There were about 70 attendees, including:
Supervisor Herrity
Park Authority board members for Braddock, Lee, & Springfield, and At-large
Representatives of FLAP & Friends of Long Branch Stream Valley
Representatives from Stormwater Planning Division were on hand to provide
expert answers to attendee questions.

Frank Graziano of WSSI presented a PowerPoint summary of studies done so far. There were five basic
options put forward, designated as A to E, along with some pros and cons of each:
   A. Continued dredging every 15 years or so
   B. Installation of a forebay to capture most sediment as it enters the lake, with annual or biennial
dredging, plus whole-lake dredging every 30 – 40 years
   C. Installation of a series of steel barriers upstream to provide a “beaver dam” type function, but
with little reduction in lake dredging
   D. Dam breaching with stream channel stabilization to hold existing sediment in place – no lake
   E. Dam breaching with stream channel stabilization to hold existing sediment in place – plus a
berm on the north bank to create a smaller lake

Following the presentation, attendees were assigned to eight groups for discussion. The groups
reported on their questions/concerns/suggestions as follows:
   • Group 1 – Is stream restoration upstream a solution? What are the costs? Who decides? Are
there lessons from comparable projects? What impact will there be on other parks? Esthetics?
Mosquitos? How about dams built by real beavers? How will flood control be affected? Will
the EPA mandate dam retention?
   • Group 2 – Option “D” is unacceptable because of lack of sediment control. Options “B” and “C”
could be combined. What are the biodiversity impacts? Could dredge spoils be hauled out by
train instead of truck?
   • Group 3 – Options for the lake need to be integrated with the rest of the Master Plan and with
regulatory mandates. What are the costs? Will sediment end up in Pohick Bay if not captured in
the lake? Option “E”, with a Huntley Meadows-like park might be the best of both worlds.
   • Group 4 – Could dredge spoils be disposed of by sale, donation, or be used to build beaver-type
dams? Marsh filtration to remove pollutants should be considered. Options “B” and “E” are
favored.
   • Group 5 – Keep the lake at all costs. Disappointed visitors were a common observation during
the 2008 dredging. Option “B” is favored. Upstream sediment controls, such as reforestation
should be included. The lake is a community treasure.
   • Group 6 – What will be the impact of planned DPWES projects? Don’t send sediment problems
downstream. Wildlife conservation should be a driver. What are the costs? Would dredging
deeper lessen frequency? Would Options “D” and “E” provide wetlands boardwalks?
   • Group 7 – Keep the lake. No to Options “D” & “E”. The lake is a very special treasure of Fairfax
County, a place to observe Nature in action. What are the costs? The EPA and TMDL may
require retention of the lake. Dredge spoil disposal needs more study. Repair costs of the dam
itself need to be a factor. Everyone is responsible for sediment control.
Group 8 - Are there lessons from comparable projects? What are the wildlife impacts? Will wetlands produce mosquitos? Could dredge spoils be hauled out by train instead of truck? Option “E” is interesting.

Next steps:
- Comments are accepted through June 30, 2016 at parkmail@fairfaxcounty.gov
- TMDL study results should be available by the end of 2016
- After analysis of the TMDL, a final study will be done.
- Future meetings and public participation remain to be determined.