

Fairfax County Stormwater Planning Division

SUGARLAND RUN/HORSEPEN CREEK WATERSHED ADVISORY GROUP MEETING JULY 21, 2010

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

I. Welcome and Introductions

[The presentation from the July 21, 2010 Sugarland Run/Horsepen Creek WAG meeting will be online at http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpwes/watersheds/sugarland_docs.htm].

Juliana Birkhoff, RESOLVE, opened the fifth 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.¹

II. Watershed Planning Update

Fred Rose, the Chief of the Watershed Planning and Assessment Branch of the Fairfax County Government, thanked everyone for attending the meeting and participating in developing the draft watershed management plan. He encouraged WAG members to stay involved as the County finishes the draft watershed management plan and begins to implement projects. Mr. Rose explained that the overall watershed planning process is almost finished. The county will send the final plan to the Board of Supervisors by the end of the year. Mr. Rose said the County will 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.

Following Mr. Rose's update, WAG members asked questions. During the discussion, Mr. Rose noted:

- The county is renewing their MS4 Permit. The new permit requires investment in stormwater infrastructure.
- The county will keep WAG member contact information for future public involvement
- The county will host a watershed management website that will include project-tracking information as the County selects and implements projects. The annual work plan will include countywide watershed management activities.
- The county is adopting an adaptive management approach to track progress against TMDL regulatory requirements. Individual projects will contribute to TMDL reduction. As the Chesapeake Bay TMDL regulations are promulgated, the county will select projects to meet those regulations.

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.

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 Sugarland and Horsepen 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, with Sugarland first.

4. Summary of Watershed Restoration Strategies

Ms. Taibi reviewed how FX Browne prioritized projects' subwatershed restoration strategies. She highlighted that F.X. Browne grouped some projects as potential alternatives to regional ponds. 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.

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/sugarlandrun_docs.htm

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 will 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. Several WAG members requested FX Browne to include abbreviations for the projects that are on the fact sheets in the fact sheet legend.

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, the model data collection, and C: *Public Involvement* records and summaries.

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

- Some of the project models include an increase in runoff. These models project growth over 25 years.
- The watershed planning process is dynamic. The county will evaluate and adjust which projects they implement each year.
- The project fact sheets should be consistent with all acronyms spelled out wherever possible.
- Try to limit projects in new Metrorail development areas. There will be a lot of redevelopment in those areas.
 - Herndon Metro development may displace wetlands.

Project Comments: Breakout Groups

The group divided into breakout groups to inspect maps of the watershed management areas with potential projects.

Individuals commented:

- SU9121 – Engineers should consider how close these projects are to homes when placing these projects. Engineers should examine an existing stormwater infrastructure at this location.
- SU9511 – Rain gardens might be a maintenance problem with the residents of the apartments at this location.
- HC9107 – Project proposes creation of marsh areas that might generate complaints of standing water and mosquitoes.
- HC9142 – One WAG member suggested re-wording the project description to better represent the project and illustrate that the high quality wetlands in the bottom of the existing pond will remain undisturbed by the retrofit. In addition, it may be possible to add a new component in an undevelopable parcel just upstream of the pond.

Projects participants disapproved of or thought would not be viable:

- SU 9136 – WAG members noted concern that the Friends of Runnymede Park will not support any project that affects trees or disturbs areas of the park. They noted that this is the only natural area left in Herndon. WAG members informed County staff that there is a bioretention project upstream that will be implemented next spring.
- SU9146 – The proposed pond retrofit may cause standing water and the homeowner next to the pond has complained about standing water.
- SU9203 – Colonial Oil spilled oil here and they funded a stream restoration project on this reach 2-3 years ago. WAG members did not think the County needed to redo work here.
- SU9201 – Possible to remove pond component of this project. The community draining to the pond is new and has on-site controls; there was stream erosion before the community was developed.
- SU9505 – Elden Street will be widened in the future, the proposed swale is probably not viable.
- SU 9509 – This project is not viable if it involves removing any trees. Trader Joe's specifically preserved the trees on this property. Engineers should investigate the property across the street as a potential secondary project location.

Next Steps

WAG members were encouraged to take maps home and share them with their communities. The County will accept comments on the draft watershed management plan until September 3. 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 August 3, via the County's [Sugarland Horsepen](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/sugarlandhorsepen) 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 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
JULY 21, 2010**

Meeting Participants+

Nicki Foremsky Bellezza*
Zoran Dragacevac*
Richard Gollhofer
Konrad Huppi*
Greg Noe*
Dana Singer*
Yasmin Shafiq*

Fairfax County Staff

Takisha Cannon
Catherine Morin
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.