Appendix C: Public Involvement

Summaries of the initial community workshop, the draft plan forum and each of the five Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) meetings that were held through the watershed management plan development process are included in Appendix C.

i. January 22, 2009
ii. March 17, 2009
iii. May 28, 2009
iv. June 30, 2009
v. April 20, 2010
vi. September 9, 2010
vii. September 23, 2010

This page intentionally left blank.

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run and Pond Branch Watersheds Community Workshop

Great Falls Library 9830 Georgetown Pike, Great Falls, VA

Thursday, January 22, 2009 6:30-9:00 pm

Agenda

6:30 p.m. **Watershed Registration – Sign in and find your watershed address**

7:00 p.m. **Welcome** by Fred Rose, Chief, Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County

Supervisor John W. Foust, Dranesville District

7:15 p.m. **Slide Show:** Introduction to the watershed and planning Process

8:00 p.m. **Watershed Input Sessions** – attend a breakout group and note locations or concerns for the watersheds

9:00 p.m. **Adjourn** *(turn in any comment sheets)*

Visit the Virtual Forum at:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun.htm

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN / POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS WORKSHOP
JANUARY 22, 2009

Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike
Great Falls, VA 22066

I. Welcome and Introductions

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County Department of Public Works, opened the meeting, welcoming the members of the public in attendance.

Mr. Rose reviewed Fairfax County watershed management history. He noted that the County developed its first set of watershed plans in the 1970s. Those plans focused on addressing flooding and erosion. More recently, the County has focused on water quality. In 2001, the County completed a Stream Protection Assessment that found 70 percent of the streams in Fairfax County were ranked as "fair" to "very poor". Since then, the County has been improving the stream quality by preserving pristine areas and restoring degraded areas.

Mr. Rose discussed Fairfax County's new watershed planning process. The County develops the in two rounds – in the first round, the County finished six watershed plans in three years. Those plans encompassed about 50 percent of the county. Currently, the County is conducting the second round of watershed plans, of which Nichol Run and Pond Branch is one of seven. The County intends to complete all of the watershed plans by 2010. The Chesapeake Bay Agreement requires two-thirds of the Chesapeake Bay watersheds to have watershed plans by 2010.

Mr. Rose acknowledged that watershed planning is a long-term investment. The watershed plans provide the county with a 20-25 year watershed management road map. According to Mr. Rose, Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds are less densely developed and, therefore, are in better condition compared to other watersheds in Fairfax County. He explained that everyone living in a watershed contributes to watershed problems. The County hopes that including the public in watershed plan development can encourage the community to be part of the solution.

Mr. Rose introduced Wes Calendar from Dranesville Supervisor John Foust's Office. Mr. Calendar told the group that environmental quality is a priority for Supervisor Foust.

Juliana Birkhoff, meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda. She introduced the Fairfax County team members; the F.X. Browne, Inc. engineering team; and the public involvement team for the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watershed plan.

II. Slide Show

Watershed Primer: An Introduction

Joe Sanchirico of the Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division reviewed watershed management concepts and terms. He explained that the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds are nested within the Potomac River watershed, which is nested within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. To facilitate developing the watershed management plan, the County broke the watersheds into watershed planning units called Watershed Management Areas and then broke the Watershed Management Areas into subwatersheds. Mr. Sanchirico noted that watershed management involves controlling the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff. Places that have lots of impervious surfaces have more stormwater run off with more pollutants and sediment.

He briefly reviewed the watershed planning process and listed the five main steps:

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

The county designed watershed plans to address stormwater issues through many approaches. Fairfax County requires comprehensive and complex plans to restore water bodies due to the urbanized nature of the area.

Watershed Workbook

Erika Tokarz of F.X. Browne, Inc. reviewed the watershed characterization of Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds. She noted that all of Pond Branch watershed and all but 1% of Nichol Run watershed are entirely in Fairfax County. The water in both watersheds flows north to the Potomac River.

Ms. Tokarz summarized the structure and contents of the Watershed Workbook and the methods used to develop the watershed characterization presented in the Workbook. She reviewed the indicators the County uses to rank the different characteristics in the watershed. She noted that nutrient and sediment runoff occur when a watershed is more urbanized.

Ms. Tokarz explained that the subwatershed rankings incorporated the Fairfax County Goals and Objectives. The goals are to:

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

The objectives include the following:

1) Hydrology
2) Habitat
3) Stream Water Quality
4) Drinking Water Quality
5) Stewardship

Participants asked questions following Mr. Sanchirico's and Ms. Tokarz's presentations. In response to questions, members of the Fairfax County and F.X. Browne, Inc. teams made the following points:

- The County has completed three different stream assessments. In 2001, the Stream Protection Strategy surveyed benthic and fish communities. In 2003-2005, the County conducted a Stream Physical Assessment, walking the streams and making notes of channel morphology, habitat, and buffers. In 2002-2003, the county conducted a Perennial Stream Mapping Project, which was a separate effort from the other two.
- The Stream Protection Strategy monitored 1,400 sites around Fairfax County. Currently, a randomized selection of sites (approx. 40) is monitored annually. There are also fixed trend sites that are monitored, and bacterial sampling is done quarterly.
- Compared to the rest of the county, the Nichol Run/Pond Branch watersheds are in very good condition. The County's goal for these two watersheds would primarily be focused on preservation as opposed to retrofitting.
- The quantity of stormwater runoff in the watersheds has been increasing, and that trend is continuing.
- The subwatershed ranking takes into account each basin.
- The assessment performed to prepare the Watershed Workbook did not recreate the original Stream Physical Assessment, but was meant to spot-check. The channel evolution model on the stream condition map in the Workbook shows which segments of the streams were physically walked.
- The Watershed Workbook is available online at http://www.fairfaxCounty.gov/dpwes/Watersheds/nicholrun.htm, where it can be downloaded in full or in smaller segments.

Public Involvement Process

Juliana Birkhoff of the Consensus Building Institute provided a brief overview of the public involvement process. She noted that the public can provide comments on the Watershed Workbook at the website for thirty days, ending February 23, 2009. She shared that a Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) consisting of approximately twenty members representing a diverse set of interests and types of people will help the County develop the watershed management plan. The WAG will meet over six sessions to identify problems and possible solutions and issue a draft report. Following these sessions, there will be another forum where members of the public can offer improvements and suggestions to the WAG report. The County will accept comments throughout the WAG process through the website at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/Watersheds/nicholrun.htm.

Following Dr. Birkhoff's presentation, there was a short question and answer session. In response to questions members of the Fairfax County and public involvement teams made the following points:

- The County will provide a contact list of project staff on the website for reference.
- The County has a goal is to complete the watershed plans by 2010. By early that year, there should be a completed plan ready for adoption by the County Board of Supervisors.
- The watershed plan will focus primarily on correcting existing conditions, rather than affecting the development criteria around streambeds. The implementation of the plan will be dependent on available funding. Historically, stormwater management in Fairfax County is funded by a one-penny assessment on real estate taxes, which provides on average $20 million a year for the past four fiscal years. This one-penny assessment is currently up for renewal in the budget process.
- The Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division coordinates with other departments regarding requirements. Another Fairfax County office is working with the Army Corps of Engineers to ensure new development or redevelopment complies with the county and state's evolving requirements. The Army Corps study is not directly related to the efforts to develop watershed management plans by the Stormwater Planning Division, which is looking at the impact of future development.
- New regulations passed by the state limiting nutrient runoff will affect the watershed planning process by setting higher standards which have to be met in retrofitting and new stormwater facilities.
- Fertilizer runoff from landscaping is a source of nutrient runoff, but previous attempts to regulate this have been unsuccessful.

III. Open House

Dr. Birkhoff invited meeting attendees to participate in break out sessions based on their location in the watersheds – Nichol Run or Pond Branch – to identify locations of concerns in the watershed.

Individuals identified the following items during the break out sessions:

<u>Nichol Run</u>

- The Supervisor's Office receives numerous stormwater complaints along Springvale Road.
- There is a five acre pond under a conservation easement from the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust on Springvale Road, across from Springvale Meadow Lane. This area is part pasture and part wildlife habitat with native vegetation. There is a headcut on the western part of the pond where the owner lay down some rocks. The headcut is probably at stage 2 but the owner is unsure if restoration or stabilization is possible because of trees.
- At a pond along Nichol Run at "Trail 17" the stream is dammed up with rocks.

Pond Branch

- There is severe erosion off of River Park Drive.
- At the pond off of Beech Mill Road across from Bliss Lane, there is a lot of trash dumping, including large items that cannot be carried away during stream cleanups.
- The homeowners north of Carrwood Road have put in a cement/stone wall all along the stream underneath the road, completely channelizing the stream.
- Sedimentation and algae from the development along Arnon Lake Drive has killed fish. There is an opportunity for possible restoration.
- At the outlet on Clarks Branch, there is a lot of scar from the flow, and the scar will only increase because of a tree obstruction.
- On Beech Mill Road there is erosion on a private drive right across from Carrwood Road. This erosion started before the development twenty years ago, but there is now even more development. A county project implemented less than a year ago has questionable effectiveness. The county engineers attribute part of the problem to the culvert depth of the private drive.
- In Riverbend Park, there is a pond covered with algae year-round. The algae happened after a home was built on Nature Center Road on top of the hill.
- There is flooding at road crossings along Walker Road near the intersection with Forest Brook.

NICHOL RUN / POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
INTRODUCTORY AND ISSUES SCOPING FORUM
JANUARY 22, 2009

Forum Participants

Eleanor Anderson
Dena Bergstrom
Wes Calendar, Supervisor Foust's Office
Wayne Foley
Bev Geserick
Robin Rentsch
Mark Scofield

Fairfax County Staff
Darold Burdick
Takisha Cannon
Fred Rose
Joe Sanchirico

F.X. Browne Staff
Melissa Taibi
Erika Tokarz

Public Involvement Staff
Juliana Birkhoff, Consensus Building Institute
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run and Pond Branch Watershed Management Plan
Watersheds Advisory Group (WAG) Meeting #1
March 17, 2009
7:00-8:45
Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike, Great Falls
703-757-8560
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/library/branches/gf/

Agenda

Purpose: Set the stage and begin involving the WAG in the watersheds planning process for Nichol Run and Pond Branch, including having the WAG:

- Become aware of the big picture of the watersheds planning process;
- Understand their role in the process;
- Develop a common understanding of the current watersheds characteristics;
- Identify and discuss problems in the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds.

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

7:00-7:10 **Welcome and Introductions** *Juliana Birkhoff, CBI*

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

7:10-7:30 **Introduction to the Watershed Planning Process and Presentation of Policy Issue** *Fred Rose, Fairfax County*

- Purpose and History

7:30-7:40 **Timeframe of Watershed Plan and WAG involvement processes** *Joe Sanchirico, Fairfax County*

- Milestones, timing and activities

7:40-8:00 **Introduction and expectation for WAG meetings** *Juliana Birkhoff, CBI*

- Role of Watershed Advisory Group
- WAG Participation Guidelines
- Clarifications and Questions about WAG Role and Participation

8:00-8:30 **Presentation of Watershed Characterization** *Erika Tokarz, F.X. Browne, Inc.*

- Watershed Workbook Wrap-up and Review
- Additional Problems, Comments and Issues Identified
- What Types of Projects Can Be Found in a Watershed Plan?

8:30-8:35 **Next Steps** *Juliana Birkhoff, CBI*

- Next WAG Meeting – timing and focus

8:35-8:45 **Questions and Answers/Discussion** *Juliana Birkhoff, CBI*

8:45 **Adjourn**

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

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

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run & Pond Branch Watersheds Plan
Watersheds Advisory Group (WAG) Meeting #2
April 28, 2009
7:00 – 8:45 PM
Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike, Great Falls
703-757-8560
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/library/branches/gf/

Purpose:

- Update on Nichol Run and Pond Branch modeling;
- Discuss County goals objectives;
- Review preliminary strategies for watershed improvements and preservation and discuss their application to Nichol Run and Pond Branch.

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

7:00-7:15 **Welcome and Introductions** *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

- Introductions
- Review meeting purpose
- Review agenda
- Review group expectations and participation

7:15-7:30 **Presentation of Fairfax County Goals and Objectives**

- Presentation *Joe Sanchirico, Fairfax County*
- Facilitated discussion to understand goals and objectives and apply to Nichol Run and Pond Branch *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

7:30-7:50 **Problem Areas Identified by Subwatershed Characterization** *Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc.*

- Presentation
- Questions

7:50-8:00 **Break and Discussion:** WAG members can take time to review the subwatershed characterization and problem area maps posted in the room and provide comment.

8:00-8:40 **Preliminary Strategies for Watershed Improvements and Preservation** *Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc.*

- Presentation
- Questions
- Facilitated discussion to discuss how strategies could be applied in Nichol Run and Pond Branch

8:40-8:45 **Next Steps** *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

- F.X. Browne will begin identifying specific projects and provide homework to WAG on possible projects.
- Next meeting to discuss proposed projects.

8:45 **Adjourn** *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

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

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run and Pond Branch
Watershed Advisory Group #3
Tuesday, June 30, 2009
Great Falls Library
9830 Georgetown Pike, Great Falls, VA

Agenda

Purpose:

- Learn about how potential projects were identified;
- Learn about F. X. Browne, Inc.'s work to date;
- Locate projects on the map, discuss appropriateness, and provide feedback on any missing projects or conflicts;
- Review next steps and WAG homework.

6:30 pm	***Check-in and Light Refreshments***	
7:00– 7:15	**Welcome and Introductions** • Introductions • Review meeting purpose and agenda • Review group expectations and participation	*Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*
7:15-7:30	**Project Development Process** • Presentation • Facilitated discussion to learn how projects were developed.	*Melissa Taibi F. X. Browne, Inc.*
7:30-8:30	**Break Out Groups to Review Potential Projects** • Facilitated small break out sessions to discuss projects and locations and provide feedback.	*Melissa Taibi and Jon-Paul Do F. X. Browne, Inc.*
8:30 – 8:45	**Next Steps** • F. X. Browne, Inc. will evaluate projects based on County goals and objectives, WAG input, and field assessment; develop prioritization to identify a subset of projects for concept design. • Next meeting – late July/early August	*Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*
8:45 pm	***Adjourn***	

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

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.

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**

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run and Pond Branch Watershed Advisory Group Meeting #4
7:00-8:45 p.m.
April 20, 2010

The Dranesville District Community Room; McLean Governmental Center
1437 Balls Hill Road, McLean, VA 22101
Map – http://snurl.com/uss1j

Agenda

Purpose:

- Learn about how projects were developed;
- Learn about FX Browne work to date;
- Identify projects on the map, discuss appropriateness, and provide feedback on any missing projects or conflicts;
- Review next steps and WAG homework.

6:30 pm	***Check-in and Light Refreshments***	
7:00-7:15	**Welcome and Introductions** • Introductions • Review meeting purpose and agenda • Review group expectations and participation	*Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*
7:15-7:45	**Project Prioritization Process** • Presentation • Facilitated discussion to learn how projects were prioritized.	*Melissa Taibi* *FX Browne*
7:45-8:45	**Break Out Groups to Review Potential Projects** • Facilitated small break out sessions to discuss projects and locations and provide feedback.	*Melissa Taibi* *FX Browne*
8:45-9:00	**Next Steps** • FX Browne will evaluate projects based on County goals and objectives, WAG input, and field assessment; develop prioritization to identify a subset of projects for concept design.	*Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*
9:00 pm	***Adjourn***	

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

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.

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.

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run and Pond Branch Watershed Advisory Group Meeting #5
September 9, 2010 | 7:00-9:00 p.m.
Herndon High School - Lecture Hall
700 Bennett Street | Herndon, VA 20170

Agenda

Purpose:

- Recap the steps taken since last WAG meeting;
- Review the organization of the watershed management plan;
- Discuss comments to improve draft plan;
- Discuss community outreach plans for the forum;
- Review how the plan will be finalized and next steps in the process.

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

7:00-7:10 **Welcome and Introductions** — *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

- Introductions
- Review meeting purpose and agenda
- Review group expectations and participation

7:10-7:20 **Thank You and Process Recap** — *Fred Rose, Fairfax County*

7:20-8:00 **Overview of the Draft Watershed Management Plan** — *Melissa Taibi, FX Browne*

- Plan progress update since WAG #4
- How the plan is organized
- Overview of project fact sheets

8:00-8:45 **Questions and Discussion of the Watershed Plan**

8:45-9:00 **Next Steps** — *Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE*

- Preparation for the Public Forum
- How to comment on the draft plan
- Finalization of Plan

9:00 pm ***Adjourn***

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

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN / POND BRANCH WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING
SEPTEMBER 9, 2010

Herndon High School – Lecture Hall
700 Bennett Street | Herndon, VA 20170

I. Welcome and Introductions

[The presentation from the September 9, 2010 Nichol Run/Pond Branch WAG meeting will be online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm *].*

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, opened the fifth 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]

II. Watershed Planning Update

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and participating in developing the draft watershed management plan.

Mr. Rose reviewed the overall watershed planning process. He thanked WAG members for their involvement throughout the process and encouraged WAG members to stay involved. The County will finish the draft watershed management plan considering comments from WAG members and the public. The county will send the final plan to the Board of Supervisors by the end of the year. Mr. Rose said the County would use a new tool to prioritize and select projects as they implement the 13 watershed plans. This tool helps the County use resources efficiently to meet budget needs, regulatory requirements, and watershed objectives.

Mr. Rose emphasized that the County's watershed management process is dynamic. Regulatory changes will drive County priorities. On-the-ground watershed conditions will change. The tools and technology used to analyze and manage watershed conditions will also change. The County is adopting an adaptive management approach to track progress and select projects for implementation.

III. Overview of the Draft Watershed Management Plan

Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc. summarized the organizational structure and components of the draft watershed management plan.[2] She reviewed the following components of the draft watershed plan:

i. Executive Summary

The executive summary includes background information for the Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds and a summary of each of the draft watershed management plan sections. The executive summary includes non-structural, 10-year, and 25-year master project lists (by project number, type,

[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/nicholrun_docs.htm.

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

WMA, and location). Ms. Taibi emphasized that participants should use these lists to identify projects and find them on the map.

1. Introduction

Ms. Taibi informed WAG members that this section introduces watersheds and watershed planning. This section also includes a map of the Fairfax County Watershed Planning Groups.

2. Watershed Planning Process

This section includes the criteria and objectives for the watershed planning process. Ms. Taibi reviewed the indicators used to measure and compare existing and future conditions. She reviewed the composite scores and how FX Browne used the scoring system to rank high and low priority watershed management areas. The section also reviews stormwater modeling techniques and the County's Public Involvement Plan.

3. Summary of Watershed Conditions

This section summarizes information on each WMA's size and sub watershed stressors. There are also maps for each sub watershed.

4. Summary of Watershed Restoration Strategies

Ms. Taibi reviewed how FX Browne prioritized projects' sub watershed restoration strategies. Ms. Taibi informed WAG members that the descriptions of each project type (both structural and non-structural) are in this section with pictures and sample project plans.

5. WMA Restoration Strategies

This section reviews WMAs and how proposed projects will help meet watershed restoration objectives. This section includes WMA maps and project fact sheets for the 10-year projects.

Ms. Taibi reviewed a project fact sheet with WAG members. Each fact sheet includes the project's location, land owner(s), costs, control type, drainage area, and receiving waters. The fact sheets include a description of the project, its benefits, design considerations, and an aerial map of the project area.

6. Benefits of Plan Implementation

This section includes analysis from the watershed model for existing conditions, future conditions without projects, and future conditions with projects. The section also describes the costs and benefits of implementing the plan. She told WAG members that the final watershed management plan would include an analysis of the benefits to the watershed of implementing all the 25-year projects.

7. Glossary and Acronyms

Ms. Taibi asked WAG members to let her know if she missed any abbreviations and acronyms.

8/9. References / Appendices

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

Following Ms. Taibi's presentation, the WAG members asked questions. During the discussion,

engineers and County staff shared information including:

- Not all projects will be implemented.
- The fact sheets include planning level considerations. Engineers will design specific project details as the County selects and funds projects for implementation. Sample project designs are included in section 4 of the Draft Watershed Management Plan.
- County staff are sorting and characterizing policy recommendations for implementation. These recommendations include revisions to zoning regulations and new ordinances.
- The county is conducting an interagency review on the Draft Watershed Management Plan. The County will integrate Agency comments into the draft plan finalized before submitting the final plan to the Board of Supervisors.

Project Comments: Breakout Groups

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed management areas with potential projects. Engineers and County staff assisted WAG members in finding projects. Engineers described projects to WAG members highlighting the decision-making factors considered when listing the project, the on-site impacts, and watershed wide benefits of implementing the project. Some specific comments included:

- Maps should be revised before the public forum to reflect that the non-structural projects don't have a time frame associated with them.
- Stream restoration projects like NI9201 on Map 5.3 next to Beech Mill Road should be given higher priority than some of the proposed culvert retrofit projects. VDOT has had a harder time getting some of the culvert retrofit projects through, and it didn't help that they experienced a major blowout after a culvert retrofit on Dale Boulevard. If on the other hand a project can be shown to protect a roadway, e.g. where stream erosion may threaten the edge of a road, then they may be able to act on those more readily as a public safety issue.
- Better explain that conservation easement projects are located in areas that are currently undeveloped and proposed for future development according to the Comprehensive Plan; explain that they would/should be implemented before development occurs.
- PN9201 has a bridge as part of the project – to reduce costs, it could be a crossing with concrete pillars for hikers and horse paths.
- PN9407 needs more clarification regarding the culvert description.

Next Steps

WAG members were encouraged to take maps home and share them with their communities. WAG members can request additional printed or digital copies of the Public Forum flyer for distribution within their communities. The County will accept comments on the draft watershed management plan until October 23. If members have any feedback they should note the project ID number and send comments to Melissa Taibi (mtaibi@fxbrowne.com) or Joe Sanchirico (Joseph.Sanchirico@fairfaxcounty.gov.) FX Browne will also review any public feedback to revise the draft watershed management plan. Comments can be submitted at the public forum on September 23, via the County's Nichol Pond website, via mail to the Stormwater Planning Division at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 449 Fairfax VA 22035, or via Fax 703-802-5955 or Phone 703-324-5500, TTY 711.

The Nichol Run and Pond Branch watershed is degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. 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
SEPTEMBER 9, 2010

Meeting Participants+

Ed Behrens*
Dena Bergstom*
Richard Bottomley
Susan Bottomley
Bev Geserick*
Bret Leslie*
Alex McVeigh
Amy Stephan*
Elaine Tholen*
Tom Wassaff*

Fairfax County Staff
Takisha Cannon
Sajan Pokharel
Fred Rose
Joe Sanchirico

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 listed as attending, please inform Jason Gershowitz (jgershowitz@resolv.org) and he will add you to the list.

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run & Pond Branch
Draft Watershed Management Plan Forum

Herndon High School
700 Bennett Street
Lecture Hall
Herndon, VA 20170

Thursday, September 23, 2010 6:30-9:00 pm

Agenda

6:30 p.m. **Watershed Registration – Sign in**

7:00 p.m. **Welcome** by Fred Rose, Chief, Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County

Supervisor John W. Foust, Dranesville District

7:15 p.m. **Slide Show:** Introduction to watershed concepts and overview of the Nichol Run & Pond Branch Draft Watershed Management Plan

8:00 p.m. **Watershed Input:** Learn about the plan comment period and timeline and attend breakout sessions to view watershed maps and provide feedback for proposed projects

9:00 p.m. **Adjourn** *(turn in any comment sheets)*

For more information:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

NICHOL RUN/POND BRANCH DRAFT WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC FORUM
SEPTEMBER 23, 2010

Herndon High School
Lecture Hall
700 Bennett Street | Herndon, VA 20170

I. Welcome and Introductions

[Please note that the presentation from the September 23, 2010 Nichol Run/Pond Branch Draft Watershed Management Plan Public Forum will be available online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, opened the Nichol Run/Pond Branch Draft Watershed Management Plan (DWMP) Public Forum. She welcomed the Nichol Run/Pond Branch Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) and other members of the public. Ms. Birkhoff reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.[1]

II. Welcome and Process Update

John Foust, the Dranesville District Supervisor, thanked members of the public for attending the public forum and for providing community input in developing the DWMP. He said that the plan will be finalized and presented to the Board of Directors. After the Board of Supervisors approves the plan, County staff will initiate countywide project prioritization and project implementation. Mr. Foust recalled the 2006 penny for stormwater initiative, which secured a portion of constituents' real estate tax to fund stormwater and watershed management. He indicated that federal and state stream quality and sediment control requirements will be a part of Fairfax County governance in the future.

Following Mr. Foust's welcome, participants asked questions. During the discussion, Mr. Foust noted that the DWMP is an opportunity to excite public interest in an important issue. A member of the public commented that pictures of project sites before and after project implementation could help highlight real world effects.

Fred Rose, the Branch Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and participating in developing the DWMP. He reviewed the watershed management planning process, which began with a comprehensive assessment of the County's stream and watershed quality. Mr. Rose emphasized the objective of the watershed management process is for an adaptive approach to solving watershed quality problems. The county has developed a flexible project prioritization tool to select projects for implementation across the county. The watershed management plan is dynamic and will reflect countywide needs.

[1] A copy of the meeting agenda is available at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm.

Following Mr. Rose's process update, participants asked questions. During the discussion, participants made the following points:

- Projects identified in the Nichol/Pond watersheds will be considered along with projects from all of the County's watersheds
- The County will seek funding from federal and state grants and programs to support project implementation.
- The County has prioritized projects with strong citizen support playing a significant role in the ranking. Mr. Rose indicated that the county intends to establish partnerships between the County and citizens to accomplish non-structural projects such as planting and buffer restoration. The County will also seek pilot projects with community partnerships.
- The DWMP includes non-structural project opportunities.
- Complete information about the project prioritization process is available in the technical memos (Appendix B.)

II. Overview of the Draft Watershed Management Plan

Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc. summarized the organizational structure and components of the draft watershed management plan.[2] She reviewed the following components of the draft watershed plan:

i. Executive Summary

The executive summary includes background information for Nichol Run and Pond Branch watersheds and a summary of each of the draft watershed management plan sections. The executive summary includes non-structural, 10-year, and 25-year master project lists (by project number, type, WMA, and location). Ms. Taibi emphasized that participants should use these lists to identify projects and find them on the map.

1. Introduction

Ms. Taibi informed WAG members that this section introduces watersheds and watershed planning. This section also includes a map of the Fairfax County Watershed Planning Groups.

2. Watershed Planning Process

This section includes the criteria and objectives for the watershed planning process. Ms. Taibi reviewed the indicators used to measure and compare existing and future conditions. She reviewed the composite scores and how FX Browne used them to rank high and low priority watershed management areas. The section also reviews stormwater modeling techniques and the County's Public Involvement Plan.

3. Summary of Watershed Conditions

This section summarizes information on each WMA's size and subwatershed stressors. There are also maps for each subwatershed.

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

4. Summary of Watershed Restoration Strategies

Ms. Taibi reviewed how FX Browne prioritized projects' subwatershed restoration strategies. Ms. Taibi informed WAG members that the descriptions of each project type (both structural and non-structural) are in this section with pictures and diagrams for clarification purposes.

5. WMA Restoration Strategies

This section reviews WMAs and how proposed projects will help meet watershed restoration objectives. This section includes WMA maps and project fact sheets for the 10-year projects.

Ms. Taibi reviewed a project fact sheet with WAG members. Each fact sheet includes the project's location, land owner(s), costs, control type, drainage area, and receiving waters. The fact sheets include a description of the project, its benefits, design considerations, and an aerial map of the project area.

6. Benefits of Plan Implementation

This section includes analysis from the watershed model for existing conditions, future conditions without projects, and future conditions with projects. The section also describes the costs and benefits of implementing the plan.

7. Glossary and Acronyms

8/9. References / Appendices

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

Following Ms. Taibi's presentation, there was a brief Q&A session. During the discussion, Ms. Taibi noted:

- Project numbers indicate project location and project type. Participants can find each project's actual prioritization score in Appendix B.
- Project prioritization may change based on site development and community support.
- F.X. Brown considered land acquisition needs in prioritizing projects. If landowners come forward willing to donate the necessary property, project prioritizations may change.
- The County will share resources and contact information for erosion control on their website.
- Engineers have considered wildlife concerns when proposing projects. The Nichol/Pond DWMP does not propose any new wet ponds.

Project Comments and Watershed Input: Breakout Groups

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed with potential projects. During the breakout, participants made the following comments:

- NI9014 – A participant noted concern for this project and requested additional design information to determine if he would support the project.
- NI9119 – Participants strongly supported this project. Participants also have lingering questions about the water upstream.
- NI9404 – Participants noted that the pond at this project site is stream fed, and therefore may not be appropriate for a project.
- PN9111 – Participants strongly supported this project and would like it to be considered as a high priority.
- PN9900 – A participant noted that easements may not be possible on this land
- PN 9901/9900 – A participant noted that local HOAs may be very interested in non-structural projects in this area. The participant also noted that the County may have difficulty obtaining easements.

Next Steps

Joe Sanchirico informed participants that the County will accept comments on the draft watershed management plan for a 30 day comment period, ending October 23. Comments can be submitted via the County's Nichol Pond website, via mail to the Stormwater Planning Division at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 449 Fairfax VA 22035, or via Fax 703-802-5955 or Phone 703-324-5500, TTY 711. Mr. Sanchirico added that County agencies are reviewing the plan. The County will submit the final WMP to the County Board of Supervisors in early 2011.

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

The Nichol Run and Pond Branch watershed is degraded, mostly due to urbanization. A planning process initiated by Fairfax County is underway to improve the quality of the waterways and their watersheds. The Watershed Advisory Group (WAG) provides input to Fairfax County. The WAG members serve as liaisons between their respective communities and the project team. 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/*

NICHOL RUN / POND BRANCH WATERSHEDS
DRAFT WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN FORUM
SEPTEMBER 23RD, 2010

Forum Participants

Eleanor Anderson
Tressa Bennet
Dena Bergstrom
Jennifer Boysko
Greg DeMarco
Bev Geserick
Walter R. Key
David Kondner
Robin Rentsch
Amy Stephan
Tom Wasaff

Healthy Watersheds, Healthier Communities

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

Nichol Run & Pond Branch
Draft Watershed Management Plan Forum

Herndon High School
700 Bennett Street
Lecture Hall
Herndon, VA 20170

Thursday, September 23, 2010 6:30-9:00 pm

Agenda

6:30 p.m. **Watershed Registration – Sign in**

7:00 p.m. **Welcome** by Fred Rose, Chief, Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch, Fairfax County

Supervisor John W. Foust, Dranesville District

7:15 p.m. **Slide Show:** Introduction to watershed concepts and overview of the Nichol Run & Pond Branch Draft Watershed Management Plan

8:00 p.m. **Watershed Input:** Learn about the plan comment period and timeline and attend breakout sessions to view watershed maps and provide feedback for proposed projects

9:00 p.m. **Adjourn** *(turn in any comment sheets)*

For more information:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/nicholrun_docs.htm

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division
12000 Government Center Pkwy, Ste. 449 • Fairfax, VA 22035 • 703-324-5500, TTY 711
www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds