

**COUNTY OF FAIRFAX
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL (EQAC)
MINUTES**

DATE: May 11, 2016

TIME: 7:15 PM – 9:50 PM, with a 6:00-7:15 PM discussion among four EQAC members

LOCATION: Hidden Oaks Nature Center, Annandale

EQAC Member Attendance

Name	Present Absent*	Name	Present Absent*
Stella Koch (Chairman, At-Large)	P	Larry Zaragoza (Vice Chairman, Mount Vernon)	A
Linda Burchfiel (At-Large)	P	Frank Crandall (Dranesville)	P
Johna Gagnon (Lee)	P	Richard Healy (Mason)	P
George Lamb (At-Large)	P	Ken Lanfear (Hunter Mill)	P
Renee Grebe (At-Large)	P	Paul Pitera (Braddock)	P
Alex Robbins (Providence)	A	Katrina White (Student Member)	P
Clyde Wilber (Springfield)	P	Rich Weisman (Sully)	P

*Note: P indicates present, and A indicates absent

Staff Attendance

Kambiz Agazi, Noel Kaplan

Visitor Attendance

Kate Bennett, Monica Billger, Craig Carinci, Laura Grape, Emma Gutzler, David Kepley, Don Pless

Note: Prior to the regularly scheduled EQAC meeting, between 6:00 PM and 7:15 PM, four members of EQAC (Johna Gagnon, Stella Koch, Paul Pitera and Clyde Wilber) met with Gayle Hooper (Fairfax County Park Authority) and Laura Grape (Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District) at Gayle Hooper's request. Ms. Hooper gave a presentation titled "Lake Accotink Sustainability Plan: Summary of Potential Alternatives." The presentation highlighted sustainability issues associated with the lake, focusing on the need for dredging of the lake on occasion due to the buildup of sediment. Several alternatives to address this issue were presented by Ms. Hooper and discussed by Ms. Hooper, Ms. Grape and the four EQAC members. There were no motions, votes or follow-up actions identified.

Agenda Items, Discussion, Decisions and Votes

1. Update on the implementation of recommendations from the watershed management plans

Craig Carinci (Director, Stormwater Planning, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services) gave a presentation on watershed management plan projects, with a focus on the factors driving project selection, how projects are assessed and prioritized for implementation, and the relationship of this process to the county's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit requirements (see the discussion of Kate Bennett's presentation below). Based on cost-benefit analyses, Craig identified stream restoration as the most cost-effective type of project, followed by pond retrofits. Craig noted a lack of funds to take on every necessary project and detailed the formula DPWES uses to determine the number of projects it can complete. Restoration and retrofit projects are methodically prioritized through scores regarding potential success. DPWES continues to monitor project sites post-restoration.

Craig's presentation concluded with an overview of the history of funding of the stormwater program since FY 2005, a summary of the disposition of funds for the program during FY 2017, and an overview of completed, active, and "bench" stormwater projects (projects anticipated to be ready to be initiated within the next two years or so) by watershed. He noted how funding for the program has steadily increased over the past 10 years; Stella Koch discussed how stream and water quality spending in general will continue to increase.

During and after the presentation, there were discussions of the following issues:

- The relationship between the stormwater program and the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District
- Coordination with communities on project implementation
- The need to allocate resources to maintenance and monitoring of stream restoration projects
- The need to ensure that projects will not result in raised floodplain elevations
- Control of invasive plants before, during and after stream restoration projects
- Anticipated increases in stream and water quality project implementation as the Stormwater Service District rate increases
- Stormwater program staffing levels
- Lining of stormwater pipes
- The ages of the watershed management plans and whether there is a need for a comprehensive review of them (Craig indicated that the plans are still serving the program well and noted that these plans have been beneficial to the county's attainment of MS4 permit requirements.)
- Lag times between project implementation and water quality improvements
- Trends in Index of Biological Integrity scores over time
- Ability to restore streams in urban areas—benefits of restoration/reconstruction projects; potential for state urban stream standards
- Thermal impacts of urban runoff
- Ecological monitoring (pre- and post- project) by program ecologists

2. Update on Total Maximum Daily Loads in Fairfax County

Kate Bennett (MS4 Program Coordinator, DPWES) briefed EQAC on the regulatory background of TMDLs for impaired Virginia waters and how the state's TMDL development efforts relate to the county's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) permit.

Kate described the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality's annual water quality monitoring plan, which consists of biological, probabilistic, surface water, and fish tissue research, and DEQ's biennial process through which impaired waters (pursuant to the Clean water Act) are identified. She noted the extent of impaired waters identified for Fairfax County and described how TMDLs are determined in order to identify "pollution budgets" that are needed to address these impairments. She identified the TMDLs that have been developed to date that affect Fairfax County (including the Chesapeake Bay TMDL), noting that most are for bacteria.

Kate provided an overview of the county's MS4 permit and its requirements, noting that the permit requires the county to develop and implement a program to reduce contamination of stormwater runoff and prohibit illicit discharges to the county's storm sewer system. She noted the interconnectedness of the county's MS4 with other MS4s (i.e., the Virginia Department of Transportation, Fairfax County Public Schools, federal permittees and other local government permittees) and highlighted the complexities associated with this interconnectedness. She provided details regarding the county's required MS4 program elements and indicated that the biggest unknown at this time is the level of effort that will be required for compliance with TMDLs. She discussed the relationship between the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and the county's MS4 permit and highlighted related requirements that the county will need to address through three cycles of the county's permit. She also discussed the development of actions plans for other TMDLs affecting the county and discussed the difference between an action plan and an implementation plan.

Kate concluded her presentation by noting a requirement to provide DEQ with a summary of potential stormwater management projects, of which at least 30 would need to be completed during the term of the permit. She noted that such a list had been provided to DEQ in March 2016; she identified stream restoration and pond retrofit projects (identified in Craig Carinci's presentation as the most cost-effective) as the most common types of projects that have been identified.

3. Consideration of a resolution regarding tree conservation on residential infill projects in relation to stormwater management requirements

Stella Koch noted that she had not drafted a resolution on this matter. She noted that Keith Cline, the Director of the Urban Forest Management Division, would be briefing the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee on May 24 and that she anticipated that part of that presentation would address the tension between stormwater requirements and tree preservation. She suggested that EQAC hold off on considering this issue further until after that briefing.

4. Consideration of a resolution regarding work program items to address sea level rise adaptation

Larry Zaragoza was recovering from emergency retina surgery and has not been able to put a sea level rise adaptation resolution together.

Decision: EQAC will discuss a possible resolution at a later date.

5. 2016 Annual Report on the Environment

-Identification of authors for remaining sections

Decisions: Rick will copy edit and the student member will prepare the Stewardship section.

-Scheduling of EQAC reviews of chapter/section drafts

Decisions: Ken's chapter will be ready for review during the July meeting. Renee and Frank will have their chapters prepared for August. George will have his in September. The title of the section addressing coyotes will be broadened to "Small Mammals."

6. Appointment of an Environmental Excellence Awards nomination review committee

Individual, county staff, business and organizational awards can be given.

Decision: Renee, Linda, Paul, Ken, and Katrina will select recommended awardees. They will try to have a recommendation prepared for EQAC's approval by the July meeting.

7. Discussion of preparation of meeting minutes

Noel noted that he was not yet able to get dedicated staff support for the preparation of minutes—the person who had agreed to assist was unable to do so, given the detailed/technical nature of issues addressed by the council. He noted that Clyde and Ken had prepared a draft proposed standard process, which Stella suggested trying and evaluating after some experiences had been gained.

Johna recommended a five-day turnaround for preparation of minutes.

Noel agreed to send the template for the minutes to Katrina and Renee for their use for the May and June minutes, respectively.

8. Approval of meeting minutes

No meeting minutes were ready for approval—this item was deferred.

9. Chairman's items

Stella noted that she had attended the recent Tysons Sustainability Summit and indicated that it was nice to see how much is getting done. She stated that Tysons is the largest redevelopment project in the country, by more than 50 percent. She noted that one thing that is not getting done is implementation of district energy systems, and she expressed her understanding that Dominion Virginia Power is not interested in supporting this concept.

Stella noted the upcoming meeting of the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee on May 24.

10. Council member items

Clyde updated the council on his research into lead levels identified in blood samples of county residents. He noted that, based on his review of relevant documentation, lead levels are not as much of a concern as may have been anticipated—for children less than five years in age, only 0.3 percent were identified as having lead levels above acceptable levels—with strengthened criteria, this figure could rise to perhaps one percent (with the higher levels being located primarily in the Falls Church and Belle Haven areas). After reaching out to the County Health Department, he discovered that there is an individual assigned to monitor each county resident with high lead levels. In most cases, lead contamination has been traced to food and spices or cultural sources (i.e., henna) and not from water or paint. Linda Burchfiel thanked Clyde for his research.

Rich Weisman noted that he had asked a representative of Fairfax Water about lead water lines and was told that there are none. Clyde indicated that there may be some lead lines in Arlington and Alexandria.

Johna suggested that Clyde's lead update should be included in the annual report, as it is a positive story and shows that the council is aware of current concerns and is looking into them. Noel asked if there should be statement within the Chairman's letter. Stella suggested that another approach would be a one page write-up identifying EQAC's research observations on this issue.

Decision: Clyde agreed to prepare a one-page summary on his investigation that could be included as an appendix to the report. Clyde indicated that he could include Rich Weisman's statement regarding the lack of lead water lines if such a statement would not already be included in the Water Resources chapter.

George noted the next Green Breakfast would be May 14 and that this meeting would be held outdoors at the Government Center. The meeting would include a tour and planting of the pollinator garden.

Rich mentioned that the Student Member selection committee had received 37 applications, including some quality and some average ones. Paul suggested the group meet an hour before the

June meeting to establish a recommendation. Noel noted that the number of student member applications had increased greatly within the past few years.

Ken Lanfear stated that he saw the need for a major structural revision regarding presentation of information in his Technology chapter and that he would soon send Noel an e-mail about this that should be shared with all members.

Frank requested that the automatic doors at Hidden Oaks be repaired.

11. Staff items

Noel reminded the council that the June 8 meeting would include a presentation by the Virginia Department of Transportation as well as a briefing on Fairfax County's wildlife management program. Noel will be travelling on June 8 and will have other DPZ staff provide support for this meeting.

Noel indicated that the joint meeting with the county Environmental Coordinating Committee would take place in September at the Government Center.

Noel noted that no agenda except work on the Annual Report had been established yet for EQAC's July meeting.

Noel asked that the Student Member selection committee be prepared to present its recommendations at the June meeting. Rich asked if the committee could meet one hour prior to the June 8 meeting.

Noel noted that the next meeting of the Planning Commission's Environment Committee would be held on May 26.

Kambiz referenced Stella's discussion of the Tysons Sustainability Summit. He noted that much has changed over the last 10 years or so in regard to solar opportunities, but what hasn't changed is the highly regulated nature of the area. He noted that Dominion was looking for open spaces on which to provide solar power facilities and that the county was exploring possible opportunities at both the I-95 and I-66 Landfill sites.

12. Adjournment – 9:50 p.m.