

(Joe Sestak) I am representing Seminary Ridge Civic Association:

On April 6, I came before you when the city admitted that Strawberry Run's 2010 Natural Channel Design:

1. had a waterfall that unless stopped, would cause both the streambed and banks of the proposed Natural Channel Design upstream to fail.
2. **And, second, that** the stream itself needed repair. However, if 50% of the Natural Channel's original design had changed since its completion in 2010 – which it had -- the Expert Panel's direction is to [Quote] "abandon Natural Channel Design." But the city has not abandoned its plans. Perhaps it assessed the damage wrongly at only 20%, a level at which the Expert's Panel directs [QUOTE] "an immediate forensic investigation is to be conducted to identify cause(s)" by a Review. Nor has the city undertaken a forensic review as it continues to proceed with the proposed Natural Channel Design.

Knowing this, I come to City Council to explain why that forensic review must, at a minimum, be done if the City won't abandon the Natural Channel Design for Strawberry Run. And this is because I believe its second effort to do a Natural Channel Design will fail again, this time not from downstream, but from upstream:

1. **(First)** The city's 2016 Storm Water Capacity Analysis for Strawberry Run's watershed shows that the velocity of water coming out of the six foot culvert where the proposed Natural Channel Design begins is 22 feet per second, for a ten year storm. However, the engineering plans for the Strawberry Run's proposed Natural Channel Design are based instead upon a velocity of only 9 feet per second, which the consultant claims is for a 100-year storm. This is 60% less than the city's velocity.

In the first hundred yards of Strawberry Run beyond the culvert's outlet, there are about 160 huge boulders strewn about from a previous effort to restore the stream, many the same size proposed in the consultant's engineering plans. Obviously, that size has already not worked.

Also, the city's analysis did not include 80% of Strawberry Run's storm water inlet catchments at the direction of the city staff. And it was not done for a 100 year storm – both of which would add dramatically to the storm water's 22 feet per second velocity.

I was agnostic at the start on Natural Channel Design and approached it like Dragnet, "just the facts, Ma'am." But now I am seriously concerned with this latest information on the velocity of water as well as the Expert Panel direction to "abandon the project" if it has changed by 50% from its original design in a stream. It does not appear it is appropriate for our small urban stream. We have confirmed with VDEQ the grant can be adjusted for another design until June 2022, and even pro-rated for fewer pollution credits. That being said, if the alternative design earns

no pollution credits, there is the city's already committed \$800,000 dollars to protect the owner whose property the stream is encroaching upon and/or other key high impact bank or banks that may deliver large volumes of sediment to Strawberry Run.

Tonight, 10 Alexandrian citizens will walk you through the staff's presentation to show what is missing or incorrect. They will start with slide 17. As you know, we have asked for a host of documents countless times despite a reply that "you don't need those to make public comments" or another asking "what difference does it make." But it does make a difference as they were used to identify what storm water velocity the engineering plans were based upon as opposed to the city's own analysis. Nevertheless, I understand how challenging it can be to change from applying one long-standing and accepted protocol as the norm, almost a one-size-fits all.

As Head of the Navy's anti-terrorism unit when Afghanistan began, I went in early, linking up with SEALs and special forces. This was a different war and we were applying conventional norms. Our rules of engagement were to target white Toyota trucks since intelligence said the Taliban had purchased over 500. A similar set were used for collection operations that brought in suspected Taliban and Al-Qaeda illustrated by the young man brought back one night banging his head repeatedly on the impromptu barb wire wrapped around trees as posts. Asking what gives, the SEAL said with resignation, "he's the village idiot" and we have to give a \$3000 bounty for whomever the chieftains point to line their pockets.

Upon return, Secretary Rumsfeld was briefed directly and he changed the rules of engagement, protecting innocent civilians by clear intelligence on who was in each truck, and bounties were no longer handed over indiscriminately for body counts. But I always wondered if that disturbed man ended up in GITMO because it took us awhile to see that one size does not fit all, and to then convince the leaders who have to have the judgment to change. This is about accountability, not pollution credits; just like that should not have been about body and truck counts.

Thank you.

(Susan Clark-Sestak) Council woman Pepper, you entered public office the year I entered the Soviet Union for studies. The woman ahead of me met only obstruction from an obstinate border guard, finally spitting out, "For God's sake, nobody's trying to sneak into this country, they're only trying to get out."

I later faced this steadfast obstruction for years negotiating with the Russians to prevent their submarines from leaking nuclear waste into northern fishing waters, to search Soviet archive records to help us locate American POW/MIA remains – and I watched Chernobyl's nuclear disaster occur because the Soviets did not follow prescribed Expert protocols.

I've similarly watched the City not respond 13 times to whether it had done the Expert Panel's required assessments of Strawberry Run. You walked with a sprained ankle to see the waterfall the staff failed to admit was there even though they'd sent a consultant two months earlier to view it. Only after a third month when my husband made the 14<sup>th</sup> request did staff admit to you it was there -- acknowledging the proposed design would fail if not fixed – but not providing the cost, scope or damage it would incur. It was easier to get information from the Soviet Union.

Councilwoman Pepper, you voted against the Braddock West Project due to its disappointing storm sewer improvements focused on 10-year storms. "Ten year storms?" you said.... That's a sprinkle...we're up there in the 100s.... They're the ones that flood the basements and ruin people's carpets and furniture." And that is why the proposed design will be destroyed without a review.

If my husband had walked you to see the six-foot high culvert outlet that connects Strawberry Run under the road to the other side of Fort Williams Parkway, you'd see 165 huge boulders blown away from the city's last failed effort to restore the stream there; half are the same huge size as the 160 boulders that are to be put there again with tons of sediment for the Natural Channel Design. There is nothing natural about doing what failed before. Because a 2016 City study shows that the water from just a ten-year storm comes barreling out of that outlet at a velocity of 22 feet per second. The consultant's design, however, is planning for just 40% of that -- a velocity of only 9 feet per second for a 100 year storm?! Doubtful that will work.

Moreover, the city directed that the 2016 study was not to include private storm water systems that flow into public ones -- so only 20% of Strawberry Run's storm water inlets were included in the city's analysis. Imagine the real outlet velocity if private systems were included, especially for a 100-year storm.

We've asked for a year's review because the 2010 Natural Channel Design failed, and we've not done the Expert Panel required forensic study to find out why. Then the city failed to provide the documented assessments required by the Expert Panel. We've shown that the waterfall would make the proposed design fail from

downstream. And we've now informed you that a City's study shows the Natural Channel Design will fail from upstream because it is based on a maximum velocity of 9 feet per second, not at least 22.

I witnessed a loss of trust in Soviet leadership and competence, while its failure to follow Expert guidance caused the Chernobyl disaster. That should not happen in Alexandria, Virginia; what should happen is a delay to review the city's plan to get it right this time – and not Natural Channel Design.

---

(Fran Vogel) I am speaking as the representative of Strawberry Hill to slide 17 regarding Strawberry Run's 2010 failed Natural Channel Design.

We told the head of TES it had failed, and he said "no stream restoration was done there." The head of Storm Water Management said he "would take a look to see if it needed maintenance." We then repeatedly requested the Expert Panel Assessments because the EPA 's Natural Channel Design Review Checklist states, "it is important that methods ... are **described**." But after seven months, we were finally told they had been simply "eyeballed," and the City Manager sent a hazy photograph in the [QUOTE] "general vicinity" taken by the consultant in 2018 showing no waterfall. It is the left photograph.

But Wood's engineering plans show the exact stream locations of all photographs it took in 2018, and not one of them is in the failed downstream area -- not one. Four times we have requested all those photographs. The Stormwater Management Chief said, "I'll try to remember." We haven't received anything.

Why would Wood take only one fuzzy photograph, with no date-time-stamp or documentation? Written statements were sent to you by three residents who live next to the waterfall. Each confirms the waterfall was there prior to 2014.

Slide 17 says the 2010 restoration was a "Developer funded management strategy." No matter the source of the money, it was a city project overseen by city staff as confirmed by Brian Rahal's email, Storm Water Division on January 8, 2020.

The City selected the design and construction consultants in 2010: Williamsburg Environmental Group and Total Development Solutions in 2010 – NOT the Developer. Just as the City selected Wood for today's design. Both sets of engineering plans are approved and signed only by the city heads of TES, Planning and Zoning, and the Planning Commission's Chair. There is no difference – the City is responsible and accountable for both restorations, even the one that failed.

Slide 17 says 2010 was an "earlier natural channel design." No.... There were more than 700 designs that had already been done in the Chesapeake Bay watershed alone in the previous fifteen years.

Slide 17 says the City failed to use "full natural channel design principles and applied practices" in 2010. But today's plans use near-identical engineering techniques and structures: using sediment to raise the streambed 3-5 feet higher to connect to a new flood plain; and using deep emplacement of huge boulders to channel a water's energy by structures called J-hooks, cross vanes, scour pools, etc.

Wood states it will use 4 by 3 by 2 feet boulders for 100-year storms, as well as ones that are 3 by 2 by 2 feet. Those are the same size boulders used in 2010 for just 2-year storms. In fact, Wood's engineering plans state it will reuse the 2010 boulders for its cross-vane constructions.

Slide 17 says storms in the past 14-18 months impacted the stream. But there were six storms from 2011 to 2019 at least as bad in total inches and inches per hour than in the past 14-18 months. You have testimony from three stream residents that the stream failed within a few years.

Bottom line: an engineering review must be done to definitively determine why the 2010 Natural Channel Design failed so we know if it can work this time.

Actually, the Expert's Panel requires that if a Natural Channel Design [QUOTE] "shows major compromise" the city must conduct "an immediate forensic investigation to identify cause(s)." But if the stream has failed 50% or more – the city must abandon doing Natural Channel Design or reconstruct an entirely new stable channel.

Wood admits the waterfall we showed the city will erode the new \$1.6 million Natural Channel Design and must be fixed in conjunction with the new Design, while also doing "rehabilitative maintenance" on the 2010 failure – but with unknown cost, scope or damage. Worse, we don't "forensically" know why the 2010 design failed. We believe the Natural Channel Design project is not appropriate for Strawberry Run based on the new information, and must do a thorough scientific review to determine the best alternative.

(Jeanne Jacob) As President of Seminary Ridge Civic Association, I am speaking to slide 18 which lists “process concerns.” Mine began September 2020 when a Board member asked three questions of a City official: Why don’t you measure for phosphorous? Reply: Because it’s everywhere. Did you use the BANCS model? Reply: I don’t know. Why are you doing the Natural Channel Design? Reply: We follow the protocols.

That would be the second of only two meetings we would ever have; promised a third in November, we never heard back. And you already know the alleged 2018 meetings didn’t occur. And the 2018 letters to elicit Strawberry Run residents’ concerns were only sent to – but not received by – two residents who abutted the stream, but not those adjacent to it. However, VDEQ was told the letters were sent because permission for easements is needed from these two property owners in order for the project to proceed.

While permission has not yet been given, these residents will speak this evening because they – like we – want something to be done -- but done correctly after the necessary review.

Slide 18 correctly mentions BANC Assessments were not provided. We did what the section chief dismissively told our Board Member: [QUOTE] “We follow the protocols” – but we found out the city did not.

We requested the six assessments 14 times without success because Protocol 1 requires them when using the BANCS model to help predict pollution credits. The city knew their importance because they were pulled out of the 153 pages of Expert Panel guidance and placed prominently in the City’s grant application to VDEQ.

One assessment requires numerous bulk density measurements be taken along the stream banks to assess how compact the bank’s soil is at each location and therefore help predict its rate of erosion. Soil density varies greatly within just a few yards, so the accuracy of the BANCS model in predicting pollution credit’s relies upon numerous measurements. But city documents showed only one location, so we asked to see if other locations had been assessed.

You also know by now the BANCS model is not effective in predicting erosion if there is a waterfall downstream, like there is. After repeatedly asking whether this had been known and documented, the City Manager referred us to Appendix K of Strawberry Run’s design plans. Unfortunately, the plan states “Dimensions and slopes may be adjusted by the Town of **Leesburg’s** qualified representative.”

Public outreach has been limited not just in the number of meetings, but it was very limited in candid, forthright responsiveness to requests. Still, our efforts have saved the \$1.6 million in stream restoration from being eroded away, as the consultant admitted. Listening and then answering should be part of any city outreach in the future -- if city officials care about trust.

Susan Clark-Sestak has explained that the velocity coming out of the culvert upstream is two and a half times greater than predicted by the consultant's 100-year storm assessment. That will shear away the city's third attempt to restore the northern portion of the stream -- and it is another reason we do not support the Natural Channel Design for Strawberry Run, and are requesting a review to get the stream's restoration alternative right.



(Gerry Frank) I'll speak to slide 18's section on the 2010 stream. We've explained why "Developer funded management strategy" is dishonest. The city selected and oversaw the two design and construction contractors, with only city officials approving and signing the engineering plans -- just like for Wood. That a home developer did the stream's construction is flat wrong; it was Total Development Solutions, a highly regarded restoration contractor. The developer provided funding, just like VDEQ; in return, he directed storm water to the stream. The city is solely responsible for any stream restoration on public lands -- the city should know that.

2010 was also not an early Natural Channel Design as 700 designs had already been done in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, alone.

The Expert's Panel uses the term "failed" if 50% or more of a stream has changed compared to the original design. You walked it. The streambed has dropped several feet as fill sediment has been washed away; nearly all banks are eroded to the same or worse state seen in the 2005 photographs we showed you; most huge boulders have been pulled out or moved downstream, and Wood plans to use them upstream. This seems to meet the Expert's criteria to [QUOTE] "abandon the project". But even if it has failed only 20% to 40%, the Expert Panel directs the City to [QUOTE] "conduct an immediate forensic investigation to identify cause(s)." We are asking you to follow the scientific experts and do the review.

We also ask for a thorough review to prevent the City from a future slide reading, "in hindsight we should have first fixed upstream," as this one does. This is because the engineering plans are erroneously designed for a maximum velocity of 9 feet per second; but a city study says the stream needs to withstand a velocity of 22 feet per second. This is the muzzle velocity that shoots out from the huge culvert outlet behind my house. I've watched twice as hundreds of huge boulders were embedded in the stream, and then all were blown away.

The study shows 42% of Strawberry Run watershed's inlet catchments have insufficient capacity even for a 10-year flood. Moreover, 200 pipes with 6 to 48 inch diameters were eliminated from the analysis -- all upstream. This is why the two large pipes leading up to just before the culvert outlet become supercharged from the immense backed-up water pressure in the flooded pipes. It's as if a four-inch fireman's hose is connected to a garden hose. Imagine the velocity if the city does a 100-year study. Separately, part of the consultant's issue is that a model used for its velocity used 2011 data, instead of the 2016 data that was available.

Finally, there's the issue of the city's responsiveness: the restoration and the current plans are now finally posted. But each took five months and repeated requests so we could finally do this assessment.

(Susan Gould) I wanted to let the Council know that slides 27 – 31 contain options called “community-proposed alternatives” -- but none were forwarded or proposed by us for Strawberry Run.

Our focus has instead been upon the integrity of the substance and outreach process. The conclusion is that a thorough and objective review is required that delays awarding a contract until the right decision is made for the appropriate stream restoration for the entirety of Strawberry Run. That is Option C on slide 32, but rephrased as “Delay for a Review” since we don’t want to stop the grant; we know something needs to be done. We want the correct decision to be made in light of the following considerations the process has revealed, and if you turn to slide 35, the following should be listed as the advantages of this option:

1. The Natural Channel Design done in 2010 in the southern segment of Strawberry Run failed a few years after completion. The Expert Panel directs Natural Design be abandoned if 50% of the original design has changed, which it has. We support abandoning. The panel says a “forensic investigation” be conducted if 20-40% has changed to determine the cause. If the city does not abandon Natural Channel Design, this investigation must be done before a consultant begins [QUOTE] “working on an approach to perform rehabilitative maintenance on the downstream portion in conjunction with the upstream restoration.”
2. Only after this required “forensic investigation,” can we know how to best prevent channel incision and bank erosion in any stream restoration planned upstream.
3. The Review must then determine the cost, scope, design, time and possible environmental damage before implementing the results of 1 and 2.
4. If the stream is to be returned to a Natural Channel Design, the Review must demonstrate how the same design could work a second time in the same location – and upstream. If not, why not? And what are the lessons learned for upstream? If the southern segment is not returned to a Natural Channel Design, the Review must determine if any [QUOTE] “rehabilitative maintenance” done is also a better alternative for restoring the middle segment of Strawberry Run.
5. The Review must also accurately determine the velocity of water coming out of the culvert for a 100-year storm. The city’s estimate is 22 feet per

second is for a 10-year storm, AND 80% of Strawberry Run's storm water inlet catchments were excluded from these calculations. Whereas the proposed engineering plans incongruously assume 9 feet per second for a 100-year storm.

6. In view of this, the Review must determine if a Natural Channel Design is feasible due to this immense velocity. The city admits that in hindsight, not doing the stream restoration upstream of the failed 2010 effort was a mistake. This is a similar situation. The review must determine if changes upstream are required first. For example, should the fact that 42% of Strawberry Run's storm water catchments have insufficient inlet capacity be addressed to decrease back up water pressure, and thus, velocity? And what is the cost, design, time and consequences to address this outlet velocity issue?

I'm going to turn over the rest of these remarks to my husband, Rick Gould for his three minutes.

1. (Rick Gould): I will continue where my wife, Susan Gould, just left off: All material that is created during the Review by the City or consultant must be made immediately available to the public. In addition, the following documents should be publicly available: any documented assessments not yet provided that are required by the Expert Panel when the BANCS model is used; the document(s) and field work -- including photographs -- done by Wood in 2018-2019 with regard to where the 2010 Natural Channel Design was completed; and any similar information provided by Wood between late 2020 and end-January 2021.
2. As the City stated, no alternatives were considered for Strawberry Run when choosing the Natural Channel Design. Therefore, the Review should assess alternatives for Strawberry Run that might prove better suited for this small urban stream, and potentially at less cost.
3. Since the VDEQ has extended the deadline for awarding a contract for Strawberry Run's until June 2022, the grant will not be lost. The City has stated that pollution credits from Strawberry Run are not necessary to meet the City's 35% compliance by 2023. Rather, they would be used for the final 60% compliance by 2028. Furthermore, the Review should consider the integrity of the current pollution credits for Strawberry Run since the Expert Panel no longer permits "default rates" to be used if a contract has not been signed by 1 January 2021. Regardless, it would be good governance to accept the Expert Panel's decision to no longer use a default value since Strawberry Run's has been acknowledged by the City as incorrect. And, the Expert Panel's guidance to use two different consultants for the BANCS model should be followed.
4. This one-year delay will permit the City to:
  - a. Determine the cause, accountability, and lessons learned from the failure of the Natural Channel Design used on Strawberry Run in 2010 before proceeding to do another Natural Channel Design – or an alternative – just upstream on Strawberry Run.
  - b. Determine the cost, design, time and consequences of preventing the "head cut" from eroding the proposed upstream Natural Channel Design as well as figuring out how to address the 2010 failed effort before any "rehabilitation maintenance" is undertaken.

- c. Resolve how to properly address the northern segment's output velocity from the culvert connecting it to the middle segment.
  - d. Allow an accurate provision of Strawberry Run's pollution credits after a concurrent professional assessment of alternatives that are better suited at less cost for this stream.
  - e. Give back the time for review and public comment that was lost due to the failure of the City to provide documents and conduct effective public outreach.
5. In the end, this is about accountability. Do you believe the scientists – the Experts Panel – and actually follow its guidance? Did you include citizen input into the process at the beginning and transparently throughout it – and perhaps learn from it?

(Lyn Allen) Councilman Aguirre, you recently said with regard to a community police review board, "We need to go back to the drawing board to reassess what our options are" – and the City then got a better option. That is what we are asking with our request for a review of Strawberry Run. We are asking City Council for this because of what you also said, "I could be the bridge between what's happening on the ground, in the trenches, with the policy that is being created by the decision makers."

In our case, the city's decision makers have neither been forthright nor responsive to our repeated efforts to be involved in the civic process of Strawberry Run. We therefore come to you for accountability above all else, to be treated as we deserve to be so that what is done will be done right.

Despite the city stating no Natural Channel Design was done in Strawberry Run in 2010 ... and then stating it was unaware the stream restoration had failed ... claiming later it was only minor damage ... refusing 13 times to give us the required assessment of whether there was a waterfall there ... quietly seeing if there was one in January, then not telling Council until our 14<sup>th</sup> request three months later ... then admitting the waterfall will ruin the proposed stream restoration if not fixed ... not providing cost, scope or likely heavy equipment damage to personal property or public forested areas to do so ... telling us staff met with two residents that it needs easements from in 2018, then telling you the meetings never occurred ... closing the public comment period despite repeated requests for design plans and assessments ... then stating they were not needed to make our comments ... saying a single photograph purportedly taken by the consultant on March 1, 2018 in [QUOTE] "the general vicinity" of the waterfall was proof it wasn't there despite three residents stating it was ... and when asked to provide all the photographs and documentation the consultant must have taken that day in 2018, replied, "I'll try not to forget" – but did, despite four requests for them and the Mayor saying we could have anything that the consultant had done.

Above all else, we come to you for accountability, so what occurred to us should not occur again to a citizen, so we are treated as we deserve to be treated – with justice and respect.

That is why the police board was belatedly established – because if anyone believes themselves beyond accountability, people lose trust because they know, treating people wrongly will just happen, again. For us, a review is about accountability to do the right thing now, or else it will happen again. Pollution credits don't rank above that in a democracy.

(Christy Walika) I agree that something needs to be done with Strawberry Run. While I am not sure what the solutions should be, I disagree that anything should be done without adequate community input, transparency, and alternatives. I believe the city needs to take a closer look at all possible solutions.

But I feel strongly about the City's misstatements regarding me and Strawberry Run.

The City Manager's March 30 memorandum on Strawberry Run informed City Council that I was one of two residents on Taft Avenue that [QUOTE] "city records indicate" a letter was sent dated February 26, 2018. He attached an unsigned letter but the Manager did not point out in the accompanying memo that it requested authorization for both city employees and a private company's staff to be allowed to enter my property.

I never received the February 26, 2018 letter -- and I certainly never gave permission for any staff to enter my property; nor do I have records that I provided authorization. Nonetheless, in June 2019, we were thrilled that the city was going to address the stream erosion. I had several conversations with city staff afterward to keep abreast of the project. It wasn't until later, when a city employee, Altan Erginkoc, knocked on my door on September 3, 2020 -- two and a half years later -- asking for access to my property. He asked if I received a letter from the city with a Right of Entry. I told him no and that no one was allowed on my property without permission. I then called Alex311. The letter arrived days later with a very poorly worded "Right of Entry" they wanted me to sign. I refused.

Additionally, the City Manager informed Fran Vogel in a memorandum dated January 28, 2021 that [Quote] "city records indicate" staff had met with me on-site in 2018. However, in last week's memorandum to you he states differently: that I did not contact the city after the 2018 letter was sent and therefore the City did not meet on-site with me.

The City Manager's story may change, mine does not: I did not receive any letter from the City until June 2019. Moreover, my neighbors at 3729 Taft that who the City Manager claims received the unsigned letter, did not either. He will speak tonight also.

My house is adjacent to Strawberry Run and will be greatly impacted by the restoration plans, and may, in fact impact my property value. I have therefore closely followed the project since first informed of it in the letter dated June 10, 2019. I have a timeline of everything in my records. You can see why I am concerned about the lack of transparency and lack of community input into the project. I understand that COVID has caused a disruption in everything, but that is no reason to move forward in haste.

I believe there are questions concerning solving a problem that may not exist and possibly using the wrong methodology. As I understand it, Natural Channel Design was done in Strawberry Run in 2010 only 50 feet from my property and has now failed. This time it could possibly make the environmental impact irreversible, failing again. But transparency in what is said and done is most important, and hopefully as we move forward, we can find an acceptable solution for all parties with permission given to work from my property.

---



(Alex Cortez) I wanted to speak this evening and validate everything that our neighbor, Christy Walika, said this evening about the city's outreach. We are at 3729 Taft Avenue next door to Christy, and our homes were said to have been initially contacted by the city in the spring of 2018 by letter and that we had a meeting on-site with the city regarding a proposed Strawberry Run stream restoration project and to elicit our concerns. They both did not happen. The first time the city reached out was with a letter in 2019.

We are not opposed to some form of stream restoration. However, the only interest the city has shown in speaking with us is in its request to have permission for a right-of-way/easement to do the project.

We have not given that permission. We want to do what's right with an easement for the proper stream restoration project. But you can understand why we have great unease when the city says it met with us to express our concerns when it never happened. We later found out that the City Manager had told you, the City Council, that if the city had met opposition, it might have rescinded the application for the grant to do it. Moreover, the staff separately informed the Virginia Department of Environmental Policy that we had been sent letters but never responded. The staff also told the Commonwealth it needed easements for our two properties and anticipated no problems getting them.

We have not given permission for the easements. We do think a review to find the correct stream restoration is very important, particularly since the Natural Channel Design completed a few yards from our property in 2010 completely failed a few years after it was done. We don't want that design to fail again.

We also do not want to lose the grant, so we very much would like a thoughtful review done well in time to sign the contract for the grant. And for the right stream restoration project we will provide a right-of-way/easement.

Please learn the needed lessons from your efforts at outreach. It is easy to lose trust when it is not done honestly and well. Thank you.

(Carol Kocot) I will speak to the supposed disadvantages of a review that seeks to ensure the city's second Natural Channel Design is not a failure like the first.

First, VDEQ has repeatedly said the SLAF grant will not be lost if we delay until June 2022 to sign a contract. If the review recommends a different stream restoration alternative, they will adjust the grant if there are pollution credits. If there are a lot less, they would pro-rate it. If the Review determines a less comprehensive restoration focused only on protecting key banks and properties from erosion, the city would use the \$800,000 it has committed for this less extensive solution.

Second, we informed the Mayor yesterday that VDEQ confirmed no decision has been made if Strawberry Run is presently "grandfathered" from having to measure its pollution rate instead of using one from a Pennsylvania stream. That depends upon VDEQ's pending decision of whether the city's design contract with Wood grandfathers Strawberry Run, or if it is the pending construction contract. If it is construction, the city would have to do actual measurements no matter what.

However, since the Expert Panel says using the Pennsylvania stream is a faulty method, why would city officials say doing what is scientifically correct is a disadvantage?

Third, regarding having to do a redesign, the City will have to do one anyway since the city's consultant used 9 feet per second as Strawberry Run's maximum storm water velocity instead of the City's own study of 22 feet per second.

Fourth, regarding an increase in project cost: it may actually be less. But if it isn't, remember we have saved the city \$1.6 million by showing there is a waterfall downstream.

Fifth, risk to sanitary sewer. The consultant's design plans state that the stream's flow and erosion endangers no sanitary sewer. For this to happen, the stream would have to erode all of the forested park on both sides of it and all of Fort William Parkway on its east side or all of Featherstone Place on the other side -- within a year. We believe the City's public outreach would be good enough to warn homeowners at least within a year.

Sixth, increase Storm Water Use fee – does this also mean that citizens shouldn't inform the city that its Natural Channel Design has failed because the cost to do "rehabilitative maintenance" of a failed city stream could raise their Storm Water Use fees?!

Seventh, on fiscal impact: All these were answered under the supposed disadvantages, except inflation. Perhaps this is meant as a reminder that John Maynard Keynes was wrong in not having added it to his famous quote that "In this world nothing can be said to be certain, except death and taxes -- and now -- inflation."

As our first speaker this evening said, we believe this is about accountability for doing the right thing. Leaders can give others responsibility for doing something, but they cannot avoid accountability for what is then done. If they do, the people will lose trust in those who feel themselves beyond accountability for what they do.

(Dave Cheney) I've lived 22 years on the corner of Ft Williams and Duke Street, backing up to Strawberry Run. We raised our children there as I served 22 years as a naval flight officer, and currently serve in the Pentagon.

The beauty and enjoyment of having Strawberry Run alongside our home is a highlight of living there, and that and the wonderful flowering trees on Fort Williams were some the reasons my wife first purchased the home 25 years ago.

We've enjoyed the stream through each of the four seasons, having played with our kids and strolled along it hundreds of times. We watched the City do a stream restoration in 2010. It was beautiful upon completion with built up slopes covered with grass and trees planted. Unfortunately, torrents in the next 2 to 3 years eroded it back to its previous state with large boulders strewn about the stream, beginning with Hurricane Lee in 2011, followed by others. If you have never seen the creek at full capacity and volume after a storm you would understand the damage it can do.

I am a member of the Seminary Ridge and Seminary Hills Civic Associations of some 400 households. I agree with the Seminary Ridge Association as someone who watched the stream restoration be quickly destroyed: find out why and how the Natural Channel Design failed before you do it again in Strawberry Run. Reading the Association's monthly newsletters and now zooming into its Board meetings, I've kept apprised of its persistent efforts to ask for City documents and assessments to help them and you do so.

I know the city initially responded there was not a stream restoration done in Strawberry in 2010. Then, that the damage was minor. Then, that the failure occurred in 2020 with flash floods; and now, in a City Manager memorandum to you that the waterfall in it occurred after 2018.

I can tell you that waterfall has been there as long as I can remember, and was enhanced by the 2010 restoration with silt built up in front of it, but becoming as it looks today because of storms years before 2018.

With the responsibility of your leadership positions and authority goes accountability. If you all know that a previous decision turned out poorly, even if it was not ill-intentioned, making the same choice again makes no sense. People will not long trust leaders who seem to willingly choose to make the same poor choices over again. We have time to make a different choice, and call on your leadership and accountability to take the time to make a wise decision.

I know you won't lose the grant if you support a year's delay that will allow for a transparent review of what restoration option is really in the stream's best interest, particularly in view of the Natural Channel Design option having failed there before. Let's not make the same mistake twice now that we know it doesn't work. No accountable leader would do that. A new plan is needed.

(David Mowry) I am David Mowry and I was born and raised in Alexandria. I have lived at 32 Fort Williams Parkway, five houses up from Duke Street, since 2000, and Strawberry Run is right behind my home. I have worked in construction my entire life and am a construction project manager.

My kids enjoyed the stream as a place to play, walk and wade in, as well as sitting on our porch overlooking it and hear the waterfall that is just behind us.

I watched the stream restoration done in 2010. It looked great upon completion and we enjoyed it two or three years before all the silt placed into the stream had washed away and the large boulders were pulled out by the rushing water during the early storms after it was done. The banks have become seriously eroded again as the design just didn't work. My recommendation is that the city comes back at least every few years to see if the money it invested was worth or did the restoration construction fail, and to have a maintenance plan as needed.

I also saw in 2010 in that the city had to take down a lot of trees to get the large trucks in through the woods with the dirt they used to raise the streambed. They tried to replace the trees but in the first year or so they still had to come back and again replace quite a number of them that didn't take, but they stopped doing that after awhile.

The waterfall has always been there. The 2010 restoration augmented it with stones and raised the bed stream a bit in front of it with sediment. But it all quickly washed away and the waterfall has been just like it is today for about seven or eight years. It is far from a recent creation.

I know the city wants to do the right thing. And I hope the city has come to see that the design they used in 2010 did not work out as they expected. Before you do it again upstream or here again behind my house a few hundred feet further downstream, see if the entire stream needs to be looked at as a whole.

I know that can be hard because I work in construction and realize there are several designs for any job, and each contractor has their favorite. But I would be cautious in believing what I gather is called the Natural Channel Design could work again in Strawberry Run, particularly as I watched the water rush through it during the flash floods from storms we had right after the 2010 effort ended.

Thank you.

(Steve Tuttle) I am Steve Tuttle and I live at 12 Fort Williams Parkway, backing up to Strawberry Run. I am a photographer and it's why Betty and I are so fortunate to live alongside this wonderful stream where we walk the path most days enjoying the trees and wild flowers.

I watched them restore the stream in what I'm told was a Natural Channel Design. It looked beautiful upon completion, but I did have some concerns. For example, I know the council members have walked it, and you may remember the right turn the stream takes about 25 yards from Duke Street walking toward it from the wooden bridge. There's a large maple there, its bank and roots now eroded. Large boulders that had been placed there when the tree was still set back from the bank are buried at the bottom of the creek. As storms blew them away within a few years, the bank and roots eroded more.

You may have seen another tree trunk had fallen and lays in front of the Maple's roots. It has slowed, if not stopped, the bank's erosion. More natural placement of logs might do better.

After the 2010 stream restoration, there were at least 6 storms that created flash floods equal to or worse in inches per hour than those in 2020, four of them before 2018. I watched the silt used to raise the bed stream being washed away. Boulders placed along it were pulled out as the banks eroded back to, and beyond, where they'd been before. The stream seemed to begin to fail the day they finished it.

I watched the 2010 stream restoration augment the waterfall as they built up the stream in front of it with soil, and some of the waterfall remained. But within 4, at the most 5, years, the waterfall became the more powerful force that you see today.

Besides fixing the waterfall issue somehow, the memo says "rehabilitative maintenance" needs to be done on the failed stream restoration. I don't know the extent planned, its cost or how it will impact our properties. In 2010, all the houses across the stream had first been torn down by the builder. It was simple to bring in heavy equipment because there was no homeowners' property to worry about.

I agree with the recommendation to delay for a year for a review before doing any restoration anywhere along the stream. We have to do it right this time, with the right design plans. What was done perviously, did not do that.