

## Ballston Pond Stakeholder Group Meeting

6/8/11

Name	Group Representing
<i>Members Attending</i>	
Robert Atkins	Bluemont Civic Association
Suzanne Sundberg	Bluemont Civic Association Alternate
Robert Morgan	Waycroft Woodlawn Civic Association Alternate
John Kelleher	Waycroft Woodlawn Civic Association Interested Party
Conor Marshall	Ballston-Virginia Square Civic Association
Lisa Larimar	Energy and Environment Commission
Alex Sanders	Energy and Environment Commission Alternate
Mary Ann Lawler	Urban Forestry Commission
Jenn Truong	Arlingtonians for a Clean Environment
Anne St. John	US Fish and Wildlife Service
<i>Members Not Present</i>	
Alex Konick	Waycroft Woodlawn Civic Association
Pamela Kahn	Ballston Partnership

The project team welcomed the stakeholder group members and briefly reviewed the project activities to date, which included the first stakeholder group meeting and the first public meeting, at which the project team received very helpful input from the community. The project team has also completed a detailed survey of existing conditions, a vegetation survey, hydrologic modeling, and examination of the existing utilities in the area.

The project team proceeded to present three conceptual designs for the pond restoration. The designs vary in the use of boardwalks and overlooks, the location of the open water of the pond, and the location of the different types of wetland vegetation.

### Concept A

This design includes a weir with notches in it as Lubber Run enters the pond, that direct lower flows into the wetland area, and higher flows to go along the east side of the pond.

This design would have a longer residence time, and might allow for the most water quality treatment. The weir will create an area for sediment to collect and will also allow for the installation of a litter control device at the pond entry area. The design includes a deep water area along the east side, a large wetland area, and some islands of shrub wetlands. It also includes some observation platforms around the pond, and two turtle basking stations.

- It is good that this design allows for the collection of litter and sediment before it enters the pond.
- There is a heavily used bike trail on the west side of the pond. If you create new observation areas or nodes near the trail, that may be a conflict with the bikers.

### **Concept B**

This design features a deep water area in the middle of the current pond. More small channels are created to allow water to flow throughout the wetland, and more tree and shrub wetland islands are included. Because this design does not use a weir, the deep water area in the middle of the pond may be more still, and have less circulation than Concept A.

This design also includes several boardwalks that allow visitors to walk out into the pond and wetland area. It includes a new trail through the grassy area on the eastern side of the pond, and three turtle basking stations. In this design the litter and sediment collection area would be at the lower end of the pond, where water flows out.

- The boardwalks extending out into the wetland area may encourage people to throw more trash into the pond, and may disturb the wildlife in the area.
- Trash cans would need to be added on the boardwalks to avoid more litter.
- The boardwalks would require more maintenance over time.

### **Concept C**

Concept C features a deep water area in the middle of the current pond. More small channels are created to allow water to flow throughout the wetland. Fewer tree and shrub wetland islands are included than in Concept B. The trail alignment on the south corner and eastern side of the pond would be moved onto boardwalks over the pond, allowing more continuous views across the pond, and access by visitors. In this design the litter and sediment collection area would be at the lower end of the pond, where water flows out. The trail would go along the top of the weir at the bottom of the pond, allowing visitors to see the weir and understand how it controls water levels.

## General Comments on Concepts

- Litter control is a primary concern. How will litter be collected? It would be best if litter is collected before it gets into the pond, like in Concept A. (*Staff responded that some sediment can be collected above the weir in Concept A. If a traditional forebay There is not room in the pond for a traditional forebay to collect sediment.*)
- It is difficult to assess the wildlife value of the different designs without knowing the benefits of the different wetland configurations for wildlife. (*Staff responded that all the designs create large new wetland areas, and new edge habitat between the wetland and shrub wetland areas, which are all beneficial to wildlife.*)
- The current overlook is underused, perhaps due to the current conditions at the pond. It may not be necessary to add so many new overlooks, especially near I-66 because the highway noise would probably discourage people from using them.
- The east side of the pond is best for views.
- The design should be self-sustaining, without needing a lot of maintenance.
- The boardwalks extending out into the wetland area may encourage people to throw more trash into the pond, and may disturb the wildlife in the area. We want to welcome people to the pond, but not so much that they disturb the area.
- If we had boardwalks, they may need to be closed at night and that would require staff time.
- Would it be possible to have one short boardwalk, near one of the overlooks? If it was not as long it may not encourage littering, but could be a nice amenity.
- It would be good to add more trees, possibly along the east side. The shrub wetland areas are good for wildlife.
- It would be good to remove invasive plants from the existing trees near the pond.
- Could we do the weir with the trash removal with the Concept C?
- What is the stability of the different concepts over time? Will one be better able to maintain its configuration over time?
- Concept B seems to be the most expensive option, and may create more of a litter problem.
- It would be good to see more developed concepts for the grassy area on the northeast of the pond, possibly including some examples of sustainable landscaping.
- Would concept A allow enough treatment of the water, since it has the flow channel along the east side?
- A larger extent of water makes the area more interesting for visitors.
- Could the County add a trash collection device on the other side of Washington Blvd, before Lubber Run flows into the pond?
- What type of fencing will be used?