

# ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY CONSERVATION COMMISSION

c/o Department of Environmental Services 2100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 705 Arlington, VA 22201

March 28, 2017

Mr. Charles Monfort, Chair  
Four Mile Run Valley Working Group  
c/o Arlington County Board  
2100 Clarendon Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22201

Dear Chair Monfort:

The Environment and Energy Conservation Commission (E2C2) is pleased to participate in the Four Mile Run Valley (4MRV) Working Group, specifically to speak on behalf of environmental objectives consistent with the Working Group Charge related to the design and development of the 4MRV project area. For the purposes of this letter, one important objective from the Charge is #10, which states:

“10) Identify opportunities and incorporate best practices for stream restoration and preservation within Jennie Dean Park and adjacent open spaces to re-naturalize and integrate the Four Mile Run stream through habitat and stream bank enhancements, stormwater and flood plain management improvements, lookouts and access, and adjacent active and passive recreation and community gathering spaces;”

Based on conversations at the March 15, 2017 meeting, E2C2 strongly urges the Chair to formally request that Department of Environmental Services (DES) staff present additional information regarding the environmental conditions and constraints of 4MR within the study area during the April 4, 2017 Working Group Meeting and subsequent Working Group meetings as required. Such information should be conveyed prior to the narrowing of options and the County Board Work Session.

E2C2 believes that the Working Group and consulting team would benefit from the expertise of DES staff regarding current stream conditions, environmental constraints, and possible opportunities. Specific topics include Resource Protection Areas (RPAs), floodplains and floodway capacity, stormwater treatment, riparian buffer, erosion control, stream bank stabilization, and stream restoration, as well as how all of these could impact design elements of the Park and Area plans. This information is critical to the Working Group as it evaluates the location of major park components, such as the Shirlington Dog Park and diamond fields, in order to avoid surprises and design changes later down the road.

While there are many questions and follow-up questions that have been discussed by various Working Group members, E2C2 supports the requests from Adam Henderson and Edith Wilson in their email dated March 16, 2017. In addition, E2C2 requests that the following questions and topics be addressed at the April 4, 2017 meeting:

- Environmental conditions, regulatory triggers, and constraints stemming from County policies that affect any aspect of the 4MRV study area, including but not limited to the Shirlington Dog Park and diamond fields.
- 4MR stream restoration needs and plans, including relevant components of the 4MR Master Plan and 4MR Design Guidelines.
- Any County staff concerns about the environmental impacts at the Shirlington Dog Park.

Other questions and concerns that have been raised by various members of the Working Group are provided in Appendix A. These questions are by no means comprehensive and are not representative of the entire Working Group, but attempt to lay the groundwork for thoughtful conversation as we continue to discuss realistic possibilities for the Park Master Plan and Area Plan.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Christine Ng". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Christine Ng  
E2C2 Chair

Cc: Caroline Hynes, 4MRV Working Group Vice-Chair  
Robin Stompler, 4MRV Working Group Vice-Chair  
Richard Tucker, CPHD Staff Liaison to the 4MRV Working Group  
John Vihstadt, County Board Liaison to the 4MRV Working Group  
Christian Dorsey, County Board Liaison to E2C2

**Appendix A**  
4MRV Environmental Questions

1. What improvements can be made to the stream and stream banks in the following three Dog Park scenarios:
  - 1) Leave the Dog Park as-is.
  - 2) Make modest changes to the Dog Park.
  - 3) Relocate the Dog Park.
2. If the Dog Park were left as-is:
  - Would this restrict stream bank improvements? If so, to what degree? How would that impact the County's environmental commitments and permits?
3. If the Dog Park were relocated:
  - Where would it go, what size, and what configuration?
4. What are the relative costs and benefits of required efforts given the three Dog Park scenarios?
  - RPA mitigation
  - Stream bank stabilization and erosion control
  - Floodplain management
  - Stormwater management
  - General operations and maintenance
5. What are the RPA rules and guidelines? How will they impact design elements of the park and area plans?
6. How does the County typically address development in RPAs and floodplains, both on County-owned and privately-owned property? What are relevant aspects of County policy and plans?
7. What activities would require permitting and/or exemptions from County Board?
8. How do stream characteristics and restoration requirements vary along the study area?
9. What are the County's best management practices for stream restoration and naturalization?
10. What are the County's plans for stream restoration along the entire study area, including the Nauck Branch?
11. Would any stream bank restoration projects qualify for funding through the dedicated stormwater fund by contributing to the objectives of the MS4 permit?
12. What are the pros and cons of locating active recreation areas closer to/further from the stream?
13. What is the impact of artificial turf fields on stormwater mitigation requirements?
14. What in-bank flood capacity has to be maintained in the study area? Is that regulated by or reviewed by the Corps of Engineers or by FEMA?