



County of Fairfax, Virginia

MEMORANDU

DATE: March 23, 2012

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: David J. Molchany 
Deputy County Executive

SUBJECT: Agency Responses to the Environmental Quality Advisory Council
Recommendations Contained within the 2011 Annual Report on the Environment

On December 6, 2011, the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) presented its Annual Report on the Environment to the Board of Supervisors. The chapters in the EQAC report are arranged to reflect the order of topics listed in the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Agenda (Environmental Excellence for Fairfax County: *A 20-Year Vision* - <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/living/environment/eip/>). Similar to the 2010 Annual Report, the 2011 report presented recommendations in two formats: items addressing ongoing considerations and continued support for existing programs (presented in the EQAC report as "comments" or "comments and ongoing concerns") and items addressing new considerations, significant refinements of previous recommendations and issues that EQAC otherwise wished to stress (presented in the EQAC report as "recommendations"). EQAC and County staff have held discussions regarding the staff responses to EQAC recommendations and agreed to focus the staff response efforts on those items presented as "recommendations" in the EQAC report. This includes recommendations in areas of: Climate Change and Energy; Land Use and Transportation; Water Resources; Hazardous Materials; Ecological Resources; Wildlife Management; and Noise. Consistent with last year's effort, the Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC) circulated EQAC's recommendations among appropriate County agencies and organizations, and coordinated a collaborative staff response to each of the recommendations for consideration by the Board.

The following County agencies were asked to respond to EQAC's recommendations:

- Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)
- Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA)
- Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
- Division of Animal Control, Police Department (PD)

Office of the County Executive
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 552
Fairfax, VA 22035-0066
703-324-2531, TTY 703-222-5494, Fax 703-324-3956
www.fairfaxcounty.gov

- Department of Information Technology (DIT)
- Department of Management and Budget
- Department of Cable and Consumer Services
- Environmental Coordinator

In addition, the Department of Transportation, the Office of Community Revitalization (OCR), the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (DNCS), the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA), the Office of Public Affairs and the county's Energy Efficiency and Conservation Coordinating Committee (EECCC) were asked to contribute to responses for at least one recommendation each. In order to facilitate agency responses and EQAC's review of these responses, each agency was asked to complete individual response forms for each of the recommendations directed to it. Twelve of the 17 responses required input from more than one agency, although, as noted below, all recommendations were coordinated through an ECC review.

Each of the agencies listed above prepared its draft responses by February 3, 2012. The responses were then reviewed by the ECC, which is a collaborative interagency management committee chaired by Deputy County Executive David J. Molchany. Among other responsibilities, this committee was established to ensure an appropriate level of coordination and review of the County's environmental policies and initiatives. This is the eleventh year that the ECC has reviewed the EQAC recommendations. While individual agencies took the lead in preparing responses to EQAC recommendations, the responses reflect the views of the entire ECC. One of several objectives of the ECC is to coordinate among the various County agencies, support deliberations, and make recommendations to the County Executive with regard to issues and initiatives associated with environmental concerns, interests, and regulatory requirements as identified by County staff. The ECC has representation from the following agencies: Department of Public Works and Environmental Services; Department of Planning and Zoning; Department of Vehicle Services; Fairfax County Department of Transportation; Fairfax County Health Department; Fire and Rescue Department; Fairfax County Park Authority; Police Department; Office of Public Affairs; Fairfax County Water Authority; County Attorney's Office; Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District; Department of Management and Budget; Fairfax County Public Schools; Virginia Department of Transportation; and the County Executive's Office.

A complete set of staff responses to EQAC's 2011 recommendations is enclosed as Attachment 1. The staff responses are provided in the same order as the corresponding recommendations in the Annual Report.

Three responses to EQAC recommendations that suggest actions with fiscal implications in the FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan are as follows:

- The Water Resources recommendation would require that the BOS approve the County Executive's FY 2013 proposal to increase the Stormwater Tax rate from \$0.015 to \$0.025 per \$100 of assessed real estate value.
- The response to the Ecological Resources recommendation states that the FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan includes \$75,000 to support the current level of the county's Invasive Management Area Program.
- The response to the three Wildlife – Deer recommendations states that in the County Executive's proposed FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan, funding for the Fairfax County Deer Management Program is proposed to remain the same as the FY 2012 budgeted level. The budget in FY 2012 supports 1/1.0 SYE Naturalist IV position and associated operating costs in support of the program.

If you have questions about this memo, please contact Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator (703-324-1788). Thank you.

Attachment: As Stated

cc: Environmental Quality Advisory Council
Environmental Coordinating Committee
Anthony H. Griffin, County Executive
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
Susan Datta, Director, Department of Management and Budget
Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator
Noel Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Climate Change and Energy #1

(Page 5 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

While the efforts of Fairfax County government help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the county's efforts to reduce Fairfax County government emissions may be most valuable as a model and to show that GHG emission reductions are feasible. There are often significant savings, especially over time, with changes that reduce GHG emissions. Education programs (including social media) and programs to promote energy efficiency will be very important to the future and funding for these programs will be critical for these programs to succeed. For this reason, EQAC recommends that Fairfax County implement energy and climate change-related projects that are part of the county's Environmental Improvement Program through a dedicated fund supporting EIP projects. Such a fund could be structured similarly to an existing Information Technology fund.

LEAD AGENCIES: DMB; Environmental Coordinator
COORDINATING AGENCY: EECCC

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Martha Reed, DMB and Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed.

At a regular Board meeting on Tuesday, December 6, 2011, the County's Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) presented the 2011 Annual Report on the Environment to the Board of Supervisors (Board). One of the recommendations centered on the need to establish a funding mechanism to support the Board-adopted Environmental Agenda (Environmental Excellence for Fairfax County: *A 20-year Vision*). Specifically, EQAC recommended that Fairfax County establish an Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) projects Fund and suggested that the EIP Fund could be established and structured in a similar manner to the Information Technology Fund.

The following briefly explains the EIP, summarizes the current process for funding EIP projects, and identifies an alternative approach that will provide some additional rigor into the process and address the EQAC recommendation.

Current EIP Project Funding Process

The EIP was first developed in 2005 by the County's Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC) in response to direction by the Board following the adoption of its Environmental Agenda on June 21, 2004. Specifically, the EIP is the tactical implementation plan to provide the County Executive and Board with environmental and energy project investment opportunities to support the Board-adopted Environmental Agenda vision and goals. The EIP is updated annually through a coordinated and collaborative process. Please see <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/living/environment/eip/> for further information regarding the EIP.

EIP projects were first funded as part of the *FY 2004 Carryover Review* (September 2004). The total EIP project funding including the current FY 2012 Adopted Budget Plan is roughly \$5.8 million. EIP project funds have been funded by the General Fund as part of Fund 303, County Construction under a series of Environmental Agenda Initiatives projects. The new funding structure within the FOCUS system allows for greater flexibility in the application of funds within the environmental projects. As projects are completed, any remaining balances can be redirected to other on-going environmental initiatives.

EIP project investment prioritization, execution and tracking are an integral part of the funding process. Based on the vision and goals in the Board-adopted Environmental Agenda, as well as changes in social, economic and environmental paradigms, and state or federal mandates that must be fulfilled, the following priorities (not listed in any particular order of importance) are used as guidelines for project funding decisions:

- The project(s) can be implemented in the fiscal year in which funding is being requested
- The project(s) accomplish more than one objective or theme in the Environmental Agenda
- The project is ideally something you can see 'in the ground'
- There is a quick impact or effect, which could include a quick return on investment
- The scope of the benefits is quantifiable and/or qualifiable
- The project is not in the CIP, Four Year Transportation Plan or Stormwater Spending Plan nor likely to be funded through other sources of dedicated funding
- The project is a part of a bigger initiative (for instance a regional effort such as the Chesapeake Bay)
- The project will have positive results in multiple magisterial districts
- The project is critical to a service/program function in the county and without funding will cease to exist

For each fiscal planning year, county agencies that participate in the development of the EIP submit top priority projects to the County's Environmental Coordinator for initial review and consideration. A technical analysis including cost/benefit information is included as part of the budget submission. Projects are then prioritized based on the criteria shown above, and a final matrix of prioritized projects is submitted to the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) for consideration in the County Executive's Advertised Budget.

DMB with input from the County Executive and the Deputies determines the appropriate level of funding that will be available for EIP projects in any given budget year. Since the EIP project funding is supported by the General Fund, the amount of funding available varies from year to year. A final list of EIP projects that are approved for inclusion in the County Executive's Advertised Budget is provided to the County's Environmental Coordinator.

Recommendation to Strengthen the EIP Project Funding Process

Although the EIP project selection and funding process as outlined above has provided a mechanism for the County Executive to fund environmental and energy investment opportunities in support of the Board-adopted Environmental Agenda, staff has reviewed the EQAC recommendation, and suggests the following to provide an additional level of rigor to the process.

First, a Deputy County Executive will be responsible for the overall EIP project funding and selection process. This process will be under the direction of the County's Environmental Coordinating Committee. The following approach summarizes the proposed evaluation and selection process:

1. The ECC will charter an interagency Steering Committee to review and score EIP projects for funding consideration during each fiscal year planning cycle.
2. The first task of the steering committee will be to develop the EIP project evaluation and selection scoring template. This template will include criteria that will be carefully selected to score and prioritize projects for funding consideration. Criteria will be shared with EQAC for further review and revision.
3. Initial project recommendations will be submitted by County departments as part of the annual budget process.
4. Early in the process, agencies will be requested to submit both a business and technical viability analysis for each proposed project.
5. Both the business and technical analyses will be reviewed by staff from the Department of Management and Budget (DMB) and the interagency Steering Committee.
6. The business analysis will include such factors as return on investment to include quantified cost savings, cost avoidance, enhanced revenue, non-quantifiable service benefits, staff savings, staffing efficiencies, indicators to measure success, estimated project costs and duration and project risks.
7. The technical analysis will include such factors as to determine project concept feasibility from the standpoint of implementation and may include the overall strategy and approach as well as an analysis to determine compatibility and alignment with county Board-adopted goals and policies.
8. DMB and Steering Committee staff will review the initial submissions and make recommendations for improvement of the proposals.
9. The final proposals will be presented in an oral interview setting conducted by Steering Committee and DMB staff, which will score the proposals and make funding recommendations for consideration by the Deputy County Executive.

The ECC is committed to working closely with EQAC to develop and finalize the project selection criteria that will be used in the template to score and prioritize the projects.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with the recommendation regarding EIP funding; however, the staff recommendation suggests general funds be used in place of setting up a separate fund outside of the general fund. Please see the above explanation for more detail.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Please see explanation above beginning with the heading "Recommendation to Strengthen the EIP Project Funding Process"

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

As in previous years, the EIP projects will continue to be supported by the General Fund and will be subject to availability of General Fund monies; however, through the proposed selection process, it is anticipated that Steering Committee will determine an appropriate level of annual funding.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Please see the response to the preceding question.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Climate Change and Energy #2

(Page 5 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct county staff to evaluate alternatives for the county to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Step one in this process should be to assess the amount of food and other waste that could be diverted to recycling as opposed to incineration and landfilling. More specifically, composting efforts similar to what is being pursued in the District of Columbia and Arlington County should be considered. For some buildings, soiled paper products, food waste and other materials are being composted in order to increase the amount of material recycled.

LEAD AGENCY: DPWES-Solid Waste

COORDINATING AGENCIES: Environmental Coordinator; EECCC

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Pamela Gratton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Solid Waste Management Program has developed a strategic plan according to the guidance provided by management of the Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES). The strategic plan spans a three-year timeframe and one of the elements of the plan is to determine where any existing or planned composting capacity exists within a geographic location where it could be utilized by the county. This project has just been initiated.

This project does not include any evaluation of the potential quantities of food waste or other organic residuals that may exist within Fairfax County. To determine the amount of food waste in Fairfax County, a significant evaluation and study would be required to be conducted. This type of study is entitled a "waste sort". A waste sort is an actual physical evaluation of waste collected where it is separated into its individual component parts with a high degree of specificity. To ensure a true evaluation of the types of waste generated in the county, the waste sort study would need to encompass many factors to ensure the quality and accuracy of the data gathered. Just a few of the elements that would need to be addressed (by no means all inclusive) are: the season of the year when the waste is generated; whether or not it is from a residential or commercial source; and what types wastes are to be evaluated (i.e. does it include recyclables, hazardous waste, construction and demolition debris, etc.). A waste sort has not been factored into the Solid Waste Management Program's strategic plan that is directing this work effort.

Additionally, EQAC references the food waste composting efforts of the District of Columbia and Arlington County. As presented in last year's response to this particular EQAC

recommendation, county staff has had direct conversations with the District of Columbia and Arlington County regarding their efforts to recycle food waste. The District of Columbia has no city-wide program to recycle food waste. There are several private concerns operating in the jurisdiction that provide limited food waste recycling, but it is not required nor is it implemented with any regularity throughout the district. In Arlington County, the only food waste composting program is associated with food waste collected from the county jail. It is not a county-wide food waste recycling program.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The staff of the Fairfax County Solid Waste Management program does not object to this recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

To address this recommendation, a county-wide waste sort would need to be conducted.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

There would be budget implications for the performance of a waste audit; this has not been included in the 2013 budget. A waste sort conducted at the level necessary to develop the data whereby a decision regarding the feasibility of food waste composting for Fairfax County would be a complex and detailed evaluation. At a minimum, this would cost about \$100K and could go up to \$300K depending on the level of detail determined to be necessary.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

If the county were to undertake a waste sort, the financial needs identified above would require funding. Any approach undertaken to address recycling of food waste in the county would require significant financial resources. Funding for the project would need to be identified and allocated. Additionally, the Fairfax County Solid Waste Management Program does not own property of the size necessary to successfully address the composting of food waste, unless an advanced technology was selected that could reduce the size of the site needed to construct said facility. Since this would be a major investment for the county, long-term planning for its siting, construction and operation, including funding sources, would need to be identified.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Climate Change and Energy #3

(Page 5 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

While the county has promoted the incorporation of energy efficient certification, such as LEED at the Silver level or higher, EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors should also promote periodic (e.g., bi-annual) evaluation of the GHG footprints for buildings and facilities. While the county has already taken these steps for Fairfax County government buildings, such actions would also be helpful for residential and commercial sectors.

LEAD AGENCY: Environmental Coordinator

COORDINATING AGENCIES: EEECC; DPZ-PD; OPA; Cable and Consumer Services; DPWES-LDS

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Kambiz Agazi

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation will be addressed in a new action item in the fiscal year 2014 Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) that is scheduled for release in fall 2012.

As EQAC is aware, the county is in the early stages of implementing its federally funded residential energy education and outreach program (EE&O) (please see response to Climate Change and Energy #4 for more detail). The EE&O is intended to help Fairfax County residents become more aware of their personal energy consumption and to educate them on how they can reduce usage; staff anticipates that home energy use monitoring will be a component of a broader set of energy efficiency and conservation messages that will be developed for this program.

County staff will also develop a companion program for the business community. Staff envisions a similar process to the residential energy and education outreach program, but tailored to encourage businesses to develop energy management plans. These would promote both operational and user conservation and efficiency and make use of existing benchmarking tools such as the Environmental Protection Agency's Benchmarking with Portfolio Manager or equivalent to track and evaluate facility/building energy usage. While staff does not anticipate that a specific recurrence period would be suggested for benchmarking, staff does anticipate that the business outreach program would have the effect of promoting continued monitoring and benchmarking of energy use (and, by extension, greenhouse gas emissions).

Other elements in the business outreach program (targeting both area businesses and institutional uses/organizations) could include:

- An outreach and marketing program supporting energy efficiency and conservation initiatives encompassing presentations to business associations such as the area chambers of commerce, templates for action and peer-to-peer problem solving.
- Recognition of success stories through programs such as the Environmental Excellence Awards and Exceptional Design Awards.
- Utilizing the county's social media platforms with posts on the Environment and Fairfax County Facebook pages and coordination with the EE&O website with opportunities for visitor engagement.

County staff is committed to working closely with EQAC as well as business groups and/or associations/chambers to develop and promote the program. As is the case for all EIP actions both past and future, projects will continue to be supported by the General Fund and will be subject to availability of General Fund monies.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with the EQAC recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

None.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Details will be provided in the fiscal year 2014 EIP, which is anticipated to be released in the fall of 2012.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Climate Change and Energy #4

(Page 5 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that Fairfax County establish a program to serve as a follow-on to the Residential Energy and Education Outreach program that is being funded by a grant through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The REE&O program is funded through fall 2012 using grant money, and then lacks funding to continue its operation. The program is seeking to educate county residents on energy conservation and greenhouse gas emission reductions, and would be most beneficial if it continued after the grant money was expended. Given the significant efforts and expenditures made by the county to get this program started, it would be most cost-efficient to continue the program at this time rather than stop it and then try to re-start it at some future date.

LEAD AGENCIES: Environmental Coordinator; Cable and Consumer Services

COORDINATING AGENCIES: EECCC; OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person:

Susan Hafeli, Department of Cable and Consumer Services

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

County staff is very interested in continuing the Residential Energy Education and Outreach (REE&O) program funded by the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) program under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). In fact, Section 5.3 of the Request for Proposal regarding this program, issued May 17, 2011, expressly directed offerors to “explain whether and how the County could continue a specific approach beyond the end of the EECBG award period, keeping in mind the limited resources” available thereafter.

County staff advised the REE&O vendor, GolinHarris International (GHI) that it envisioned a program that would continue beyond the award period and could be expanded to encompass the business community. The program name – *Energy Action Fairfax: Step Up to Savings* – reflects and accommodates these longer-term considerations.

Staff will be working with GHI to implement the REE&O program through the award period, which ends in October 2012. During this same period, staff will be evaluating the REE&O program. Staff anticipates incorporating into future energy education and outreach programs the lessons learned from its EECBG-funded REE&O program. As a result, it would appear premature to establish a follow-on program until the REE&O program is completed and its lessons identified and analyzed.

Residential energy education and outreach is described in Item EIP12-ES09-10(B) of the County's Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Staff commits to updating this EIP item to incorporate lessons learned as a result of the EECBG-funded REE&O program.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable; staff concurs.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No actions appear necessary at this time.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continuation of an energy education and outreach (EE&O) program beyond October 2012 can be expected to have budget implications for FY 2014, but the extent of those implications depends on factors not currently known. More specific information may be available in the FY 2014 EIP, which staff anticipates will be released in the fall of 2012.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1

(Page 15 and 16 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

1. Holistic Land Use and Transportation Planning

The current Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan traces its roots back to the Planning Land Use System program that culminated in 1975 and the “Goals for Fairfax County” adopted in 1988. Numerous reviews and regular updates have occurred over the past 35 years, yet as stated in the current Plan: “Many of the key components of the 1975 Plan remain in the revised Plan, such as the emphasis on focusing growth in ‘Centers’; decreasing automobile dependency; and protecting environmentally sensitive areas and stable neighborhoods. What has changed are some of the means to achieve these ends.”

EQAC continues to support a comprehensive evaluation of the plan. Recent discussions have been positive towards this recommendation, especially leveraging actual data and GIS support to substantiate and illustrate the changes. As reference, the last published review was the “State of The Plan, An Evaluation of Comprehensive Plan Activities between 1990-1995 with an Assessment of Impacts through 2010” (published in 1996). The new review should cover plan activities between 1995-2011 and assess impacts through 2025.

With the renewed focus on revitalization, especially in the mixed-use centers, EQAC continues to recommend that the county formalize and prioritize the focus on these centers. The APR Retrospective is a positive step towards this recommendation. The special studies currently under way bring together a myriad of issues that can be addressed holistically and with public participation. This formalization should include incorporating GIS technology and standards for modeling future conditions and plan potential.

The evaluation and assessment will help clarify the historical lessons learned and identify areas that have proven successful at a macro level across the county and where it needs to be strengthened for a future vision. The APR Retrospective is timely in light of the significant changes being experienced in the county.

LEAD AGENCY: DPZ

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: DOT (Dan Southworth), OCR (Elizabeth Hagg)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Aaron Klibaner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The *State of the Plan* document of 1996 provided information on how the Comprehensive Plan changed between 1990-1995 in terms of development potential (i.e., Plan build-out); provided an assessment of the degree to which the Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives and policies had been implemented; and suggested new actions that should be pursued to improve the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff is currently engaged in the Plan Monitoring and 2011-2012 Area Plans Review (APR) Retrospective efforts.

The Plan Monitoring effort entails the assessment of Comprehensive Plan amendments and implementation, focusing on Plan changes between 2000 and 2010. Trends in development will be recognized as they relate to policy goals.

The APR Retrospective project involves: an extensive examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the APR process; evaluation of potential improvements or alternatives to the process; and the updating of planning resources such as the Plan amendment database, Concept for Future Development and Comprehensive Plan Map.

The Retrospective and Plan Monitoring processes are anticipated to be completed by the end of 2012.

Through the Plan Monitoring effort, staff is quantifying and assessing the county's development potential and trends; the results will be presented in a report to be entitled "State of the Plan, 2000-2010." While this report will not be a true update to the earlier "State of the Plan" document, it is staff's view that the new report will provide the comprehensive evaluation that is being recommended by EQAC.

Staff is currently engaged in quantifying and summarizing planning activities utilizing the county's Geographic Information Systems (GIS)-based Comprehensive Plan Potential Application (CPPA). CPPA will assist staff in determining development trends by type of land use, focusing on the past decade, and comparing this information to trends since the Planning Horizons effort in 1991. This effort is primarily intended to demonstrate how planning activities have achieved growth and conservation policies related to encouraging transit-oriented, mixed-use development in the county's activity centers and other sustainability goals.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff recommends that the Department of Planning and Zoning continue to evaluate the state of the Plan through the current Plan monitoring and trends assessments efforts. Staff should also consider additional options related to the display and communication of the results. Upon

completion of the APR Retrospective process, staff anticipates that major changes in the planning process will occur, and that future amendments to the Comprehensive Plan using the new process may result in major changes to the recommendations in the Plan for the county's mixed-use centers.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

Plan monitoring and trends assessment activities are funded through the regular annual budget of DPZ, as current staff members are involved in the effort. The activities would not implicate the FY 2013 budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The staff-recommended actions do not have any longer-range fiscal implications at this time. If additional development and refinement of CPPA need to occur, longer-range fiscal implications may result.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation 2a

(Page 16 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

2. Data and Modeling

- a. EQAC is an advocate of the county GIS and the Integrated Parcel Lifecycle System. We recommend that the county push to have all land use and parcel based data tied into the GIS. This includes data that are more descriptive than quantitative. For example, the Land Development System is not easily used with GIS because it is textual rather than graphical. At a minimum there should be a note in GIS that additional data exist at a geospatial location.

LEAD AGENCY: DPZ

COORDINATING AGENCIES: Neighborhood & Community Services, DIT-GIS

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Aaron Klibaner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The first part of this recommendation involves incorporating data from IPLS into the county's GIS system. This recommendation will be answered in detail as part of the response to recommendation #2c. The portion of the recommendation relating to the LDS system is addressed below.

Staff from the Planning Division of the Department of Planning & Zoning has performed a detailed review of the LDS data related to land use changes, and sorted the useable information from this complex system of review and approval process. Currently the staff is analyzing the Department of Public Works & Environmental Services' (DPWES) data to establish business rules for the data processing.

DIT is currently working on several technology initiatives (subject to funding availability & BOS technology project priorities) that will increase accessibility of land use information via the Web.

The newest initiative is the Land Development Information (LDI) data warehouse (that includes GIS spatial capabilities). LDI will consolidate disparate Fairfax County land use data from a variety of land systems. LDI is scheduled for public release this year.

A new version of Virtual Fairfax is being planned. The ability to show on the map that additional data exist at a location and then enable users to click through to the underlying systems (LDS and LDI) is being evaluated and should be achievable. Adding this capability would let Virtual Fairfax users know from the beginning whether there is land development information in an area or not and provide direct access to the underlying land information.

The intent of these systems is to enable constituents to access land data such as development plans, site and building permits, inspections and infrastructure profiles in multiple ways, each of which includes a GIS component.

In addition, DPZ staff has created a number of new applications within the past year that establish an interactive capability between LDS and GIS and are publicly accessible on the DPZ website. These include:

- The Active Zoning Applications Interactive Map provides a geographic view of applications under review by the DPZ using the GIS server to create an interactive map of active zoning cases linking to Land Development System (LDS) information and staff reports for active zoning cases;
- A GIS generated countywide map by magisterial district which shows the location of Agricultural & Forestal Districts throughout the county;
- The Tysons Corner Interactive Portal Map provides an interactive geographic view of applications under review by the DPZ using the GIS to access information and staff reports for Tysons zoning cases.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We concur with this recommendation. It enriches the information contained in Virtual Fairfax, as well as adds GIS capability to the new LDI system. Users will be able to use GIS within LDI to access its information. They should also be able to use Virtual Fairfax to see if land data exist and then click through to the appropriate land information system. The new applications that allow the public to actively search for zoning applications by using an interactive map establish a connection between LDS data and GIS.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

LDI will be available this year, and the ability to indicate the availability of land information within Virtual Fairfax is being evaluated to determine the best approach. It should be available by the end of this calendar year. Staff is actively exploring new methods of integrating the LDS database with GIS to enhance interactive capabilities for the public.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

DIT will take an incremental approach to address EQAC recommendations (and complete the above mentioned technology initiatives) due to ongoing county budget constraints and challenges. During Fiscal Year 2012, DIT plans to complete the implementation of the Land Data Information Data Warehouse. Early in FY 2013, displaying the availability of land information in Virtual Fairfax should also be implemented. There are no FY 2013 implications for the continuing work on creating interactive mapping applications that utilize data from LDS; these are activities being pursued by existing DPZ staff.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Virtual Fairfax incurs annual service charges (for the software and cloud hosting) which must be paid. Future activity does face uncertainty since Fairfax County will continue to face out-year budget challenges due to the residual effects of the recession, the vagaries of the American business cycle and BOS budget priorities. Therefore full compliance with all EQAC recommendations is contingent on these factors.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2b

(Page 16 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

2. Data and Modeling

- b. EQAC recommends that the Comprehensive Plan be modified to better utilize GIS technology. Digital maps are continuously changing with new zoning, land acquisitions and other changes. However the latest adopted Comprehensive Plan changes are not displayed on the map. The plan should be digitally formatted so that approved Comprehensive Plan changes and other appropriate updates can be incorporated in a timely manner. The Comprehensive Plan text volumes should continue to migrate to a digital format based on GIS technology. Plan language can be tagged and referenced by GIS region for access through the digital interface.

LEAD AGENCY: DPZ

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: DIT-GIS

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Aaron Klibaner

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Staff began the process of converting the Comprehensive Plan Map from a paper format to a digital format in early 2011 and the new digital Plan Map is anticipated to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors in early 2012. The digital Plan Map will be available on the DPZ website. The new format will allow changes in the Comprehensive Plan volumes that occur as a result of adopted amendments to be reflected within a short period of time, which will achieve consistency between the Plan text and the Plan Map.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

In the future, staff intends to develop interactivity capability between the Comprehensive Plan volumes and the Comprehensive Plan Map. The ability to point and click on a specific property shown on the Plan Map will activate a link to the appropriate text within the Comprehensive Plan

volumes. This capability will greatly enhance the public accessibility of the Comprehensive Plan, and will allow citizens to perform Plan research that staff is now required to perform. Staff will need to evaluate the resources that will be needed in order to implement these improvements. Factors such as the possibility of hiring outside contractors to complete some of the software development related tasks will need to be considered.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

The conversion of the paper format Comprehensive Plan Map to digital format was funded through the regular annual budget of DPZ, as current staff members were involved in the effort. The activities would not implicate the FY 2013 budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There may be longer range fiscal implications for developing the interactivity capabilities between the Comprehensive Plan volumes and Comprehensive Plan Map, but these implications are yet to be determined.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2c

(Page 16 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

2. Data and Modeling

- c. IPLS has made great strides with the housing base, but other systems need to continue to be brought up to date. Continue to improve the plan amendment and plan quantification databases as well as their interface to IPLS. There should be an ability to easily track changes in plan potential, either at a parcel level or within small groupings of regions. New nonresidential pipeline data should be incorporated in IPLS. This would be very useful for forecasting and analyzing with existing data.

LEAD AGENCY: DPZ-PD

**COORDINATING AGENCIES: Neighborhood and Community Services;
DIT-GIS**

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation to improve the plan amendment and plan quantification databases, as well as their interface with IPLS, has been addressed in part. The Planning Division in Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) has developed an in-house GIS based application called Comprehensive Plan Potential Application that captures and quantifies the range of development scenarios at parcel or parcel grouping level based on the Comprehensive Plan Map and the land use recommendations specified in the Plan text. The data captured by this application are regularly updated based on the adopted Plan amendments and are tracked by another GIS based application developed in house called Comprehensive Plan Amendment Tracking Application.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Planning Division fully concurs with this recommendation. The data quality and accessibility have improved tremendously for planning functions since the establishment of the above mentioned in-house GIS based applications. These data are currently used for various planning functions, including employment forecasting for Fairfax County. The Planning Division represents Fairfax County on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG)'s Cooperative Forecasting and Data Subcommittee (CFDS) and provides employment forecasts as

part of the Cooperative Forecasting Program; this program enables local, regional and federal agencies to coordinate planning using common assumptions about future growth and development in the region. Quantified Plan data are used to evaluate the development potential in the county at Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) levels. COG Rounds are updated based on Comprehensive Plan and major zoning changes that can have substantial impacts on forecast data. The Plan's quantified housing potential is incorporated within IPLS and is used in IPLS to formulate household and population forecasts. DPZ staff is currently undertaking Plan Monitoring efforts that will be presented in a report to be entitled "State of the Plan, 2000-2010. Through this effort, data from the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Tracking Application and the Comprehensive Plan Potential Application are being used to evaluate how the Comprehensive Plan has changed in terms of quantity of development potential, land use mix and distribution of planned development since Planning Horizons (adopted in the early 1990s). More information about the Plan Monitoring process can be found in the response to Land Use and Transportation recommendation #1.

DPZ is continuously exploring ways to improve the Plan Amendment and Plan Potential databases and to integrate with the county's Web-based applications such as Geographic Exploration and Mapping (GEM) and My Neighborhood.

The recommendation to incorporate the nonresidential pipeline data into IPLS has been evaluated. To bring non-residential pipeline data into IPLS will involve major changes to Land Development System (LDS) where these data are processed and reside. LDS is currently designed based on the data requirements and business processes of various agencies involved. The data captured in LDS meet the requirements for calculating the residential pipeline data in IPLS. However, given the complex nature of nonresidential pipeline data, substantial changes would have to be made to the LDS system and would require extensive coordination among the agencies involved.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

This recommendation requires coordination among multiple agencies and willingness of these agencies to adjust their databases as well as allocate resources.

The Department of Planning and Zoning will continue to work on quantification of residential and non-residential data. Further work to link these data with other databases or agency systems for IPLS will require additional staff resources. Such undertaking requires an evaluation of benefits compared to the resources it will demand for creation and monitoring of the system.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

While funds are not being sought for FY 2013, updating LDS and IPLS to facilitate nonresidential pipeline data creation would require multi agency coordination and would have budget implications. A timeline has not been set for such coordination.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The actions recommended would have long-range fiscal implications and would require staff resources from the agencies involved. Implementing these actions would also require funds to update LDS and IPLS systems.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2d

(Page 16 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

2. Data and Modeling

- d. GIS tools have become essential for county staff. EQAC commends the county for providing public access to many sources and recommends this effort be continued, as appropriate and feasible. This includes the next iteration of My Neighborhood and regular updates of the county digital data holdings.

LEAD AGENCY: DIT-GIS

COORDINATING AGENCIES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Thomas Conry

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The components of this recommendation are being addressed. The complete redesign of My Neighborhood is well underway and scheduled for release in 2012. This is a total rework of the application that will enable more flexibility and easier ability to incorporate more functionality related My Neighborhood (e.g., an address research tool). Because of the complete redesign, and the ongoing work to completely revise the Digital Map Viewer and update Virtual Fairfax, project schedules have extended. The GIS office has completed a fairly extensive task to enhance its cartographic base map data for inclusion in its GIS Vendor's (Esri) web-based community maps program. This will enable My Neighborhood's maps to continue beyond county boundaries, providing context to the maps. It also makes that data available to anyone using free Esri web tools in a standard national format.

The key digital data holdings that need specific funding to update include the orthoimagery, oblique imagery and related 3-D data and planimetric data. Fund 104 monies were approved and allocated for FY 2012 that complete payment for the oblique imagery which was reflowed and delivered in CY 2011. Additionally there will be the acquisition of additional 3-D buildings for about another 5 sq miles of the county. The planimetric project is now updating data for the third quadrant (NW) of the county. That quadrant should be delivered before the end of FY 2012. DPWES has committed to funding its portion in 2012 as well. This will enable completion of the fourth and final quadrant of this update cycle. The GIS Staff have been conducting 100% quality control on the data (to date over

one million features have been captured and added to the GIS data warehouse). The quality of the planimetric work done by the contractor has been excellent.

Other digital data, such as parcels, zoning areas, storm and sanitary sewers are maintained through the regular business processes of the responsible agencies (e.g., DPWES).

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

It is being addressed and the recommendation is important. Because the imagery and planimetric data are foundational datasets of the GIS, it is important to keep them as current as possible. These data sets are widely and regularly used in county business processes (for instance, the Department of Tax Administration, Police, Fire and Rescue and the Department of Public Safety Communications). Having stale foundational data would undercut those processes by adding increased public safety risk due to out of date data; in addition, there would be, increased staff property assessment time, since imagery would not be up to date and more field work would be necessary. Similar issues face other agencies as well.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Because both ortho and oblique aerial imagery are essential components of the GIS, and they require annual funding through Fund 104, they require continuing focus on their value and importance to county operations on order to continue their support. Similarly the planimetric project requires 104 funding as well as DPWES monies. EQAC's understanding and support for these core GIS components is appreciated and helpful.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

Fairfax County partners with the state of Virginia to update the aerial and ortho imagery of the county. This partnership is highly beneficial to the county, since it obtains the imagery for less than one third the cost of doing it alone. The current imagery was obtained in 2009 and is scheduled for updating in the spring of 2013. Based on the last joint acquisitions with the state, the County's share of the cost is expected to be about \$110,000. GIS has alerted DIT to the upcoming funding requirement and will do so again in 2012 so that budget planning is aware of the upcoming cost.

Additionally, the contract for oblique imagery (from Pictometry) expires in 2012. An RFP has been drafted and will be distributed early in CY 2012. Depending on the results of that procurement, the annual costs for oblique imagery will most probably change. The extent of the change will depend on the outcome of that procurement.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

To the extent that imagery and planimetric update are essential to keeping the GIS reasonably up to date, the funding for these activities needs to be an on-going, recurring county investment

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #1

(Page 33 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that Fairfax County continue to adequately fund and implement its ongoing stormwater program, which includes dam maintenance, infrastructure replacement, water resource monitoring and management, watershed restoration and educational stewardship programs. EQAC realizes the funding for the stormwater program will come entirely from funds generated through the Service District rates. EQAC also realizes that there is a need for increasing capacity within the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services to provide these services.

EQAC recommends that the Stormwater Service District rate be increased in FY 2013 by a penny, from a rate of 1.5 cents per \$100 assessed real estate value to 2.5 cents per \$100. This would, once again, result in more funding for modest watershed improvement programs and a somewhat more realistic infrastructure replacement timeline. We realize that there will likely be a need for additional increases for water quality projects to meet future permit conditions, and for infrastructure reinvestment, as the system is continually growing and aging.

LEAD AGENCY: DPWES-Stormwater

COORDINATING AGENCIES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Craig Carinci

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details. Potential rate increases will be addressed during the upcoming FY 2013 budget process.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not? In FY 2010, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) established a Stormwater Service District to provide a dedicated funding source for stormwater management. A service district levy of \$0.010 (one cent) per \$100 of assessed real estate value was implemented. In the FY 2011, the BOS approved an increase of the levy to \$0.015 (one and a half cent) per \$100 of assessed real estate value. This increased rate to ½ penny supported the re-establishment of a capital program for stormwater management that provided for infrastructure reinvestment of existing failing facilities and for the implementation of critical capital projects to address other health and safety issues, improve stormwater quality and mitigate the impacts of stormwater flooding. Moreover, the County is responsible for the maintenance of storm sewers and stormwater management facilities, valued at roughly \$1 billion and \$550 million respectively, as well as 19 state regulated dams. The increased funding in FY 2011 was needed to continue to demonstrate to state and federal regulatory agencies the County's commitment to maintaining previous levels of effort to comply with our Municipal

Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4) permit as well as to address dam safety regulatory compliance requirements. Federal and state regulations associated with the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), Accotink TMDL that was approved by the EPA in April 2011 and the MS4 permit are projected to place unprecedented implementation requirements on the county. It has been estimated that county costs to comply with the Chesapeake Bay TMDL could be as much as \$70 million to \$90 million per year. Estimates to comply with the Accotink TMDL range from \$200 million to \$400 million.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation? Monitor the FY 2013 budget process.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain. The recommendation would require that the BOS increase the Stormwater Tax rate from \$0.015 to \$0.025 during the FY 2013 budget process.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain. Performing routine maintenance and infrastructure reinvestment and implementing water quality, flood mitigation and dam safety projects will result in extended infrastructure life expectancy, reduced expenses and liability attributable to public safety, flooding and MS4 permit violations. In addition, an adequately funded stormwater program will result in long term economic benefits to the county.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #1

(Page 40 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county continue to find ways to help people more easily recycle household hazardous waste. As examples of the need for such efforts, with the increased use of rechargeable batteries and compact fluorescent light bulbs, more households in the county will have these hazardous waste items to dispose of on a regular basis. EQAC commends the county for maintaining scheduled remote hazardous waste collection events in 2010. We urge the county to continue to schedule and publicize at least three to five of these remote events per year in the future.

LEAD AGENCY: DPWES-Solid Waste
COORDINATING AGENCIES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Joyce Doughty

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed by the Solid Waste Management Program. Three events were held in 2011, serving over 750 households. The remote program is planned to continue in 2012, with three events to be scheduled. The first two: March 24th at the South County Government Center and May 5th at the Mason District Governmental Center, have been set. A third event is planned for September in the Dranesville District; however it will need to be relocated from the McLean Governmental Center due to construction activity at that site. An alternate site has not yet been identified.

In addition, the Electric Sunday program will continue with eleven events in 2012, eight at the I-66 Transfer Station Complex and three at the I-95 Landfill Complex. During these events fluorescent bulbs are also collected, and the household hazardous waste facility is open to collect other materials. This availability is included in the advertisement.

Business hazardous waste events will all also continue, with three events again this year.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The planned programs will continue.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

Included in the budget for the Solid Waste special revenue fund.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continuation of program will have annual funding needs.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources 1

(Page 52 of the Annual Report on the Environment; Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

The Fairfax County Park Authority approved a Natural Resource Management Plan in 2004. This partially fulfills a long-standing EQAC recommendation to develop and implement a countywide Natural Resource Management Plan. However, most of this plan cannot be implemented without additional staff and funding for the FCPA. The FCPA staff estimates that full implementation will require approximately \$8 million per year and dozens of staff positions. This includes about \$3.5 million to focus on general natural resource management and \$4.5 million for a non-native invasive plant control program. A more phased approach will allow FCPA to begin to manage 10 percent of parklands and set up the program to be phased in over time. Phase 1 with this approach would require \$650,000 and six positions. EQAC strongly feels that the plan needs to be implemented. Therefore, EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide sufficient funding to implement Phase 1. EQAC recognizes that in today's budget climate, such increased funding may be difficult to achieve. However, EQAC recommends some increase in funding by the Board of Supervisors. And, once the county's budget problems are eased, EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors increase funding as a high priority. Ultimately, this increased funding should support the full implementation of the Natural Resource Management Plan. In the meantime, EQAC recommends that some additional staff positions and supporting funding be found from internal FCPA staff assets.

For example, the Invasive Management Project is the most highly leveraged program in the Park Authority system. In calendar year 2010, 974 volunteers donated 3,589 hours of work towards habitat restoration. On Volunteer Fest Day, 164 volunteers donated 470 hours and removed about 270 bags of invasive plant debris. Additional funding will allow this highly successful, highly leveraged program to expand. Absent any additional funding from the Board of Supervisors, this is a good example of funding that should be found from internal FCPA assets.

LEAD AGENCY: FCPA

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Cindy Walsh

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

While recurring funding to implement the Natural Resource Management Plan has not been secured, progress has been made in identifying positions within the Park Authority. Three new merit positions were created in 2011 in the NRMP Branch (converted from limited term positions). Two are being held vacant and can be filled as soon as funding is available as part of

the Phase 1 implementation approach. The third position is the IMA Volunteer Coordinator position. In addition, the Natural Resource Management and Protection Section (NRMP) was reclassified as a Branch and the manager's position was upgraded accordingly in 2011.

It is also worth noting that the Natural Resource Specialist position became vacant due to a resignation in late 2010 and the Park Authority prioritized hiring the position (while many positions are being held vacant to manage budget shortfalls). The Branch manager will be vacated in January 2012, is considered a priority to fill and will be advertised immediately.

Finally, the Park Authority continues to be successful in obtaining project specific funding for resource management. In addition to funding for IMA, several other projects have been funded including work at Old Colchester Park and Preserve, Ossian Hall, Fitzhugh, and Wakefield Parks. The 300 acre Sappington Property was acquired in western Fairfax to buffer the globally rare plant communities in the Elklick Woodlands Natural Area Preserve. In addition, NRMP staff will be kicking off a new natural resource restoration project at Ellanor C. Lawrence Park using bond funds in 2012. The proposed 2012 bond will include \$1 million for natural capital renovation as well as natural resource mitigation funds in each project to minimize and restore impacts from construction.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Park Authority concurs with the recommendation to fund and implement the Natural Resource Management Plan, but at this time cannot realign additional staff from other important existing programs and services to the natural resource management program.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff will work with the County Environmental Coordinator to seek dedicated recurring funding for the IMA program through an Environmental Improvement Program fund in the budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

Yes, the FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan includes funding of \$75,000 to continue the IMA program.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain

Yes, it is estimated that the Natural Resource Management Plan will require approximately \$8 million and dozens of staff position annually to fully implement. This includes approximately \$3.5 million to focus on general natural resource management and \$4.5 million for a non-native invasive plant control program.

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendations

Recommendation: Wildlife—Deer Management #1

(Page 55 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

Managed hunts should be continued as they are both cost-effective and efficient in reducing excesses in the deer herd and deer vehicle collisions.

LEAD AGENCY: Police-Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY: FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Vicky Monroe, Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes, this recommendation has already been addressed. The Fairfax County Deer Management Program will continue to utilize all available deer management tools for population control. Public managed hunts will continue to be used at selected parks to implement sustainable hunting pressures.

In fiscal year 2011 (FY 2011), managed shotgun hunts were coordinated by the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist and Animal Control (FCPD) at two county parks and at Meadowood Recreation Area managed by the federal Bureau of Land Management. Additional public hunts were held by federal and state agencies at Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge and Mason Neck State Park (this program has been in place since 1993).

Managed hunts are a safe and often highly efficient method for deer population control at select sites.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No additional actions are necessary pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

In the County Executive's proposed FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan, funding for the Fairfax County Deer Management Program is proposed to remain the same as the FY 2012 budgeted level. The budget in FY 2012 supports 1/1.0 SYE Naturalist IV position and associated operating costs in support of the program.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There is ongoing need for increased and sustained funding for the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist office in general and the Fairfax County Deer Management Program specifically in order to meet the stated program objectives addressing:

- Public safety concerns related to deer-vehicle collisions;
- Human health concerns related to disease transmission;
- Environmental concerns attempting to lower deer herd numbers to more ecologically sustainable levels (15-20 deer per square mile).

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Deer Management #2

(Page 55 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

The sharpshooter program should be continued as it is both cost-effective and efficient in reducing excesses in the deer herd and deer vehicle collisions.

LEAD AGENCY: Police-Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCIES: FCPA; NVRPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Vicky Monroe, Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes, this recommendation has already been addressed. The Fairfax County Deer Management Program will continue to utilize all available deer management tools for population control. Sharpshooting operations will continue to be used at night to implement sustainable hunting pressures at selected parks.

Sharpshooting is a safe, often cost effective, and highly efficient method for deer population control at select sites.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No additional actions are necessary pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

In the County Executive's proposed FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan, funding for the Fairfax County Deer Management Program is proposed to remain the same as the FY 2012 budgeted level. The budget in FY 2012 supports 1/1.0 SYE Naturalist IV position and associated operating costs in support of the program.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There is ongoing need for increased and sustained funding for the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist office in general and the Fairfax County Deer Management Program specifically in order to meet the stated program objectives addressing:

-
- Public safety concerns related to deer-vehicle collisions;
 - Human health concerns related to disease transmission;
 - Environmental concerns attempting to lower deer herd numbers to more ecologically sustainable levels (15-20 deer per square mile).

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Deer Management #3

(Page 55 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

The archery program should be continued on Park properties where firearms cannot be used, and is an effective tool in reducing the deer herd and deer vehicle collisions.

LEAD AGENCY: Police-Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY: FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Vicky Monroe, Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes, this recommendation has already been addressed. The Fairfax County Deer Management Program will continue to utilize all available deer management tools for population control. The Archery Program will continue to be used at selected parks to implement sustainable hunting pressures. Archery is a safe, cost effective, and highly efficient method for deer population control at select sites.

In FY 2010, the Archery Program was first developed and then implemented at two county parks. In FY 2011, the Archery Program was successfully expanded to thirteen parks. In FY 2012, the Archery Program has been successfully expanded to twenty parks. The Archery Program continues to increase the number of hunt sites through increased participation by ethical qualified hunters with superior skill.

All parks where the Archery Program is implemented remain open to the public due to the continued excellent record ensuring public safety and participant safety.

Archery has been conducted safely on private lands throughout Fairfax County for decades and the urban archery season permits legal hunting on private property from the first Saturday in September to the last Saturday in March.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No additional actions are necessary pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

In the County Executive's proposed FY 2013 Advertised Budget Plan, funding for the Fairfax County Deer Management Program is proposed to remain the same as the FY 2012 budgeted level. The budget in FY 2012 supports 1/1.0 SYE Naturalist IV position and associated operating costs in support of the program.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There is ongoing need for increased and sustained funding for the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist office in general and the Fairfax County Deer Management Program specifically in order to meet the stated program objectives addressing:

- Public safety concerns related to deer-vehicle collisions;
- Human health concerns related to disease transmission;
- Environmental concerns attempting to lower deer herd numbers to more ecologically sustainable levels (15-20 deer per square mile).

Response to 2010 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Geese Management #1

(Page 56 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly recommends that geese management be continued, particularly the public outreach and training activities so that a cadre of volunteers can be created to provide the labor to do the actual egg-oiling that is the principal control measure. In addition, the shotgun hunt pilot test conducted by the Park Authority should be expanded into an established program.

LEAD AGENCY: Police-Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY: FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Vicky Monroe, Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes, this recommendation has already been addressed. Community outreach and a public education program to train volunteers to “addle” (oil) eggs will continue to be used as management tools to control the resident Canada geese population at selected sites. In FY 2010 and FY 2011, several free geese management training sessions were conducted to train volunteers to safely and appropriately addle eggs at select sites during the nesting season.

To date it appears that the majority of the egg oiling activity remains concentrated on public lands. In order to be effective at reducing local resident goose populations, efforts will need to be greatly expanded on both public and private lands county and region wide particularly by land managers and volunteers working on properties which contained large amounts of managed turf and/or water features.

Egg oiling efforts should be combined with: habitat modification to reduce the amount of suitable habitat for resident geese; behavior modification to discourage use of lands by resident geese; and goose population control (hunting) to better manage resident goose populations.

In addition to egg oiling, the Fairfax County Park Authority granted permission in February 2011 to Wingfield Properties, LLC, the private company managing Pleasant Valley Golf Club, to hunt adult geese on that golf course in accordance with Virginia game regulations and Fairfax County Code.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No additional actions are necessary pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

The recommended actions have no budget implications for FY 2013. Geese management activity is not allocated a budget. Geese Management activity relies on trained volunteers and Park Authority staff to manage local resident geese populations at select sites.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

N/A

Response to 2011 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #1

(Page 61 of the Annual Report on the Environment, Summary Report)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC supports efforts by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority to report, on its website, results from the new noise monitoring system for Washington Dulles International and Ronald Reagan Washington National Airports. EQAC recommends, however, that the Board of Supervisors request to MWAA that these results be reported on a quarterly basis and that access to the website be simplified.

LEAD AGENCY: DPZ-PD

COORDINATING AGENCIES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

County staff has forwarded EQAC's recommendation to the Airport Noise Office of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, which has indicated that the frequency of posting of noise information will be increased such that noise monitoring data will be posted quarterly, rather than annually. This frequency of posting of data will be consistent with the previous MWAA practice of providing noise monitoring reports on a quarterly basis. Therefore, county staff feels that this concern has been addressed.

The other component of EQAC's recommendation concerns ease of access to the noise monitoring information on the MWAA website. County staff has relayed this concern to the MWAA Airport Noise Office; however, there have not been changes to the MWAA website to enhance the visibility of the noise monitoring information and it is not anticipated that any changes will be pursued in response to staff's communication.

MWAA's Airport Noise Office has, in the past, presented to management similar concerns regarding ease of access to noise and flight track information. However, there is both a desire to avoid presenting large amounts of information on the MWAA home page while presenting links to critical information (e.g., two airports; the Dulles Toll Road; the rail project), and therefore there has been a great deal of competition for space on MWAA's home page. As a result, MWAA has decided to maintain the current approach.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff feels that the component of the recommendation addressing frequency of posting of noise monitoring information has been addressed.

With respect to simplicity of access to the noise information on MWAA's website, staff concurs with EQAC that it would be desirable for the noise monitoring information to be more visible. Neither the MWAA home page nor the home pages for Dulles International and Reagan National Airports clearly identify how noise monitoring information may be accessed or even that this information is available on-line. In order to access this information, one would need to click a link to either the Dulles International Airport site or Reagan National Airport site and would then either need to click a link to "flight information" or the "A to Z index" for that airport's website. At either of these points, there would be a clear link to the noise monitoring data. Alternately, the user could conduct a search using the keyword "noise." Staff agrees with EQAC that a more visible and direct access approach would be desirable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff has communicated EQAC's concerns to MWAA's Airport Noise Office, and MWAA has been responsive to EQAC's recommendation regarding frequency of posting of noise monitoring data. Staff does not feel that additional actions on this component of EQAC's recommendation are needed.

It is staff's view, based on a conversation with MWAA Airport Noise Office staff, that a general recommendation from the county to MWAA to enhance the visibility of the noise monitoring information may not be successful. Staff recommends that EQAC develop a more specific recommendation as to how the MWAA website should be revised; this recommendation should provide background justification (i.e., it should identify the problems with and implications of the current approach) and identify an alternative approach that would enhance the accessibility of noise monitoring information in a manner that would not detract from the overall utility of the website. EQAC could then request that the Board of Supervisors transmit this specific recommendation to the MWAA Board for its consideration. DPZ staff is available to assist EQAC in developing such a recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2013? If so, please explain.

Staff time would be needed to assist EQAC with the development of a more specific recommendation regarding Web accessibility of MWAA's noise monitoring information. However, it is not anticipated that this demand would be substantial.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There are no long-term fiscal implications.