Pohick Watershed Advisory Group *July 20. 2009*
Responses to Comments
Projects 1-102

Comments submitted by the Pohick Creek Watershed WAG members for the first round of candidate projects identified throughout the watershed.

The WAG comments are listed first with the Pohick Creek Team response listed below in italics. For discussion at the WAG #4 Meeting, the comments have been grouped by category and the individual WAG member name has been removed.

- **Neighborhood concerns**

Project 13
- New pond construction can be a challenge with the surrounding community. I would need more details.

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. This could be an extension of a stream restoration project which is also needed in the area.

Project 42
- See comments for 13. [New pond construction can be a challenge with the surrounding community. I would need more details.]

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. There will still need to be coordination with the local homeowners.

Project 52
- See comments for 13. [New pond construction can be a challenge with the surrounding community. I would need more details.]

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. There will still need to be coordination with the local homeowners.

Project 54
- New wetlands, like ponds, can be tricky with the surrounding neighbors. Would need more detail.

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. It is possible to change the project to a daylighting of nearby pipe running into stream.

Project 56
- See comments for 13. [New pond construction can be a challenge with the surrounding community. I would need more details.]

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. It is possible to change the project to a daylighting of nearby pipe running into stream

Project 61
- See comments for 13. [New pond construction can be a challenge with the surrounding community. I would need more details.]

The project has been changed to an extended detention wetland pond with aquatic grasses and plants. There will still need to be coordination with the local homeowners.

- **Cost**

Project 21
- Retrofitting a green roof can be expensive for the return. Generally against this kind of project. Feel that the money could be better spent elsewhere.

The project has been changed to an LID Bioswale which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach.

Project 28
- See comments for 21. [Retrofitting a green roof can be expensive for the return. Generally against this kind of project. Feel that the money could be better spent elsewhere.]

The project has been changed to an LID Bioswale which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach.

Project 31
- See comments for 21 [Retrofitting a green roof can be expensive for the return. Generally against this kind of project. Feel that the money could be better spent elsewhere.]

The project has been changed to an LID Bioretention facility onsite which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach.

Project 90
- See comments for 21. [Retrofitting a green roof can be expensive for the return. Generally against this kind of project. Feel that the money could be better spent elsewhere.]

The project has been changed to an LID Bioswale which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach.

- **Potential disruption of trail**

Project 73
- Implementing this project will most likely disrupt use of trails around lake. Will require close coordination with community.

Trail disruption should be at a minimum, coordination of the limits of construction will come in future phases. Protection of nearby trails will be noted.

- **<u>Location</u> (also see Overall Comments)**

Project 82
- may want to move this upstream more. Residents says that closer to the lake there is more flooding.

The project will be move upstream of present location, and field visits will be used to determine the location for spot improvements.

Project 84
- If rip rap is used, it should be the larger size to prevent children for removing it for other purposes. Near this site is an old silt pond that was used for dewatering dredge material when the lake was dredged. Currently fenced in with large growth. Residence said this is one possible site for a dog park.

Fenced ponds are typically VDOT ponds and not maintained by the County. Restoration may be feasible to use natural means to restore the stream bank instead of rip-rap. Children should never play on, in, near or around stormwater management facilities, as they are dangerous and frequently have fast rising water during a storm event.

Project 85
- This should be Laurel Ridge Elementary School not Laurel Hill. Concern about type of plants used for the green roof. Community has spent a lot of effort to remove invasive species in the neighborhood and they don't want to create another problem.

- See comments for 21. [Retrofitting a green roof can be expensive for the return. Generally against this kind of project. Feel that the money could be better spent elsewhere.]

The project has been changed to an LID Bioretention which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach. The name will be changed to Laurel Ridge Elementary School and the plants used will not be invasive species.

Project 88
- This should be Laurel Ridge Elementary School not Laurel Hill. Believe reducing the storm water before it hits the stream is best.

The project has been changed to an LID Bioretention which is less expensive and more visual for education and outreach. The name will be changed to Laurel Ridge Elementary School and the new facility will help to release stormwater in a controlled manner downstream.

Project 97
- KPW has a swimming pool near this area that has been closed for years. KPW looking for options on how to handle property. Did not talk directly to anyone but this might be possible site for a SW management pond and park scenario. It currently is a liability with the pool not being used.

The pool site was reviewed. The actual location and feasibility will be determined during the cost benefit analysis portion of the project. The site has been identified as a project potential.

- **<u>Future maintenance needs</u>**

Project 1
- I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.

There is specific maintenance issues depending on the type of product used. This is currently a recommendation for a potential type of project. Any final projects that are actually implemented will undergo a cost benefit analysis in which maintenance cost and time will be a component. At that time the detail of the type of material, pavers etc, will also be considered.

Project 2
- See comments for Project 1 [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Project 6
- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Project 8
- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]
-

See response to comment 1

Project 16
- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Project 34
- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Project 39

- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Project 93

- See comments for 1. [I have concerns about future maintenance. For example, how is snow removal done on this surface? Can a plow scrape it? These are important questions at a school site for safety reasons etc...What type of pavers? Would need more detail.]

See response to comment 1

Other Comments

- **In addition to concerns, WAG members expressed support for specific candidate projects or generally in overall comments**

Project 3

- Stream buffer restoration generally a good thing across the board. Usually low cost with positive results.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 4

- In favor of maintenance and improvement of present conditions.

Removal of obstructions will help to reduce flooding issues as the water is able to flow more freely.

Project 10

- In favor of maintenance and improvement of existing infrastructure.

The retrofit proposed is actually for improvement of the existing infrastructure.

Project 29

- Generally for stream resto. projects.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 47

- Support stream restoration.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 51

- Support buffer restoration.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 58
- Support Stream restoration, especially when they impact our PL566 lakes.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 60
- See comments for 58. [Support Stream restoration, especially when they impact our PL566 lakes.]

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

Project 72
- This reach is more eroded than we initially thought. It receives a significant amount of stormwater and, judging by the change in the degree of degradation downstream of Lake Braddock Drive, it would appear that the road is a significant source. As evidenced by the "island" of sediment in the forebay in Lake Braddock, a significant volume of sediment comes through this reach. In addition, the erosion is beginning to encroach upon a community playground and a homeowner's fenceline. The proposed restoration seems to be an appropriate solution and would significantly reduce streambank erosion.

Positive preference for stream buffer repair and restoration noted.

- **Requesting additional projects at that location**

Projects 62, 63 and 64
- Concerns about DP0030. This dry pond is one that the homeowners would rather it wasn't there. The RPA is an issue for some as most of the houses [near the stream] along Byron Terrace are in the RPA. Candidate project 62, 63 or 64 proposes building another dry pond in the RPA. Southport [and Signal Hill areas] has a large runoff; is there any way we could make that into a swale or something else instead, perhaps a hybrid pond of sorts [that adds to the wetlands near Byron Terrace]?

This is the helpful type of comment we are looking for as part of the WAG comments we've solicited.

Project 74
- The proposed restoration seems to be an appropriate solution. This reach appears to be in relatively good shape, as vegetation covers much of the banks. However, there are certainly portions that could use additional cover, as tree roots are exposed and some banks are bare. We would have to assume that this would be a low priority project.

The project was placed in an area that scored fairly low on our scoring index, making it higher than a low priority project. Exposed roots and bare banks, represent a stream needing channel restoration.

- **General Comments**

Project 78

- Stream did show heavy erosion of stream banks. Noticed storm water management facility from a relatively new subdivision that takes all the runoff and directs it into a large culvert that empties into the stream. Is this facility designed to reduce peak flows because downstream from where it empties into the stream shows increased erosion.

The downstream area may be a candidate for stream buffer repair and or anchoring of the channel. It is also possible an outfall retrofit may be needed to reduce downstream flow velocities.

Project 91

- Stream erosion is evident. Upstream is an existing SW retention pond that is well maintained. Question is whether this structure is working to reduce peak flows and if not could it be modified. Structure is next to a resident.

Repair of the buffer will help to protect the stream banks with new vegetation making the channel stronger. During field visits, the site will be checked to see if restoration or stream anchoring is more feasible.

<u>Overall Comments</u>

- LBCA notes that other sites of concern (primarily the reach between Harford Lane and Dahlgren Place, northwest of Guinea Road) were not included in the list of potential projects. We will wait for the updated list and submit additional comments should these sites remain excluded in the final list.
- Restoration of streams is needed but must consider more options to reduce SW runoff such as bioretention sites, permeable pavement, green roofs, rain gardens.
- In as much as this first round of candidate project sites are not on the area of concern for our stakeholders, I am unable to provide any substantive feedback at this time. I know that as the process of prioritizing these projects moves forward, efforts will be made to inform and garner feedback from citizens and business entities directly impacted by projects that are actually adopted as part of the long range plan for the county.
- As you may know, there may be 40 or so proposed on parkland. I have reviewed them on paper and several in the field and can say that in principle we support and have no issues with any of the projects designed to improve the Pohick. If you need me to note that on the project feedback form for each project please give me a call. I hope this general comment will suffice!
- General Comments: In favor of maintaining and improving existing infrastructure and streams channels, buffers etc... New ponds ok, but may be difficult to get consensus of surrounding neighbors...NIMBY effect. In favor of projects to protect existing PL566 lakes.

We will await the final comments to see if all their concerns are met. Other project types including bioretention, permeable pavement, rain gardens, and manufactured wetland type projects have been included in the overall project list. The new ponds, as well as all the proposed projects will include coordination with the local community. The new ponds proposed are more than the typical hole in the ground type of pond. They are extended detention wetland ponds that have aquatic grasses and different configurations than normal. While this may not please everyone, it is a potential feasible project in some locations.