



Northern Virginia Regional Commission

Phone Log

Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2003
Subject: TMDL IP Conference Call with Parks People

- **Introductions**
 - Kate Bennett - VA DEQ
 - Howard Herman - Falls Church Parks
 - Kirk Kincannon - Alexandria Parks
 - Howard Hudgins - Arlington Parks
 - Lalit Sharma - Alexandria Environmental Quality
 - Paul McCray - Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority
 - Bill Hicks - NVRC

Goals for conversation

1. **Introductions**
 2. **Background of the project**
 3. **Project approach as it relates to pet waste**
 4. **Current efforts in the watershed**
 5. **Upcoming meeting - Expected Tensions**
- **TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Implementation Plan**
 - **1972 Clean Water Act**
 - **Set Standards,**
 - **Report Impaired Waters,**
 - **TMDLs**
 - **Consent Decree 1999**
 - **1998 list by 2010**
 - **Water Quality Monitoring Information & Restoration Act**

Four Mile Run

- Four Mile Run Listed in 1996 (303(d))
- Bacteria Source Tracking / DNA 2000
 - BST 12.9% Canine and 17.9% Human
- TMDL Study (Accepted by EPA 2002)
 - Water Pollution Budget
 - 4th Scenario of Reductions
 - Wildlife of 95%
 - Anthropogenic by 98%
- TMDL Implementation Plan
 - Phased Approach
- Implementation Plan
 - 10-year timeframe
 - To leverage the efforts already underway and to fill in gaps where they exist with new or enhanced efforts
 - 3-pronged strategy
 1. Pollution Prevention - At the source
 2. Mitigation Measures - In Drainage
 3. Indirect - Outreach / Education
 - As it relates to Pet Waste
 - Pollution Prevention
 - 7 - Sanctioned Dog Parks
 - Could more dog parks be located? Privately?
 - Could dogs be kept from the water?
 - Could we add bags and receptacles to all parks?
Other urban areas?
 - Mitigation Measures
 - Could BMPs be retrofitted to existing sites?
 - Indirect
 - Could we have Pet Waste Campaigns?
 - Could we add signage to our dog parks?
 - Could the Pooper Scooper Laws laws be strengthened?
 - Could enforcement be tightened?

- Could laws like Alexandria's that disallow pet waste from being disposed of in trash cans be changed?

Needs:

1. Current Ordinances
2. Think about the current efforts already underway
3. Discuss what opportunities there may be that we could commit to in the next ten years.

Discussion points raised during the call:

- Most dog parks are barren. Turf is not expected in the parks. Arlington has tried mulch and stone dust as surface materials.
- As Alexandria does not have sponsoring civic groups for their dog parks the entire burden of maintenance falls on city staff. As a result of the current budgetary situation, Alexandria is considering eliminating the purchase of bags distributed at dog parks for dog waste disposal. In Arlington, the County supplies a "mailbox" in the dog park for people to place their grocery store bags for reuse in collecting the pet waste. The only county cost for this effort is the cost associated with the occasional replacement of the mailbox.
- Falls Church has no dog parks but does provide bags and receptacles in all of their parks. The Arlington dog park in Benjamin Banneker park is thought to be used by Falls Church citizens.
- The W&OD has a leash rule but not scooper rule. Bag dispensers are available in the park as are receptacles.
- Glen Carlyn Park will likely be the park most concerning citizens when discussing access of dogs to the water.
- Do dogs actually defecate in the water? Yes (Bill Hicks related personal account.)
- In general, park users are thought to be responsible for picking up after their pets. How about dog owners on private property?
- The Alexandria Parks and Recreation Commission has proposed buffers between future dog parks and waterbodies.

- Arlington would be interested in retrofitting BMPs (sandfilters) into dog parks. How could funding be sought? Grant funding (EPA 319 nonpoint source funding?)
- Most of our Community Canine Areas are up to our current standards, but we know we have room to improve. This would be a good time to start looking at possible upgrades to those standards and to weigh the costs and potential benefits
- No dog parks are likely to be considered for the W&OD Trail as there is really too little land and because siting such parks would likely mean siting them close to the stream.
- Outreach should be considered important. Park "pick up" events could be orchestrated. In Arlington dog parks this is really inherent in the manner in which they are managed. Because each park has a sponsoring group that group is responsible for such activities. Rarely does the county have to prompt the sponsoring group to perform such "pick up" activities.
- Arlington has a new enforcement tool. Park staff can cite an offender regarding any park regulation, e.g. in park after hours, off leash, etc. The first offense results in a written citation. The second offense results in the offender being banned from all county parks. In Alexandria, the City has deputized many of their park rangers and officials who can now issue \$100 to \$500 citations.
- Public messages should be issued through the local websites and publications. (Alexandria has a trimester publication, Falls Church has a weekly section in the local paper and a quarterly publication) It would be good if a regional effort could be made to coordinate messages through the Public Information Officers.
- There is a Friends of the W&OD group that may be willing to participate with this issue.
- Dog parks are thought to be a part of the solution to reducing bacteria levels in the run.