
ANNUAL REPORT
on the
ENVIRONMENT

2002



Fairfax County, Virginia

Environmental Quality Advisory Council

Printed on recycled paper

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Katherine K. Hanley, Chairman

Gerald R. Hyland, Vice Chairman
Mount Vernon District

Sharon Bulova
Braddock District

Catherine M. Hudgins
Hunter Mill District

Gerald E. Connolly
Providence District

Dana Kauffman
Lee District

Michael R. Frey
Sully District

Elaine McConnell
Springfield District

Penelope A. Gross
Mason District

Stuart Mendelsohn
Dranesville District

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Robert McLaren, Chairman
Stella M. Koch, Vice Chairman

Samuel A. Bleicher
Frank B. Crandall
Donald J. Ehreth
John W. Foust
Johna Gagnon
George W. Lamb

Lyle C. McLaren
Elizabeth Marie Howell Newbury
J. Craig Potter
Rachel Rifkind
Sheila M. Roit, R.N.
James A. Roorbach, III

Anthony H. Griffin
County Executive

Robert A. Stalzer
Deputy County Executive

INTRODUCTION

This year's Annual Report on the Environment has been prepared entirely by the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC). Staff support for the coordination and printing of the Report has been provided by the Planning Division of the Department of Planning and Zoning.

The Annual Report on the Environment, which is an update on the state of the County's environment, serves a threefold purpose. Initially, it is intended to assist the Board of Supervisors in evaluating ongoing environmental programs and to provide the basis for proposing new programs. The document also aids public agencies in coordinating programs to jointly address environmental issues. In addition, the report is directed to citizens who are concerned with environmental issues.

The Report contains chapters on major environmental topics including: water resources; air quality; ecological resources; wildlife management; solid waste; hazardous materials; noise, light, and visual pollution; and land use and transportation. Within each chapter are: a discussion of environmental issues; a summary of relevant data; and a discussion of applicable government programs. Where relevant, discussions of legislative issues are provided. Each chapter concludes with recommendations that identify additional actions that EQAC believes are necessary to address environmental issues.

This report covers activities affecting the environment in 2001; however, in some cases, activities from early 2002 are also included.

While the Environmental Quality Advisory Council has prepared and is responsible for this Report, contributions were made by numerous organizations. Many of the summaries provided within this report were taken verbatim from materials provided by these organizations. EQAC therefore extends its appreciation to the following organizations:

Audubon Naturalist Society
Clean Fairfax Council, Inc.
Coalition for Smarter Growth
Fairfax County Deer Management Committee
Fairfax County Department of Health
Fairfax County Department of Systems Management for Human Services
Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning
Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services
Fairfax County Environmental Coordinator
Fairfax County Fire and Rescue Department
Fairfax County Park Authority
Fairfax County Police Department, Division of Animal Control
Fairfax County Sheriff's Office
Fairfax County Water Authority
Fairfax Joint Local Emergency Planning Committee
Federal Aviation Administration
George Mason University, Departments of Biology and Environmental Science
and Policy
Humane Society of the United States
Illuminating Engineering Society of North America
International Dark-Sky Association
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin
Lake Barcroft Watershed Improvement District

Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA)
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG)
National Electrical Manufacturers Association
Northern Virginia Conservation Trust
Northern Virginia Regional Commission
Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority
Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District
Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Laboratory
Reston Association
Transportation Coordinating Council of Northern Virginia
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
United States Geological Survey
Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority
Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
Virginia Department of Forestry
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Virginia Department of Transportation
Virginia Outdoor Lighting Taskforce

In addition, EQAC wishes to acknowledge the efforts of the County's interagency Environmental Coordinating Committee, which coordinated the staff responses to the recommendations within EQAC's 2001 *Annual Report on the Environment*.



FAIRFAX COUNTY

V I R G I N I A

Board of Supervisors
County of Fairfax
12000 Government Center Parkway
Fairfax, VA 22035

Madam Chairman and Members of the Board:

EQAC is pleased to present the 2002 Annual Report on the Environment. In this report, we discuss various environmental issues in Fairfax County. We do this in eight chapters – each chapter addressing a different aspect of the environment. Also in each chapter are EQAC’s recommendations as to what actions Fairfax County should take to resolve identified problems.

In the past several years, EQAC has emphasized two of its recommendations as top priority recommendations. The first was to develop and implement a Countywide Natural Resource Management Plan. The second dealt with the County's streams. We recommended that the County create a Countywide Stream Protection Plan. Thanks to your direction and hard County Staff work, progress has been made in both areas. More needs to be done in these areas, and we do continue these recommendations in this Annual Report. However, this year EQAC is emphasizing different recommendations as being of top priority.

EQAC’s top priority recommendations from the 2002 Annual Report on the Environment are the four interrelated recommendations on air quality.

These are a continuation of recommendations from the last two years; however, no significant action has occurred with respect to these recommendations. A major problem has been lack of staff resources. Unfortunately, EQAC doesn’t see any alternative but to increase staff resources in this area. The Metropolitan Region and Fairfax County need to come into compliance with Federal air quality standards – standards that we do not meet at present. Without such action, the County faces the serious financial consequences of loss of Federal transportation funding and the many other adverse economic and health impacts associated with air quality that does not meet federal standards. EQAC urges the Board of Supervisors in the strongest possible terms to take a proactive role in the area of air quality.

The last of these four recommendations states: *As a means of focusing attention on the decisions that are necessary, EQAC recommends that the County set a deadline of June 30, 2003 for the adoption of a new Air Quality Attainment Strategy – a public document adopted by the Board that sets out the policies and priorities that Fairfax County intends to pursue both within the County and through the COG to ensure the achievement of the necessary levels of air quality with a reasonable margin of safety.*

EQAC notes the success of your actions in regard to stream valley protection. In the last few years, you adopted a change to the Policy Plan stating that it was a County policy to protect and

Board of Supervisors
Continued

restore the ecological integrity of County streams. The County has published a highly successful Stream Protection Strategy report with broad stream restoration and preservation recommendations. The Stream Protection Strategy is continuing. The County is in the process of formulating watershed master plans under the Watershed Management Initiative and is mapping perennial streams. This is a drastic change from where the County was in regard to water quality several years ago. EQAC now urges you give the same attention to air quality.

Each chapter of this year's Annual Report contains the remainder of our suggestions. We urge your consideration and action on each of these.

This report covers 2001, but also includes significant actions from 2002 that could impact EQAC's comments and recommendations. Unfortunately, the report cannot capture all ongoing actions or the report would never be finished.

As we have done in the past, we would like to commend the outstanding efforts of some groups whose actions enhance the environmental quality in Fairfax County. The Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) continues to make their efforts felt in many environmental areas – both as teachers and doers. The Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT) is pursuing and successfully obtaining easements on privately owned environmentally sensitive land. (NVCT's efforts have been enhanced thanks to the public-private partnership with them that you created in 2001.) Fairfax ReLeaf continues to promote tree preservation and tree replacement programs. The Virginia Department of Forestry has undertaken several efforts aimed at improving riparian zones and stabilizing stream banks. Volunteers from the Audubon Naturalist Society (and the NVSWCD) provide valuable data on water quality. The Park Authority staff continues to have a few people, working with a very small budget, who are slowly enhancing environmental efforts in the County's parks. EQAC thanks all these hard working groups, as well as many others we haven't mentioned, for their efforts in advancing environmental quality in Fairfax County.

EQAC would also like to commend the County Staff for their outstanding efforts. Of special note are the activities of the Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC). EQAC has met with the ECC on environmental issues and will continue to do so. ECC's focus on environmental issues is resulting in improvements in County policy dealing with the environment and has greatly improved County actions in environmental areas. EQAC also notes that more and more attention is being given to water quality in DPWES – and the results are showing.

Members of EQAC wrote this report; however, we obtained most of the information contained therein from many County agencies. We thank them for their assistance. EQAC would especially like to acknowledge the contributions of two individuals. First, Noel Kaplan of the Environmental and Development Review Branch, Department of Planning and Zoning. Noel provides County staff support to EQAC. This means he sets up every EQAC meeting, attends every EQAC meeting, follows up on actions generated from the meetings, plus coordinates the inputs and publication of the Annual Report. EQAC thanks him for his hard work and long hours in our support. Second, Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator, Office of the County Executive. Kambiz attends every EQAC meeting and provides advice and suggestions. He often

Board of Supervisors
Continued

follows up after the meetings by providing additional information. His insight and overview of County environmental activities are invaluable. EQAC thanks him for his assistance and valuable contributions.

We would like to commend the Board's actions, as noted in this report, in advancing the environmental quality of the County. Every year the County makes progress. However, much more needs to be done. EQAC is especially concerned about the impact of the County's financial shortfall on environmental programs. We would like to encourage you not to cut these valuable environmental programs and reverse the gains the County has made.

Your leadership continues to be essential to advancing environmental quality in Fairfax County by preserving and protecting environmentally sensitive areas. We in EQAC will continue to provide recommendations to you on how to achieve this goal. We look forward to working with you and achieving further progress in this area.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert D. McLaren". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "R" and "M".

Robert D. McLaren, Chairman
Environmental Quality Advisory Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------|--|------|
| I. | WATER RESOURCES | I-1 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | I-1 |
| 1. | Streams | I-1 |
| 2. | Watersheds | I-1 |
| 3. | Stream Ecosystems and Communities | I-3 |
| 4. | Communities | I-3 |
| 5. | Oxygen | I-3 |
| 6. | Trees, Wetlands, and Buffers | I-3 |
| 7. | Nutrients | I-4 |
| 8. | Groundwater and the Water Cycle | I-4 |
| B. | POLLUTANTS AND OTHER IMPACTS ON STREAMS | I-4 |
| 1. | Point and Nonpoint Source Pollution | I-4 |
| 2. | The Effect of Imperviousness on Streams | I-5 |
| C. | STREAM AND WATERSHED ANALYSES | I-5 |
| 1. | Countywide Stream Assessments | I-6 |
| 2. | Fairfax County Health Department Water Quality Report | I-10 |
| 3. | Health Department Volunteer Monitoring Program (Adopt-a-Stream) | I-13 |
| 4. | Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) | I-14 |
| 5. | Special Stream Reports and Programs | I-17 |
| D. | PONDS AND LAKES | I-19 |
| 1. | Monitoring and Results | I-19 |
| E. | STORMWATER MANAGEMENT | I-22 |
| 1. | Status of Stormwater Utility (Environmental Stormwater Utility) Concept in Fairfax County | I-22 |
| 2. | Status of NPDES Requirements | I-22 |
| 3. | Regional Stormwater Management Program | I-23 |
| 4. | Other Stormwater Ponds in Fairfax County | I-24 |
| 5. | Infill and Residential Development Study | I-24 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------|
| I. | WATER RESOURCES (continued) | |
| F. | NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION PROGRAMS | I-25 |
| 1. | Chesapeake Bay Program and Agreements | I-25 |
| 2. | The Virginia Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and Regulations | I-25 |
| 3. | Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Enforcement— Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services | I-26 |
| 4. | Occoquan Basin Nonpoint Pollution Management Program | I-26 |
| 5. | Soil and Water Conservation Technical Assistance | I-27 |
| 6. | Stream Valley Reforestation | I-29 |
| 7. | Stream Bank and Other Stabilization Projects | I-29 |
| 8. | Septic Permitting and Repairs | I-30 |
| G. | WATER POLLUTION ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS | I-30 |
| 1. | Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) | I-30 |
| H. | PERENNIAL STREAM MAPPING PROJECT | I-30 |
| I. | WATERSHED PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT | I-30 |
| 1. | Countywide Watershed Planning | I-30 |
| 2. | Reston Watershed Plan | I-31 |
| 3. | Northern Virginia Regional Commission Occoquan Program Watershed Planning | I-31 |
| J. | GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT | I-32 |
| K. | DRINKING WATER SUPPLY | I-32 |
| 1. | Wells | I-32 |
| 2. | Lorton and Corbalis Systems Monitoring Results and Reports | I-33 |
| 3. | Source Water Assessments | I-35 |
| 4. | Facilities Management | I-35 |
| 5. | Regional Cooperative Water Supply Agreements | I-36 |
| L. | NEW LAWS OR REGULATIONS | I-37 |
| 1. | Amendments to the Chesapeake Bay Regulations | I-37 |
| M. | SUMMARY | I-37 |
| N. | RECOMMENDATIONS | I-38 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | I-40 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-------|
| II. | AIR QUALITY | II-1 |
| A. | ISSUES AND OVERVIEW | II-1 |
| 1. | Introduction | II-1 |
| 2. | Air Quality Status in Northern Virginia | II-5 |
| B. | MAJOR PUBLIC AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES | II-11 |
| 1. | Introduction | II-11 |
| 2. | Commonwealth of Virginia | II-11 |
| 3. | Region –The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG), and the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) | II-11 |
| 4. | County of Fairfax | II-11 |
| C. | PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ANALYSES | II-13 |
| 1. | Regional Air Quality Planning | II-13 |
| D. | LEGISLATIVE UPDATE | II-14 |
| 1. | Summary of Air Quality Laws Enacted by the Virginia General Assembly – 2001 | II-14 |
| 2. | Summary of Air Quality Laws Enacted by the Virginia General Assembly – 2002 | II-14 |
| E. | CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS | II-14 |
| F. | RECOMMENDATIONS | II-16 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | II-17 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| III. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES | III-1 |
| A. ISSUES AND OVERVIEW | III-1 |
| B. PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ANALYSES | III-2 |
| 1. Fairfax County Park Authority | III-2 |
| 2. Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority | III-6 |
| 3. Fairfax ReLeaf | III-7 |
| 4. Northern Virginia Conservation Trust | III-7 |
| 5. Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District | III-11 |
| 6. Fairfax County Wetlands Board | III-12 |
| 7. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments | III-12 |
| 8. Urban Forestry | III-13 |
| 9. Riparian Projects | III-23 |
| 10. Gunston Cove Ecological Study | III-25 |
| 11. Agricultural and Forestal Districts | III-28 |
| 12. South Van Dorn Street Phase III Road Project | III-30 |
| C. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE | III-32 |
| D. RECOMMENDATIONS | III-33 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES | III-34 |

| | |
|---|-------|
| IV. WILDLIFE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN FAIRFAX COUNTY | IV-1 |
| IV-1. IMPACTS OF DEER IN FAIRFAX COUNTY | IV-1 |
| A. OVERVIEW | IV-1 |
| B. BACKGROUND | IV-1 |
| 1. Are Deer Overabundant in Fairfax County? | IV-1 |
| 2. A Description of the Problem | IV-3 |
| C. ISSUES IN ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM | IV-8 |
| 1. Understanding Population Dynamics | IV-8 |
| 2. Determining Carrying Capacity Goals | IV-10 |
| 3. Considering Public Opinion | IV-10 |
| D. METHODS FOR DEER POPULATION MANAGEMENT | IV-11 |
| 1. Population Reduction Approaches | IV-11 |
| 2. Conflict Mitigation Approaches | IV-13 |
| E. PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM NEEDS | IV-15 |
| F. PUBLIC AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY | IV-16 |
| G. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES | IV-17 |
| H. CONCLUSIONS | IV-19 |
| I. RECOMMENDATIONS | IV-20 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | IV-22 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES | IV-23 |

IV. WILDLIFE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN FAIRFAX COUNTY (continued)

| | | |
|--------------|--|-------|
| IV-2. | IMPACTS OF GEESE IN FAIRFAX COUNTY | IV-24 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | IV-24 |
| B. | BACKGROUND | IV-24 |
| 1. | Origins of the Goose Problem in Fairfax County | IV-24 |
| 2. | Environmental Impact of Geese | IV-24 |
| C. | ISSUES IN ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM | IV-26 |
| 1. | Goose Population Biology | IV-26 |
| 2. | Considerations of Public Opinion | IV-27 |
| 3. | Federal Limitations on Remedial Action | IV-27 |
| D. | METHODS FOR POPULATION MANAGEMENT | IV-27 |
| 1. | Population Stabilization | IV-28 |
| 2. | Population Exclusion | IV-28 |
| 3. | Special Foraging Areas | IV-28 |
| 4. | Landscaping Modifications | IV-28 |
| 5. | Repellents | IV-29 |
| 6. | Prohibition of Feeding | IV-29 |
| 7. | Combined Approaches | IV-29 |
| E. | PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM NEEDS | IV-29 |
| F. | PUBLIC AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY | IV-29 |
| G. | PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES | IV-30 |
| H. | CONCLUSIONS | IV-31 |
| I. | RECOMMENDATIONS | IV-31 |
| | USEFUL REFERENCES | IV-32 |

**IV. WILDLIFE AND THE ENVIRONMENT
IN FAIRFAX COUNTY (continued)**

**IV-3. WILDLIFE BORNE DISEASES OF CONCERN
IN FAIRFAX COUNTY** IV-33

A. OVERVIEW IV-33

B. BACKGROUND IV-33

 1. West Nile Virus IV-33

 2. Lyme Disease IV-34

 3. Rabies IV-36

 4. Fecal Coliform Bacterial Diseases IV-37

C. PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM NEEDS IV-38

D. PUBLIC AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES IV-38

E. CONCLUSIONS IV-39

F. RECOMMENDATIONS IV-39

LIST OF REFERENCES IV-39

V. SOLID WASTE V-1

A. ISSUES AND OVERVIEW V-1

 1. Contractual Issues and Landfill Capacity Backup V-1

 2. Disposal Fee V-1

B. PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ANALYSIS V-3

 1. Waste Disposal V-3

 2. Waste Reduction/Recycling Programs V-7

 3. Commercial Programs V-11

 4. Public Education V-12

C. LEGISLATION AND REGULATORY CHANGES V-14

D. RECOMMENDATIONS V-15

LIST OF REFERENCES V-15

| | |
|--|-------|
| VI. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | VI-1 |
| A. ISSUES AND OVERVIEW | VI-1 |
| 1. Overview | VI-1 |
| 2. Hazardous Materials Incidents | VI-1 |
| 3. Anthrax | VI-2 |
| 4. Hazardous Materials in the Waste Stream | VI-4 |
| 5. Pipelines | VI-5 |
| 6. Rail Transport of Hazardous Materials | VI-5 |
| B. PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ANALYSES | VI-6 |
| 1. Fairfax Joint Local Emergency Planning Committee (FJLEPC) | VI-6 |
| 2. Railroad Transportation Plan | VI-7 |
| 3. Storm Drain Stenciling Program | VI-7 |
| 4. Household Hazardous Waste Program (HHW) | VI-7 |
| 5. Commercial Hazardous Wastes | VI-8 |
| C. REPORTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS AND ISSUES | VI-8 |
| D. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE | VI-8 |
| E. RECOMMENDATIONS | VI-10 |
| REFERENCES | VI-11 |
| | |
| VII. NOISE, LIGHT POLLUTION, AND VISUAL POLLUTION | VII-1 |
| VII-1. NOISE | VII-1 |
| A. OVERVIEW | VII-1 |
| B. NOISE—WHAT IS IT? | VII-3 |
| C. NOISE—WHO REGULATES IT? | VII-3 |
| D. QUANTIFYING SOUND: A BIT ABOUT THE NUMBERS | VII-4 |
| E. NOISE SUPPRESSION/ABATEMENT GUIDANCE | VII-5 |
| 1. Federal Aviation Administration | VII-5 |
| F. THE POTOMAC CONSOLIDATED TRACON AIRSPACE REDESIGN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS) | VII-5 |

| | | |
|--|---|--------|
| VII. NOISE, LIGHT POLLUTION, AND VISUAL POLLUTION--VII-1. NOISE (continued) | | |
| G. | HIGHWAY NOISE | VII-7 |
| 1. | Background | VII-7 |
| 2. | State Policy | VII-8 |
| 3. | Noise Study Submission Guidelines | VII-8 |
| 4. | State Projects in Fairfax County | VII-9 |
| H. | RECOMMENDATIONS | VII-10 |
| VII-2. | LIGHT POLLUTION | VII-11 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | VII-11 |
| B. | ISSUES AND PROBLEMS | VII-11 |
| 1. | Glare | VII-11 |
| 2. | Light Trespass | VII-12 |
| 3. | Security | VII-12 |
| 4. | Urban Sky Glow | VII-12 |
| 5. | Energy Usage | VII-13 |
| C. | CURRENT COUNTY STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS | VII-13 |
| D. | ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM | VII-14 |
| E. | PUBLIC AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES | VII-17 |
| F. | PUBLIC EDUCATION AND AWARENESS NEEDS | VII-19 |
| G. | CONCLUSIONS | VII-19 |
| H. | RECOMMENDATIONS | VII-20 |
| | LIST OF REFERENCES | VII-22 |
| VII-3. | URBAN POLLUTION: VISUAL BLIGHT | VII-23 |
| A. | OVERVIEW | VII-23 |
| B. | SIGNAGE | VII-24 |
| C. | RECOMMENDATION | VII-25 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| VIII. THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION | VIII-1 |
| A. ISSUES AND OVERVIEW | VIII-1 |
| B. THE ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE ACTIVITY STRATEGIES STUDY | VIII-3 |
| 1. Introduction | VIII-3 |
| 2. ATLAS Strategies Receiving the Most Support by Local Jurisdictions | VIII-3 |
| 3. Additional ATLAS Strategies for Integrating Land Use and Transportation | VIII-5 |
| C. THE FAIRFAX COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN— LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES | VIII-6 |
| 1. Introduction | VIII-6 |
| 2. Countywide Goals: Land Use and Transportation | VIII-6 |
| 3. Countywide Land Use Objectives and Policies | VIII-7 |
| 4. Countywide Transportation Objectives and Policies | VIII-8 |
| D. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERRELATED GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES FOR LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION | VIII-9 |
| 1. Introduction | VIII-9 |
| 2. Tysons Corner Urban Center | VIII-9 |
| 3. Reston-Herndon Area Suburban Center and Transit Station Area | VIII-10 |
| 4. The Merrifield Suburban Center | VIII-11 |
| E. OTHER PROGRAMS, PROJECTS, AND ANALYSIS | VIII-12 |
| 1. Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project | VIII-12 |
| 2. Northern Virginia Transportation Authority | VIII-12 |
| F. RECOMMENDATIONS | VIII-13 |
| LIST OF REFERENCES | VIII-14 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| APPENDIX A: EQAC RESOLUTIONS AND POSITIONS NOVEMBER, 2001 THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 2002 | A-1 |
| APPENDIX B: FAIRFAX COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE AWARDS | B-1 |
| APPENDIX C: ACRONYMS USED WITHIN THE ANNUAL REPORT | C-1 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure No. | Figure Title | Page |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| I-1 | Fairfax County Watershed Map | I-2 |
| I-2 | Countywide Site Ratings for IBI | I-7 |
| I-3 | Countywide Site Ratings for Habitat | I-7 |
| I-4 | Countywide Site Ratings for Fish Abundance | I-7 |
| I-5 | Countywide Site Ratings for Drainage Imperviousness | I-7 |
| I-6 | IBI vs. Percent Imperviousness | I-8 |
| II-1 | Air Quality Trends in Relation to a One-Hour Ozone Standard | II-9 |
| II-2 | Air Quality Trends in Relation to an Eight-Hour Ozone Standard | II-10 |
| IV-2-1 | Sources of Fecal Coliform Pollution in Accotink Creek | IV-25 |
| V-1 | Tons Recycled Per Year | V-8 |
| VII-1-1 | Flight Traffic Levels at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport, October-December, 2001 | VII-1 |
| VII-2-1 | Effects of Cut-off and Non Cut-off Luminaires | VII-15 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table No. | Title | Page |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| I-1 | UOSA Permit Requirements and 2000 Performance | I-15 |
| I-2 | NCPCP Permit Requirements and 2000 Performance | I-16 |
| I-3 | Watersheds Included in the First Phase of the Watershed Master Planning Initiative | I-31 |
| I-4 | Sources of Fairfax County's Water Supply, 2001 | I-32 |
| II-1 | Regional Ozone Exceedances, 2001 | II-7 |
| II-2 | Regional Ozone Exceedances, 2001, Eight Hour Average | II-7 |
| III-1 | Open Space in Fairfax County | III-1 |
| III-2 | Fairfax County Open Space Preserved Through NVCT Efforts | III-10 |
| III-3 | Urban Forestry Division Workload, 1999-2001 | III-14 |
| III-4 | NVCS Hierarchical Levels, Sweet Gum Swamp Forest | III-20 |
| III-5 | Number and Sizes of Agricultural and Forestal Districts in Fairfax County | III-30 |
| III-6 | Changes in Acreage Incorporated in A&F Districts | III-31 |
| IV-1-1 | Deer Density Surveys | IV-3 |
| IV-1-2 | Out of Season Kill Permits Issued For Deer Damage in Fairfax County, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries | IV-5 |
| IV-1-3 | Deer-Vehicle Collisions in Fairfax County | IV-7 |
| IV-3-1 | Reported Lyme Disease Cases Meeting Centers for Disease Control (CDC) Case Definition Program, Fairfax County | IV-35 |
| VI-1 | How to Report Environmental Crimes | VI-9 |
| VII-1-1 | Possible Airport Noise Abatement Actions | VII-6 |

SCORECARD
Progress Report on 2001 Recommendations

I. WATER RESOURCES

| Water Resources Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>1. EQAC strongly recommends implementation of a Comprehensive Countywide Steam Management Program.</p> | <p>Staff agrees with this recommendation. A major aspect of this recommendation is being pursued through the Watershed Management Initiative – under which the staff will develop watershed master plans for the entire County in the next five to seven years. The baseline Stream Protection Strategy (SPS) report released in January 2001 included broad stream restoration and preservation recommendations. The SPS study is ongoing. The County is updating its base stream map of all stream channels through a perennial stream mapping project. Significant funding will be required to complete the development of the watershed master plans and to implement the recommendations of these plans.</p> | <p>EQAC’s recommendation is on the way to being satisfied – if the County continues with its current activities in this area. EQAC is concerned about funding being available to continue these efforts. EQAC continues to emphasize this recommendation.</p> | <p>In process, with more to be done.</p> |
| <p>2. EQAC recommends the funding of the Stormwater Utility Program. The Program should place equal importance between environmental protection, restoration, and monitoring as compared to infrastructure improvement and maintenance. The Program should also include a Watershed Board to oversee the Program.</p> | <p>Staff is developing a Stormwater Utility (now called a Stormwater Environment Utility) implementation strategy. A study, <i>Conceptual Plan for a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program</i>, was completed in March 2000. DPWES proposes to develop watershed master plans over the next five to seven years. As needs are identified in these plans, DPWES will initiate a public education effort. As public awareness increases, DPWES anticipates citizen understanding and support for a Stormwater Environmental Utility will become strong.</p> | <p>EQAC again reiterates its comments from prior years, with emphasis added. EQAC is concerned about the slowness of the process described by staff, with no clear end in sight. EQAC reiterates its recommendation, strongly urging the Board of Supervisors speedily adopt a Stormwater Environmental Utility Program. Without this program, EQAC is concerned about the continued availability of funds for a Comprehensive Countywide Stream Management Program.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

| Water Resources Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. EQAC recommends that the County initiate a study as to the sources of fecal coliform bacteria in County streams within 12 months and subsequently implement a plan to address the sources of actual threats to public health. | This recommendation is in the process of being addressed. A recently completed study in Accotink Creek identified the three dominant fecal coliform sources as geese, humans, and dogs. From a health viewpoint, the fecal coliform bacteria attributed to humans are the most critical to control. A two-year follow-up study is in progress to identify sources of human wastewater inputs to Accotink Creek. This study will develop and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to identifying physical sources of human wastewater that can be transferred to other County streams. | While efforts are underway, the process appears to be taking too long. EQAC recommends that the County speedily resolve this potentially serious public health problem. | Some progress, but more needs to be done. |
| 4. EQAC recommends countywide monitoring to collect data on the efficiency of stormwater management ponds, other BMPs, and the effectiveness of required erosion and sediment control procedures, structures, and enforcement efforts. EQAC recommends the monitoring of streams prior to and after the issuing of stormwater waivers and special exceptions to see the impact on County streams. | The Kingstowne Environmental Monitoring Program assists the County in evaluating the sediment removal efficiencies of erosion and sediment controls in Kingstowne, and a second station will be installed nearby to evaluate nutrient loads from the entire Silver Springs segment of Dogue Creek. As part of the requirements for the renewed MS4 permit, the County will be monitoring additional areas in selected watersheds over the next five years. However, while a comprehensive countywide program to monitor the effectiveness of stormwater management ponds and BMPs would be desirable, it would be cost-prohibitive. | EQAC agrees that in today's financial climate, a comprehensive program is cost-prohibitive. However, EQAC remains concerned about the efficiency of the measures the County uses for stormwater management. Therefore, EQAC encourages the County to set up a selective program to collect data to evaluate the actual efficiency of these measures (incorporating this into the MS4 monitoring). | No. |

| Water Resources Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>5. EQAC recommends an accounting of all costs, by both County and private individuals and entities, spent to counter the effects of siltation and erosion in County streams.</p> | <p>Given that the County is starting a comprehensive Watershed Planning project, a detailed assessment of the cost of not moving forward with an overall watershed protection and stream bank stabilization program is not practical. (Staff did supply some costs for dredging some lakes and ponds in the County, noting that efforts to get detailed activity information from many facility owners were unsuccessful. Staff also supplied some costs on some stream bank erosion mitigation projects.)</p> | <p>EQAC agrees with staff that further pursuit of data in response to this recommendation is not practical. However, EQAC emphasizes that the Watershed Planning project must move forward, followed by projects to protect healthy streams and restore damaged streams.</p> | <p>Sufficiently complete.</p> |
| <p>6. Given the increase in construction activities, EQAC commends the County for additional inspectors and training to handle construction site inspection responsibilities.</p> | <p>Staff recently established a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week complaint line for citizens to report suspected violations. The number of erosion and sediment violations has almost doubled in the past three years. The increase in the number of violations is a direct result of the increase in inspection staff and an increased emphasis on enforcing environmental regulations. Training on erosion and sediment control continues to be conducted periodically.</p> | <p>EQAC is pleased with the progress that has been made in this area. EQAC will continue to monitor progress and continues to recommend that the County monitor complaints.</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |

II. AIR QUALITY

| Air Quality Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|--|--|--|------------|
| <p>1. EQAC again recommends that the County take steps to integrate air quality planning needs more directly into the County planning process.</p> | <p>EQAC’s recommendations correctly note that there has been no direct action taken over the last year regarding staffing levels. Further, there has not been a concerted or coordinated effort to “take a hard look” at developing strategies that the County can pursue to address air quality issues. Staff agrees that, outside the context of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee’s air quality planning efforts, there has not been a systematic evaluation of emission reduction strategies that the County may be able to pursue unilaterally. Staff notes that last years response is unchanged in that limited staff resources are available for the enhanced air quality functions recommended by EQAC.</p> | <p>While staff responses to EQAC’s recommendations have been generally supportive, staff is limited by available resources. However, the situation in regard to air quality region and in Fairfax County has become even more dire since EQAC started recommending these actions. See this year’s Air Quality Chapter for why this is so. EQAC reiterates these recommendations and strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to take a proactive role to ensure that Fairfax County comes into compliance with Federal air quality standards – standards that we do not now meet. Without such action, the County faces the serious financial consequences of loss of Federal transportation funding and the many other adverse economic and health impacts associated with air quality that does not meet federal standards.</p> | <p>No.</p> |
| <p>2. In the area of air quality monitoring, the County must develop its own capability to systematically evaluate and address air quality compliance.</p> | <p>See above.</p> | <p>See above.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

III. ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| Ecological Resources Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>1. EQAC recommends that the County BOS develop and implement a Countywide Natural Resource Management Plan. Two tasks should be done first: complete a Countywide Baseline Natural Resource Inventory and adopt a unified Natural Resource Conservation Policy. The BOS should reinstate funding for the Ecological Resources Inventory Committee.</p> | <p>Staff concurs with EQAC’s recommendation. A number of activities are taking place that support this recommendation – with technical staff from several County agencies identifying actions needed to implement this recommendation. The team is collecting layers of natural resource data and compiling these data layers into a central natural resource management data set in the County’s GIS. The Park Authority is in the process of creating a Natural Management Plan for parklands and is preparing a “green infrastructure” map of the County. They continue to work on developing a Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) program, with inventories complete for six parks. There are not, however, overall programmatic strategies that have been developed to provide for the identification, conservation, and long-term management of the County’s natural resources.</p> | <p>As noted in earlier Annual Reports on the Environment, EQAC commends the Park Authority and fully supports its efforts. EQAC also notes more efforts are underway in this area than in previous years. However, unless increased staff and resources are allocated to these efforts, and an overall programmatic strategy is developed, EQAC’s recommendation will not be satisfied. EQAC reiterates its recommendation.</p> | <p>Some progress, more than in past years.</p> |
| <p>2. EQAC recommends that the County BOS emphasize public-private partnerships that use private actions such as land purchases and easements to protect forests and other natural resources.</p> | <p>The public-private partnership between the Board of Supervisors and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT) was established as of June 30, 2001. The memorandum of understanding (MOU) detailing this partnership is for three years. Funding and execution of the agreement is contingent upon annual appropriations by the Board of Supervisors.</p> | <p>This partnership between the BOS and NVCT fully satisfies EQAC’s recommendation. EQAC commends the BOS for this action. EQAC encourages the BOS to provide the required annual funding and to extend the MOU past three years.</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |
| <p>3. EQAC recommends that the topic of land preservations through easements continue to be publicized by the County</p> | <p>DPZ has the easements program brochure on their web site. A hard copy is in design and production. The FCPA has coordinated with various land trusts and will continue to pursue possible partnerships. FCPA is investigating possible advertising and networking strategies.</p> | <p>The continued presence of the information on the web site, the publication of the brochure, and advertising by FCPA satisfies EQAC’s recommendation.</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |

IV. DEER MANAGEMENT IN FAIRFAX COUNTY

| Deer Management Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>1. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to implement and monitor the comprehensive deer management program as set forth in the November 1998 Integrated Deer Management Plan and refined by the Deer Management Committee in the summer of 1999.</p> | <p>During 2001, managed hunts were conducted at Bull Run and Upper Potomac Regional Parks. Infrared activated cameras are used to address deer population densities with most of the parks under consideration for deer management. Sharpshooting is used to supplement managed hunts. During the growing season of 2001, a marked improvement was noted in the understory at Bull Run Regional Park. While it will take years for the habitat to rebound, these signs are encouraging. The Park Authority concurs with this recommendation and has been following the management principals referenced by EQAC.</p> | <p>EQAC notes that actions taken to date are a start, but the results are a long way from restoring natural areas to the former levels of biodiversity. The change at Bull Run Regional Park is encouraging; however, actions to manage the deer population need to continue and to be increased.</p> | <p>In process.</p> |
| <p>2. EQAC strongly endorses on-going public input into the Deer Management Plan.</p> | <p>The Deer Management Committee met twice in the Fall of 2001. They reviewed comments received in response to a questionnaire mailed to households located near parks. A County web page devoted to deer issues provide citizens with current information and continue to be updated and expanded. Citizens are able to send emails to this site to provide input, voice opinions, or to ask questions. Input is also received from citizens via telephone, other emails, public gathering, etc.</p> | <p>These efforts are providing the desired public input and should be continued.</p> | <p>Yes.</p> |

| Deer Management Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>3. EQAC strongly recommends increased participation of the Fairfax County Park Authority in the deer management program.</p> | <p>Fairfax County Park Authority has worked in close cooperation with the Animal Control Division to identify parks that might be considered as sites for deer herd reduction. Sharpshooting has been successfully used at many of these sites. The Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority (NVRPA) has conducted successful managed hunts. Based on this, and a flawless safety record for these hunts, the County Wildlife Biologist will meet with the FCPA Board to encourage the addition of managed public hunts to FCPA deer management activities.</p> | <p>EQAC encourages continued, and increased, participation by FCPA in deer management.</p> | <p>In process.</p> |
| <p>4. EQAC believes the deer management program must address problems of small private property owners.</p> | <p>The Virginia Department of Game & Inland Fisheries (VDGIF) will issue permits to property owners experiencing damage from any wildlife, but many citizens are not aware of this program. DGIF and Fairfax County have increased efforts to inform citizens of this program. Additionally, state code now allows an extended urban archery deer hunting season. The County Deer Management web page provides information about methods available to private property owners.</p> | <p>While the staff response outlines some options available to small private property owners, more needs to be done. A more aggressive media campaign is one, perhaps publishing and distributing a brochure. The out-of-season permit program should be expanded to include more property owners (permits now typically are given only to owners of larger parcels). More consideration should be given to including private property owners in the County's program (such as with sharpshooters).</p> | <p>In process.</p> |

| Deer Management Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|---|------------------|
| 5. EQAC believes the management program must accomplish: (1) immediate, sustained reduction of deer population; (2) ongoing monitoring of availability of methods for maintaining population limits; (3) consideration of development and its effects on ecosystem health and biodiversity. | The deer management program continues to reduce local herds to levels consistent with long-term carrying capacity of remaining habitats. Fairfax County continues to monitor developments and progress of non-lethal methods of deer herd control. However, scientists conducting immunocontraception research at Penn State have stated that this method would not be available as a management tool for at least ten years (and longer without the development of new drug delivery methods). | The deer management program is making inroads into the overpopulation of deer in the County. However, this needs to continue until all local herds have been reduced to levels consistent with carrying capacity. | In process. |
| 6. EQAC recommends the Board of Supervisors provide for a vigorous and enhanced program of public education. | Educational efforts have been underway since the start of the Deer Management Program. Additional measures are now being considered, including better use of the County's cable TV and updating of publications in the County Library system. (The staff response goes on to list a large number of educational efforts done in the last year.) | The County certainly has been conducting a vigorous program of public education. This program needs to be continued and enhanced such as suggested by County staff. | Yes. |

V. WASTE MANAGEMENT

| Waste Management Recommendation | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|--|------------|
| <p>1. EQAC strongly opposes the use of surplus funding to subsidize tipping fees. This approach is not sustainable and may have negative impacts on recycling programs.</p> | <p>Reserve balances from the Solid Waste Funds are no longer used to subsidize tipping fees. However, tipping fees cover the disposal costs, not necessarily the ancillary costs of the community based programs. In FY 2001 and FY 2002 the solid waste system received support for the General Fund to pay for certain elements of the waste disposal programs offered to County residents. General Fund support has been requested for this for FY 2003.</p> | <p>Originally, the tipping fees were used to cover disposal costs plus community based programs. With the change in waste disposal economics, this is no longer feasible. However, EQAC remains concerned that the community based programs do not have a secure funding source and may suffer in times such as now where the County faces financial shortfalls.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

VI. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| Hazardous Materials Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>1. EQAC strongly encourages the Board of Supervisors to determine mechanisms through which the Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (CESQG) program can be reinstated.</p> | <p>The CESQG was reinstated in late FY 01. A new program, able to comply with DEQ regulations regarding acceptance of CESQG material, was developed in partnership with a private disposal firm, Safety-Kleen/Curbside, Inc. The contractor works directly with the generator, with the County backing the program through public notices.</p> | <p>DPWES reestablished, on a limited basis, the CESQG. The web site provides resource information for commercial hazardous waste generators that do not qualify as a CESQG. Given current economic conditions, EQAC is pleased that this level of the CESQG program is again functioning.</p> | <p>Partially completed.</p> |
| <p>2. EQAC recommends an aggressive public education campaign on how to properly dispose of household/residential, commercial, and industrial hazardous wastes.</p> | <p>A substantial amount of program information already exists, with brochures and web site information readily available. DPWES personnel will be working with the Fire and Rescue Department. DPWES will be coordinating with the Office of Public Affairs in include information in upcoming news releases.</p> | <p>EQAC knows of no aggressive effort to educate the public about household hazardous waste. There has been a 6% increase in participation in this program from FY 01, but that follows four years of static use or reduction in use of this program.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

VII. NOISE, LIGHT POLLUTION, AND VISUAL POLLUTION

| Noise, Light and Visual Pollution Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|--|---|-------------|
| 1. EQAC recommends the Board of Supervisors continue to monitor the FAA TRACON project. | The first phase of the EIS process was completed. The second phase, addressing a redesign of the airspace, is underway. A draft EIS for the airspace redesign effort had been anticipated for mid-2001; however, as of January 2002 the document has not been released. | The draft EIS has been released. See the Noise, Light, and Visual Pollution Chapter of this Annual Report on the Environment for EQAC's comments. Staff should continue to monitor this issue. | In process. |
| 2. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors investigate and establish zoning and noise requirements to ensure that any commercial helicopter service in the County does not result in an intolerable rise in noise levels. | There are no provisions in either the Zoning Ordinance or the Noise Ordinance that regulates helicopter noise. The Board included this issue as a Priority 2 item on the 2001 Zoning Ordinance Amendment Work Program. While the Helicopter Noise Working Group has meet sporadically, efforts to map area susceptible to such noise impacts have not progressed significantly due to other staff priorities and limited resources. | No progress is being made here due to lack of staff resources. Zoning and noise requirements need to be established before commercial helicopter service becomes established in the County. EQAC reiterates the recommendation. | No. |
| 3. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors participate in the update of the Noise Compatibility Study for Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. | Due to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the subsequent restrictions placed on the airport, and resulting uncertainties regarding the extent and nature of future airport operations, the Study for the airport has been delayed. Staff concurs with EQAC's recommendation; however, no actions can be taken until the study resumes. Once the study resumes, the County should continue to monitor this issue and participate in study committees. | Since Supervisor Hyland is on the Part 150 Advisory Committee, this recommendation is satisfied if he, or another Supervisor, continues in that role if and when the study resumes. | In process. |

| Noise, Light and Visual Pollution Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|--|--|---|------------------|
| 4. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct DPZ develop a comprehensive ordinance to address lighting standards and practices in the County and the problems of light pollution. | The Zoning Ordinance currently only regulates glare and these standards have remained essentially unchanged since 1978. The Board recognized that these standards may no longer be suitable and included the review of glare performance standards as a Priority 1 item on the 2001 Zoning Ordinance Amendment Work Program. Staff is doing the background research. A proposed ordinance amendment will likely be brought to the Board in the Fall of 2002. | EQAC encourages the Board to move rapidly once the staff presents their proposed amendment. | In process. |
| 5. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that future lighting fixtures installed in the County follow the recommendation of the Illuminating Society of North America (light be directed down). | The Board of Supervisors, on January 24, 2000, approved changes to the Citizen Petition Street Light Program Policy to reduce light pollution from County streetlights. Under the changed policy, new streetlights will use "cutoff" optics that totally direct light downward. Efforts are continuing to amend the PFM to formalize the requirement that new streetlight installations have cutoff optics. Semi-cutoff cobra head fixtures may be used where cutoff installations are not economically practical to meet lighting standards. However, since January 2000, it has not been necessary to install any new semi-cutoff cobra head fixtures. Based on this experience, DPWES will standardize all new cobra head streetlight installations with the cutoff optic system. | EQAC encourages the amendment of the PFM to formalize this change. EQAC is pleased that, in these cases, that the recommendations of the Illuminating Society of North American will be followed. | Yes. |

| Noise, Light and Visual Pollution Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|--|--|---|----------------------|
| 6. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all older lighting fixtures under County control that do not meet the above standard be replaced on a phased basis. | The Board of Supervisors, on January 24, 2000, approved changes to the Citizen Petition Street Light Program Policy to reduce light pollution from County streetlights. However, the Board concurred with using cutoff fixtures on new installations only. Older lights will not be retrofitted due to high costs. Additionally, some of the older fixtures do not meet current lighting standards – replacing them with cutoff fixture would require an increase in wattage. As a result, there would be a cost increase in replacing these old fixtures. | EQAC continues to note that Tucson, Arizona, has drastically reduced light pollution and believes that Fairfax County can do the same. EQAC reiterates the recommendation. Additionally, saying that replacing some fixtures with cutoff optics would result in cost increases is flawed logic. Since these do not meet lighting standards, they should be replaced with upgraded wattage lights. The replacement, with cutoff optics, would be cheaper than a replacement without cutoff optics. | No. |
| 7. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with VDOT and elected officials to replace existing roadway lighting fixtures (under the control of VDOT) with those in recommendation #5. | VDOT concurs with this recommendation with respect to new projects only. They agree to adhere to more environmentally sensitive criteria in the design of new roadway lighting projects. VDOT does not have sufficient data to support either concurrence or disagreement with the recommendation on existing lighting. Applying the same level of environmental sensitivity would require a detailed engineering review. | EQAC is pleased that VDOT has at least agreed to follow the recommendation for new projects. EQAC continues to recommend that a plan be developed to replace existing fixtures. | Partially completed. |

| Noise, Light and Visual Pollution Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|--|--|---|------------------|
| <p>8. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct County staff to prepare brochures and information on a web site to promote public awareness of light issues. EQAC also recommends a brochure be prepared to help educate architects, contractors, electricians, and builders to what the County permits in the field of illumination.</p> | <p>Staff concurs with this recommendation and believes that public education of any new regulations is extremely critical. However, staff believes that development of such materials prior to adoption of new regulations in this area would be an inefficient use of staff's time and resources.</p> | <p>EQAC agrees with Staff. The intent of the recommendation was to tie the production of brochures into the same process as changing the regulation as recommended under Recommendation #4.</p> | <p>No.</p> |
| <p>9. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors immediately negotiate and execute an agreement with VDOT (as done by Prince William County) such that VDOT would delegate enforcement authority, including penalties, to the County regarding illegal signs in VDOT rights of way.</p> | <p>In the Countywide Sign Task Force Report presented to the Board in September 2001, there was a recommendation that the County enter into such an agreement with VDOT. The Board has asked for additional input from the community on the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>EQAC reiterates its recommendation and urges the Board of Supervisors to adopt the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>No.</p> |
| <p>10. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors use a multimedia approach on illegal signs to make citizens aware of Title 48 (Virginia's nuisance statute) as has been done in Loudoun County.</p> | <p>In the Countywide Sign Task Force Report presented to the Board in September 2001, there was a recommendation that there be a media campaign as this type. The Board has asked for additional input from the community on the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>EQAC reiterates its recommendation and urges the Board of Supervisors to adopt the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

| Noise, Light and Visual Pollution Recommendations | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>11. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors authorize the use of trained and certified volunteers to remove illegal signs from public property or the right-of-way.</p> | <p>The Countywide Sign Task Force has been advised that the Board does not have this authority. There have been discussions with VDOT representatives regarding the Adopt-a-Highway program, although under this program all litter and debris must be removed, not just illegal signs. It might be beneficial to include information on this program in any media campaign as discussed in Recommendation #10.</p> | <p>EQAC encourages volunteers in the Adopt-a-Highway program to remove illegal signs along with trash and debris, and supports any expansion of this program; however, infrequent sweeps of the roadways will do little to combat illegal signs since they rapidly reappear.</p> | <p>No.</p> |
| <p>12. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors request the Commonwealth Attorney's Office and the Virginia courts Virginia District Court to sentence non-violent offenders to assist in litter and illegal sign removal.</p> | <p>The Sheriff's Office Community Labor Force has expanded its efforts and has continued to provide manual labor services for removal of trash and debris from roadsides. The Sheriff's Office will continue to work with the County in these efforts, including the removal of illegal signs. The Sheriff's Office suggests that the Board of Supervisors should consider requesting the Circuit Court, the General District Court, and the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court to use the Community Labor Force as a sentencing alternative for non-violent offenders.</p> | <p>Using the Community Labor Force does partially satisfy EQAC's recommendation. EQAC agrees with the Sheriff's Office recommendation that the Courts consider the Community Labor Force as a sentencing alternative.</p> | <p>Partially completed.</p> |
| <p>13. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors authorize the hiring of additional employees to address illegal signs.</p> | <p>In the Countywide Sign Task Force Report presented to the Board in September 2001, there was a recommendation that the Board should re-establish a County program for the removal of roadside litter (which would include illegal signs). The Board has asked for additional input from the community on the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>EQAC reiterates its recommendation and urges the Board of Supervisors to adopt the Task Force recommendations.</p> | <p>No.</p> |

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

| Land Use and Transportation Recommendation | Action taken by Agency or Department | EQAC Comments | Completed |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>1. EQAC agrees with the recommendations of the TCC Task Force on Land Use and Transportation in their alternative transportation and land use activity strategies study.</p> | <p>A number of activities took place in 2001 that support elements of EQAC's recommendation: (1) Adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the Merrifield area; (2) Adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the Dulles Airport Access and Toll Road corridor; (3) Adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the Engineer Proving Ground site; (4) Adoption of a Zoning Ordinance amendment establishing the Planned Residential Mixed Use District; (5) Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan amendment that would add a Revitalization section to the Policy Plan; and (6) Consideration of revisions to the Countywide Trails Plan. Staff recommends that EQAC meet with the Planning Commission and the Transportation Advisory Committee to foster an exchange of ideas on the issue raised by EQAC.</p> | <p>EQAC has revised the Land Use and Transportation chapter in the 2002 Annual Report to reflect EQAC's continuing study in land use and transportation. EQAC has met with the Planning Commission and the Transportation Advisory Committee to discuss air quality issues that are associated with land use practices and transportation strategies. The County needs to continue to look at these practices and strategies with the goal of reducing the current negative impacts we are seeing in air quality, water quality, and the increasing congestion on County roadways.</p> | <p>No, but the process has started.</p> |