Kingstowne Public Information Meeting
Park Master Plan Revision and Dam update
August 9, 2011

Welcome and Introductions:

Supervisor Jeff McKay, Lee District Representative
Sandy Stallman, Manager, Park Planning Branch, FCPA

Presentation: See full presentation at:
http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/plandev/downloads/kingstowne_pim080911.pdf
Meeting Purpose and Park Planning Process Review- Sandy Stallman, FCPA
Site information and background- Pat Rosend, FCPA
Dam Repair Update- Paul Shirey, DPWES

Public Questions and Discussion:

What problems is the County trying to solve with the dam repairs?
The county is looking for opportunities to gain stormwater treatment locations in the county to be positioned for changing State and Federal requirements (MS-4 Permit and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). These mandated requirements provide increased protection to water quality in the local and Chesapeake Bay watersheds. . There may be an opportunity at this site in conjunction with repairing the dams, to capture additional untreated stormwater improving the quality of the downstream waters. Repairs will also help to stabilize and improve the performance of the other existing ponds and wetlands.

Why preserve the lakes? What is the function of the ponds?
There is a community interest in restoring the lakes back to their original condition.
Ponds four and five were original features of the gravel pit at the site prior to the Kingstowne development. They were used on-site for gravel operations. Over time the ponds had become established as a wildlife area and natural preserve. Restoring the lakes would return this habitat and allow for public use of the footpaths around the ponds and through the stormwater and park areas. The ponds may also be able to serve as a regional stormwater facility with some improvements.

Why has there been such limited public input on the dam failures?
A meeting was held with the adjacent homeowners to apprise them of the repairs. The meeting tonight is the first public meeting held since the dam breach. Evaluation of repair options have been under study and were now ready to be presented. In addition, a decision was made to update the park master plan at the same time as the dams were being evaluated because of the discrepancy between the master plan approved in 1985 and the actual site conditions and use. The master plan process is a public process and the public has the chance to participate. Numerous public meetings were held in conjunction with past rezoning approvals for Kingstowne that resulted in amendments to the site plan and proffered conditions in 1999. This

process included many public hearings and meetings over several years and included negotiations for the wetlands mitigation areas.

Is there any threat to public safety?
Areas that are currently under construction are unsafe and have been fenced off to protect the public. The low water lake areas are especially dangerous due to large silt areas which create a quicksand like hazard.

Other areas of the site are safe at this time. There is minimal danger to downstream areas and properties if other dam failures occur.

How will the County pay for the repairs/improvements?
There is no funding currently in the budget for any improvements. Current repairs are being funded out of County emergency funds. Further funding sources will need to be identified depending on the nature of further repairs or restoration. If repairs will enhance ponds to allow for stormwater management then funds can be out of the stormwater fund on a priority basis which is funded by a dedicated $.015 property tax. If the project is to be funded out of general funds, it could be a long time before it could get funded.

How are priorities set for using the penny funds?
Each year the county stormwater division develops a workplan establishing project priorities for the upcoming year. Dam failures are at the top of the priority list along with safety issues and increasing stormwater management capacity countywide. Projects that can be done on county owned land are also a priority due to the cost savings.

What is the history of the dams and how did it get to this point?
Ponds four and five were constructed as part of the gravel pit operations that existed before Kingstowne was developed. These dams are the oldest on the site. Basins one, two and three were reconstructed in 1999 as part of the wetland mitigation efforts required in the development of Kingstowne . Ponds four and five were connected in 1999 as part of the EPA consent decree with Kingstowne. The work done at this time may have contributed to some undermining and weakening of the dams. Since the dams are covered with trees and brush it was difficult to accurately evaluate the condition of the structures. While county staff has been concerned about a potential dam failure in recent years, studies of potential failure impacts concluded that, downstream damages to real property would be minimal.

Since the dam breach, the county has actively monitored the site and has conducted a full study of all of the ponds and mitigation sites. The report recommends a number of maintenance issues that also need to be corrected along with the dam breach.

How much have repairs cost to date?
About $360,000. Interim repairs have been designed for a ten year storm event and are intended as an interim term solution to erosion and further dam degradation.

Is that money being spent wisely?

Yes. This was necessary to prevent further degradation of the facilities. Some of the improvements can carry over into the permanent solution.

Is Hayfield subdivision at risk of future flooding?
No.

Why put in a new spillway? Why can't we open up and use the spillway on pond #5?
The spillway at pond five was closed in 1999 because it was inadequate and was being undermined. The channel was eroding severely below the dam. Additionally, the dam was located such that motor vehicles used the dam as a short cut in to the site causing considerable damage to the park.

Why is this property being discussed now?
The dam breach offers the opportunity to evaluate the site for increasing stormwater treatment capacity within the county. Previously the site has not been considered because of a concern that working on the dams would potentially weaken them to a point of failure.

What is the purpose of the meeting?
To begin the process of revising the park master plan and to inform the public of the options being discussed for dam repairs and options for future county use

Other Public Comments:

- Some discussion about the pros and cons of the different spillway types.
- Would like to see downstream restoration as part of the project.Dam breach has disturbed the existing wildlife habitats.
- Would like to see the dams restored and encourage wildlife to return.
- Would like to see more established trails.
- Would like to maintain a loop trail system.
- No need for a lot of park facilities.
- Trails are perfectly suitable.Hayfield residents enjoy having the lake for public useWith the steep slopes and mature trees, the site is not suitable for park facilities.
- The trails should be improved and maintained.
- Trees should be maintained on the dams unless failure is imminent.
- Preserve natural areas and trees off trails. These areas serve as wildlife and bird habitats.

- Interest in continuing cooperation with Hayfield Secondary School for educational partnerships and maybe establishing a friends group like at Huntley Meadows.

- Interest in returning the lakes for fishing

- Stormwater funds could not be used for improving the trail network or other park facilities. Funding for park improvements would have to come from another source.

Next Steps:
DPWES—MSMD

• Selection of dam replacement alternative
• Design

Park Authority

• Review Comments and Input
• Prepare Draft Master Plan
• Present draft plan to public for comment
• 30 day comment period
• Revise plan
• Review and Action on Final Master Plan by Park Authority Board

Meeting adjourned.