

*Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division*

**SUGARLAND RUN/HORSEPEN CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING  
JUNE 3, 2009**

**Herndon Fortnightly Library**  
768 Center St  
Herndon, VA 20170

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

*[Please note that the presentation from the June 3, 2009 Sugarland Run/Horsepen Creek WAG meeting will be available online at [http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/sugarland\\_docs.htm](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/sugarland_docs.htm)].*

Juliana Birkhoff, the meeting facilitator, opened the third meeting of the Sugarland Run/Horsepen Creek Watershed Advisory Group (WAG). She welcomed WAG members and the members of the public and reviewed the meeting agenda and group expectations.<sup>1</sup>

Joe Sanchirico, the project manager from Fairfax County, thanked everyone for a great field trip on May 29<sup>th</sup>. WAG member Nicki Foremsky led a tour of the Snakeden stream restoration, and the group went to Fox Mill Estates to look at streams in relatively good condition and streams that were severely degraded. After that, the group drove around to look at other sites and noted some potential solutions to problems related to stormwater.

**II. Subwatershed Strategy**

Melissa Taibi, F.X. Browne, Inc., 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.

Ms. Taibi went into more detail on each step, using one subwatershed in the Horsepen Creek headwaters as an example.

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

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

- When the county decides what projects to include in the watershed management plan, it

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/sugarlandrun_docs.htm).

should consider the different impacts of each project, and how many of each type of project will be included on the final projects list.

#### 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 go visit the site. Some project sites had multiple potential projects; the engineering team has not yet determined which project would be best so included them all.

Individuals offered the following comments:

- There is a bad erosion problem in HC-CR-0001 at the trail crossing near project 191, and the path is almost gone. The whole stretch behind Motherwell Court has degraded significantly since the stream assessment.
- Rock Hill Road in HC-HC-0019 is an area under an APR process.
- The obstructions that would be removed as part of project 122 in HC-HC-0031 might already be gone.
- Project 161 in HC-HC-0035 is an active recreational area. Any treatment should maintain the field off of Emerald Chase Drive.
- There is a high quality wetland to the east of project 181 in HC-HC-0040, which could be impacted if the project was implemented. The county should consider a project upstream closer to the source instead, perhaps LID or a small structure, to control the water draining from the shopping center.
- One WAG member noted that projects 99F-H in SU-FF-0003 should not be a high priority.
- For project M86 in SU-FL-0005, topography may inhibit otherwise good infiltration.
- For project M67 in SU-FL-0002, rather than building a new dry pond, it may be better to divert just downstream to an existing depression which already collects water.
- One WAG member liked the possible community involvement aspect of stream restoration and riparian buffer planting after construction of project M87 in SU-FL-0005.
- In SU-FL-0004 where projects M81 and M83 are proposed, that area is already naturalized and people have complained that it is an eyesore. The area holds some water, leading to a mosquito problem.
- There is development currently in SU-FL-0004. This will have BMPs and walking trails.
- Projects M85 and M86 in SU-FL-0005 are in the middle of an HOA's property. There may not be open space there to implement the proposed projects.
- There may be resistance to projects M88 and M89 in SU-FL-0006 from the golf course, which purposefully maintains the channels to look a certain way. The county needs to coordinate with the golf course.
- The Town of Herndon is already planning stream restoration projects on a reach of Follylick in SU-FL-0008, where projects M109 through M118 are proposed.
- In SU-RI-0003, the Shaker Woods HOA supports regional pond alternatives (projects 166A-F). Also in that subwatershed, water is not getting to the dry pond in the area, possibly due to obstruction. Southington Lane has flooding and drainage problems.
- There are drainage problems in SU-RI-0005 where projects 166 through 167 are proposed. While VDOT maintains the roadways generating flows to the area, the HOA

may own the adjacent land where the concrete ditches are located.

- One WAG member was worried about tree loss from projects 119-124 in SU-SU-00032.
- Project 176 in SU-SU-00034 would be near Sugarland Run trail. If a stormwater management pond was installed, there could be a safety issue as this trail is heavily used by children.
- Stevenage Road in SU-SU-0035 above project 222 is a possible stream restoration site. There is a headcut problem from Bennington Woods.
- SU-SU-0035 contains Reston Association property. There is creek cutting at Moss Point Lane. Interior drainage flows over a homeowner's yard. There is a need for infiltration.
- At Spectrum Court in SU-SU-0037, the shopping center is in redevelopment. The county should keep an eye on that area. There are plans for a possible high rise building.
- In SU-SU-0043, projects 326 and 327 are stream preservation projects, which could include some stream flow diversion to take pressure off of the stream during flooding. The projects are situated on undevelopable land that belongs to the business park owner. The owner would like to develop the land but cannot because it is on a floodplain. The county can work with the owner to put in riparian buffers and trees. There is an easement possibility.
- The building located in SU-SU-0045 where project 358 is sited cannot support a green roof. Cisterns are currently not allowed in Reston but rain barrels will work. The trapezoidal ditch outside of the building should be removed and naturalized.
- One WAG member liked the idea of bioretention in the Target parking lot in SU-SU-0045 (project 363), noting there are currently some trees but the lot is very dry.
- One WAG member noted that project 359 in SU-SU-0045 is a good project.
- Projects M35 and M36 in SU-SU-0046 are located in really high quality woods. A vernal pond may be a better alternative as a means to keeping the area wooded but still have treatment.
- The USGS facility in SU-SU-0046 has flow northwest from the parking lot. This is an opportunity to convert one of the parking lots into a pond or other stormwater control.
- Project M16 in SU-SU-0049 may not work because the soil's low porosity could cause poor infiltration.
- The Dulles Metro development/redevelopment would cause large scale disruption to the watershed. However, any redevelopment should reduce stormwater runoff by 25 percent.
- The Dranesville District Supervisor's Office endorses all projects prioritized by the Town of Herndon staff.
- One WAG member noted that the county should use conservation easements and stream restoration when possible.
- The following subwatersheds are considered priorities by Supervisor Foust's office:
  - SU-FF-0002, for and conservation easement and stream restoration;
  - SU-FF-0004;
  - SU-FL-0003, for conservation easement;
  - SU-FL-0004, to repair erosion;
  - SU-FL-0008;
  - SU-MB-0001, for conservation easements;
  - SU-SU-0020, for conservation easement;
  - SU-SU-0022, for conservation easement;

- SU-SU-0028;
- SU-SU-0034, for conservation easement and stream restoration;
- SU-SU-0039, for stream restoration; and
- SU-SU-0040.

A few WAG members raised concerns about communication before the County implements projects. Mr. Sanchirico noted that before the County finalizes the plan being County will hold another public forum and allow members of the community to comment on the plan both at the forum and online.

Mr. Sanchirico informed the group that in the final watershed plan, the county will include approximately 100 projects in the 10 year plan for both watersheds. There are currently 800 possible projects, including duplicate projects at the same site location. A lot of those 800 will be eliminated relatively quickly through feedback and field reconnaissance.

He added the cost will factor into what projects are picked. Fred Rose, Fairfax County, noted that there is no ceiling on the total cost of the projects included in the final plan but that the costs will be realistic. He acknowledged there are more problems and issues than can be solved with the budget and that the county has to pick wisely. Mr. Sanchirico informed the WAG that if they were interested in the total estimated cost, previously completed watershed plans are online at the county website, and that the executive summary of each mentions the cost.

#### Next Steps

The Sugarland Run/Horsepen Creek WAG will next meet in approximately six weeks. As the county library hours will change beginning July 1<sup>st</sup>, Dr. Birkhoff asked WAG members to suggest alternate meeting locations.

The county will provide a summary of the proportions of different projects. If WAG members would like copies of the maps or informational brochures, they can request them from Dr. Birkhoff via email.

The Sugarland Run and Horsepen Creek 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](mailto: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*

**SUGARLAND RUN/HORSEPEN CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING  
JUNE 3, 2009**

**Meeting Participants**

Jennifer Boysko\*  
Zoran Dragacevac\*  
Alan Ford\*  
Nicki Foremsky\*  
Richard Gollhofer  
Konrad Huppi\*  
Greg Noe\*  
Jim Palmer\*  
Glen Rubis\*  
Cheri Salas\*  
Alison Smith  
Bob Soltess\*

**Fairfax County Staff**

Takisha Cannon  
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  
Debbie Lee, RESOLVE

**\*WAG member**