

**SALONA PARK TASK FORCE
MEETING MINUTES
December 3, 2013**

Chair Margaret Malone called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Members Present: Richard Bliss, Sybil Caldwell, Dan DuVal, Carole Herrick, Ed Pickens, Joel Stillman, and Margaret Malone. Guests included Shannon O'Neil from the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust. Also present, Andrew Galusha representing the Fairfax County Park Authority and Jane Edmondson representing Supervisor John Foust.

Approval of Minutes: After discussion about the November 19 meeting minutes, a motion was made, seconded and approved to strike the last sentence in the second paragraph in the Approval of Minutes section. The minutes of the November 19 meeting were then unanimously approved.

Chairman's Remarks: Margaret mentioned that she had received an email from Dan Schwartz, soil scientist with the NoVA Soil and Water Conservation District. He had visited the eastern field at Salona next to Buchanan Street. His measurement showed that the soil was very wet, and as a result, permeable parking in most of that area may not be possible. However, there is a very narrow strip next to Buchanan Street that might support permeable parking. He added that further soil tests would be required. It was commented that as an alternative impermeable parking could be considered, but doing so would cause drainage issues and require additional measures to protect the Resource Protection Area.

Consideration of Task Force Recommendations for the Development of Salona Park:

- Margaret gave Task Force members some time to read the revised Executive Summary of the Draft Report.
- She asked that members review again the full report as soon as possible and send any comments to her.
- In response to a question about distribution of the report, Margaret said that copies would be sent to members of the Board of Supervisors and the Park Authority Board. It would be put on the Task Force web site. In addition, Margaret would make a presentation at a Park Authority Board meeting, date to be determined.

Presentation by Joel Stillman

- Joel discussed a proposal that he said was being considered and that he described as an effort to try to come to a compromise. He said that the purpose was to alleviate needs, that if met, would make it possible to keep Salona as people would like. The proposal provided for additional field development in McLean on a near-, mid- and long-term basis.

For the near term, he proposed that over 1-2 years there be lights installed on Spring Hill field # 5, paid for by the Fairfax County Park Authority. Lights would also be installed at Linway Terrace, paid for by the McLean Youth Soccer Association.

For the mid-term, he proposed that over 2-3 years a synthetic turf field with lights would be constructed at Longfellow Middle School. There would be a 440 yard synthetic turf track on the perimeter to serve the needs of McLean Youth Track in lieu of having a track constructed at Langley Fork. He also proposed construction of a synthetic turf field with lights at Kent Garden Elementary School.

For the long term (4-6 years) he proposed construction of three synthetic turf fields with lights at Langley Fork, a synthetic turf field with lights at Cooper Middle School, with a full sized hard surface track, and an infield area for long-jump and pole vault. Lights would be installed at Springhill Recreation Center fields 2 and 3, and Holladay Field would be reconstructed with synthetic turf and lights.

He suggested there should be a recommendation by the Salona Park Task Force that would include one unlit natural grass field to be included in the Salona Park Master Plan. He proposed that Fairfax County reduce future payments to the DuVal family (the grantors of the property to the Park Authority) by \$2.4 million. This money would be allocated to the construction of the mid-term field development and Langley Fork.

Finally, if all of these proposals were met in the proposed time frame, McLean Youth sports would not pursue construction of an unlit grass field at Salona Park for a period of 10 years.

Discussion following the presentation

- A Task Force member commented that reducing the payment for the easement would be a breach of the easement contract. He stated that the Park Authority amends master plans on a routine basis. The Salona master plan could be amended at the appropriate time if it is decided that fields are needed.
- Joel commented that the need for fields exists today.
- Another stated that the field development proposal and determining what is done at Salona is like “comparing apples and oranges.”
- Joel commented that they are connected. People feel that fields should be put at Salona, and those people would be satisfied, somewhat, if they knew that fields would be developed at other places.
- One member stated that it is difficult to comment on the proposed field development at specific locations without knowing the impact on the surrounding communities. He would be reluctant to have the Task Force support specific locations and he doesn't think doing so is appropriate for the Task Force. Another member commented that it is outside the scope of the Task Force to consider athletic fields at other locations.
- Joel stated that he didn't think the Task Force needed to name specific fields; rather it could recognize the need and state that while it prefers that fields not be at Salona, the option should remain open.
- Another member said that the proposal was not a compromise and that there would be community push back.
- Another member asked why the proposal was just now being presented so close to the vote on the Task Force report.

- Joel responded that recent events, including possible development at Langley Fork, led to the proposal.
- One member said that given where the Task Force was in its deliberations, it needed to vote that evening on Joel's proposal. He made a motion to that effect; it passed with 5 ayes, 1 nay.
- The same member then made a motion to vote up or down on the proposal.
- Before the motion was seconded, another member suggested that the Task Force consider adding additional language regarding athletic fields to the Task Force report. After discussion, he moved that the following language be inserted on page 17 of the draft report: *"The Task Force recommends that the County government, including the Board of Supervisors, the Fairfax County Park Authority, and the Fairfax County School Board examine and pursue existing opportunities for enhancing the use of the facilities under their control in the McLean area to help satisfy the need and demand for such athletic facilities."* The motion was seconded and approved without objection and the motion for an up or down vote on the proposal was withdrawn.
- Joel stated that he would like the Task Force to consider the proposal (which he called a concept) over the next few days and give him feedback on the ideas. He added that the proposal was thrown out to the members to spark discussion. He was asked to provide the proposal in writing. Joel indicated that it was not ready for distribution at that time.
- One member said that he would have considered the proposal if it had been presented to the Task Force earlier. He thinks that it is too late at this point, given that the draft report is expected to be voted on at the next meeting.
- Another member stated that he thought the approval by the Task Force of the additional language for the report was the Task Force's response to the discussion item Joel raised.
- One member observed that Joel could present the proposal as an amendment to the Task Force Report when the Task Force votes on the report.

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 17, at 7:30 p.m. in Supervisor Foust's office. It was announced that the first order of business will be the vote on the Task Force Report.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.