2009

Meeting Participants

Ed Behrens*
Dena Bergstrom*
Bev Geserick*
Brittany Geserick
Robin Rentsch*
Amy Stephan
Jackie Taylor*
Elaine Tholen*
Thomas Wasaff*

Fairfax County Staff
Darold Burdick
Takisha Cannon
Joe Sanchirico

Engineering Team
Jon-Paul Do, F.X. Browne, Inc.
Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc.

Public Involvement Team
Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

***WAG member**

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
APRIL 20, 2010

The Dranesville District Community Room; McLean Governmental Center
1437 Balls Hill Road | McLean, VA 22101

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the April 20, 2010 Nichol Run/Pond Branch WAG meeting is available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the fourth meeting of the Nichol Run/Pond Branch Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.[1]

Joe Sanchirico, Fairfax County, reviewed the process timeline. Mr. Sanchirico said the WAG will meet again to review and comment on the draft watershed plan. There will also be a public forum to engage the public for feedback prior to submitting the final plan to the county supervisor before the end of the year.

III. Project Prioritization Process

Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc. summarized how the county developed its process to prioritize projects s. She listed the following steps to prioritize projects :

1. Field reconnaissance to narrow down potential projects. The initial list included 281 projects.
2. F.X. Browne cut the first projects to eliminate any projects that were low priority or not viable. After the first round of cuts, there were 71 structural projects left.
3. F. X. Browne prioritized the final proposed project list with 65 structural projects for Nichol Run and Pond Branch. F.X. Browne plotted the projects with GIS mapping technology. To prioritize the projects they considered 5 factors;
    - effect on watershed impact indicators,
    - effect on source indicators,
    - location within priority sub watersheds,
    - sequencing,
    - and implementability.
4. F.X. Brown assigned composite scores for each project. The higher the score, the higher the priority of the project (ex; 65=lowest priority, 1=highest priority.) F.X. Browne used a weighted average of the 5-prioritization factors to determine the composite scores.

Ms. Taibi introduced 10 and 25-year implementation plans. The 10-year plan will include the 35 highest ranked projects in Nichol Run and Pond Branch (projects ranked 1-35.) The 25-year plan will include the next 30 projects in ranking order (projects ranked 36-65.) Ms. Taibi emphasized WAG input in

[1] Attachments: The meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm. Meeting participants are at the conclusion of this summary.

assisting project staff to decide which projects the County would includein the final implementation plan.

Ms. Taibi discussed including non-structural projects in the final implementation plan. County engineering contractors did not rank non-structural projects because it is difficult to quantify their benefits. Ms. Taibi explained that each sub watershed includes non-structural projects. They complement structural projects or provide water quality benefits where it would be difficult to implement structural projects. Non-structural projects also can be implemented through existing County policies or through cooperative agreements with residents and/or other agencies.

After Ms. Taibi's presentation, the WAG members asked questions. During the question and answer session, the engineering team and county staff noted:

- F.X. Browne staff will use best professional judgment (BPJ) to finalize project rankings. For example, engineers use BPJ to rank projects higher that are in a headwaters area and are down-steam. The project ranking process does not account for the kind of complexity.
- Engineers calculated project implementability by assessing the; (i) overall complexity of the project (design, maintenance); (ii) types of property ownership (county owned, private); and (iii) number of property owners (shared parcel, single owner.)
- After the first round of project cuts 71 structural projects remained. F.X. Browne dropped six projects from the project list. The draft project ranking includes 65 structural projects.

<u>Project Comments: Breakout Groups</u>
The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed depicting potential projects. The project list distributed to the WAG lists the project ID number, sub watershed location, rank, and brief description of the project. Some project sites had multiple potential projects, indicated by alphabetical project components.

Individuals suggested:

- The trail running adjacent to Pond Branch is eroding. While this is not an immediate concern, one WAG member suggested continued monitoring of the erosion.
- Participants approved the project rankings for NI9118, NI9119, and NI9202. A participant said the public would support these projects.
- The farm upstream from the PN9111 project group, contributes fine sediment which builds up in the pond. Project PN9111C adequately addresses the sediment problem, but does not prevent its recurrence.
    - One WAG member was concerned about the impact a County maintenance access road may have.
    - The community surrounding PN9111 is very active. A community and youth education project with outreach through local schools (Thomas Jefferson High School, Whitman Middle School) would compliment these projects.

Projects participants felt F.X. Browne should rank the following projects higher:

- Erosion has deteriorated the access road/trail behind 182 River Park Drive. Excessive water flow has washed out the nearby bridge/culvert (approximately behind 176 River Park Drive.) These two areas constitute both environmental problems and major public safety hazards.

    - One WAG members suggested a structural solution to the bridge to restore the crossing for bikes, hikers, and horses.
- The area around PN9400 has seasonal flooding that causes considerable problems.

Projects participants disapproved of or thought would not be viable:

- The draft project ranking does not include PN-PN-002 "148 River Park Lane." This project should not be included in the final project rankings. The previously proposed project would have adverse affects on adjacent properties and limited environmental impact.

Participants noted the following project map and location problems:

- Maps with road overlays would help WAG members identify project locations.

Next Steps

WAG members were encouraged to take maps home and share with their communities. The County can accept feedback until May 3. WAG members can send additional feedback (including the project ranking and ID number) to Melissa Taibi (mtaibi@fxbrowne.com) or Joe Sanchirico (Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov.) FX Browne will consider WAG member feedback to refine the 10 and 25-year plans. Project staff will distribute the final ranking to WAG members before the next meeting.

The County will host the final Nichol Run/Pond Branch WAG meeting in approximately six weeks. The meeting will be an opportunity for WAG members to provide feedback on the draft watershed plan prior to the public forum. F.X. Browne will prepare a fact sheet for each project in the 10-year plan to distribute to WAG members before the meeting.

WAG members should begin to consider targeting members of their community to attend the public forum. The county will mail postcards to residents on a parcel of land, or attached to a parcel of land, that contains a proposed project. The county will send the outreach contacts spreadsheet to WAG members for assistance in identifying missing parties. County staff asked WAG members about newspaper, flyer, and website posting timelines. The county will consider these timelines to develop an outreach strategy for the forums.

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. F.X. Browne, Inc. serves as the technical team lead, prepares watershed plan drafts and engineering studies, and facilitates WAG and public meetings for the county. For more information, please contact <Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov> or visit *http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/*

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
APRIL 20TH, 2010

Meeting Participants+

Bev Geserick*
Eleanor Anderson *
Robin Rentsch*
Thomas Wasaff*
Amy Stephan

Fairfax County Staff
Takisha Cannon
Catherine Morin
Sajan Pokharel
Joe Sanchirico
Darold Burdick

Engineering Team
Jon-Paul Do, F.X. Browne, Inc.
Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc.

Public Involvement Team
Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE
Jason Gershowitz, RESOLVE

***WAG member**
+ If you attended the meeting and are not in the participant list above, please inform Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org) and he will add you to the list.