

# APPENDIX B

## EQAC RESOLUTIONS AND POSITIONS DECEMBER 2006 THROUGH OCTOBER 2007

### CONTENTS

<u>Date</u>	<u>Resolution/Position</u>	<u>Page</u>
January 10, 2007	Letter supporting a “Cool County” effort	B-2
January 10, 2007	Resolution regarding the Metrorail extension through Tysons Corner, Virginia	B-3
January 17, 2007	Memorandum addressing pathway lighting and glare	B-5
February 16, 2007	Memorandum supporting a proposed Public Facilities Manual Amendment to incorporate low impact development practices	B-9
April 10, 2007	Letter addressing FY 2008 budget issues	B-11
April 11, 2007	Resolution addressing Base Realignment and Closure and related actions at Fort Belvoir	B-12
June 2007	Resolution supporting implementation of compact Fluorescent light bulbs	B-16
October 15, 2007	Testimony regarding a proposed Tree Conservation Ordinance	B-17



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** January 10, 2007

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Stella Koch, Chairman *Stella M. Koch*  
Environmental Quality Advisory Council

**SUBJECT:** Support for a Fairfax County "Cool County" Effort

EQAC would like to commend members of the board of supervisors for their comments in the discussion on global climate change on December 11, 2006 at the board's Environmental Committee meeting. We understand that the county supports the concepts in the Sierra Club's Cool Cities program. We support and applaud Fairfax County's existing efforts to address some of the factors involved in creating the greenhouse gases that contribute to global climate change.

We support the board's intention to take action on this issue. We urge the county to take a leadership position and move forward in creating and implementing a "Cool Counties" program that mirrors the intention and performance-based orientation promoted by the Sierra Club's Cool Cities Program. We note that measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions have local environmental benefits as well as cost savings. We look forward to working with the board and staff on this issue.

SMK:nhk

cc: Anthony H. Griffin, County Executive  
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive  
Kambiz Agazi, Fairfax County Environmental Coordinator  
Environmental Quality Advisory Council file: January, 2007

---

**Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC)**  
**c/o Department of Planning and Zoning**  
Planning Division  
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 730  
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509  
Phone 703-324-1380  
Fax 703-324-3056  
[www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/)

**Resolution of the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council  
Regarding the Metrorail extension through Tysons Corner, Virginia**

**January 10, 2007**

**WHEREAS**, the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC) is an advisory group that has been appointed by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors to advise the board on environmental matters; and

**WHEREAS**, EQAC has consistently advocated for better land use and transportation integration, which includes a complete multimodal transportation system with complimentary rail, bus, car, and pedestrian facilities which is greatly facilitated by a street grid and safe connecting pedestrian walkways; and

**WHEREAS**, it is EQAC's view that the proposed extension of rail transit into and through Tysons Corner will be an essential component of such a multimodal transportation system and will be important to the continued economic vitality of Fairfax County; and

**WHEREAS**, the approved design of this rail extension would result in an alignment that is largely above ground through Tysons Corner; and

**WHEREAS**, it is EQAC's view that the construction of an aerial Metrorail project cutting through one of the nation's largest retail and business centers would negatively impact the Tysons Corner area; and

**WHEREAS**, it is EQAC's view that the proposed aerial route would not allow for an effective street grid due to large concrete pillars required to support the aerial track along route 7 and 123, and would impose significant physical barriers that must be addressed by the land use plan for the future mixed-use urban vision for Tysons Corner; and

**WHEREAS**, it is EQAC's view that the aerial Metrorail option, independent of land use planning decisions that may be made pursuant to the Tysons Corner Transportation and Urban Design Study, would ultimately result, when compared with a tunnel option, in more congestion, less walkability, more car miles/person, extra car trips and associated environmental impacts to include: increased noise pollution, visual pollution and light pollution; and

**WHEREAS**, while the aerial option has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration, EQAC believes that it is still timely and appropriate to revisit this decision; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 8, 2007, the board of supervisors endorsed consideration of the tunnel option;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL** that EQAC commends the board of supervisors for its endorsement of the tunnel option.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE FAIRFAX COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL** that:

County leaders are urged to continue to explore and advocate for the construction of a Metrorail tunnel through Tysons Corner; and

The council expresses its support to achieve:

- 1) An assessment of the environmental advantages of constructing a tunnel option instead of an aerial Metrorail option through Tysons Corner;
- 2) Simultaneous consideration of both a 3.5 mile tunnel beneath the entire length of Tysons Corner and an aerial design;
- 3) Side-by-side, open, competitive bidding of the tunnel option and the aerial option;
- 4) Assurance that total life cycle costs are included in any side-by-side competitive bidding; and
- 5) Consideration of the average car miles/person as a factor in the decision for the aerial or tunnel option.



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** January 17, 2007

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Environmental Quality Advisory Council

**SUBJECT:** Pathway lighting and technical aspects of “glare”

At the December 4, 2006 meeting of the board of supervisors, at which the Environmental Quality Advisory Council’s Annual Report on the Environment was presented, Supervisor Hudgins raised some technical questions concerning lighting glare in certain applications. The EQAC chair indicated that those questions could be best answered by the two EQAC members most conversant with these issues. In a subsequent discussion with Supervisor Hudgins to be certain that her questions would be properly addressed, it was determined that her particular concerns were for lighting of sidewalks and walkways that would provide safety but without glare that would degrade night vision of pedestrians and that would not adversely affect adjacent residences.

Through this memorandum, EQAC is responding to the specific questions that were raised on December 4, 2006, as clarified through subsequent coordination. This memorandum does not address the board’s January 8, 2007 request for EQAC’s review of the Fairfax County Park Authority’s Field Lighting Study. We will review this document and provide comments through future correspondence.

In order to familiarize the board with the various provisions of the county’s Outdoor Lighting Ordinance that apply to sidewalks and walkways, a copy of the ordinance and the explanatory 16 page guidance booklet are attached. The relevant paragraphs are highlighted. The Public Facilities Manual (PFM) does not contain any information dealing specifically with pathway lighting.

In general, there are two types of lighting fixtures that work well for paths and walkways: 1) post-mounted fixtures that are above head height and 2) bollard or short fixtures that are generally below waist height. In order to avoid glare, pole-mounted fixtures should be of the full cutoff type as illustrated in the guidance booklet and also in the EQAC Annual Report on the Environment. The higher the poles the greater can be the spacing between them. Bollard-type fixtures are available in a number of different styles and are generally in the range of 24-

---

**Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC)**  
**c/o Department of Planning and Zoning**  
Planning Division  
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 730  
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509  
Phone 703-324-1380  
Fax 703-324-3056  
[www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/)

36 inches tall with louvers or other shielding devices at the top end so that the bulb surface is not directly visible. These are in use at many of our newer Fairfax County government and Park Authority facilities. Lower fixtures are usually about 10-15 inches above the ground and are widely used along the edges of planting beds and in similar situations so that the edges of a paved path are adequately lighted for safety but with a gentle indirect light. Because of the closer spacing normally required with bollard and lower level fixtures, installation costs may become an important consideration. The third attachment illustrates a variety of these latter fixture types.

Glare is a complex and frequently not well understood issue. However, it is very important in the type of lighting involved in this inquiry. The objective is sufficient lighting on a pathway surface for safe walking and enough to the sides to provide safety against intruders but, at the same time without luminous surface of high intensity being directly visible and thereby degrading sensitive night vision. To exemplify some of the confusion surrounding the glare issue, the recent memo to the Board of Supervisors from Harold Strickland, Chairman of the Fairfax County Park Authority, dated November 15, 2006, relating to the FCPA Athletic Field Lighting Study and a Performance Specifications Outline (ver. 3.0) dated November 1, 2006, which claimed the FCPA had adopted “glare” standards is instructive.

The FCPA letter states that “direct glare” is “the visual discomfort resulting from insufficiently shielded light sources in the field of view and is measured in candelas.” This statement is largely correct as to visual discomfort but incorrect as to units of measurement.

The U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) defines the candela as the SI (International System of Units) unit of luminous intensity, which is essentially equivalent to the older term candle power. It refers to the luminous intensity of the source itself and is technically more completely stated as, “The candela is the luminous intensity, in a given direction, of a source that emits monochromatic radiation of frequency  $540 \times 10^{12}$  hertz and that has a radiant intensity in that direction of  $1/683$  watt per steradian.” There is no national or international standard for ‘glare’ and neither the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) nor the International Dark-Sky Association (IDA) have promulgated one, though both bodies have extensively discussed the importance of the issue.

Glare is a complex concept. In addition to intensity of the source, its spectral distribution and whether it is a point source or distributed over a larger surface is important. Even more important is the background against which the source is viewed. An intense source, say a 1,500 watt metal halide bulb such as is common in sports lighting fixtures, viewed against the background of the mid-day or early evening sky appears only a little brighter than the background and is not particularly bothersome (see the left hand figure in the fourth attachment). However, the same source viewed against the dark night sky (the right hand figure) appears so intense as to be almost physically painful and destroys the dark adaptation (i.e. bleaches rhodopsin and the three photopsins) of the human eye. Thus, the complex characteristics of the human eye and the time of day are as important or more important than the mere physics of the light source. This is precisely the reason that there are no established standards for glare.

It is rather like one of our supreme court justices said of pornography, “I can’t define it, but I know it when I see it.”

A good encyclopedia definition of glare is as follows:

“Glare is the result of excessive contrast between light and dark areas in the field of view. For example, glare can be associated with directly viewing the filament of an unshielded or badly shielded light. Light shining into the eyes of pedestrians and drivers can obscure night vision for up to an hour after exposure. Caused by high contrast between light and dark areas, glare can also make it difficult for the human eye to adjust to the differences in brightness. Glare is particularly an issue in road safety, as bright and/or badly shielded lights around roads may partially blind drivers or pedestrians unexpectedly and contribute to accidents. Glare can be categorized into different types. One such classification has been developed by Bob Mizon, coordinator for the British Astronomical Associations Campaign for Dark Skies. According to Mizon’s classification:

- **Blinding Glare** describes the effects such as that caused by staring into the sun. It is completely blinding and leaves temporary vision deficiencies.
- **Disability Glare** describes effects such as being blinded by an oncoming car’s lights, with significant reduction in sight capabilities.
- **Discomfort Glare** does not typically cause a dangerous situation in itself and is annoying and irritating at best. It can potentially cause fatigue if experienced over extended periods.”

Notice that in all three cases the glare is due to a directly visible luminous source. The adverse impacts of sports field and road/pathway lighting are primarily of the discomfort glare type, but often they occur over extended periods and therefore have a material impact on adjacent residential neighborhoods.

From the above it is clear that statements that ‘glare’ is limited to a certain number of candelas are meaningless since the candela measurement refers only to the luminous intensity of the source and has nothing to do with the background against which the source is viewed or the perceptual mechanisms of the human eye. Further, the IESNA has no glare standards and the International Dark Sky Association (IDA) specifically recommends full cutoff type fixtures where the luminous source is fully shielded and therefore not directly visible.

It is useful to note the ordinances of adjacent jurisdictions. Melinda Artman, Zoning Administrator of Loudoun County (and formerly in Zoning Administration in Fairfax County), supplied the relevant section of the Loudoun County zoning ordinance entitled Light and Glare Standards (see fifth attachment). It is stricter than either the Fairfax County ordinance or the recent FCPA version 3.0 draft standard. Similarly, the Montgomery County ordinance appears to have stricter provisions (see sixth attachment).

Should additional information be desired please contact Frank Crandall, the EQAC member who authors the Light Pollution section of the Annual Report on the Environment. He may be reached by phone at 202-633-1771 or by e-mail at [crandalf@si.edu](mailto:crandalf@si.edu).

cc: Anthony H. Griffin, County Executive  
Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive  
James P. Zook, Director, Department of Planning and Zoning  
Lorrie E. Kirst, Deputy Zoning Administrator, Zoning Administration Division, DPZ  
John E. Reale, Jr., Zoning Administration Division, DPZ  
EQAC file, January 2007

Attachments: *[Not provided in the 2007 Annual Report. For copies, contact the Department of Planning and Zoning at 703-324-1380.]*

1. Fairfax County Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.
2. Fairfax County Outdoor Lighting guidance booklet.
3. Illustrations of low level path lighting fixtures.
4. Views of pole-mounted lights against different backgrounds
5. Loudon County ordinance.
6. Montgomery County ordinance.



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** February 16, 2007

**TO:** Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Environmental Quality Advisory Council

**SUBJECT:** Support for a Proposed Public Facilities Manual Amendment to Incorporate Low Impact Development Practices

EQAC would like to commend the Board of Supervisors for initiating the process of amending the Public Facilities Manual (PFM) to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) practices. This action supports the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Agenda, which includes the following statement: "Encourage the use of low impact development concepts and techniques, especially in new residential and commercial areas, and seek opportunities for retrofitting established areas."

EQAC recommends that the Board move forward with this initiative and approve the proposed PFM amendment consisting of six LID practices (pervious pavement, bioretention filters and basins, vegetated swales, tree box filters, vegetated roofs, and reforestation). Incorporating these six proposed practices into the PFM is an important first step and will provide additional tools and options for meeting stormwater management requirements. LID practices provide better pollution mitigation from small, more frequent storm events than existing conventional stormwater management. Having established design and construction standards will help facilitate implementation of LID throughout the county.

EQAC shares with others considerable concern over the recommended restrictions on the application and location of selected practices. These restrictions are based on consideration of long term sustainability of these LIDs given maintenance and inspection responsibilities. However, as the county more closely approaches build-out, an increasing fraction of our stormwater problems will originate with infill redevelopment sites, resulting in the bulk of locations not considered for LIDs because of these restrictions. It is our firm opinion that as more of these practices are implemented throughout the county, and experience and data are obtained, these issues and restrictions should be reviewed and minimized to optimize implementation of these six practices and other LID technology in the county.

---

**Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC)**  
**c/o Department of Planning and Zoning**  
Planning Division  
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 730  
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509  
Phone 703-324-1380  
Fax 703-324-3056  
[www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/)

It is critical to take the first step and incorporate the proposed LID amendment into the PFM to continue the forward momentum of the Board's Environmental Agenda.

EQAC further commends the county for partnering with other local jurisdictions, the Northern Virginia Regional Commission, and Engineers and Surveyors Institute on developing a supplement to the Northern Virginia BMP Handbook that will include LID practices (including the six proposed to go into the PFM).

EQAC looks forward to continuing to work with the Board and county staff on this issue.

cc: Fairfax County Planning Commission

Anthony H. Griffin, County Executive

Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive

Jimmie D. Jenkins, Director, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services

EQAC file, February 2007



# County of Fairfax, Virginia

---

To protect and enrich the quality of life for the people, neighborhoods and diverse communities of Fairfax County

April 10, 2007

Chairman Connolly and Board Members:

Good evening, my name is Stella Koch and I am speaking on behalf of the Environmental Quality Advisory Council this evening. We thank you for this opportunity to speak.

EQAC commends the board for its continued strong support of environmental programs that have been developed and expanded through the last decade. Each year we see advancement and improvement in the county's stewardship efforts. As support is largely manifested through staff and budget resources, we would like to make the following comments about the proposed FY2008 budget:

We support the continued dedication of the one penny of the Real Estate Tax for additional stormwater management efforts, including the protection and restoration of our local streams.

We also support the following inclusions in this proposed budget:

- 1) Funding of the first of four installments to purchase planimetric data, which will allow the county to keep current with land use and development changes through aerial imagery and digital orthophotography.
- 2) Funding to hire an additional Wildlife Biologist and support for Deer and Geese Management programs.
- 3) Funding for a dedicated Soil Scientist to maintain the newly created soil survey data base, to be available for questions from county staff and developers on soil issues and to integrate the new survey materials into the county's GIS programs.

We are very pleased that over the past three years the county has funded parts of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), the non-stormwater environmental initiatives in the county. In light of the Cool Counties program and other energy use / carbon dioxide reduction efforts the county is making, we would recommend that there be additional funding for the EIP program, most specifically funding for an environment and energy staff position.

We thank you again for this opportunity to speak and look forward to working with you on these issues.

---

**Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC)**  
**c/o Department of Planning and Zoning**  
Planning Division  
12055 Government Center Parkway, Suite 730  
Fairfax, Virginia 22035-5509  
Phone 703-324-1380  
Fax 703-324-3056  
[www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/eqac/)

**Resolution of the Fairfax County Environmental Quality Advisory Council  
Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement addressing Base  
Realignment and Closure and related actions at Fort Belvoir**

**April 11, 2007**

**WHEREAS**, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, released the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Implementation of 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Recommendations and Related Army Actions at Fort Belvoir, Virginia* in March 2007, and

**WHEREAS**, this EIS shows significant environmental impacts to Fairfax County; and

**WHEREAS**, EQAC reviewed this EIS and has concerns about the adequacy of the EIS and about the proposed mitigation measures (attached);

**BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED** that EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors include EQAC's comments and recommendations in the Fairfax County response to the EIS, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with our Congressmen and Senators, plus our Delegates and State Senators, to ensure that all traffic mitigation measures are funded and in place before any personnel moves associated with BRAC take place, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with our Congressmen and Senators to delay the movement of personnel to Fort Belvoir and the Engineer Proving Ground if traffic mitigation measures are not in place by 2011.

## EQAC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIS FOR BRAC AND RELATED ACTIONS AT FORT BELVOIR

April 11, 2007

### A. The traffic summaries contain significant flaws.

(1) Table 4.3-15 shows the distribution of NGA employees. However, this is based on payroll data and therefore only includes federal employees, not embedded contractors. Embedded contractors are approximately 50% of the personnel coming to Fort Belvoir. All calculations done on the effect of the move of NGA are based on the federal employees. The implicit assumption is that the embedded contractors have the same distribution as federal employees, but this is not supported in any fashion.

(2) Support contractors, not embedded, are not considered. It can be expected that some support contractors will relocate to be nearer to the agencies they are supporting, but others will elect to stay in place. The impact of these contractors is not addressed.

(3) Table 4.3-15 shows that 45% of the employees at NGA will have to cross the Potomac to get to Fort Belvoir. While this figure is subject to debate (see A1 above) and may be much higher, this puts a significant number of new crossings over bridges across the Potomac. This will have a significant impact on already overloaded bridges and make the existing situation worse. Yet none of these bridges are addressed in the study.

(4) There is an error in one table on road intersections in Table 4.3-5 and this leads to a question about the accuracy of the others in this table. The Telegraph Road/South Van Dorn Street intersection is given as having traffic condition C in the AM and as D in the PM. The nearby intersection of Telegraph Road/South Kings Highway is not addressed, yet it will contain significant traffic going to Fort Belvoir. At 8:00 AM, the intersection of Telegraph Road/South Kings Highway is F and the intersection of Telegraph Road/South Van Dorn Street is often D or worse. At 5:00 PM, the intersections of both Telegraph Road/South Van Dorn Street and Telegraph Road/South Kings Highway are both F.

(5) The EIS does not take into consideration or include an analysis of the increased production of ground-level ozone (smog) or particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) that will likely result from the significant increase in traffic that will be coming to Fort Belvoir. An ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> hot spot analysis should be included as part of the EIS to determine what impacts, if any, each alternative would have on local ground-level ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations.

**B. The measures for mitigating the admitted serious (Paragraph 4.3.4.4) traffic impacts are inadequate.**

(1) Only potential measures are shown and a comprehensive list of measures that will be done, if any, is left to the future. Since there are many uncertainties in these measures, including cost, an informed guess cannot be made as to what measures will be selected.

(2) At this time, it is highly unlikely that a complete set of mitigation measures will be in place by 2011, the date the BRAC changes will occur. Therefore, severe traffic impacts will happen and be experienced by not only those newly assigned personnel to Fort Belvoir, but also all users of the roads in eastern Fairfax County.

(3) Rail is not considered as a mitigation measure. This is a serious mistake. As mentioned in A3, there will be a significant number of people coming across the Potomac. If NGA at the Washington Navy Yard is a good example, a significant number of NGA personnel use Metrorail today, and these personnel would have to find alternative ways of getting to Fort Belvoir. This will be via an already overloaded road network. While busses can help, they are still tied down to the road network and will suffer delays due to traffic. Rail extensions, either extending today's Metrorail or by light rail, on both the Blue and Yellow lines to Fort Belvoir on Richmond Highway and to the EPG, need to be put in place before 2011. Furthermore, there needs to be internal shuttles that will carry people from the new rail stations to their places of work.

**C. The change in land use categories (paragraph 2.2.1.2) may reduce protection to environmentally sensitive areas.**

(1) The existing 1993 Master Land Use Plan includes a category for environmentally sensitive land (currently at 3,063 acres, which does not include EPG). The proposed new plan eliminates this category and places some of the environmentally sensitive land into a community category. However, large areas of environmentally sensitive land are placed into other categories – airfield, professional/industrial, and training. These three categories will encompass significant environmentally sensitive areas such as portions of the wildlife corridor, streams and wetlands in the southwest area, and all the streams and wetlands on the EPG.

(2) While some protections remain in place for these environmentally sensitive areas, the overall designation as such is gone. As a result, future development can be expected to encroach into these areas. This expectation of future development is illustrated by a statement in paragraph 4.6.2.1.1 “The Professional/Industrial, Community, and Residential land uses would allow development in areas that were considered Environmentally Sensitive in the 1993 land use plan, although environmental constraints (e.g., endangered species habitat) would retain their protected status and continue to limit potential development in some of these areas.”

(3) The Environmentally Sensitive category should remain in the land use plan.

**D. Construction because of BRAC will have significant impact on streams.**

(1) A number of subwatersheds will experience over a 10% increase in 1- and 10-year storm event peak discharge (Table 4.7-7). These increases range up to 100%. Furthermore, these increases can be even greater since experience in storm event has shown that models can, and do, under predict peak discharges.

(2) The EIS does not address any impact on streams other than peak discharges. Due to the increase in impervious surface, many subwatersheds will experience an increase in total volume of water, thereby increasing erosion.

(3) A good list of mitigation measures is proposed (paragraph 4.7.2.4); however, there is no commitment to some of these. The language that some of the measures “could be included” needs to be changed to “will be included.” These include LID management practices, man-made wetlands, restored riparian buffers, stream restoration projects, and participating in Fairfax County’s Watershed Planning Process.

**E. Additional mitigation measures can be done both within and outside of the areas affected by BRAC.**

(1) Stream restoration and riparian buffer restoration should be done at Davison Army Airfield. This can mitigate some of the impacts of BRAC on Accotink Creek.

(2) Reforestation should be done on selected areas within Fort Belvoir. This would help replace some of the trees that BRAC construction removes. One such area would be those portions of the EPG that are being grubbed to remove unexploded ordnance (UXO). Where possible, oak and mixed oak hardwoods should be considered for upland areas. Such replantings that would help regenerate a mixed oak forest would have long-term benefits to both water quality and animal life that depends upon oaks as a food source.

# Environmental Quality Advisory Council

## Resolution Supporting Implementation of Compact Fluorescent Light Bulbs June 2007

**Whereas** Compact Fluorescent Lights (CFLs) conserve approximately two-thirds of the energy used by incandescent bulbs; and

**Whereas** electricity generated from fossil fuels also produces air pollution, greenhouse gases and acid rain; and

**Whereas** CFL use results in lower emissions of SO<sub>2</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and mercury specifically, which is in the spirit of the Clean Air Interstate Rule; and

**Whereas** the introduction of just one CFL in each of Fairfax County's 238 schools prevents about 107,100 pounds of power plant emissions; and

**Whereas** the replacement of 238 60-watt incandescent bulbs with 238 13-watt CFLs can save at least \$7,140 in energy costs; and

**Whereas** CFLs contain 5 milligrams of mercury sealed within the glass tubing that is harmless during appropriate use, but necessitates proper disposal of all bulbs; and

**Whereas** FCPS has retrofitted lighting fixtures in 106 schools and offices, thereby replacing standard incandescent light bulbs by approximately 99%; and

**Whereas** all FCPS buildings now use high efficiency T-8 or T-5 lighting with electronic ballasts; and

**Whereas** FCPS has conducted other such energy-efficiency lighting programs.

**Therefore be it resolved** that EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors commend Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) for discontinuing purchase of incandescent bulbs and for its commitment to energy efficiency; and

**Be it further resolved** that EQAC recommends that the Board encourage FCPS to continue and maintain the transition from incandescent to fluorescent light bulbs in all county public schools; and

**Be it further resolved** that EQAC recommends that the Board direct the County Executive to train custodial staff or require contract custodial service firms to train their staffs regarding safe operation and disposal of fluorescent lights; and

**Be it finally resolved** that EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide information on CFLs to the public so that similar actions will be taken by private schools and large businesses in the county.

# Tree Preservation Ordinance

Testimony before the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

October 15, 2007

My name is Chet McLaren. I am the Braddock District representative on the Environmental Quality Advisory Council and the EQAC representative on the Tree Commission. I am here today to speak on behalf of EQAC.

The members of EQAC are pleased that the Board is continuing to take actions in regard to the quality and quantity of tree cover in Fairfax County. This proposed Tree Conservation Ordinance is another necessary step in carrying out provisions of the Tree Action Plan and also attaining your goal of 45% tree cover for the County.

We encourage you to approve the Tree Conservation Ordinance which is under consideration today.

However, we are concerned that the Ordinance does not take full advantage of all provisions of the State tree conservation ordinance concerning the taking of property and compensation therefor. Accordingly, we strongly recommend approval and implementation of the Ordinance as presented. Then, staff should perform a study directed at modifying the Ordinance to provide the Board the option of taking full advantage of State authorized action if the Board should see the need to employ such actions in the future.

Thank You.

Lyle C. McLaren

