

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Chris Blouin
Organization:
Topic: Air Quality
Comment: Policy 3 - Bicycling safety & bike paths; No safe place currently; Need bike lane network; Bike Plan - should be actionable, accomplishable, and supportive.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Alexander Kot
Organization:
Topic: Tracking/Monitoring
Comment: Need better coordination of existing land applications w/ long term plans; Requirement for studies, research, testing to support & verify that heavy industrial areas are not polluting; Look at case-by-case.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Granville-Smith
Organization: citizen, developer, builder
Topic: Incentives
Comment: Need to put forth incentive to justify what developers do; Density credits?; Stream credits?

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Granville-Smith
Organization: citizen, developer, builder
Topic: Performance-Based Review
Comment: How to look at specific applications; Clearcutting trade-offs; More allowances for conservation?

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Neil Nelson
Organization:
Topic: Metrics/Accounting
Comment: Look at metrics & measures; Open Space and re-align Zoning; Follow-up on open space goals by transferring into Zoning Ord; Acquisition of sites; Countywide greenway - measures? Accountability is key.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Jan Cunard
Organization: LOCCA PELT
Topic: Successful Examples
Comment: Enviro chapter much like Cultural Res chapter; i.e., Costa Rican programs & status of enviro; Govt. incentives; Programs for parks, pristine beauty, creative recycling, tree cut limits, wind farms, sustainability, citizen buy-in; Follow good examples.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Hjelm
Organization:
Topic: Property Rights
Comment: Don't need restrict anymore via Plan; Compensate for taking away; Restrictions need to be recorded in deeds; Ditch re-classification; Promote use of property; No expansion of regulations without justification.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Chris Blouin
Organization:
Topic: Brownfield Redevelopment
Comment: Asphalt plants direct heavy industrial uses to brownfields; Need to have incentives to look at brownfield sites, at external locations or where appropriate.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Marvin Wilson
Organization:
Topic: Tree Preservation & Conservation Ordinances
Comment: Page 11, AS; Tree Preservation Ord (i.e., Fairfax Co - as model & learn from them!); Goal for tree canopy & baseline info in PWC; Special studies to address enviro red flags (emerald ash borer) pg 11, #6; #7 - Encourage donating conservation easements.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Chris Blouin
Organization:
Topic: Plan/Stormwater
Comment: Look at Maryland Department of Environmental Quality (storm drain marking); Successes - pay attention!

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Alexander Kot
Organization:
Topic: Use Capabilities
Comment: Co-location of use limitations; Look at compatibility of land uses; Set up radius threshold w/ uses in reference to environmental resources.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: Open space shall be connected; PWC shall have walkable communities; No more big box stores; We shall support local groceries, visit parks, go to movies, and work within walking distance of our homes.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: PWC shall have "green jobs", with high and medium salaries that shall never put our health at risk; Green jobs shall be for everyone.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: County residents should know where all resources are and such areas shall be protected w/ 100 ft. buffer (place language into DCSM & Comp Plan); PWC shall save 40% of open space on each parcel of land to be developed.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: PWC shall have 1,000 foot buffers between residences, schools, and any kind of industry that can potentially harm us; Such buffers will be forested with native vegetation and w/ redundant diversity.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: We shall preserve every inch of history and grave sites; We shall walk them and not allow a developer to destroy our history; PWC shall lead by giving developers guidance and telling them to use LEED standards, which shall be in our DCSM and Comp Plan.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: self
Topic: Environmental Leadership
Comment: We are proud to call PWC our home and thank our current BOCS, PC, and Planning staff and all our County employees for listening to their constituents and making this county the "Environmental Leader of Virginia".

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Kevin McMaw
Organization:
Topic: Streams
Comment: Follow the intent of the existing environment chapter. Protect natural resources (i.e., headwaters of Neabsco Creek); Paving over resources is contradictory (i.e., Villages on the Parkway project)

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Chris Blouin
Organization:
Topic: Plan/Metrics
Comment: No dates in plan; Without dates, these are "wondering generalities"; With dates, these are "meaningful specifics"; Need some type of metrics and timeframe to aim for and actually follow.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Christine Rosenfeld
Organization: Bristow Opposition
Topic: Stormwater Mgmt. Ponds
Comment: Concern w/ recent asphalt plant proposals; Need higher standards for ponds and better oversight; Need to closely monitor stormwater; Any industry needs to realize that stormwater flows into system; Lack of stormwater oversight.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Al Alborn
Organization:
Topic: Accountability
Comment: Environmental themes should integrate with action strategies and be better tied to other processes so we can measure results; Look more closely at how components interact.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Bob Simon
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic: Tree Canopy, Streams
Comment: Establish measurable tree canopy coverage monitoring system as measuring tool; Publish results quarterly; Ban clearcutting by developers; Propose limits of clearing; PWC is serious about environment w/ high standards; County-wide stream assessment

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Bob Simon
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic: Smart Growth
Comment: Honor what we said in draft plan that is being proposed; Be consistent about Smart Growth concepts; Clearly state where we want to go.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Bob Simon
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic: Wetlands
Comment: Protect them; (i.e, corner of Hoadly Road & Prince William Parkway); Accurately depict limit/extent of wetlands on maps and recognize the permanency of RPAs; Tell the truth on all maps.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Marian Hamamo
Organization: PWC Conservation Alliance & PW Trails and Streams
Topic: Clearcutting
Comment: Prohibit developers from clearcutting.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Marian Hamamo
Organization: PWC Conservation Alliance & PW Trails and Streams
Topic: Wetlands
Comment: Do not allow any development in wetlands - period.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Marian Hamamo
Organization: PWC Conservation Alliance & PW Trails and Streams
Topic: Stormwater
Comment: Limit impervious surfaces; Utilize more pervious surfaces in parking areas.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Granville-Smith
Organization: citizen, developer, builder
Topic: Enforcement
Comment: Regulations are plentiful; Address enforcement of rules & regulations; New Virginia DCR/DEQ regulations coming and are significant; Don't need more limitations!

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Nancy Berlin
Organization: 4H volunteer
Topic: Wetlands
Comment: Prohibit public utilities in wetlands; Look to environmental high school to set example and protect wetlands.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization: MidCo, PW Conservation Alliance
Topic: Buffering
Comment: Clarify confusing language in plan; Density overlays in Occoquan; Update Zoning Ord to show RPAs; Need 50-ft buffer for intermittent streams and stronger protections for streams; Adopt recommendations of RPA Committee; E&S controls during development.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Towne
Organization:
Topic: Environment Plan - structure & process
Comment: Integrate with own objectives & accountability; Break down components and measure as function of intent; Clarify definitions and control mechanisms; Community-based org to partner w/ PWC; Evaluate policies against AS & goals; Voice of community heard?

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Julian Russell
Organization: Bristow Opposition
Topic: Environmental Health & Safety
Comment: Need minimum thresholds for protection of children health, safety, and environmental sense.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Julian Russell
Organization: Bristow Opposition
Topic: Accountability & Tracking
Comment: Separate industrial facilities from analysis; Evaluate pre-existing community over new development; Focus on preservation of pre-residential vs. new industry development; Need better public announcements system.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life, citizen
Topic: Awareness, Buffers & Stormwater
Comment: Buffers to require native plants; Consider bio-treatment options; Stormdrain stenciling as awareness; PWC should adopt new mindset; Aim for zero runoff; Use eco-friendly products; Need 100-ft buffer for intermittent streams and map such features.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Nancy Berlin
Organization: 4H Volunteer
Topic: PWC Landfill
Comment: Need to be aware of monitoring activities for wetlands and forest buffer areas at landfill facility.

Date: 6/24/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Julian Russell
Organization: Bristow Opposition
Topic: Environment Plan - structure & process
Comment: Gaps in plan and need to have more accountability; Disconnect (i.e., asphalt plants); Publish info on development applications.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/1/2009
Source: E-mail
Name: Myrtle Harrison
Organization:
Topic: Resource Protection/Buffering
Comment: Please increase protection for streams and wetlands, especially in the SRR district which drains to our drinking water supply; Focus on watershed protection.

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 10
Comment: Action Strategy 2. BIG one for my area - Study Occoquan Reservoir watershed for density, etc, and create overlay district. Way overdue in my opinion!

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 4
Comment: AS 1: Deals with "discouraging" development in the listed sensitive areas, but the question is: how? what document?
AS 6: Recommends assessing erosion and sediment control effectiveness and improvement methods. Another RPA Committee recommendation.

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 3
Comment: Action Strategy 1. Recommends establishing procedures to monitor air quality in county. I suggest targeting known sources for proximity monitoring.
Action Strategy 2. Recommends establishing more DEQ monitoring stations. See above comment.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 1
Comment: AS 1: This deals with accounting for the depreciation of renewable resources when evaluating the economic health of the county.
AS 2: Recommends separately delineating wetlands, RPAs and intermittent streams in the Zoning Ordinance.

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: Implementation of Policies
Comment: We need metrics and timelines and a concrete path to implementation.
Urge adoption of RPA Committee recommendations.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 5
Comment: Action Strategy 9. Recommends providing 50' buffer for intermittent streams. How?

Date: 7/8/2009
Source: Email
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization:
Topic: EN Policy 2
Comment: Action Strategy 1. Recommends developing educational programs for environmental issues. This dovetails nicely with the RPA Committee recommendation to post info on RPAs on the county website and channel 23.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic: Vernal Pools

Comment:

1. All vernal pools and the forests that surround them shall be gis, mapped and permanently protected and studied.
http://www.vernalpool.org/vernal_1.htm
http://www.vernalpool.org/vpinfo_1.htm
<http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/types/vernal.html>
2. Conservation landscaping information to be places in Environmental Comp Plan and DCSM:

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization:
Topic: Soil Erosion and Plant Health
Comment: Stop Soil Erosion and Increase Plant Health By Using Compost and Compost Tea:instead of Chemical Fertilizers, Pesticides and Herbicides
Erosion is caused by dead soil. Dead soil is caused by chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides.

Compost and compost tea brings back live organisms in the soil that are the glue that nature has always used to control soil erosion.

Spreading compost 2 times a year on lawns, as well as any plants grown, will bring back the live organisms that break down the food components the plants need to be healthy and disease resistant. Compost tea feeds the microorganisms faster and is a natural boost for the plants immune system to fight disease and predation.

Benefits: no more soil erosion, no more poisoning of the earth or ourselves, no more reasons to pay for expensive pesticides and herbicides that must be made more toxic every year to keep up with the pests and diseases that are caused by the spraying of pesticides and herbicides which weaken plants. The chemical fertilizer makes the tops of the plants grow or the roots to grow but does not make the plant grow as nature intended: an equal amount of top growth and root growth at the same time.

Plants expel exudates that decide what type of organisms will survive around them. When compost is used as a fertilizer, the plant expels exudates that protect the plant as well as feed the plant by feeding the microorganisms they need for both purposes at once. Compost does not hurt humans.

Chemical fertilizers are salts that kill everything in the soil, the good and bad microorganisms. The bad microorganisms recover faster and if compost and compost tea is not spread on the soil (not tilled), the good microorganisms won't be able to catch up and the plants will continue down the road to of more chemical pesticides and herbicides.

Why use chemical pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers if there is any reason to believe that they can harm the environment and humans, especially when a natural and inexpensive alternative is available.

Books to further this research:

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Teaming with Microbes: A Gardener's Guide to the Soil Food Web by Jeff Lowenfels

The Organic Lawn Care Manual by Paul Tukey

The NOFA Organic Lawn and Turf Handbook: Beautiful Grass Naturally, a publication of the Organic Land Care Committee of the Northeast Organic Farming Association (NOFA), Connecticut and Massachusetts Chapters

Thanks to the University of Florida's Tropical Research and Education Center and its findings into the benefits of composting for farming, the agency had an angle to try to convince the farmers to step away from chemicals. Some of the University's findings included, successful competition for nutrients by beneficial microorganisms, antibiotic production by beneficial microorganisms, successful predation against pathogens by beneficial microorganisms.
http://www.cbsm.com/cases/innovative+uses+of+compost+using+microorganisms+instead+of+pesticides+for+farming_146

Pesticide Facts
www.chebucto.ns.ca/environment/RATE/pestfact.html

Pesticides around the home
www.clemson.edu/ipm/Curriculum_14pesticidesmodule.pdf

Pesticides in the Environment
<http://www.pested.msu.edu/Resources/slides/CoreManual/ch5A/ch5script.pdf>

Yards for Kids
City of Cedar Falls over the last three years developed a reduction plan which has saved nearly \$18,000 and 300 gallons weed killers.
<http://www.ceee.uni.edu/Home/Programs/Hometown/Hometown/YardsforKids.aspx>

Pesticide Reduction Initiative
www.smallparty.org/reducepesticides/faq/

Iowa Communities Keep Lawns Green Without Toxic Pesticides
http://www.beyondpesticides.org/news/daily_news_archive/2002/06_05_02.htm

Landscape Chemicals Banned across Canada
<http://www.panna.org/mag/spring2009/landscapae-chemicals-banned-canada>

Canada: New Pesticide Regulations in the Province of Ontario
www.buyusa.gov/canada/1180.pdf

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization:
Topic: Proposed statewide stormwater regulations
Comment: Please, place the complete package of the draft regulations from DCR concerning stormwater runoff from developed properties into our Environmental Comprehensive Plan as well as our DCSM for PWC.

Release Date: June 24, 2009

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: Gary Waugh, PR Manager, (804) 786-5045,
gary.waugh@dcr.virginia.gov

Proposed statewide stormwater regulations available for comment until Aug. 21

~ Series of public meetings begin June 30 ~

RICHMOND – Proposed changes to the state’s regulations regarding stormwater runoff flowing from developed properties are available for public review and comment. Five public hearings will be held statewide to receive comments on these changes, which have been more than three years in the making. Comments will be accepted through Friday, Aug. 21, 2009, by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation and the Virginia Soil and Water Conservation Board.

The proposed changes include provisions for establishing local stormwater programs statewide, a fee structure for the new local programs, and new water quality and quantity standards. Stormwater runoff from developed properties is the fastest growing and only increasing source of water pollution in the state. These stormwater regulation changes are being proposed in accordance with legislation passed by the Virginia General Assembly in 2004 and the federal Clean Water Act.

Rooftops, parking lots, sidewalks and streets do not allow rain water to soak into the ground. Stormwater runoff from these impervious surfaces picks up pollutants including nutrients, sediments, heavy metals, grease, oils and other toxics. These surfaces also greatly speed up the flow of stormwater leading to increased erosion with more nutrient and sediment pollution and destroyed aquatic habitats in nearby streams and lead to further degradation to waters

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

downstream. Stormwater also contributes to flooding.

“Enhancing these stormwater regulations is a key part of Virginia’s overall approach to improving water quality statewide and restoring the Chesapeake Bay, which includes pollution reductions from sewage treatment plants and farmland runoff,” said Joseph H. Maroon, DCR director. “Due to their importance we have already engaged in one of the most extensive efforts at having an open and publicly scrutinized process. We intend to carefully analyze all the comments we receive and the agency has a good track record of being responsive. Therefore, we continue to seek constructive input and comment from local governments, the development community and citizens at large.”

Several technical committees made up of representatives from local governments, developers, contractors and environmental groups have helped develop the proposed regulations. DCR conducted more than 50 public meetings. The Center for Watershed Protection and Virginia Tech were among the institutions that provided technical support and economic benefit analysis in developing the proposals.

For the first time, the regulations will result in local stormwater management programs in all localities statewide. Currently, local stormwater programs exist only in localities in eastern Virginia covered by the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, localities with populations of more than 100,000 people or a handful of other local governments that opted to have their own stormwater management programs. These regulations propose requirements for qualifying local programs and a fee structure that allows local governments to fund their programs.

They also revise water quantity and quality standards, including a more protective phosphorus standard for developed lands. Phosphorus is seen as a leading indicator of other potential stormwater-carried pollutants. In addition, the regulations increase stream channel and flood protection measures, promote the use of low impact development techniques and provide developers new methodologies, best management practices and off-site reduction options to help reduce costs associated with meeting the new regulations. The draft runoff standards are set at levels needed to help improve state waters and the Chesapeake Bay while still allowing for development to occur. The proposed rate of phosphorus runoff is not as severe as would be necessary to achieve a rate commensurate with a forested area, the land cover that would yield little or no impact.

[Click here](#) for more information on stormwater and links for viewing the draft regulations.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic: Native Plants

Comment: 1. Plant only Virginia native plants in PWC: no more alien ornamentals allowed to be planted in PWC. Coordinate an alien plant pull with volunteers that simultaneously plant natives in their place. No chemical pesticides: goats, and other natural methods to be used that are healthier and cheaper.

Research and the reasons for this ordinance to be placed in the Environmental Chapter of the PWC Comprehensive Plan:

Bringing Nature Home, Updated and Expanded: How You Can Sustain wildlife with Native Plants

2. Plant lists to be placed in the Environmental Chapter of the PWC Comprehensive Plan (Virginia native plants and non native, alien ornamentals):

Plant Invaders of Mid-Atlantic Natural Areas by National Park Service, U S Fish and wildlife Service

Alien Plant Invaders of Natural Areas
<http://www.nps.gov/plants/alien/>

Native Plants for Anne Arundel County, Md (they are the same as the native plants of Virginia)
<http://www.aacounty.org/IP/Resources/AANativePlants.pdf>

Virginia Native Plant Society
<http://www.vnps.org/links.htm#invasive>

Native Plants for Conservation, Restoration and Landscaping (for the Piedmont Plateau) www.dcr.state.va.us/dnh/

Native Plants for wildlife Habitat and Conservation Landscaping for the Chesapeake Bay Watershed by US Fish and Wildlife Service

3. Hire an Invasive plants Coordinator and a Virginia native plant coordinator <http://www.bugwood.org/news/post.cfm/hiring-an-invasive-plants-coordinator>

4. Start a PWC volunteer list to delineate, GIS and walk all wetlands,

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

forests, streams (perennial and intermittent), and 100 year flood plains, as well as current and future bike and hiking trails.

5. Every school in PWC shall have a Virginia native plant habitat for wildlife: to study nature on the school property, reduce stress of students and staff, and beautify landscape, to be created by the students using:

Homes for Wildlife: A Planning Guide for Habitat Enhancement on School Grounds...with appendices adapted for Virginia WILD School Sites, written and edited by Marilyn C. Wyzga, developed by the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department

Twenty/Twenty: Projects and Activities for WILD School Sites: An Ohio Project WILD Action Guide by the Ohio Division of Wildlife, written and compiled by Paul D. Schiff

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization:
Topic: Ordinances to incl in PWC's DCSM & Envi Comp Plan
Comment: Special Area Management Plans, Md and Ca
<http://www.spl.usace.army.mil/regulatory/samps.htm>

Maryland Heritage Areas Program
 recognize, certify and safe guard land and structures
http://mht.maryland.gov/heritageareas_certification.html

Anne Arundel County Regulations
 - Requires a 100-foot buffer surrounding the Critical Area
 - Places buffers around wetlands outside the Critical Area. A buffer's extent is defined from the top of the slope adjacent to the wetland boundary, and an additional 25-foot buffer for slopes of 25% or greater adjacent to wetland boundary.
http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Anne Arundel County, Md. reports
 Critical Area Violation Report, On-line Permit System, Approved
 Subdivisions(updated weekly), Subdivision Activity Maps, Subdivision Applications, Developers' Progress Meeting Schedule, Pre- submission Community Meeting Calendar, Modification Applications and decisions (waivers), Mapping: Engineeing Recoed Drawing Internet Website, Maps, Publications and Services, plats.net, property database search
<http://www.aacounty.org/landuse>

Land use: reports, mapping, useful links and forms
<http://www.aacounty.org/LandUse/Index.cfm>

Native plants for the Chesapeake Bay area, Anne Arundel County, Md
<http://www.aacounty.org/IP/Resources/AANativePlants.pdf>

Emergent (marsh) grasses application
<http://www.aacounty.org/IP/Resources/EmrgntGrasses.pdf>

List of local nurseries that offer plants native to the Chesapeake Bay region for native plant and conservation landscaping
<http://www.fws.gov/chesapeakebay/BayScapes/bsresources/bs-nurseries.htm>
<http://www.aacounty.org/IP/Resources/NativePlantNurseries.pdf>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Vegetation Management Plan

Guidelines for Completion of the Anne Arundel County Standard Vegetation Management Plan in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area or a Forest Conservation Area

http://www.aacounty.org/IP/Resources/Veg_Manage_Plan.pdf

Baltimore County, Md. Regulations

- Provides protection for buffers around streams, wetlands, and floodplains.

• Enforces the Critical Area law, providing a 100-foot buffer around all tidal wetlands.

• Requires a 75-foot buffer is in place around all "Use 1" streams, and a 100- foot buffer exists around "Use 3 or 4" streams.

• Established a 25-foot buffer around wetlands, floodplains, and erodible slopes.

• Principle buildings must be 35 feet from a buffer.

• Specifically pertaining to streams, the County prohibits the discharge of pollutants into streams including sewage, wastes, toxics, and high- temperature effluents.

http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Cecil county, Md. Regulations

- Enforces the Critical Area law, but has expanded the buffer width to 110 feet around the Critical Area.

- Mandates a 110-foot buffer around perennial streams, and

- No new subdivision building within a 100-year floodplain.

http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Charles County, Md. Regulations

- Established a Resource Protection Zone (RPZ) that encompasses an area based on the combined limits of the existing 100-year floodplain, non-tidal wetlands contiguous with or within 25 ft of a stream channel or 100-year floodplain, and a buffer. The RPZ extends 25 feet around included wetlands within development districts, and 50-100 feet around included wetlands outside of development districts. Minimum stream buffer widths include 100 ft for stream of "Order III" or higher, and 50 feet for intermittent streams of "Order I or II", measured from the stream channel.

- The RPZ may be extended by the County Commission to include adjacent hydric soils, erodible soils, steep slopes, Natural Heritage Areas, Wetlands of Special State Concern, threatened or endangered species habitat, other critical and significant wildlife habitat, and "Priority One" forested areas.

- The RPZ must be field staked and clearly delineated prior to clearing and grading activities within 50 feet.

- Land uses are prohibited inside the RPZ, including mining, dredging, filling, alteration of a stream bed, clearing of vegetation, and grading.

- Land uses permitted within the RPZ include agriculture with vegetative filter strips, timber harvesting, utilities (when no

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

- alternatives are present), non-motorized recreational trails, and
 - construction of single-family homes on lots platted prior to 1992.
 - Development occurring on land adjacent to an RPZ must obtain a
 - performance bond to cover possible damage to the RPZ during
 - construction.
- http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Hartford County, Md. Regulations

- Established a Natural Resources District that encompasses the perimeter of:
 - Slopes greater than 25% that are 40,000 sq.ft. or more;
 - A 75-foot buffer around nontidal wetlands;
 - A 150-foot buffer around each side of streams draining 400 or more acres,
 - A 75-foot buffer on streams draining less than 400 acres; and
 - A 50-foot buffer beyond the 100-year floodplain.
 - In the Natural Resources District, the following uses are prohibited; new mining operations, refuse, landfill, or solid waste disposal (except manure), alteration of a waterway except for best management practices.
 - Permitted uses in the District include; agriculture and forestry, as long as certain BMP's are met, utilities, and storm water management. Development in the Natural Resources District is allowed, providing impacts to sensitive areas are avoided, the 75-foot buffer around nontidal wetlands is not disturbed, and disturbance of steep slopes is only as necessary for roads and utilities.
- http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Kent County, Md. Regulations

- Enforces the Critical Area law.
 - Limits development and fill in the floodplain and minimizing any new building in the 100-year floodplain, and requires building elsewhere when alternatives exist. Additionally, no new subdivisions will be permitted within the 100-year floodplain. Floodways (that carry the flow of flood waters) are also protected against development or fill.
 - Development is also restricted in Coastal High Hazard Areas, where wind, wave, and tidal flooding impacts are a factor.
- http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Queen Anne's County, Md. Regulations

- Established the Resource Protection Area (RPA), placing restrictions on development in this area. The RPA includes 100% of rivers, floodplains, and wetlands, 100% of streams and buffer zones (80% in agricultural land), 60% of woodland acres (50% in agricultural land), and 100% of all steep slopes (>5%).
 - Enforces the State Critical Area law.
- http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Talbot County, Md. Regulations

- Established a 100-foot buffer around perennial streams, and a 50-

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

foot buffer around intermittent streams.

- Development is discouraged in the 100-year floodplain when alternative sites exist.

http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act and Program

Maryland Dept. of Environment

Maryland Agricultural Water Quality Cost-Share Program

Maryland Environmental Trust

Maryland Historical Trust

The Maryland State Programmatic General Permit

Migratory Bird Conservation Act

Migratory Bird Conservation Commission

Migratory Bird Conservation Fund

Forest conservation Act

National Environmental Policy Act

National Estuary Program

National Flood Insurance Program

Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (<http://www.nvct.org/>)

Near Coastal Waters Program

Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act

Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act and Program

Summary:

The Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act seeks to protect nontidal wetlands by regulating and restricting all activities that could impact nontidal wetlands or waters of the state. The Act also helps to insure "no net loss" in wetlands, by requiring mitigation or compensation for any wetland losses. The Act also has provisions for the structuring of a smooth and expedient application review process, for dealing with developments in wetlands.

Regulated activities include:

Removal, excavation, or dredging of soil or materials of any kind;

Changing existing drainage or flood retention characteristics;

Disturbance of the water level or water table by drainage, impoundment, or other means;

Filling, dumping, discharging of material, driving piles, or placing obstructions;

Grading or removal of material that would alter existing topography;

Destruction or removal of plant life.

Three aspects of Maryland law differ from federal regulation: isolated wetlands, the alteration of vegetation and hydrology, and regulation of a 25-foot buffer. Buffer requirements are expanded to 100 feet for "nontidal wetlands of special State concern". These wetland areas are designated by regulation and mapped as having exceptional ecological or educational value of Statewide significance.

The Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act allows for delegation of all or part of the State program to local governments and provides for the development of watershed management plans. Watershed management plans, developed in accordance with the Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act and the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR), can be used as the basis for regulatory decisions. The

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

plans are developed in cooperation with local governments and specifically protect wetlands by incorporating them into a jurisdiction's land use decisions. To date, watershed plans have been adopted for the Big Annesmessex River watershed in Somerset County and initiated in Baltimore, Calvert and Montgomery Counties.

Related laws/programs: Nontidal Wetlands Act & Program, Critical Area Law, Tidal Wetlands Act & Program, Maryland State Programmatic General Permit

Contacts:

Maryland Department of the Environment

Nontidal Wetlands Division

1800 Washington Blvd.

Baltimore, MD 21230

Phone (410) 537-8094

Fax (410) 537-8047

Links: MDE Wetlands and Waterways Program homepage

North American Waterfowl Management Plan

North American Wetlands conservation Act

North American Wetlands conservation Fund

Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program

Prince George's County Laws

Lead agency/organization: Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources

Summary:

Development is restricted in or near the 100-year floodplain. New subdivisions with land in the 100-year floodplain may not use floodplain land to meet minimum lot sizes, and residential buildings must be located 25 feet back from the edge of the floodplain.

Additionally, 100-year floodplain land in a subdivision must be designated as a floodplain easement, with restrictions on activities.

Floodplains to watercourses with less than 50 acres of watershed upstream may be excluded from identification of the floodplain area.

The County also mandates 50 foot buffer zones from each bank around perennial streams. This buffer can be extended to include the 100-year floodplain, slopes of 25% or greater, and erodible soils on slopes of 15% or greater. The 25 foot State wetlands buffer can also be expanded to include slopes of 25% or greater, and erodible soils on slopes of 15% or greater.

Related laws/programs: Forest Conservation Act

Contacts:

Montgomery County

Department of Environmental Resources

9400 Peppercorn Place

Largo, MD 20774

phone: 301-883-5390

Links: Department of Environmental Resources website

Program Open Space

Lead agency/organization: Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

Summary:

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Maryland introduced Smart Growth legislation during the 1997 session making Program Open Space the keystone for Maryland's new Rural Legacy Program (RLP). Maryland's first Rural Legacy Areas were announced in June 1998.

When a person buys a house or land, a small percentage of the state real estate transfer tax goes into a special fund for Program Open Space. This effort has resulted in the acquisition of more than 150,000 acres of open space for state parks and natural resource areas and more than 25,000 acres of local park land.

Program Open Space also administers the Waterway Improvement funds previously managed by the Boating Administration. The boating industry in Maryland, with more than 194,000 registered vessels, is one of the strongest on the East Coast, and relies heavily on state and local parks funded by Program Open Space and Waterway Improvement Fund grants.

Related laws/programs: Rural Legacy Program

Contacts:

Program Open Space

Tawes State Office Building E-4

580 Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401

phone: 410-260-8403

Links: Program Open Space homepage

Queen Anne's County Laws

Lead agency/organization: Queen Anne's County - Department of Planning and Zoning

Summary: Queen Anne's County has established the Resource Protection Area (RPA). The RPA includes 100% of rivers, floodplains, and wetlands, 100% of streams and buffer zones (80% in agricultural land), 60% of woodland acres (50% in agricultural land), and 100% of all steep slopes (>5%). Development is restricted in the RPA. The County also enforces the State Critical Area law.

Related laws/programs: Forest Conservation Act

Contacts:

Queen Anne's County

Department of Planning and Zoning

107 N. Liberty Street

Centreville, MD 21617

410-758-4088

Links: Queen Anne's County homepage

http://www.mde.state.md.us/Programs/WaterPrograms/Wetlands_Waterways/regulations/lawsandprograms3.asp

http://shorelines.dnr.state.md.us/state_local.asp

http://www.mde.state.md.us/Programs/WaterPrograms/Wetlands_Waterways/regulations/lawsandprograms3.asp

Wetlands and Waterways Program

http://www.mde.state.md.us/Programs/WaterPrograms/Wetlands_Waterways/index.asp

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

COASTAL BAYS WETLAND PRIORITIZATION METHODS:

In Maryland Coastal Bays watershed, we will consider all wetland restoration and preservation projects having interested landowners. This first sentence shall read: In the Prince William County watershed system, we will consider all wetland restoration and preservation projects before and after a parcel of land is to be developed.

Many of the Coastal Bays wetlands were drained historically for agriculture. In order to have the most cost-effective wetland projects, it is ideal to restore sites where little effort is required to obtain the wetland by restoring the hydrology. Major excavation is expensive and can be minimized in an area where the majority of land has an elevation near the water table, as found in most hydric soils in this region. Therefore, in the Coastal Bays watershed, we were able to select only sites with hydric soils and include the majority of the watershed. Adjacent to streams with no forest/wetland buffer (with pollutant source): Vegetated streams buffers improve water quality (through pollutant reduction and decreased water temperature) and provide a habitat corridor and food base for stream organisms. Streams adjacent to agriculture and developed land generally receive higher nutrient and sediment runoff than streams adjacent to naturally vegetated areas. We looked for inadequately buffered streams having an adjacent pollutant source (agriculture, barren, or developed land use). We made a stream buffer (150 ft similar to that used by DNR during the WRAS process) intersected with MDOP 2002 landuse (xtools) to get the landuse type within the 150 foot stream buffer. We selected portions of the stream buffer having urban, agriculture, or barren land. We then intersected this layer with our hydric soil layer to get only sections of the stream with urban, agriculture, or barren land within 150 feet of the stream on hydric soil (st150luh.shp). This method was employed in the WRAS characterization for IOW. We used the DNR Coastal Bays stream layer for this procedure. This layer does not include some of the small ditches (largely intermittent) but corresponds well with the orthophotos. The stream layer with the

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

detailed ditches (Tiner data) lined up very poorly with the orthophoto, so we were not able to use it for the GIS analysis (since in some cases, the drawn ditch was >40 meters from the ditch shown on the orthophoto). Many Coastal Bays wetland systems are discharge wetlands, with the water coming up from the water table. Additionally, most precipitation falling to this area infiltrates rather than running off the soil, so wetlands not directly along the stream may also benefit water quality. Wetlands having deep-rooted vegetation (e.g. trees) may be the most effective at removing nutrients from the groundwater. In many cases, wetlands created next to the streams will need to be built off-line to address actual or perceived reduction in upstream drainage.

PROTECTION

Priority 1 protection sites:

- Nontidal Wetlands of Special State Concern (NTWSSC) or proposed Nontidal Wetlands of Special State Concern (MDNR, 2004). Since all NTWSSC and proposed NTWSSC either have unique flora or fauna, or provide unique habitat, we ranked all NTWSSC and proposed NTWSSC as priority 1 for protection. We looked for NTWSSC or proposed NTWSSC that were not already protected. Within this priority 1 layer, we ranked these sites further. We wanted to protect wetlands that were surrounded by protected natural land, either currently or planned, since a large contiguous natural system is desirable for habitat function. For this reason, sites were ranked based on Green Infrastructure (GI), ecological surrounding land use (LU), and surrounding protected land.

Additional sites were added to priority 1 protection. These are all within or adjacent to designated Rural Legacy area and other protected land. Other considerations included:

- Wetlands within MDNR-designated Ecologically Significant Areas (ESA). We selected wetlands that were not yet protected that intersected (xtools) with the ESA layer.
- Within or adjacent to Green Infrastructure or corridor. Consider ecological ranking and

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

development risk. Look for remaining wetlands in high ecological ranking area.

- Adjacent to waterways or other natural systems (i.e. wetlands, hardwood forests).
- Areas identified by the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986
http://www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/wetlandswaterways/CB_MehTar.pdf

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic: Ordinance Web Info for Wetland and Forests

Comment: Maryland House Bill 1056, Environmental Matters (Delegate George at al.)
http://mlis.state.md.us/2008rs/fnotes/bil_0006/hb1056.pdf

Maryland state application fee:
http://www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/wetlands_application_fee.pdf

WASHINGTON COUNTY FOREST CONSERVATION ORDINANCE
REAL ESTATE TRANSFER DECLARATION OF INTENT

[http://www.washcomd.net/washco_2/planning/docs/REAL%20ESTATE%20TRANSFER%20DEC%20%20OF%20INTENT%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.washcomd.net/washco_2/planning/docs/REAL%20ESTATE%20TRANSFER%20DEC%20%20OF%20INTENT%20(2).pdf)

COMAR, Maryland state online, The Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR)
<http://www.mde.state.md.us/permits/comar.asp>

The new State of Maryland Stormwater Management Statute, COMAR 26.17.02:
(www.dsd.state.md.us).

The MDE stormwater Management Design Manual; the Design Manual is incorporated by reference into the new State of Maryland Stormwater statute and will be similarly incorporated into Cecil County's Stormwater Management Code:
<http://www.mde.state.md.us/environment/wma/stormwatermanual/>
The Clean Water Act: <http://www.epa.gov/epahome/laws.htm>

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE
CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
Refer to the SWM Guidance Manual
<http://www.ccgov.org/uploads/PublicWorks/WaterSewer/stormwater.pdf>

Non-Tidal Wetland and Waterway Permits, Approvals and Certifications
http://www.mde.state.md.us/Programs/WaterPrograms/Wetlands_Waterways/permits_applications/nontidal_permits.asp

Local government wetland protection programs- common questions

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

http://www.aswm.org/pub/6_localgov_6_26_06.pdf

Green Growth Tool Box (presentation to BOCS)
<http://www.ncwildlife.org/greengrowth/index.htm>

Section 4. Greening Ordinances
<http://www.ncwildlife.org/greengrowth/documents/Manual/GGTBsec4.pdf>

Quality growth
<http://www.georgiaqualitygrowth.com/ProcessExamplesSearch.asp?GetExample=350>

Urban growth boundaries
<http://www.georgiaqualitygrowth.com/ToolDetail.asp?GetTool=53>

Quality of growth assistance
<http://www.georgiaqualitygrowth.com/assistance.asp>

BUFFER PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE
(will save forested buffer)

Sect. 14-342, b,5 (changed to: Individual trees in the forest buffer may be removed which are in danger of falling (on), causing damage to dwellings or other structures, or causing the blockage of streams,)
 b, 1 clearly demonstrated that no other feasible alternative exists and that minimal disturbance will take place
<http://www.epa.gov/nps/ordinance/documents/A2a-Baltimore.pdf>

Maryland's State Wetland Conservation Plan Overview
http://www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/wetlandswaterways/section_i_overview.pdf

TURKEY CREEK WETLAND CONSERVATION EASEMENT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
http://www.tnike.com/pdf/turkey_creek.pdf

Maryland atlas of Greenways, water trails, and green infrastructure
<http://www.dnr.state.md.us/greenways/counties/somerset.html>

Benefits of wetlands (slide show)
http://www.naco.org/Content/ContentGroups/Programs_and_Projects/Environmental1/Water1/Benefits_of_Wetlands_Brochure_Web_withpagenumbers.pdf

Shifting the Focus of Wetlands Protection to state and local governments
<http://www.bdlaw.com/assets/attachments/197.pdf>

Wetlands: From my backyard to our bay (slide show)

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

http://www.cecilscd.com/pdf/4_Wetlands.pdf

Model Ordinances to Protect Local Resources
<http://www.epa.gov/nps/ordinance/misc.htm>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/15/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic: Conservation Landscaping Workshops and Charettes

Comment: Conservation Landscaping Workshops
Contact Carol Heiser-(to set up a workshop or pose questions)
Wildlife Habitat Education Coordinator
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
4016 West Broad Street, PO Box 11104
Richmond, Va 23230
804-367-6989
carol.heiser@dgif.virginia.gov

Richard Street- (worked for VDOT many years, wealth of information)
Environmental Engineer
Chesapeake Bay Division
Code Compliance Department
10304 Spotsylvania Ave, Suite 400
Fredericksburg, Va 22408
540-507-7426
rstreet@spotsylvania.va.us

Louis Verner, PH. D.-(he is also a wealth on information)
Watchable Wildlife Biologist
Wildlife Diversity Division
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
4010 West Broad Street
Richmond, Va 23230
804-367-1779
Fax 804-367-2427
lou.verner@dgif.virginia.gov

Natural Lands Trust
Hildacy Farm
1031 Palmers Mill Road
Media, PA 19063
tel:610-3535587
fax: 610-3530517
Ino@natlands.org
www.natlands.org

Further reading:

Arendt, Randall, 1996. Conservation Design for Subdivisions: A

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Practical Guide to Creating Open Space Networks, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Arendt, Randall, 1999. Growing Greener: Putting Conservation into Local Plans and Ordinances, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Arendt, Randall, 1999. Design Characteristics of Traditional Neighborhoods, Old and New, Chicago: American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report No. 487488.

Sustainable Landscape Planning
Conservation Design Forum, Inc.
http://www.cdfinc.com/images/download/sustainable_Landscape_Cost_Comparison.pdf

The Benefits of Better site Design in Residential Subdivisions, Article 46 - Feature article from Watershed Protection Technique. 3(2): 633-646

An Introduction to Better Site Design, Article 45
Feature article from Watershed Protection Techniques. 3(2): 623-632 - www.cwp.org

Alien Plant Project- to protect native plant habitats
The Virginia Native Plant Society (VNPS) and the Department of conservation and Recreation (DCR)
<http://www.vnps.org>
www.dcr.virginia.gov/natural_heritage

Native Alternatives to Invasive Plants
www.bbg.org/nativealternatives

VDOT, native flowers and environmental sites
<http://www.virginiadot.org/>

Commonwealth of Virginia
Managing Invasive Alien Plants in Natural Areas, Parks, and Small Woodlands
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
<http://www.dcr.state.va.us.dnh/>

Recommended Species for Enhancement of Aquatic Areas in Virginia
Recommended Native Trees and Shrubs for Virginia Wildlife
Louis Verner, Ph.D.
Watchable wildlife Biologist
Wildlife Diversity Division
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
4010 West Broad Street
Richmond, Va 23230
804-367-1779

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Fax: 804-3672427
lou.verner@dgif.virginia.gov

Nurseries Specializing in Native Plants
Virginia Native Plant Society (VNPS)
400 Blandy Farm Lane, Unit 2
Boyce, Va 22620
540-837-1600
www.vnps.org

Agroforestry
Working Trees for Water Quality
National Agroforestry Center
www.unl.edu/nac

Department of Conservation and Recreation
LID Product Order Form
"Reining in the Storm: One building at a Time:
"Low Impact Development: A Tutorial and Toolkit"
(DCR-199-168) (02/06)

Chesapeake Conservation Landscaping Council
Restoring our natural heritage...protecting our watersheds brochure
c/o Adkins Arboretum
12610 Eveland Road, PO Box 100
Ridgely, MD 21660

Low Impact Development brochure
Low Impact Development Center
301-982-5559
<http://www.lowimpactdevelopment.org>

LID National Manual
[http:// www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lidnatl.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owow/nps/lidnatl.pdf)
How does your Garden Grow? A guide for homeowners
<http://for.communitypoint.org/pages/LID.htm>
Bioretention Tour. See a rain garden near you!
<http://for.communitypoint.org/pages/LID.htm>

More information about LID is available at:

Friends of the Rappahannock
PO Box 7254
Fredericksburg, Va 22404
504-373-3448
cleanriver@pobox.com
<http://for.communitypoint.org>

Real Estate Strategies for Conservation
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

"We can never have enough nature." Henry David Thoreau, Walden, 1854

www.dgif.virginia.gov

Habitat Partners...an education outreach effort of the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries that promotes wildlife habitat enhancement

Farm Habitat

Schoolyard Habitat

Corporate Habitat

Habitat At Home

www.dgif.virginia.gov

or contact Carol Heiser

Habitat Education Coordinator

HabitatAtHome@dgif.virginia.gov

Virginia's Wildlife Action Plan brochure

"Humankind has not woven the web of life. We are but one thread within it. Whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves." Chiel

Seattle

www.BeWildVirginia.org

Virginia Wildlife magazine, \$2

subscription 1800-710-9369

www.dgif.virginia.gov

Organic Land Care brochure

A healthy choice for Families, pets and the environment

202-888-5146

www.organiclandcare.net

Organic Land Care Accredited Professional

How do I become a NOFA Accredited Organic Land Care Professional

www.organiclandcare.net

All natural swimming pool

www.toalhabitat.com

Kenaf-pollution control for petroleum

Thomas Jefferson-conservationist

Slanted bricks under the eaves of his roof to direct storm water away from the house and into his ornamental garden- vegetable garden

Safe Lawns- for a healthier planet

Non profit organization dedicated to promoting natural lawn care and grounds maintenance

<http://www.safelawns.org/>

Audubon Society

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Make your community more sustainable
Let us train your staff
Developer-develop with nature in mind
Green your school
Get your golf course certified
Become a green golfer
<http://www.auduboninternational.org/>

Ron Cloer of Gold Cup Designs
Let him design your native landscape and rain garden, mitigate storm
water and soil erosion with native plants
703-791-4450
rcloer@comcast.net

Organic Lawn Care and Landscape
Gerry Korsak of Mow Cow
703-425-5630
www.mowcow.com

Solar shingles
<http://www.newwayswiki.org/blog/2008/05/solar-shingles/>
<http://www.oksolar.com/roof/>
<http://www.fsec.ucf.edu/en/publications/html/FSEC-GP-171-00/>

from Cindy Patterson. 2008
cindy.patterson@mac.com

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/25/2009

Source: Email

Name:

Organization: MIDCO

Topic: Occoquan Protection Area

Comment: Environmental Chapter Recommendations From MIDCO

To expand on the previous correspondence sent to the Planning Commission on this subject earlier this month, we offer the following:

The conditions below are recommended for the newly formed Occoquan Protection Area, but most also pertain to the entire county.

Amend the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that natural open space resulting from cluster development is permanently protected.

Any wetland impacts must be immediately mitigated within the small watershed where the impacts occurred.

Limit any wetlands impacts within the Occoquan Protection Zone and prioritize preservation.

A groundwater study must be performed before further development is allowed.

Add a 15-foot additional buffer to currently required utility easements.

Encourage and incentivize solar technology, thermal heat pumps, passive solar, and other "green" technologies.

Do not allow clearcutting of development properties.

Encourage interspersions of trees into pervious areas.

Encourage use of pervious pavers.

Require enhanced erosion and sediment control during construction – mats, stabilization, better silt control and other protection.

Limit cut lines through tree roots (use trenchless technology).

Place public utilities outside of the buffers.

Develop a green infrastructure map.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

As stated before, these ideas are worthless unless tied to the DCSM, or Zoning Ordinance, or whatever method can be used to actually require actions to be taken rather than simply be recommended.

Date: 7/26/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization:
Topic: Safe routes to school for biking and walking
Comment: Develop safe routes to school for biking and walking.

<http://www.bikewalk.org>

Resources

Consult our Active Living Partners:

Active Living Resource Center provides technical assistance to create active communities.

Active Living by Design increases physical activity through community design.

Active Living Leadership works with government leaders to create and promote active communities.

Active Living Research investigates policies and environments to support active communities.

Active Living Network brings together leaders from a variety of organizations and disciplines to make sure health concerns become part of each groups' s agenda.

Active for Life delivers physical activity programs for adults age 50 and older.

Active Living Blueprint develops strategies to increase physical activity among adults age 50 and older.

Partners are available through the Active Living button on the NCBW web site: <http://www.bikewalk.org>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/26/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization:
Topic: Vegetative buffers
Comment: Cleaning and Protecting Water

Vegetative Buffers: The most effective protection for our water resources

The Problem

- how you can help

Polluted runoff—which occurs when rainfall, snowmelt, or irrigation washes pollutants such as sediment, nutrients, and pesticides into lakes, streams, coastal waters, and ground water—is the number one source of pollution to the waters of our state.

According to the DNR, polluted runoff degrades or threatens an estimated 40 percent of the streams, 90 percent of the inland lakes, many of the Great Lakes harbors and coastal waters, many wetland areas and substantial groundwater resources in Wisconsin.

Vegetative Buffers

Studies show that vegetative buffer zones are highly effective for controlling sedimentation, erosion, and pollution from runoff. Sedimentation occurs when excess soil particles accumulate in water bodies, which can suffocate organisms and reduce sunlight needed by aquatic life. Pollutants that are attached to soil particles are transported by sediment to the water.

Two common pollutants, phosphorus and nitrogen, cause excessive algae growth, deteriorate water quality, and can kill fish. Phosphorus and nitrogen are the basic nutrient elements of fertilizer.

Buffers trap sediment and allow phosphorus and nitrogen to filter into the soil, thereby preventing it from getting into the streams and lakes. Buffers also provide habitat for wildlife, controls stream temperature (critical to cold-water fish), and is a source for the organic matter needed by aquatic life.

Benefits Of Buffers

- Prevent streambank erosion

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

- Filter out pollutants and sediment
- Protect groundwater
- Improve aquatic habitat
- Improve wildlife habitat
- Protect against flooding
- Add natural beauty
- Shield agricultural fields and livestock from wind
- Prevent equipment rollovers near sloping shorelines and streambanks

Buffer Widths

The width of buffers is extremely important in controlling for sediment, phosphorus, and nitrogen. Scientific literature supports a minimum buffer width of 100 feet—with 2 more feet per 1 percent slope (Wegner, 1999).

Buffers are also more effective when they are contiguous and are accompanied by nutrient management plans to efficiently use nitrogen and phosphorus.

What Would The Rules Do?

The rules to control polluted runoff would require vegetative buffers: in new developments around lakes, streams, and wetlands; and during the construction of new projects.

Vegetative buffers are proposed as one option to maintain water quality corridors in agricultural fields.

The Clean Water Coalition's Position On Vegetative Buffers

The Clean Water Coalition supports the requirement of buffers and argues for wider buffers in order to maximize the gains from this practice.

The Clean Water Coalition supports a standard of 20 to 35 feet of buffer along navigable waterways with an additional 30 feet of conservation farming practices.

For new developments, the Clean Water Coalition supports the requirement of 50 to 100 foot buffers for all new developments and 150 feet for high quality water resources.

On transportation related construction, the Clean Water Coalition supports the requirement of 50 to 100 foot buffer zones.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 7/26/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic: Native Virginia plant communities

Comment: This wording shall be placed in the Environmental Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the DCSM and the Zoning Ordinance.

Native Virginia plant communities shall be the only plant species planted in PWC by staff, landscapers and developers on all development sites as well as all PWC area ways, and instilling our PWC residents in the intelligence of planting only native Virginia plant communities.

We shall have pamphlets and media ads to educate all of PWC to plant only native Virginia plant communities.

Not only will our county and residents save money by not needing to buy fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides to keep the native plant communities alive, we will also save time because native plants take care of themselves after the first year of planting.

We are also losing our migrating and native bird population due to the planting of alien ornamentals, as well as our butterfly populations. The alien ornamentals are not used as nesting sites and food sources by our native caterpillars which is our birds main food source during nesting and raising of their young.

Alien ornamentals displace our native Virginia plant communities because they have no natural enemies (insects, disease) with which to control their growth. Consequently, they have taken over vast areas where developers have stripped our land of native plants and where the developers have either left the land bare or actually planted alien ornamentals.

When we plant native Virginia plant communities we are bringing back the beauty that Captain John Smith saw when he landed in America.

When we plant native Virginia plant communities we shall be planting biodiversity which will sustain our bird, caterpillars, butterflies, and our oxygen supply. Biodiversity, planting many species of plants in one area, assures that no pest infestation will wipe out our vegetation. We may see 10% of leaves lost to caterpillars; a small price to pay (and not very noticeable) when you consider the reality

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

that monocultures (many of one plant in a small area) causes the use of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides which diminishes our quality of life, air, water and land.

And an added bonus to planting native Virginia plant communities will be; cleaner air, water and land. Trees collect air pollution in their leaves, wait for the rain to clean the leaves. The leaves gently filter the storm water through the leaves and the water will fall harmlessly to the ground where the storm water can slowly percolate into the soil to replenish our groundwater while the roots of the tree absorbs gallons of storm water from every storm event. The trees slow the flow of storm water so that the water can gently filter through the soil which cleans the water and at the same time replenishes our ground water and aquifers. The trees clean our air by taking in CO₂ and giving us O₂. In this same process (photosynthesis) we also receive clean water from the tree in the form of water vapor.

We will once again be able to sit back and enjoy our gardens instead of wasting our time and money spraying chemicals.

We will once again enjoy the abundance of song birds that eat our insects so we don't need chemicals and we will have once again given balance to the ecosystem that has sustained us before we started allowing developers to bury our biodiversity under impervious surfaces and destroying our land and polluting our water.

Here are some web sites and books that explain, in more detail, the realities and devastation of alien ornamentals:

Lepidopteran Use of Native & Alien Ornamental Plants
<http://udel.edu/~dtallamy/host/index.html>

Alien Plant Invaders of Natural Areas
<http://www.nps.gov/plants/ALIEN/fact/llya1.htm>

Natural Landscaping: Designing with Native Plant Communities
http://books.google.com/books?id=fmajmru4g98C&dq=native+virginia+plant+communities&printsec=frontcover&source=bl&ots=aOHKoGxHKP&sig=oe6a0O3JmS4UMzryNphpip7XW34&hl=en&ei=GhsSv6RK5CSMfSYhfkG&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=8

Native Plants for Conservation, restoration and Landscaping
www.dcr.virginia.gov/natural_heritage/nativeplants.shtml

Native Plants for Wildlife Habitat and Conservation Landscaping in Maryland
<http://www.nps.gov/plants/pubs/nativesMD/info.htm>

Native Plants for Wildlife Habitat and Conservation Landscaping
www.nps.gov/plants/pubs/nativesMD/pdf/MD-CoastalPlain.pdf

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Bringing Nature Home: How You Can Sustain Wildlife with Native Plants, updated and expanded
by Douglas W. Tallamy

Teaming with Microbes: A Gardener's Guide to the Soil Food Web
by Jeff Lowenfels

The Organic Lawn Care Manual: A Natural, Low-Maintenance System for a Beautiful, Safe Lawn
by Paul Tukey

Date: 9/2/2009

Source: Email

Name: Joe Newberry

Organization:

Topic: Green Technologies

Comment: Request consideration of incorporating "green" technologies where fiscally responsible and justifiable.
Within developed areas, build/maintain natural habitat environments and route to/from to encourage wildlife to remain or occupy.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/9/2009

Source: Email

Name: Robert S. Fields

Organization:

Topic:

Comment: The proposed changes to the Prince William comprehensive plan will

1. Significantly limit the inherent right to use private property without draconian government regulations. This is a government "taking" of much of Prince William County.

2. Drastically lower the value of "raw land". Developers will reduce the amount paid to the landowner due to increase in costs.

3. Increase the taxes of Prince William County residents. These changes will assure full employment to those Prince William County employees who will have to review and monitor the new "green initiatives". Call me cynical, but these are the same people who helped write the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Fields

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mike Kitchen
Organization: Brentsville
Topic:
Comment: Engineer perspective... LID and Bioretention, lots of restrictions; Need DCSM changes; Encourage infiltration; By limiting sewer in RPAs, you lose ability to get gravity sewer system and harder to maintain; Sewer easements as trail system opportunities; To get rid of sprawl, consider density credits - max out in certain areas and may encourage structured parking for economic reasons; Cluster development to max out density in certain areas, where you can; By developing in rural area, you end up saving more resources; Sewer lines, near streams maybe best option; Occoquan Forest development as example.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Truett Young
Organization: Stanley Martin
Topic:
Comment: Expansive soils, slope failures - way to deal with them and mitigate - refer to Fairfax County; Do not exclude ability to develop these areas (case-by-case); Expansive soils should not even be in Environment chapter - idea? (more of a building issue, and not relevant in this chapter); clarify meaning; Consider map for non-permeable soils.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Granville-Smith
Organization: Classic Concept Builders / NVBIA
Topic:
Comment: Proposed text destroys ability to work with citizens and consider feedback; Properties that utilized land features through proffers to minimize development such as Classic Oaks, Classic Springs; Flexibility is crucial; If in absolutes, harder to achieve results; Clustering is not always the answer and needs to be case by case; No clear incentives to preserving environmentally sensitive features; Predictability is lacking in chapter; Citizen input is critical; Less restrictive and more guidance-oriented; Performance-based review; ECA information, not always relevant?; Reward developers who go extra step so they could afford to really develop.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Eddie Byrne
Organization: Byrne Consulting
Topic: Viewsheds
Comment: As newly defined, adds "natural" component; Need more specificity; Hard to define; If regulatory, hard to do without inventory; Careful with terms - viewsheds (what it means and seems subjective)

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Lorie Whitacre
Organization: Burgess & Niple
Topic: Brownfield Redevelopment
Comment: Page 13, AS 7 - reword to encourage brownfield redevelopment.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Marian Hamamo
Organization: Master Naturalist/ PWC Trails & Streams
Topic:
Comment: More citizen input; Not getting enough publicity; News and broader media; People are not "getting it"; Need to get more to participate; Reach out to the public; No easy way to find information on website.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Martin Jeter
Organization: MidCo Civic Association & PW Conservation Alliance
Topic:
Comment: Watershed Overlay Areas - very important; been on books for a while; Need to set priorities, limits and finite timeline; Citizen Committee is good idea; E & S and development controls - enhanced levels of controls; Need to research latest controls and improve process; More binding language, to better implement; Consider groundwater study in MidCo area? Look at capacity, usage; 100' buffer on intermittent and perennial streams; REZ online with details and better notification of changes and revisions; Economic growth should target areas that need revitalization - Triangle area and other work-live areas; Stronger protection for resources; County should and can do more than Federal or State government.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Bob Simon
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic:
Comment: Nothing about seriously protecting environment; Mitigation should be included in CBPA; Need absolute protection, not just suggestion; Search for money to apply to ideas; Look for ways to afford environment protection; Really want several citizen organizations to be integral part of development process; "Smart Growth" (change term - attempt to change environmental assets into development ?); What are most valuable things in our lives - ask ourselves this; Let County citizens know what environmental measurements are and track them; Outlaw clear-cutting; Look at land first; Consider system for sewage treatment, waste into biofuels (conversion) - PWC Service Authority should consider application of these.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Eileen Sheridan
Organization:
Topic:
Comment: Need more citizen input through information technology; Development applications should be put on website for citizen comments/input, prior to public hearings; More details earlier in process for input.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: George Rhodes
Organization: Williamsburg Environmental Group
Topic:
Comment: Clearer definitions of terms; (will provide specific e-mail); Perennial streams, consistency needed; Forest definitions; Look at perennial flow scoring criteria (25 points); Significant streams, better defined through scoring criteria (14 points); Critical slopes criteria - mapping issues and how will this be implemented; Page 13, AS 1 - What does an impact to slope mean?; What is the mitigation? -standard E & S practices, onsite mitigation (in reference to wetlands/stream impacts - contrast to Army Corps of Engineers procedures) and conflicts with approach; "require", "shall", "encourage", "support" - need to better balance out.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Mark Headly
Organization: Wetlands Studies & Solutions
Topic:
Comment: General comment... People like well-defined terms... There are lots of new definitions, and should make effort to define terms; (will send more info); Streams - 2 types of perennial; 2 kinds of wetlands definitions - (need only 1); Ways to measure success & progress... Resources to create maps, mapping resources and staff?; Policy #3, buffer on a buffer...? Conservation areas - not clear; Policy 6, #4 - Density credit approach, like Fairfax County; Policy 8, 100 foot buffer (buffer on buffer); Mitigation options - leave to Feds and not Prince William County; Wetlands creation should follow Federal policy; (Conway-Robertson example)

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Julian Russell
Organization: Citizen & Bristow Opposition
Topic:
Comment: Still don't see way for citizen direct involvement; What input gets passed onto County; Transparency of government; Need to remove disconnect with citizens and development process; Citizen participation to directly be involved and protect resources; Need specific language for citizen empowerment and need to be part of process; Lots of words in draft that do not require action, i.e., "encourage"... need more action-oriented language with commitment.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Greg Ayre
Organization: Citizens for Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic:
Comment: Stronger language in plan - shall, should - not encourage, consider, etc; Need more action; Specific standards needed for canopy cover; Take out jargon and spell out critical slope area; Page 13 - Intermittent streams; Legal perennial stream? Underwater storage systems for stormwater collection - not wanted in County; Consider non-jurisdictional wetlands?; Prince William County could have authority; Page 5 - Resource Protection Area, need to define; Stream mitigation - need policy for monies to stay within Prince William County for this purpose; Page 26 - within 500' of reservoir (waterway) area - need to broaden definition; Page 33 - add wind, solar, etc...

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Karen McReynolds
Organization:
Topic:
Comment: How does intent provide for continued economic growth? Compromises needed, then to provide ways; Some may be fearful to engage in conversations; In making standards in Prince William County, need to encourage density tradeoffs; Continue to look at economic component; Energy section - new chapter, maybe better to be separate? Sustainable development, broader contexts; Consider property rights issues (more info to be emailed); More clarity on cluster development.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Sherman Patrick
Organization: Resident of PWC; NVBIA Representative
Topic:
Comment: PWC very diverse, environmentally-speaking; Huge variety of soils, terrain, etc; Can't broadbrush regulations; Need diverse regulations that are appropriate to property issues and factor in County's variety; Viewsheds more of a quality of life issue; Should emphasize metrics/benchmarks in technical appendix to establish and present baseline; Focus on problem trying to solve and what is being resolved; Prioritization needed and must happen; Impervious areas - parking areas (high schools, largest areas); Public uses also should be subject to same requirements; Public education is key; Hard to get information and resources; ECA submissions; S.M.A.R.T. = Strategic, Measurable, Attainable (affordability), Realistic, Time sensitive... Need prioritization of maps/info; VDOT - infrastructure maintenance issues/largest developer; Need clear criteria for decision-makers.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Stacey Sutton
Organization: citizen
Topic:
Comment: Policy 10, page 23, #5 - loves section!; Rewrite where developers cannot have mitigation options; New development next to existing development that is out of compliance - track; Policy 13 - new trees planting and criteria; Environmental comments be entered into staff report and posted online.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Daun Klarevas
Organization: Christopher Consultants
Topic:
Comment: More clarification on definitions for wetlands and streams; EN Policy 1, EN Policy 3 and EN Policy 5 - 100' buffer off of conservation area may be too limiting; 100' buffer should be from feature or property line? LID applications, consider soils; EN Policy 8, Action Strategy 5 - What about existing structures; EN Policy 9 - compact parking, but need to consider SUVs; 100' buffer on non-RPAs; (will e-mail more); Watershed management as priority.

Date: 9/10/2009
Source: Community Input Meeting
Name: Al Alborn
Organization: Citizen from Coles district
Topic:
Comment: Public policy; Use technology to make process easier and more visible; Capture more through e-technology; Forests mostly contained in 10 acre lots or less; Need to protect small wooded lots; Preservation of wooded areas; EN Policy 13 - native plants could be emphasized; Should be more into standards - mathematic modeling; Use Federal/State agency modeling to predict impacts of development in Prince William County.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/11/2009
Source: Email
Name: Alan Alborn
Organization:
Topic: Feedback on Aug 26, 09 draft
Comment: Kim,

Per our conversation, here's the suggestion we discussed.

I attended a course called "The Woods in your Backyard" sponsored by VCE a couple of years ago. One of the things that I learned was that 42% of the forestland in the United States is owned by private families and two-thirds of these forest landowners own 10 acres or less (source: VCE class, The Woods in Your Backyard). I also believe that the presenter stated that 70% of Virginia's forests (not including Federal land) are on lots 10 acres or smaller (although I couldn't find a specific reference). In any case, these smaller lots represent a significant percentage of our woodlands and have a significant impact on the environment and the watershed.

I suggest that the Environment Chapter Update to the Prince William County Comprehensive Plan address this issue by creating a vision for land management strategies for working with owners of these smaller lots to encourage land management practices such as minimal clearing and cutting, RPA buffer area protection, and natural succession (to a native woodland environment) to name a few. I would guess that most owners of small parcels of woodlands are unaware of the implications of land management decisions concerning their property.

For example, the County recently passed a policy that grass on lots of two acres or less not be allowed to grow higher than twelve inches. This is contrary to good land management and watershed practices and perhaps should be revisited. I would suggest that the lot size be reduced to a more typical urban lot size one-fourth acre or less. We need to encourage land management practices that restore natural succession of lots that are two acres or more in size.

Comments:

1. The Woods in your Backyard is a course developed for owners of 10 acres of property or less in the Mid-Atlantic region. It is based on a book by the same name. I would suggest this book would provide excellent guidance for crafting a vision and perhaps policy for encouraging owners of small properties to implement land management practices favorable to the environment and the

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

watershed. I would suggest the Prince William County (perhaps VCE) consider sponsoring a recurring offering of this course.

2. I use the term Natural Succession to refer to Clement's theory of succession. According to Clement, succession is a process involving several phases culminating in the development of a stable (or climax) community. In the context of this suggestion, undisturbed land will evolve through several phases until it eventually returns to a natural state (which, in Virginia, tends towards woodland). H. H. Shugart's book, *A Theory of Forest Dynamics*, provides additional information.

Regards,
Al
Alan P. Alborn

www.alborn.net

To see what I'm up to, check my blog at <http://alborn.blogspot.com/>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/11/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Smith
Organization:
Topic: water quality
Comment: Planning Commissioners

I apologize for not being able to attend the meeting last night regarding the Comp Plan Environment Chapter. I wanted to share my thoughts. As you all are aware, Prince William County will not meet the 2010 goals for the Chesapeake Bay. The Bay will not meet its water quality goals, its nutrient goals, or sediment reduction goals. Thus, a very expensive TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) will have to be written for the Bay. We will be paying for our past poor land development practices.

But, we have an opportunity to avoid this in the future!

The new Environment Chapter is stringent, but for very good reasons. I encourage you to approve responsible development and to preserve land that will protect our future water quality. Please don't be a push over for the developer interests.

Currently at George Mason University, I'm working on a federally funded NOAA project, where we're teaching every 6th grader in Prince William County about cleaning up stormwater runoff at their school and neighborhood. Our goal is to empower teachers and students to participate in stewardship projects that benefit water quality in the Bay.

One child recently asked me, "Why are WE always having to clean up streams, didn't they used to be clean? How come the government lets people build so much stuff that makes the water dirty?"

I encourage you to think how you would respond to this 6th grader.

You can put tough development standards in place now or let the land be developed without them and pay for the clean up later. I'd rather see the tough standards and minimize future clean up efforts (even if it costs more).

Thanks for listening.

Cindy Smith

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/11/2009
Source: Email
Name: Alan Alborn
Organization:
Topic: Feedback on Aug 26, 09 draft
Comment: I found the Environment Chapter Update Community Input Meeting to be a worthwhile investment of my time last night (Thursday, 10 September 2009). After pondering the input from the other attendees, I would like to add the following suggestions.

This document contains a lot of references to science without any attribution as to the source. The entire document (including definitions) should be properly attributed so those who use it may investigate the scientific source for specific recommendations. Recommendations that lack a referencable scientific basis should probably be dropped as they fall into the category of a subjective recommendation.

As you know, I am a Virginia Extension Service Master Gardener and a Virginia Master Naturalist. When advising or teaching the public, Master Gardeners and Master Naturalists may only give out research based recommendations based upon the labs at Virginia Tech. It occurred to me that perhaps you might want to send a draft of the Environment Chapter to Virginia Tech for review. Prince William County should provide only research based advice to its citizens and developers.

I would suggest that references to research based standards be inserted in the document (with a summery on intent) rather than actual standards. Environmental science is continually evolving. For example, we know that storm water management practices from just a few years ago were found to do more harm than good. While developers should have approved best practices "grandfathered" (unless significant risk is subsequently identified), I would suggest that they be directed to the latest science on the subject under consideration vice a "snapshot" standard that may quickly become obsolete.

The Virginia Extension Service, particularly its Environmental and Natural Resources section, is the logical interface between the County and Virginia Tech. As you know VCE provides training to citizens and local businesses on a number of environmental issues we discussed last night on subjects such as Storm Water Management, watershed management and protection, rain gardens, yard maintenance techniques (proper amendmets), etc. They should have a role (perhaps a lead role) in Prince William County's Environment Chapter and its implementation that leverages their existing knowledge base, infrastructure, and volunteers.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

I would suggest that future Environmental Chapters be implemented as an on-line knowledge base that points citizens and developers to the latest science instead of developing a hard copy document. This would actually reduce costs as a Knowledge base could be maintained in real time often transparently as research that it links to is updated. I would propose this be considered for a wide range of Prince William County documents to transition from annual hard copy production exercises to real time knowledge based guidance. This could be part of a wider ranging business process re-engineering project to move the County permitting process on-line. Commercial experience indicates that, over the long run, this would reduce time (which is money to PWC businesses) and costs (to PWC).

Representatives from the developer community (Mark Granville-Smith's comments particularly come to mind) remarked on the unique nature of each property and the fact that perhaps this document as written actually causes more problems than it solves. I would propose that the knowledge base approach would allow Prince William County to access the specific science for specific situations to ensure that our environment is protected while protecting the county business interests.

I would also propose that before this document be subjected to a feasibility analysis via scenario exercises with developers before is published in its final form. In the technology world, this is called "use case". Simply put, developers bring scenarios to the Planning Commission to test the Environmental Chapter update. Developers and the planning commission then walk through the Environmental Chapter update using these scenarios to determine if a given set of guidance (or the entire document) is feasible (i.e., if it really works in a real world environment.) Results of use case analysis are used to refine the document to ensure it meets the needs of potential consumers.

Thanks to all of the folks on the Planning Commission for their efforts.

Regards,

Al

Alan P. Alborn

www.alborn.net

To see what I'm up to, check my blog at <http://alborn.blogspot.com/>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/15/2009
Source: Email
Name: Cindy Patterson
Organization: Citizens of Davis Ford Quality of Life
Topic: Priorities for the environmental plan
Comment: Honorable Ms. Hosen,

Here are the six priorities for the environmental plan from the Citizens of Davis Ford Quality of Life:

1. The plan needs standards to protect our environmental resources. These standards should be developed for each of these concerns.
 - The County needs to develop standards to protect non jurisdictional wetlands.
 - The County needs to develop and adopt clean water standards to protect our streams, creeks, rivers and reservoirs.
 - The County needs to adopt clean air standards.
 - The County needs to develop standards that protect specimen and champion trees.
 - The County needs to develop and implement standards that support a protection of the PWC tree canopy.
 - The County needs to develop standards that protect natural species and their ecological systems.
 - The County needs to develop standards that prohibit clear cutting.
2. The County should have an Ombudsman who can enforce the standards of the environmental section and insure that any mitigation that is necessary, stay within the property effected or, at the very least, within the County.
3. There needs to be more should and shall in the document. The Citizen's Committee "should" be established not just encouraged.
4. Developers plans and rezoning issues need to be posted to the PWC website when they are received. This should be several weeks before they are formally presented to the Planning Commission or the BOCS. At this point there is no need for the planning staff summary. The summary can follow on its normal schedule. Citizens should be encouraged to review the plans, provide comments, and communicate to the Citizen's Environmental Committee, directly, who will insure that citizen's comments are presented in writing.
5. There shall be a physical walk of each parcel of land scheduled to be rezoned or approved for development and the walk must be

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

conducted by the Citizen's Environmental Committee, at least one member of the Planning Department and the Developer before the request is presented to the Planning Commission.

6. There shall be a requirement for a tree canopy evaluation annually. A baseline must be established and the Planning Department must provide reports to the Planning Commission and BOCS.

7. All streams shall be evaluated each year by the Citizen's Environmental Committee and at least one member of the Planning Department.

Detailed Comments

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/17/2009

Source: Email

Name: Marian Hamamo

Organization:

Topic: Comments on Aug 26, 09 draft

Comment: I think you have done an excellent job on your first draft of the update.
My comments and suggestions follow:

1. All abbreviations should be preceded by the full text. For the most part this has been done but not in all cases. For example - DSCM.

2. The document should be double checked by a complete novice to any environmental issues and terms and definitions added at the top. I didn't know what Level Spreaders in EN-Policy 8 #10 were.

3. The document does mention creating public education materials, websites, etc in a couple of places. This is great, however, I think these programs need to be advertised through news coverage through the regular Local News Stations and Newspapers. Marketing is everything.

4. It would be good if there could be some sort of monetary incentive offered for existing homeowners to make the expenditure to make changes to improve the environment. I think that each section of the document should be reviewed with this in mind. For example, a rain garden, or replacing an impervious driveway with a pervious one.

5. I would like to say make it illegal to fertilize, pesticide and fungicide you lawns but I realize that that would be a bit extreme. However. an educational blitz of some kind telling people.

1. fertilizing is not necessary if you don't collect your grass clippings as the grass clippings make natural fertilizer and also hold the moisture.

2. don't cut your grass any shorter than 3 1/2 inches. This will shade the roots and keep the weeds down.

3. In the fall, instead of fertilizing with chemical fertilizers that run off into the streams and get into the ground water supply, go to the landfill and get some compost and spread that instead
That is all I can think of right now.

Thank you.
Marian Hamamo

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/17/2009

Source: Email

Name: Mike Kitchen

Organization:

Topic: Comments on Aug 26, 09 draft

Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the proposed changes. I'd like to provide the following as a summary of my comments:

1. My primary concern is that many of the proposed changes promote not only the preservation of sensitive areas but will also encourage sprawl by reducing the density of both commercial and residential projects. If a proposed project preserves sensitive areas, why then punish them by reducing density and FAR? Developers should be rewarded by being able to calculate density based on the original site area; bonus density should even be considered in some cases. Specific sections related to this that need to be revised are EN-6, #4, EN-12, #1 and #3.

2. EN-1, #2 - I support the proposed changes to the requirements for an Environmental Constraints Analysis that were discussed at the meeting with NVBIA and Commissioners Holley and Hosen on 9/15. More information up front is always helpful, but the cost to obtain such information should also be considered.

3. EN-3, #1 - Cluster development should absolutely be encouraged. However, changes need to be made to the Zoning Ordinance to make it a flexible and attractive option as I describe above. Flexibility in lot size and frontage could allow reductions in impervious area.

4. Allowing sewer in the rural area could assist in allowing clustering, minimize disturbed area and protect reservoirs (see EN-12, #6). Occoquan Forest was brought up as a good example of development, but this project could not be built today under the proposed rules regarding disturbance of slopes, proximity to reservoirs, stream buffers, etc. Much of Lake Ridge would also fall into this category.

5. EN-4, #8 - allowing runoff to filter through buffer strips is an excellent idea, but the DCSM requires curb, which will prevent this. Need to amend the DCSM to encourage this.

6. EN-6, #7 - the DCSM needs to be amended to allow more flexibility in the use of low impact development techniques. It is currently too restrictive as to where they are allowed, how they are built and what needs to be provided in terms of easements, access,

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

etc.

7. EN-6, #8 - sewer must be allowed to remain in RPAs. Pushing them out of the RPA will require the use of many pumps throughout the county, greatly increasing energy use and maintenance costs. Also, sewer easements in RPAs can be used for trail routes.

8. EN-8, #3 - encouraging higher standards for SWM is currently being considered by DEQ through an update of the state stormwater management regulations.

9. EN-9, #5 - making structured parking a requirement for rezoning applications will absolutely stop commercial development in PWC. At a cost of \$15,000 or more per space and considering the lease rates in the county, there is simply no financial incentive for it. Allowing much higher densities than what are currently permitted in certain commercial areas might have sufficient impact to make some structured parking financially feasible, but it simply will not work under the current ordinance.

10. EN-10, #5 - proposing to protect "headwaters" with 100 foot buffers will essentially put the entire county into a buffer. Drainageways as small as roadside ditches can be considered headwaters. This requirement must be eliminated.

11. The entire viewshed section needs to be reviewed. A viewshed is a very general term and can mean many different things depending upon the person and the point of view (literally). Also, what is this information going to be used for.

Thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to provide input.

Michael Kitchen

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/17/2009
Source: Email
Name: Henry Bibber
Organization:
Topic: Comments on Aug 26, 09 draft
Comment: Draft Environment Chapter, Comments and Suggestions

As an advocate of strong policies for protection of the County's natural environment and its cultural resources, I believe that the changes proposed in the draft are very positive. I offer the following comments and suggestions at this time:

Definitions:

Page 4: Suggest the following definition for "legally perennial stream:"

CBLAD Perennial Stream: A body of water designated as perennial based upon a scientifically valid system of in-field indicators approved by the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department. A stream that scores > 24 points in the County's approved Perennial Flow Determination (PFD) Process.

Page 4: Suggest the following definition for "jurisdictional wetland:"

Jurisdictional Wetland: A wetland that has been determined by the U. S. Corps of Engineers to have the characteristics that require it to be placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

Page 4: Comment - Retain the proposed definition in the draft for "wetland." A "jurisdictional wetland" is a subset of "wetland." There is no conflict here, except in the minds of those persons who do not want to recognize the existence of non-jurisdictional wetlands.

Page 6: AS 4 - Suggest that the language that is proposed to be eliminated is needed, although it may fit better in another location.

Page 13: AS 2 – Suggest that this strategy be reworded as follows:

Amend the DCSM to require identification of all areas with shrink/swell soils and marine clays. Permit construction on such soils only if appropriate measures are taken to prevent foundation problems and only if such measures do not cause significantly increased clearing and grading over what would be required on stable soils.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Page 14: AS 9 – Suggest expansion of this strategy by adding “including increased buffer widths ” in an appropriate location.

Comment – It has become clear that the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance is not adequate in sensitive areas, especially where there are steep slopes. Increased buffer widths are another means to protect our watersheds during and after development.

Page 15: AS 2 and AS 3 – Suggest expansion of this strategy by adding “transport” after the word “store.”

Comment – Pipelines, if they break or leak, are a land use that can have potentially devastating impacts on downstream land uses and watersheds.

Page 20: AS 1 – Suggest that “steep slopes” be restored to this strategy or placed in a similar strategy.

Comment – Steep slopes (15% and greater) are the cause of much of the failure of existing BMPs to prevent soil erosion. Steep slopes should also be very important constraints on densities, because steep slopes result in greatly increased grading. Steep slopes provide an excellent rationale for clustering. Please do not eliminate the need to reduce densities where steep slopes are present.

Page 22: AS 1 – Suggest that this strategy be re-worded as follows:

At the time of rezoning or special use permit, any wetlands on the subject property should be designated for preservation rather than elimination. Where destruction of wetlands is unavoidable, require mitigation within the County, backed by financial assurances, such as bonds or cash escrows.

Comment – We need to strengthen the idea of protection of our wetlands. The term “mitigation” sounds nice, but the truth of the matter is that a mitigated wetland is a destroyed wetland.

Page 23: AS 3 – Suggest that this strategy be re-worded to read as follows:

At the time of rezoning or special use permit, the approved plan of development should show how wetland areas found on the subject property will be preserved and buffered, both during and after development, so that the wetlands will retain their functionality over the long term.

Page 23: AS 5 – Suggest that the word, “wetlands,” be placed after the word “streams” so that the sentence reads as follows

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

“ . . significant non-RPA streams, wetlands and headwaters areas . . ”

Comment – Wetlands require a buffer as well as the other mentioned features.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft.

Henry G. Bibber

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/17/2009

Source: Email

Name: Daun Klarevas

Organization:

Topic: Feedback on Aug 26, 09 draft

Comment: First, I would like to commend many of the good ideas within the proposed environmental section of the Comprehensive Plan. However, are those ideas logically sound and effective?

1. The definitions of Legally Perennial Stream, Perennial Stream, Significant Stream, Jurisdictional Wetland and Wetland should be revisited.

2. The mentioning of "limits of disturbance" on Page 5, EN-POLICY 1: 2.i.; and Page 14 and 15, EN-POLICY 5:13 and 16. The limits of disturbance are not typically determined until the final design phase of a project. Efforts are already made to minimize the limits of disturbance. On many occasions, we have performed significant redesigns in order to preserve specimen trees and cultural resources.

3. Page 8, EN-Policy 3: 3. No structure within 100' from conservation and preservation areas. This needs to be re-evaluated. There are two projects that I have worked on that 50% of the site was preserved in either preservation or conservation areas. If this proposed "buffer" does take effect, those sites would become undevelopable. This will cause the economic value of those properties to depreciate tremendously.

4. Page 18, EN-POLICY 6: 7. Encourage innovative stormwater management techniques. This is a wonderful idea. However, it has not been fruitful. On one project site, 6-7 LID structures were designed. Unfortunately only 3 were able to be constructed due to the poor infiltration on site.

5. Page 20, EN-POLICY 8: 4. What about 2-year storm?

6. Page 20, EN-POLICY 8: 5. What about enhancing/retrofitting existing structures for BMP controls that won't increase water surface elevations as to not damage wetlands?

7. Page 21, EN-POLICY 8: 8. The use to construct stormwater wetlands is a good idea. There may be public concern that these wetlands will be another breeding ground for mosquitoes and other unwanted pests.

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

8. Page 22, EN-POLICY 9: 4. 30% compact car parking. However, we all know when you try to park your car in one of these spots there are always a huge SUV parked in a compact car space next to you. Or at times you cannot even park in a compact car space, because a big truck or SUV is hanging over the spacing lines.

9. Page 22, EN-POLICY 9: 5. Structured Parking is not economically feasible in a majority of locations.

10. Page 23, EN-POLICY 10: 5. 100-foot buffer on significant non-RPA streams. Again, better definition of significant stream. A property owner may have an ephemeral stream on their property. If they need to have a 100 buffer on either side of that stream that property owner may not be able to build a home, garage or storage shed. This will drive down the economic value of that property.

11. Page 25, EN-POLICY-11: 11. Reducing lawn areas? In order to conserve on water, perhaps you should eliminate irrigated lawns or have PWCSA meter the irrigation lines and have those at a higher rate. Perhaps better public education or have HOAs revise their covenants in regards to landscaping.

12. Page 27, EN-POLICY 12: 8. Will this task be fulfilled by the County, Service Authority, Virginia American Water, Dale City Service, etc.?

13. Page 34, EN-POLICY 17: 7. This is another great idea. However, not all people want to see wind turbines and solar panels in their neighborhoods.

14. Viewsheds – shall be removed out of the Environmental section. From what standpoint are the viewsheds to be considered. For example, Manassas Battlefield is clearing trees to have it resemble what it looked like during the Civil War. Buildings, roads and etc. that were previously not visible from the Battlefield are now within view. Should an adjacent property owner or one within view be limited on what he can develop on his property because it is within view? Viewsheds are in contradiction with the utilization of wind turbines because the wind turbines will be within a viewshed.

Please note that items 3, 10 and 14 will depreciate property value due to the fact that the property may become undevelopable. This will adversely impact County tax revenue.

Thank you.
Daun

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/22/2009

Source: Email

Name: Gail Burda

Organization:

Topic: Comments on Aug 26, 09 draft

Comment: After reading the goals of this Chapter, I will be very happy if the details of the Chapter seek to fulfill these goals. I am particularly concerned about the loss of natural areas as a result of development. I live in Lake Ridge and see around me examples of housing developments that were developed in a manner that preserved much of the natural surroundings. The current practice of clear-cutting sites before building makes me very sad. No amount of replanting can ever make up for the loss of mature trees and wildlife habitat. Sports fields and golf courses should not be considered natural areas.

Gail Burda

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/22/2009

Source: Email

Name: Martin Jeter

Organization:

Topic: SRR

Comment: I attended the town hall meeting last week, and was mostly pleased with the meeting. I like the fact that the county is making an active attempt to reach out to the citizens of the county, and I think the end product will be better because of it.

I had one concern, however, and that was during the discussion of the SRR, or semi-rural residential classification of the county Comprehensive Plan. It was stated by staff that the current language is confusing in that the density is recommended to be in a range of from one to five acre lots, with an average of 2.5 acres per home over the entire re-zoned parcel. That language seems pretty understandable to me, but I didn't have the opportunity to ask staff where they feel the confusion lies.

I realize that we're under constant pressure to increase density, since more density means more dollars for developers, but I hope as a county we're not being misleading about what the motivations are for proposed changes to the plan. We already have the ability to cluster lots under the current language, and we can strengthen environmental protections during the Environmental Chapter update, so a change proposed and championed by the chair of the Northern Virginia Building Industry Association that increases (more than doubles) density under the guise of increased environmental protection and "simplifying the language" should be very carefully evaluated and presented to avoid misinterpretation. Thanks.

Martin Jeter

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 9/23/2009
Source: Email
Name: NORTHERN VIRGINIA BUILDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
Organization:
Topic: Comments on Aug 26, draft
Comment: Please click on the link below to view comments from NVBIA.
<http://www.pwcgov.org/docLibrary/PDF/10914.pdf>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 10/7/2009

Source: Email

Name: Cindy Patterson

Organization:

Topic:

Comment: Thank you all for placing these practices into the Environmental Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. Because of your diligence in saving and cleaning our environment, Prince William County will again be the leader for all of Virginia.

I was honored to attend the Virginia Water Monitoring Council 2009 Conference. They have updated information to pass onto interested counties like us.

No longer allow developers to place retention ponds off site of their development. It is dangerous and unsightly for the undeveloped site being used. One retention pond to hold storm water for 4 different developments is making our county look like pot holes with fences. Let storm water detention ponds be a thing of the past.

There are numerous ways to keep storm water on site. Let the developer decide what is best for the site as long as the water stays on site. If the developer decides not to retain the storm water on site then a fee should be imposed. Incentives to retain the storm water on site should be given: the more practices, the more incentives. If the water does leave the site, there are plenty of ways to clean the water before leaving the site and, again, the developer should have incentives to clean the water.

Vegetation should be counted and documented before and after the development of the site, so the water quality will be the same. Incentives should be given to those developers that retain the original vegetation or replace the vegetation 100% with mature native species.

Vegetation should be left on site during construction, so that violations will be minimized due to sediment run off during storm water events.

I learned that water is more valuable to the developer if they keep

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

the water on site and use it in innovative ways. Storing the storm water on site for future use and in drought situations for vegetation.

Maintenance is needed no matter what methods of storm water management techniques are chosen. They can be just as cost effective as our current retention ponds. And we all know that the citizens of Prince William County bear the burden of the maintenance costs of those ponds, not the developer.

The time is now to prevent storm water flooding and blown out streams. The developers may complain but they should know that these water saving practices will make money for them if they apply them to their building sites. Employers want these practices and will rent office buildings with native plants and rain gardens, as well as the myriad of other practices to save storm water so that they and their employees can enjoy a little green in their work day.

The Tower of Babylon kept their storm water run off in site and grew their fruits and vegetables on and next to the building.

Our modern day parking garages and parking lots can be the storm water management for development sites.

Here are some examples:

www.thcahill.com/unc.html

www.chesterfield.gov/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id

Low Impact Development (LID) practices help retain as much stormwater as possible on the land.

<http://www.lowimpactdevelopment.org/lid%20articles/lid%20fact%20sheet%20050207.pdf>

Project Review & Evaluation Criteria for Proposed Development Projects

<http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/vwmc/March2009Conference/ProjectReviewEvaluationCriteriaforProposedDevelopmentProjects.pdf>

A Local Board's Experience with Civil Charges and Penalties

<http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/vwmc/March2009Conference/VAWetlandsReport2006%20LocalBoardExperience.pdf>

Stormwater Resources

<http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/vwmc/March2009Conference/StormwaterResources.pdf>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Stormwater-Related Resources on the Internet

<http://www.vwrrc.vt.edu/vwmc/March2009Conference/StormwaterRelatedResourcesontheInternet.pdf>

Thank you once again for cleaning our air, water and land by saving our trees and RPAs,

Cindy Patterson

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 10/7/2009

Source: Email

Name: Al Alborn

Organization:

Topic: Action Items

Comment: Action items from Citizen/Staff Site Review meeting, Oct 05, 2009

Place in Comprehensive Plan, DCSM and Zoning Ordinances (to speed up process for Development Services) :

Storm water management

- place incentives to keep water on site
- site plans complete as to how SWM implemented
- before Development Services receive plan
- will expedite implementation of plan

Soils: hydric, low pH, marine clays, etc

- documented for counties permanent records
- independent of developer
- paid for by developer
- possible volunteers by citizens

Historic site assessment, (language from Jan Cunard)

Preserve historic cemeteries, buildings and archeological sites

- permanently and in writing

Water movement: above and below ground

- needs to be documented on site before review process

Vegetative native plant hedge rows on site plan

- between industrial, residential and school sites
- verify length, width, maturity of vegetation on site plan
- 200 foot rule for public hearing notices
- distance needs to be extended to include nearby residences
- eg. residents need knowledge of industrial sites nearby
- lettering of signage needs to be larger

Tree preservation laws written into Zoning Ordinance

- no need for waivers of DCSM to save trees (less work for staff)

Maintain vegetative level of site

- preserve or replace vegetation with equal maturity

Stream monitoring program

- documented before development and after
- sedimentation #1 problem

Before application is looked at by PWC staff

- see civic association of that area,
- to help assess site and impediments
- (local groups from each district know how to assess site better because they live there)

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

- When shall applicant go before citizen review, triggers:
- road change
- shift in SWM that allows more flow and polluted water off site
- not paying SW inspector
- changing any proffers
- location or relocation of facilities
- moving buildings to new location on site
- more?

Place native plant vegetative hedge row buffer between industrial, residential and schools

- for privacy and health
- native plants clean air, water, land
- place in Comprehensive Plan, DCSM, and Zoning Ordinance
- need to specify how wide, long and mature a buffer
- permanently protect hedge
- impact study
- may approve something different
- remember 7 yrs ago, classic bait and switch
- look at proffers statement, not at all what was shown us
- eg. walmart on route 1
- insist on proffer that they come back for public hearing, true blue test

Look at variances for Zoning Ordinances

Look at waivers for DCSM

eg. Cherry Hill, 1600 acres

- storm water management mishandled
- land loss from erosion
- stream damage
- front road was changed
- after BOCS approved of first plan
- citizens did not approve of different traffic pattern
- no ability to comment after the change
- before road was built
- marine clays
- highly erodible soils
- Possum Point severely impacted, flooding
- proffers- look more closely
- eg. would only build a road if so much traffic were measured on already built roads
- gave developer ability not to build road
- LOCCA recommended denial
- were local citizens heard
- Experts, environmentalists not listened to

Frustrating process for citizens input

- last minute changes between Planning Commission and BOCS meeting

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

- citizens study applications before they go before BOCS
- applicant changes plan without citizens knowledge
- citizens can not give wisdom to BOCS
- citizens have incite to impacts of plan in their community
- need friendly outreach process for citizens
- between legislative process and site plan process

Check all property for cemeteries and historic buildings and archeological findings (value of site increased by permanently preserving history)

- entire site, not just new building footprint
- building footprints get moved before being built
- historical buildings and cemeteries are destroyed in the process
- because entire site was not checked
- history of flooding cemeteries
- site graded straight down
- need better wording in our legislative process
- developers need to know how to grade around cemeteries properly
- to prevent flooding and erosion
- preserve historical buildings permanently
- on site or by moving to another site
- developers to pay for preservation
- penalized for accidental harm
- preserve cemeteries on site permanently
- developers to pay for preservation
- penalized for accidental harm

All Planning Commission meetings to be televised

Before applicant can go before Planning Commission or BOCS site plan must include:

- where storm water run off will occur
- what they are going to do about SWM
- water movement under the ground
- before land is disturbed
- estimate of water movement after land disturbance
- soil type with pH
- list of vegetation on site before site plan implemented
- size, maturity and scientific names
- will save developer time and money in long run

You will always be tweaking the engineering of site until final site plan, it takes no more time and money to at least check water movement above and below the property as well as soil type and vegetation on site to maintain vegetative level and maturity to be duplicated on site or preserved to save money for developer, so an equal standard can be set for site and save a step for Development Services.

develop policy whereby any waivers, etc of DCSM or variances to

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Zoning Ordinance have to be included in public hearing process

all waivers and variances to be listed on web site for public access during review process

place site plans on internet for public access
can read staff comments on line already
need maps to go with comments

need to understand application process

Significant changes in law, according to Va code, need proffer amendment

Things that do not need proffer amendment

- still needs citizen input
- impacts their quality of life
- need to know if what is submitted to BOCS for approval
- changed after the approval process
- not just staff level

Date: 10/14/2009

Source: Email

Name: NAIOP

Organization:

Topic: Comments on August 26, draft

Comment: Please click on the link below to view comments from NAIOP.

<http://www.pwccgov.org/docLibrary/PDF/11021.pdf>

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 11/6/2009
Source: Email
Name: Janet O'Neill
Organization: Rinker Design Associates
Topic: Aug 26 Draft comments
Comment: Click on the link to view comments:
www.pwcgov.org/docLibrary/PDF/11120.pdf

Date: 11/10/2009
Source: Email
Name: Mike Rolband
Organization: NAIOP / NVBIA
Topic: Comments on Oct 14 -09 Draft
Comment: Click on the link to view comments
www.pwcgov.org/docLibrary/PDF/11128.pdf

Environmental Chapter Update Comments

Date: 1/25/2010
Source: Email
Name: Kate Norris
Organization: PWC Soil and Water Conservation District
Topic: Env Draft
Comment: Click on the link to view comments
www.pwcgov.org/docLibrary/PDF/11590.pdf