
From: Jones, Bryan [bryan.jones@deq.virginia.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Robb, Jaime Bauer
Subject: Fwd: Secondary Impacts Discussion
Attachments: 19-2036_Potential Secondary Impacts Map.pdf

Jaime,

I asked about secondary impacts to wetlands at one location at Project Tiger and Timmons has provided this initial response. I have discussed with Jean and Justin, and we all agree that this response sounds logical and generally acceptable, but none of us had accepted a secondary impact proposal/response like this in the past. Our biggest concern was how it would get written into the permit documents and depicted on the impact map. There was also concern with setting a precedent across the state and if this was a type of response that other regions could accept as well. However, I do think that this is a bit of a unique situation given the changes that occurred with this delineation in the last 5 months and the fact that the potentially secondarily impacted wetlands being reviewed here were not even included in original confirmations.

Anyways, I'd be interested to discuss this with you when you have time. I've included Timmons' initial response below and attached an impact map that identifies the area in question. I have also drafted language in applicable permit documents (**highlighted in turquoise**) where secondary impacts may be addressed for you to review to see how I anticipate it being included in permit documents. These documents are still very much in rough draft mode, but they at least give some idea of the general text and format.

U:\Permit - Water\WVP Permits\INDIVIDUAL PERMITS\19-2036 Project Tiger - Airpark Site\Permit Docs

Thanks!

Bryan Jones
Environmental Specialist
Virginia Water Protection Program
Department of Environmental Quality | Piedmont Region
4949-A Cox Road | Glen Allen, VA 23060
P: (804) 527-5074 | F: (804) 527-5106 | E: Bryan.Jones@deq.virginia.gov
www.deq.virginia.gov

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Matt Neely** <Matt.Neely@timmons.com>
Date: Tue, Dec 17, 2019 at 10:28 AM
Subject: Secondary Impacts Discussion
To: Jones, Bryan <bryan.jones@deq.virginia.gov>

Bryan

The discussion below outlines what we were thinking:

1. In accordance with 9 VAC 25-210-80 B 1.h, please provide detailed information describing how the remaining wetlands up gradient of Impact 22 will not be secondarily impacted as a result of this project. Will remaining surface waters still receive adequate hydrology post construction?

While there is certainly a decrease in the contributing drainage area to the confluence point with the main wetland system which would result in secondary impacts from the pre-development to post-development condition, the area immediately upland of the hammerhead wetland pocket itself is being reduced in a linear fashion along the drainage divide. There is no major contributing area being cut off, it is more so tightening up and reducing in size. Therefore, direct rainfall to this pocket in the post-development condition will still maintain some hydrology within the existing system. See Pre and Post Flow Calculations exhibit for rational method peak flow comparison at the confluence point. Peak flow will be reduced by approximately 40% as a result of the proposed development surrounding the wetland system (Peak Flow 1 = $(2.5/4.20) = 40.5\%$).

As such, the applicant proposes compensatory mitigation for 40% of the secondarily impacted area, which would result xxx acres (xxx square feet) of impacts requiring the purchase of xxxx compensatory mitigation credits, which has been included in Figure 5: Preliminary Jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. Impacts Map and Wetlands and Waters Impacts Table, as well as the Required Mitigation Table.

Matt Neely, PWD

Senior Environmental Project Manager

TIMMONS GROUP | www.timmons.com
1001 Boulders Parkway, Suite 300 | Richmond, VA 23225
Office: 804.200.6369 | Fax: 804.560.1648
Mobile: 757.329.0573 | matt.neely@timmons.com
Your Vision Achieved Through Ours

To send me files greater than 20MB [click here](#).