

Major WQIA Review

Yes / Page No	NA	Requirement	Comments	Line Item	TNT Responses	
State the section of 118-6 for the submission					1.	
Y pg4		State which section of Chapter 118, the request is submitted under; 118-6-7, or 118-6-8, or 118-6-9.		2.		
		Narrative 118-4-3(a)		3.		
	X	Display RPA boundary (A site-specific RPA delineation is required unless agreed with the Director to use the County GIS; GEM). Note that the RPA components can be certified by a wetland specialist on a plat sealed by a land surveyor or engineer (A Virginia professional engineer may certify both). In some cases, it may be waived by the Director.	Although the text, pg 4, par a) states that the RPA boundary from the approved INF plan may be used, the INF is not included in the submission. The exhibits on sheets 32 and 33 may not be used, a land surveyor/engineer licensed in VA must seal the plat.	4.	This was discussed several times and agreed upon with County officials (meetings on 9/17/20 and 12/22/20). This is an approved RPA that should be allowed to be used for this report. The signed/sealed copy of the plat is found on pages 58 and 59.	
Narrative 118-4-3(b)					5.	
Y pg3		Nature of the proposed encroachment		6.		
Y pg4		Condition & type of vegetation		7.		
Y pg4, pg30		Details of the requested encroachment		8.		
	X	Any previously approved encroachments into the RPA	7996-WRPA-001-1 not referenced	9.	This was referenced on page 2 (PDF page 3) in "General information". There was a WRPA in 2005 but that proposed house was not built, no other previously approved encroachments in the RPA.	
	X	Existing topography, soils, hydrology, and geology of the site and adjacent lands;	Soil map, sheet 18, does not show the soils within 500 feet	10.	This has been updated.	
	X	Location, type, characteristics, and condition of RPA features	Information not provided, see line 4	11.	See line 4.	
	X	Impact of the proposed development to the existing topography, soils, hydrology, and geology of the site and adjacent lands	Information not provided, see line 4	12.	See line 4.	
	X	Nature and extent of any fill material Duration and proposed phasing of the project		13.		
	X	Type of all vegetation to be removed	Not address the vegetation removed since the INF plan	14.	This has been addressed in this section and mitigation has been proposed.	
	X	Nature and extent of any fill material		15.		
	X	Duration and proposed phasing of the project		16.		
				17.		
		Type of all vegetation to be removed	See line 14	18.	See line 14.	
Narrative 118-4-3(c)					19.	
Pg 4	X	Provide justification for proposed encroachment	Justification not clearly stated	20.	Additional justification has been added.	
Narrative 118-4-3(d)					21.	
Pg4, par b)	X	Wetlands shown on the plan. Contiguous wetlands identified and included in the RPA boundary. Consult with SWPD as needed.	States not wetland on the property	22.	The approved RPA (7996-WRPA-001-1) did not include wetlands and no wetlands were observed onsite. This is stated in Section 118-4-3(d). Per the meeting on 9-16-21, Camylyn checked the wrong box for this comment.	
	X	Statement that all requisite wetland permits required by other agencies will be provided; must be provided before any land disturbing activity is approved.		23.		
	X	If applicable, describe impacts to wetlands		24.		
Plan / Narrative 118-4-3(e)					25.	
	X	Calculation of percent increase in impervious surface on-site and types of surfacing materials used; shown on the plan	Percent not provided; see page 31	26.	This has been added to this section.	
	X	Replanting schedule and locations of replanting proportional to removed vegetation; shown in the plan	Not addressed the conditions shown on the approved INF	27.	Per correspondence with the County, this comment does not apply to this application. The trees previously removed within the RPA will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio.	
	X	Where sufficient plantings cannot be provided, BMPs may be provided with calculations to support the water quality benefit using the VRRM (Proposed planting areas assumed to be forested)	See line 27	28.	No BMPs are required because the disturbance is less than 2,500 SF, this is stated in this section.	
	X	For cases submitted under 118-6-9, pre-development and post-development pollutant loads in runoff using VRRM spreadsheet/ simple equations (Proposed planting areas assumed to be forested)	Calculations do not address the entire site and the disturbance since the approved INF	29.	There was no other disturbance in the RPA except for the sport court and trees removed. The VRRM spreadsheet has been updated to reflect the new revegetation area.	
	X	Erosion and sediment control measures (Violation cases, the E&S measure are usually already installed; proposed methods typically are super silt fence)	E&S plan not provided	30.	There is no E&S Plan required because disturbance is less than 2,500 square feet. Further, the violation has already occurred and the area is stable. Silt fencing has been proposed and shown on the plan sheet.	
	X	Narrative explains the mitigation (revegetation/BMPs) and how it will be effective at preventing an increase in nonpoint source pollution. (VRRM is required for the CBPO 118-6-9)	Not addressed the changes to the property since the approved INF	31.	See line 28 and 29 responses.	

	X	<p>Large projects may have notable hydrogeological (www.sciencedirect.com/topics/earth-and-planetary-sciences/hydrogeology) impacts and the cumulative effect of numerous smaller projects may be significant. This should be discussed in the narrative, including the potential cumulative impacts and mitigation measures. Computations may be required for large projects.</p> <p>Potential mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to: Proposed erosion and sediment control concepts.</p> <p>Concepts may include minimizing the extent of the cleared area, perimeter controls, reduction of runoff velocity and volume/ rates, measures to stabilize disturbed areas, and schedule and personnel for site inspection.</p> <p>Minimization of proposed excavation and fill. Groundwater recharge/infiltration practices</p>	Address in a narrative	32.	The RPA plantings and mitigation measures were discussed in this section. Additional narrative has been added.
	X	<p>A planting plan in accordance with §118-3-3(f) and the PFM, including a statement that all selected plants are indigenous species appropriate for the riparian buffer.</p> <p>Plant to be selected from the RECOMMENDED TREE AND SHRUB SPECIES FOR REFORESTATION OF RESOURCE PROTECTION AREAS June 4, 2008, or approved by UEMD</p>	Address all the vegetation removed from the RPA since the INF plan.	33.	The trees removed have been mitigated for and discussed in this section.
Plan / Narrative 118-4-3(f);					
	X	Existing indigenous vegetation is preserved to the maximum extent possible	See line 33	34.	See line 33.
		Impervious cover is minimized to the maximum extent possible	A permeable court should be considered. Although for the purposes of calculating the impervious cover on the lot, credit would be given for water quality.	35.	The complete removal of the sport court and construction of a permeable court would create even more disturbance in the RPA and would defeat the purpose of this application. This has been added to the narrative
Plan / Narrative 118-3-2					
	X	(a) No more land shall be disturbed than is necessary to provide for the proposed use, development, or redevelopment.	See line 46	36.	
	X	(b) Indigenous vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent practicable consistent with the use, development, or redevelopment proposed.	See line 46	37.	
	X	(c) Impervious cover shall be minimized consistent with the use, development, or redevelopment proposed.	See line 46	38.	
	X	(d) Any land-disturbing activity that exceeds an area of 2,500 square feet shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 104 of the County Code.	See line 46	39.	
	X	(e) For any development or redevelopment, stormwater runoff shall be controlled by the use of best management practices (BMPs) in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 124 of the County Code.	See line 46	40.	
	X	(f) The Director shall require certification on all plans of development that all wetlands permits required by law will be obtained prior to commencement of land-disturbing activities in any area subject to the plan of development review. See line 23.	See line 46	41.	
	X	(g) Restrictions for on-site sewage disposal systems requiring are addressed in the plan and the narrative	See line 46	42.	
	X	(h) The restrictions for agricultural land are addressed on the plan and in the narrative	See line 46	43.	
	X	(i) The buildable areas allowed on each lot must be delineated on all preliminary plans, site plans, minor site plans, subdivision plans, infill lot grading plans, conservation plans, rough grading plans, and public improvement plans. The buildable area must be based on: 1) the performance criteria specified in Article 3 of this Code, 2) the minimum required yards of the zoning district in which the lot is located, and 3) any other relevant easements or limitations on lot coverage.	See Chapter 101-2-5 Final subdivision plat. Paragraph 101-2-5.c.12ii The RPA is to remain undisturbed and vegetated in accordance with the requirements of Section 118-3-3(f) of Chapter 118 of the County Code	44.	Per correspondence with the County, this comment does not apply to this application. The trees previously removed within the RPA will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio.
Plan / Narrative 118-3-3					
	X	(d) The plan and narrative address the buffer area requirements: To minimize the adverse effects of human activities on the other components of the RPA, state waters, and aquatic life, a buffer area that is effective in retarding runoff, preventing erosion, and filtering nonpoint source pollution from runoff shall be retained, if present, and established where it does not exist. Notwithstanding permitted uses, encroachments, and vegetation clearing, authorized by this Chapter, the buffer area is not reduced in width.	See line 46	45.	See line 46 response.
	X	(e) On agricultural lands, the buffer area must be managed to prevent concentrated flows of surface water from breaching the buffer area and appropriate measures, as recommended by the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District, may be taken to prevent noxious weeds from invading the buffer area.	See line 46	46.	This is not applicable.
	X	(f) Buffer area establishment: Where buffer areas are to be established, they shall consist of a mixture of overstory trees, understory trees, shrubs and groundcovers. The density of overstory trees shall be a minimum of 100 trees per acre. The density of understory trees shall be a minimum of 200 trees per acre. The density of shrubs shall be a minimum of 1089 plants per acre. If seedlings are used instead of container plants, the density of trees shall be doubled. Large caliper trees shall not be planted on slopes steeper than 2:1. Plant materials shall be randomly placed to achieve a relatively even spacing throughout the buffer. The Director may approve the use of a seed mixture as a supplement to or in lieu of individual plants for shrubs and groundcovers. Plants shall be native to the degree practical and adaptable to site conditions. Wetland plantings (including herbaceous plantings) and/or wetland seed mix shall be used where site conditions warrant. Plant materials and planting techniques shall be as specified in the Public Facilities Manual.	See line 46	47.	This has been provided in the submitted document and associated exhibits in accordance with 118-3-3(f). Additional trees have been added to mitigate for the removed vegetation prior to the violation.
Plan / Narrative 118-4-3(g);					
				51.	

	X	Applications submitted under 118-6-9; Pre- and Post- development water quality calculations using the VRRM spreadsheet or simple equations, which demonstrate a water quality benefit.	See line 46	52. This has been provided in submitted Appendix V.
--	---	--	-------------	---