

**FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2007**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-large
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District
Timothy J. Sargeant, At-Large

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Walter L. Alcorn, At-Large
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District

OTHER PLANNING COMMISSIONER PRESENT:

Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Barbara J. Lippa, Executive Director, Planning Commission Office
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission

COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:

Pamela Nee, Chief, Environment and Development Review Branch, Planning Division
(PD), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ)
Noel Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner, PD, DPZ
John Bell, Planner III, PD, DPZ
Dawn Dhavale, Planner II, Environment and Development Review Branch, PD, DPZ
James Patteson, Director, Land Development Services, Department of Public Works and
Charles Bolen, Design and Construction, Fairfax County Public Schools
Carey Needham, Planning and Design Division, DPWES
Teresa Lepe, Planning and Design Division, DPWES
Stephen Turchen, DPWES

OTHERS PRESENT:

Vicki Worden, Vice President for Commercial Buildings and Project Development,
Green Building Initiatives
Michael Rolband, Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc. (WSSI)
Russ Dudley, WSSI
Jennifer Brophy-Price, WSSI
Rob Walker, W. H. Gordon Associates
Judith Heisinger, Bull Run Civic Association
Elizabeth McKeeby, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley, Emrich & Walsh, P.C
Tom Lee, Samaha Associates, PC

OTHERS PRESENT (Continued):

Pamela Vosburg, Virginia Sustainable Building Network (VSBN)
Annette Osso, VSBN
Peter Rosen, JPI

//

Chairman James R. Hart called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

Commissioner Alcorn MOVED THAT THE ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES OF AUGUST 13, 2007 BE APPROVED.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

//

Commissioner Hart announced that there were two remaining items on the agenda:

- Presentation from Vicki Worden, Vice President for Commercial Buildings and Product Development, Green Building Initiatives on the Green Globes environmental assessment and rating system;
- Follow-up from the September 6, 2007 Green Building Workshop.

//

Vicki Worden, Vice President for Commercial Buildings and Product Development, the Green Building Initiative (GBI), delivered a PowerPoint presentation on Green Globes environmental assessment and rating system, a copy of which is in the date file. She explained that two buildings in Fairfax County, a family shelter and a probation center, were expected to earn certification.

Ms. Worden said that Green Globes had two modules, Green Globes for New Construction, introduced in 2005, and the second, Continual Improvement for Existing Buildings, introduced in 2007. She explained that Green Globes' approach to green building included a report card that guided both new and experienced builders through the process and was a questionnaire-driven system designed to be used without the help of a consultant that provided feedback on sustainable design and delivery throughout the life of the building. She said a point system was used which allowed emphasis on the most important aspects of high-performance buildings and allowed for regional flexibility. In addition, Ms. Worden pointed out that the system integrated the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Target Finder program for design and operation of

green buildings based on actual operational performance data. She said that an early reporting mechanism determined if projects were on track and the user friendly reports summarized achievements and provided recommendations for improvement. She reviewed a portfolio case study on a Canadian company that had 50 buildings in the system. She noted that the Green Globes system was used by the Canadian federal government for their existing buildings portfolio.

Summarizing, Ms. Worden said Green Globes had a certification program with a very rigorous third-party verification system and was developing green building education, research, standards, and rating systems with the goal of achieving higher-performance buildings. She said ratings consisted of one, two, three or four globes and that a building could not earn certification unless it passed two points of verification. She explained that soon experts across the country would be taking a formal personnel certification program exam, created by an entity separate from GBI, to ensure the quality of third-party verification. She said the organization was working extremely hard to keep certification costs down by streamlining the process and eliminating paperwork costs with one individual reviewing all documentation. She said the goal was to keep certification under \$10,000 per building. She noted that technical feedback, received from colleges and universities who had used the system in a classroom setting was being used to develop software to make user interface as effective as possible.

Ms. Worden pointed out that 20 percent of states in the United States had recognized Green Globes alongside with the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program. She said GBI considered the two programs complementary and was trying to make sure that policies at the local, state, and federal levels were written to allow the marketplace to compete. She said GBI was working hard to meld the system with today's technology and to provide projections of green building costs. Ms. Worden said she hoped that Fairfax County would continue to allow Green Globes to compete fairly as policy and procedures were formulated.

In response to a question from Commissioner Flanagan, Ms. Worden said to her knowledge, the new system would be based on a rigorous third-party review process and a 1,000 points system. Responding to another question from Commissioner Flanagan, she said that GBI served on the National Institute of Building Sciences High Performance Building Council and the National Association of Home Builders American National Standards Institute (ANSI) committee. She added that the modus operandi of GBI was to work with mainstream builders and practitioners so everyone would build green.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Sargeant, Ms. Worden said that GBI had met with the American Institute of Architects' (AIA) Committee on Environment approximately two and one-half years ago and had decided to set goals for carbon neutral initiatives. She explained that AIA was rating-system neutral and emphasized life cycle assessment, an emerging science that was not interjected into rating systems today.

Commissioner Sargeant asked Ms. Worden for examples where it would be appropriate to use Green Globes versus LEED. She responded that LEED tended to be used in higher profile projects that could spread costs over a larger square footage building whereas Green Globes

provided a solution that worked in any size building. She said that although the criteria of both programs overlapped, Green Globes was able to be offered in cases where LEED was not.

Mr. Worden responded to questions from Commissioners Sargeant and Flanagan about how energy efficiency was measured by Green Globes and LEED and the point system ratio for site issues versus building issues.

//

Noel Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, explained that a number of issues had been raised at the September 6, 2007 Green Building Workshop. He said many of the comments addressed planning issues; i.e., the Comprehensive Plan, the strawman document, while other comments concerned issues, although valid and interesting, that were not directly related to the Comprehensive Plan, i.e., expedited plan review; tax incentives, and inspection of green building practices by staff. He said the committee might want to consider looking at these issues separately.

Chairman Hart commented that he thought the issues that were not directly related to the Plan Amendment should be addressed in follow-on motions.

Noting that a public hearing on the proposal was scheduled before the Planning Commission on November 8, 2007, and the Board of Supervisors on December 3, 2007, Mr. Kaplan said staff would like to proceed with the development of a staff report and an amendment based on the strawman document, with the concurrence of the committee. Without objection, Chairman Hart concurred on behalf of the committee.

Mr. Kaplan suggested that the green building fund concept be incorporated into the advertisement for consideration. He said at the request of the committee, staff had researched green building funds in other jurisdictions and had found that such funds were not broadly applied. He noted that they were applied in Arlington County, Virginia and in Washington D.C., but that staff was not aware of other jurisdictions that had established green building funds aside from serving as kind of a punitive measure (failure to meet a green building obligation results in a monetary penalty, and the money goes into a green building fund).

Mr. Kaplan also said that the amendment itself would incorporate most of the recommendations of the proposals in the strawman document but would not speak to enforcement because it was not a Comprehensive Plan issue.

//

Another committee meeting was scheduled to further discuss the proposed Policy Plan Amendment at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, October 4, 2007.

//

ADJOURNMENT

September 19, 2007

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.
James R. Hart, Chairman

For a record of this meeting, reference may be made to the file which can be found in the
Planning Commission Office.

Minutes by: Linda B. Rodeffer

Approved: October 4, 2007

Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission