

The following is a list of issues with specific recommendations which address process concerns and landowner burdens without substantially reducing the water quality benefits of the draft ordinance. Issue numbers, descriptions and references are based on the CBPO Stakeholder Issues Matrix.

#	Issue Description	Recommendation	Rationale & Considerations
1.	How should the RPA be mapped?	<p>Option 3. Offer property owners the option of having County staff conduct site-specific RPA delineations for single family detached dwellings, associated accessory structures and agricultural structures.</p> <p>Option 6. Use the RPA as currently mapped and require additional RPA delineations for specified application types (e.g. ZMAP, SPEX, SBPL, CPAP, STPL, specified grading permits)</p>	<p><i>Reduces or eliminates the cost of RPA delineation for existing landowners. Would likely require additional resources, to include a wetland specialist, which would have budget implications.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to development properties are extensively evaluated already so this would not be a major hardship or cost factor; RPA mapping is a required practice in neighboring jurisdictions so it is not an unexpected or unusual practice.</i></p>
2.	Should the RPA be removed adjacent to wet ponds?	Option 1. Retain the current draft Ordinance and create a simple, streamlined and standardized process for all existing homeowners with RPA to eliminate hardships.	<i>A single process to eliminate hardship for all homeowners with RPA would also address the needs of lot owners next to stormwater ponds.</i>
5.	Should accessory residential structures be exempt from the CBPO requirements?	Option 3. Exempt residential accessory structures in the RPA with a cumulative footprint and disturbance of up to 150 sf per lot inclusive of existing accessory structures in the RPA.	<i>For most affected homeowners, this takes out the predominant cause of hardship and eliminates the element that is hardest to enforce for the County.</i>
9.	Should the grandfathering policy require previously approved projects to meet the CBA regulations to the “greatest extent possible” or the “extent practicable?”	Option 3. Amend the current draft Grandfathering Policy to read “extent possible.”	<i>This represents a compromise initially sought by the development community and follows Fairfax County guidelines, a standard already working in our neighboring jurisdiction.</i>
27.	Should buffer encroachments be authorized in the Rt 28 Tax District and other designated areas targeted for economic development?	Option 1. Retain the current draft Ordinance.	<i>Waivers, exemptions, permitted uses and exceptions should take care of the needs for commercial uses to encroach into the RPA without blanket authorization.</i>
33.	Is 100-foot buffer necessary in all circumstances? Should the buffer be reduced or increased based upon scientific data?	Option 1. Retain the current draft Ordinance (100-foot buffer).	<i>35ft buffers are inadequate to provide the desired benefits. 100 ft buffers with waivers and exemptions are a simple &amp; cost-effective way to provide variability based on existing conditions and construction hardships.</i>
39.	Simplify the current draft Ordinance and related processes to the extent possible.	<u>Guiding Principle</u> : Any modifications that are made to the Ordinance should be done without major impacts to the water quality benefits.	<i>The Ordinance is for the purpose of water quality and the public benefits should not be sacrificed for the purpose of simplicity.</i>

We also agree with the initial resolved issues list: Item 4 (Option 2), 19 (Option 1), 24 (Option 2), 29 (Option 2). Outside of the outlined recommendations above, we support the Planning Commission recommendations for the ordinance.

## Value of 100 Foot Buffers

### Comparison of Buffer Widths and Effectiveness

The Effect of Different Size Buffer Zones on Potential Reductions of Sediments and Nutrients from Field Surface Runoff  
(from Lowrance, R., et al, Water Quality Functions of Riparian Forest Buffer Systems in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, 1995)

Buffer Width Ft	Buffer Type	Sediment Reduction %	Nitrogen Reduction %	Phosphorus Reduction %
15	Grass	61.0	4.0	28.5
30	Grass	74.6	22.7	24.2
62	Forest	89.8	74.3	70.0
75	Forest/Grass	96.0	75.3	78.5
95	Forest/Grass	97.4	80.1	77.2

<sup>1</sup>Percent reduction = 100 x (Input – Output)/Input

Source: Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay  
Attachment 6 Riparian Forest Buffers  
Linking Land and Water, p. A-6-9

