

# **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE**

**April 25, 2023**

**1:30 P.M.**

**Government Center Conference Room 11**

## **Board of Supervisors Members Present:**

Board Chair Jeffrey C. McKay  
Committee Chair Daniel G. Storck, Mount Vernon District  
Supervisor Walter L. Alcorn, Hunter Mill District  
Supervisor John W. Foust, Dranesville District  
Supervisor Penelope A. Gross, Mason District  
Supervisor Pat Herrity, Springfield District  
Supervisor Rodney L. Lusk, Franconia District  
Supervisor Dalia A. Palchik, Providence District  
Supervisor Kathy L. Smith, Sully District  
Supervisor James R. Walkinshaw, Braddock District

## **Others Present:**

Bryan J. Hill, County Executive  
Beth Teare, County Attorney

April 25, 2023, Meeting Agenda:

[BOSEC April 25, 2023 Agenda \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/bosec/agenda/2023/04/25)

April 25, 2023, Meeting Materials:

[Board of Supervisors Environmental Committee Meeting: April 25, 2023 | Board Of Supervisors \(fairfaxcounty.gov\)](https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/bosec/meetings/2023/04/25)

The following is a summary of the discussion from the April 25, 2023, Environmental Committee meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M.

## **Item I Opening Remarks**

After a brief introduction from Supervisor Storck, Committee Chair, the Environmental Committee was asked if there were any changes to the meeting summary from February 28, 2023. With no changes, the summary was accepted.

Supervisor Storck asked if there were any updates or outstanding items that were owed to Board members. Supervisor Storck asked Supervisor Gross if she had received a staff response to her inquiry about universal design standards for electric bus charging stations. Supervisor Gross mentioned she had not seen a response to her request. Supervisor Storck requested John Morrill, Acting Director for the Office of Environmental and Energy Coordination (OEEC), provide a brief response to Supervisor Gross. Mr. Morrill offered his apologies that a written response was not provided and went on to explain that the charging infrastructure for both transit fleet and school buses utilize the same equipment in a combined charging system. Supervisor Gross thanked Mr. Morrill for the explanation and asked that he provide that response in writing to the committee for continuity. Next, Supervisor Storck mentioned that Supervisor Walkinshaw had asked about the conversion rate of county electric vehicles (EVs). Supervisor Storck explained that the Board received a Budget Q+A addressing this question. Supervisor Storck then moved to the next item.

## **Item II Lake Accotink Dredging**

The update on dredging Lake Accotink was presented by Chris Herrington, Director, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) and Charles Smith, Project Coordinator, DPWES. Mr. Smith began by explaining the history, current uses, and location of Lake Accotink. Mr. Smith explained a previous community engagement process led by the Fairfax County Park Authority from 2016 – 2019. Through that process, dredging program project goals were developed, to establish an eight-foot average lake depth, implement a maintenance dredging program, and maintain the lake as an aesthetic and recreational amenity.

Mr. Smith then provided a dredging project timeline covering the initial community engagement process (2016 – 2019) to the most recent public survey and comment period, which was held February 16 – April 1, 2023. During this

time, the county engaged Arcadis to begin the dredge program project and pursued state funding opportunities. It became apparent during this time that dredging costs would be much higher than originally anticipated, and the county began to engage with stakeholders and the public to evaluate potential alternatives to dredging.

A dredging program overview was presented next, explaining the four steps involved with dredging, should the county decide to proceed with this approach: 1) establishing a dewatering site away from Lake Accotink 2) dredging the lake 3) pumping the dredge spoils through a pipeline for dewatering, and 4) transporting the sediment to a disposal site, resulting in an estimated 50,000 truckloads over a three-year period. The base dredging program would be a one-time 500,000 cubic yard (cy) removal event (assumed three-year duration) and a maintenance dredging program with 150,000 cy removal every five years, on average.

Mr. Smith then shared the evaluated Lake Accotink dredging options. An extensive process was completed and communicated to the public, with suggestions accepted from stakeholders and the community at large. Both wet and dry dredging options were evaluated. County staff and consultants evaluated 19 potential spoils processing locations. Seven pipeline locations were evaluated for viable spoils processing areas. Nine spoils disposal options were assessed including site disposal on county lands and beneficial reuse.

Mr. Smith shared the dredge program's estimated costs, including a base dredge cost of \$95 million, and a maintenance dredging program. The estimated post-dredging maintenance costs are \$46.5 million for a five-year post-base dredge cost, \$59.4 million for a 10-year post-base dredge cost, \$96.8 million for a 15-year post-base dredge cost, and \$123.5 million for a 20-year post-base dredge cost, which is a \$300 million cost over a 20-year period. A 25-year project is projected to cost \$400 million.

Mr. Smith then explained the drivers for the lake dredging cost increases. First, he said, emptying the lake would cause it to become more efficient at capturing sediment creating a 43 percent increase in sediment to remove. Second, there are much higher processing, and trucking and disposal costs than the original concept. Market adjustments and inflation over the maintenance project timeline also need to be accounted for. The dredging will cause a need for frequent maintenance dredging. These project cost estimates are consistent with all Fairfax County projects for consideration of long-term maintenance costs and an application of a five percent consumer price index for future actions. Mr. Smith provided a

summary of dredging cost differences between the project conception and today. Many of the considerations in 2018 have different requirements in 2023, including disposal and trucking costs, the total base dredge, and the maintenance required.

Mr. Smith said that the escalating project costs drove staff to evaluate additional management options. Staff evaluated the possibility of a smaller off-line lake which would require increased sediment removal, resulting in 82,500 truck trips to haul out unsuitable sediment and 40,000 truck trips to import suitable fill. It would also require the creation of a half-mile-long dam. This option would have a \$198 million construction cost and a significant risk to the county for long-term public safety and maintenance due to a large dam/levee. Thus, staff recommended not pursuing a smaller off-line lake option.

Mr. Smith then expounded on the implications of not dredging. He addressed the community impacts including the loss of some or all of the open-water aesthetic and recreational opportunities, the continued management of Lake Accotink Park for social, recreational, and aesthetic purposes, and the avoidance of trucking, noise, and disruption of recreational resources. Next, he addressed the environmental impacts. He explained that most of the sediment not captured by the lake will be caught within the Accotink Creek floodplain. He said the restoration within the Accotink Creek channels will be required whether or not the lake is dredged and will reduce stream sediment and assist in the recovery of stream organisms. He mentioned the avoidance of loss of forest cover and wetlands and highlighted the opportunity to manage the lake footprint for higher quality habitat and climate resiliency. He explained that Fairfax County will face regulatory implications and must reduce sediment impacts to Accotink within the stream channels above and below Lake Accotink as required under the Accotink TMDL, and that staff anticipate a minimal increase in additional assigned load reduction below the lake. Not dredging Lake Accotink will create an avoidance of an estimated \$16 million in annual dredging costs over 25 years.

A summary of the February 16 – April 1, 2023, public survey was provided by Mr. Smith. Staff read and evaluated 1,078 responses. Of those respondents, most live close to the lake, and use it for hiking, walking, or running. Support for dredging versus not dredging was evenly split amongst the respondents. Comments pertained to concerns over dredging costs, a need for more information, support for a return to park visioning, and concerns about wetlands.

Mr. Herrington then expressed his regrets for the staff recommendation that Lake Accotink not be dredged due to significant community and environmental impacts and excessive costs. Regarding environmental impacts, he continued, the negative environmental impacts of dredging the lake far outweigh the positive environmental benefits that would be realized in maintaining the lake. However, he mentioned that he cannot quantify what the lake means to the community. He explained how a transition to wetlands would have associated costs and affect park users. County staff recommend attention be focused on completing a new Master Plan for Lake Accotink Park and reinvesting in that community vision. Reimagining Lake Accotink Park could include further analysis of managing the lake footprint to support community needs, wildlife habitat and Fairfax County and Park Authority policies.

Fairfax County Park Authority Executive Director, Jai Cole, said the Park Authority recommends a return to the Lake Accotink Park Master Plan, with an investment in the results of the Master Plan for the community.

#### Board Discussion:

Supervisor Storck thanked staff and acknowledged the degree of difficulty involved with this project and determining next steps.

Chairman McKay thanked staff for the effort in investigating the dredging project and expressed his regret for the results of the study. He said he has more questions about what can be done and is not ready to make a decision. He stated a need for a new task ask for staff to show exactly what would happen at the lake, what the options for wetland management would be at this facility and explain to the community what can be done to the park, over what period, and ask for community input on a potential plan. He stated the park is owned by the Park Authority and will continue to be managed by the county as a public park. If the lake is not dredged, he requested a look at any potential wildlife, ecological and cultural resources that may be impacted by any decisions and what additional resources could be added to the park. He then asked if the five-year maintenance dredging program staff outlined is the only option and inquired as to how the five-year intervals were decided upon.

Mr. Smith answered by explaining the sediment load, how it is affected by weather, and how removal loads, efficiency and costs change, therefore the five-

year recommendation was determined as the most efficient and cost-effective option.

Chairman McKay asked if the cost would be the same if the maintenance interval was ten years instead of five years to potentially mitigate some of the community impacts.

Mr. Smith replied that increasing the intervals does not just double the load, but that the load increases are greater and would result in over-dredging. To keep the lake up and keep it functional with the set targets, maintenance would need to be done frequently. He explained that spreading the maintenance over time will not save any costs and will actually increase costs. He added that every time a lake is dredged, there is a learning process that affects efficiency, and the community has to re-learn what it takes to complete the project in terms of disruption to the area.

Supervisor Walkinshaw thanked the community for providing their thoughts and feedback on the project. He mentioned the lake is loved by the community and has been a public resource for generations. He stated that a commitment was made in 2019 to restore Lake Accotink by dredging it, and that many are upset that there is consideration of not keeping that promise. He described the survey results as mixed. He appreciated that the costs were high but he is not ready to decide. He said that if the county opts not to dredge the lake, the county must provide the citizens with details on any wetland management options. He suggested the Board create a task force to review the recommendations made up to this point, and fully analyze the wetlands management option. This will help the community and the Board know the details and meaning of any decisions. He also requested the task force investigate a hybrid approach that will maintain an open water feature.

Supervisor Lusk agreed with Chairman McKay's and Supervisor Walkinshaw's comments and supported the idea of creating a task force. He asked about the survey response that so many use the park for the trail network and asked how the trails could be impacted if a transition to a wetland occurs. He then asked what stream stabilization and restoration would entail and if we know the costs associated.

Ms. Cole answered that as part of any Master Plan, she anticipates that the trail system would be highlighted, protected, and augmented. She stated that a large trail system project is nearing completion at the park, and that there will always be a very heavily utilized and valued trail system at Lake Accotink Park.

Supervisor Lusk inquired about requirements connected to the Accotink Creek TMDL, and asked if we don't dredge how we address those specific issues around those TMDL requirements and if we have any idea what those costs might be.

Mr. Smith answered that Chesapeake Bay TMDLs have been met through aggressive county action. He explained that the county has been moving to more challenging local TMDLs and has invested an estimated \$25 million in the Lake Accotink watershed.

Supervisor Lusk asked that when staff look at the options for the dredge, they also look for examples from other places to reference what might happen to Lake Accotink and how it can best be operated and managed. He thanked staff for their work in communicating with the community, handling their concerns, and their commitment to helping the Board understand the recommendations.

Supervisor Gross asked about the total acreage of the park and the total acreage of the lake. Mr. Smith answered that the lake is about 55 acres, and the park acreage is 493. Supervisor Gross mentioned that previous dredge sediment was taken to the Mason District. She then inquired if the task force would be different from the task force looking at the Master Plan. Chairman McKay mentioned that the Master Plan would need to wait until the Lake Accotink conversation was had. Supervisor Gross explained that she would not want the same group of people working on both the Lake Accotink and Master Plan task forces. She then asked how long the Master Plan process would take to complete. Ms. Cole replied that it could be completed in a year. Supervisor Gross then asked what the lifespan of the lake would be if no action was taken to restore or dredge. Mr. Smith answered that they had no way to predict due to weather conditions and other factors. Supervisor Gross suggested that light detection and ranging (LiDAR) could be used to assess the area to demonstrate how the park and lake area would look with these changes.

Supervisor Alcorn asked if stream channel restoration and stream restoration are the same things. Mr. Smith replied that they are the same. Supervisor Alcorn shared his experiences with the Lake Accotink project while serving on the Park Authority Board. He then said that he is okay with waiting and seeing what the task force recommendation is, but that he is sympathetic to the staff recommendation and would vote to move forward with it if a vote were required today. He mentioned the long-term costs and the tax impact to the entire county.

Supervisor Herrity asked about the park user numbers cited in the presentation. Mr. Smith acknowledged that the Park Authority would have a better idea of park user numbers. Ms. Cole responded that the numbers were higher during the pandemic and explained that due to the numerous entrances to the park, any counting of visitors will be much higher than the number of those who arrive via car/front entrance.

Supervisor Herrity asked why stormwater management was not included in the Lake Accotink dredging evaluation. Mr. Smith answered that the lake is not a stormwater facility and has no detention capabilities. The lake does not remove enough sediment to be effective to clean water quality in a meaningful way, therefore staff did not recommend the lake be a stormwater facility. He mentioned the goals staff was working towards in the project were establishing the eight-foot lake depth and the dredging maintenance program for recreational and aesthetic purposes. Supervisor Herrity asked where the eight-foot depth requirement came from. Mr. Smith answered that the eight-foot depth came from the original study done by Wetland Studies and Solutions, (WSSI), which explained that the depth allows the lake to clear after storm events. The eight-foot depth would provide a buffer between dredge cycles and provide a better water quality and aesthetic environment. Supervisor Herrity asked if that was a 2019 requirement and Mr. Smith answered that the eight-foot depth has been consistent.

Supervisor Herrity inquired about EPA grants and if we have approached congressional delegation to ask about the availability of funding grants. Mr. Smith answered that the available grants are not available for maintenance projects. Mr. Herington added that there are a lot of federal funds available for resiliency around water supply, which does not apply to this project.

Supervisor Herrity then asked if we sought advice from Virginia Beach, a municipality with a lot of dredging experience. Mr. Smith answered that we have not reached out to Virginia Beach due to the different nature of the dredging. He explained that staff looked at several beneficial reuse options. The first of those was with Luck Ecosystems for soils processing and separation. This is not a viable option because the load is too large. The second beneficial reuse option, suggested by a citizen, was with a company that makes building materials out of dredge spoils. This option would require barging the spoils to Florida and would result in no cost savings. Supervisor Herrity asked if staff looked at using the railroads. Mr. Smith explained that the railroads are carrying a usable product from a source to an end-user. To haul our dredge spoils, specialized cars are required and there are no



available places to take the spoils. Therefore, rail was not a viable option because of the difficulty in the loading, hauling, and disposal processes.

Supervisor Herrity asked if the public survey gathered an indication of how many residents were concerned about the process of trucking through the neighborhoods. Mr. Herrington answered that the survey was an open response question, and that four percent of respondents mentioned the hauling aspects as a concern. Supervisor Herrity mentioned the cost of inaction and its effects on downstream areas and asked that staff consider that. He asked what the timeline is for a decision and Mr. Herrington replied that is up to the Board.

Supervisor Storck explained that input from the Board is needed to evaluate if they have enough information, and whether to dredge or not. He noted that there were still a lot of questions that staff will answer for the Board.

Supervisor Smith thanked staff for the work they have completed on the Lake Accotink dredging project and the Board for the questions before her. She asked about the safety of the materials should they go to a quarry, specifically regarding groundwater safety. Mr. Smith that the soil must be tested during the dredging process, the load is subject to random sampling, and may be tested after transport to the quarry. He added that all but one sample collected thus far has been acceptable to put into the quarry. Further, there are moisture parameters before depositing in the quarry. He added that Luck Ecosystems has very specific criteria to what they will accept and that they have a large capacity to take a lot of material. Therefore, staff felt Luck Ecosystems was the best and most cost-effective option. Supervisor Smith added that the cost is prohibitive and thinks the task force will be beneficial to look at what options are available.

Supervisor Foust supports the recommendation to continue to look at the project. He noted concerns about the cost increases and the potential environmental impact of the 50,000 truck trips through the area. He asked if this was an expectation of a one-way or a two-way trip. Mr. Smith answered that this the trips were measured as 50,000 trips in to retrieve the dredging materials and 50,000 trips out to remove. Supervisor Foust asked about the path of the trucks and sites they would be traveling to. Mr. Smith answered that staff had two sites considered viable, Wakefield Park and Southern Drive. The Southern Drive site had many neighborhood concerns about truck traffic (180 trips per day) but is also located near an industrial area that made the location feasible. The Wakefield Park option offered a possibility of entering and exiting onto the Beltway, but staff would need

to find a way to avoid the consequence of closing a busy park for three years. Supervisor Foust then compared the projected cost of the project to the yearly Park Authority budget over a twenty-year period.

Supervisor Palchik shared her appreciation that there will be a task force to tackle this complex issue. She asked if the area had been a dry wetland before the lake was formed. Mr. Smith explained that a narrow point of the stream valley was selected and a dam built, creating a drowned riverine valley. Supervisor Palchik said that she supports the need to take time to consider the cost and impacts, both natural and to the community.

Supervisor Walkinshaw corrected that there is an improvement project planned for Braddock Road, not a road widening project. He then addressed the increased truck traffic but added that the trucks are not a deal breaker for the project. He thanked his colleagues for keeping an open mind and providing the task force with the time they will need to work through the issues. He recommended the project website as a good source of information.

Chairman McKay thanked the Board for understanding this project requires more time to understand the reasonable options. He stated that the technical recommendation has been received by staff but that the question of what to do with the park remains unanswered. He added that the task force meetings will be open to the public with opportunities to provide feedback. He said the playground is planned to be replaced at the park and he is concerned about it being used when it may not be safe to use. Ms. Cole answered that fencing around the playground will be replaced and the hazard will be removed. She assured that the Park Authority will provide updates to Chairman McKay and Supervisor Walkinshaw on the status of the playground. Chairman McKay suggested expediting the replacement after the budget is approved.

### **Item III**

#### **Private Stormwater Management Facility Assistance Grant Program Update**

Ellie Coddling, Deputy Director, DPWES, and Chad Crawford, Director, Maintenance and Stormwater Management, DPWES, provided an update on the Private Stormwater Management Facility Assistance Grant Program. Mr. Crawford explained he would provide two updates and a recommendation for the creation of a maintenance grant program. He began with an overview of the Northern Virginia

Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) Conservation Assistance Program (CAP) and the Virginia Conservation Assistance Program (VCAP). This is an existing program where a project owner may receive technical and financial assistance to do water quality or energy efficiency retrofits. NVSWCD oversees and administers the program. Since the program is doing well, Mr. Crawford recommends using it as a model for the proposed maintenance grant program.

He then explained the private to public pilot and eligibility. He explained that some privately owned ponds can apply for county maintenance and the cost of rehabbing a facility is prorated based on the amount of on-site and off-site area that is drained into the pond. He shared that of the four communities in the pilot program, two have completed the upgrades and two are incomplete. He explained this is a complex process that takes considerable time and sometimes significant public investment. He said the next step in the process is to finish the pilot program then return to the Board with a program recommendation. He explained that if the Board opts to continue the program, up to 175 ponds may be eligible, as currently envisioned. He estimates the initial capital investment of all 175 ponds to be \$75 million, plus additional maintenance costs and staff.

The proposed maintenance grant would provide technical support to private facility owners, be open to all types of individual property owners, provide a one-time financial reimbursement per facility, and cover up to 80 percent of total eligible maintenance or replacement costs up to \$7,000.

Mr. Crawford then provided a comparison of the three different programs – the proposed maintenance grant program, the private to public pilot and the CAP program. Finally, he recommended the Board create a Local Stormwater Management (SWM) Fund under Appendix O of the County Code and to establish a Private SWM Facility Assistance Grant Program.

Board Discussion:

Supervisor Palchik noted the success of the private to public pilot project but acknowledged it has taken a lot of staff time and resources and asked if the county will receive the same or better quality through the proposed grant program given the onerous nature of the private to public transfer. Ms. Coddling replied that the programs are completely different because the maintenance grant program will allow private owners to take responsibility and do the maintenance in accordance with their desires and the community's desires and then offer a cost share on the

maintenance side. Supervisor Palchik requested more information as the process is worked through.

Chairman McKay asked for clarification on the private to public pilot, what the status is and how it relates to the presentation. Mr. Crawford explained that the private to public program and the grant program are mutually exclusive. The private to public program is underway, with two of the four projects completed. He said they propose to complete that pilot and come back to the Board with recommendations at a future date. Chairman McKay asked what the timeline is for that program. Mr. Crawford answered that they hope to have three of the four ponds complete by the end of the year, and the fourth one is in the beginning stage of the process. There is a possibility that the fourth one may not be successfully transitioned. Chairman McKay asked if the ponds are uniquely different and inquired if enough information could be gathered from the first three pilot ponds to make a recommendation. Mr. Crawford confirmed that he believes there will be adequate information to make a recommendation. Chairman McKay asked if there are additional ponds in the queue since the pilot began and asked if a running list was being kept of interest across the county. Mr. Crawford answered affirmatively and estimated there were less than a dozen in the queue at this time. The Chairman said this private to public program has been discussed for several years and stated that the county needs to either get serious about putting the program in place countywide or understand if the project should not be done. He said he supports the grant program, but the private to public program needs to be completed.

Supervisor Gross asked where the funding for this program would come from. Mr. Crawford replied that the money would come from the stormwater tax. She mentioned her concern that there are multiple projects already funded. She requested a list of stormwater fee funded projects and more information.

Supervisor Gross asked if the grant program was open to houses of worship and if they pay into the stormwater fee. Ms. Codding answered that houses of worship do not pay the stormwater fee. Supervisor Gross asked if they would be able to access public funds given that they pay no taxes and no stormwater fee. Ms. Codding answered that they could include how much an interested party pays in taxes into the qualifying requirements framework. Supervisor Gross then asked if homeowners associations (HOAs) would be abdicating their responsibility for stormwater detention or if they would be signing an agreement to have the county assume the maintenance responsibilities. Ms. Codding explained that the maintenance grant program would not require any change in ownership and allows

the property owner to come into compliance. Supervisor Gross said she supports the program on an environmental level but has financial concerns.

Supervisor Lusk thanked staff for the presentation and their continued work on the grant program. He referenced Chairman McKay's point and expressed his desire for the private to public program continue to move forward so interested parties could know the status of the program. He stated anything that can be done to expedite the conclusion is better and suggested the first three projects be the template to determine if a decision can be made. He suggested that, under this approach, the fourth project become the first in the new program, should the program be approved. He noted that there are communities that are waiting for the status of the program.

Supervisor Smith inquired about the purpose of the maintenance grant program. Ms. Coddling replied that most of the facilities within the county are privately maintained and the maintenance responsibilities are clear, however in some cases ownership has been in question. Therefore, this small grant program allows DPWES to meet their MS4 permit obligations, which requires bringing noncompliant owners into compliance. Supervisor Smith asked if, once an owner is in compliance, there is an expectation that they remain in compliance. Ms. Coddling replied affirmatively. Supervisor Smith concluded by stating the explanation provided was helpful and she is open to the county doing something, provided the program is tight and expectations are clear.

Supervisor Alcorn asked if the maximum grant amount was \$7,000. Receiving that confirmation, he asked how many potential awardees there could be. Mr. Crawford answered that the grant total equates to no more than 30 per year. He asked if the program was a pilot or would be recurring. Mr. Crawford answered that the program is proposed to be an ongoing program. Supervisor Alcorn asked if there were many appropriate projects that the grant could help and received confirmation from staff. Supervisor Alcorn thanked Chairman McKay for his comments on the private to public program. He added that he had once served on a statewide working group on structural integrity for common-interest community's structures and this subject might come up as a legislative issue.

Supervisor Storek noted the many ways to approach stormwater. He stated staff is looking for concurrence to move forward to create a local stormwater management fund and establish a private stormwater fund management facility assistance program. He recommended that the Board move forward with this but

acknowledged the expectations that need to be met with the public to private program.

**Item IV**  
**County Response to Bamboo Ordinance on Public Lands**

Due to time constraints, agenda item IV was deferred.

**Item V**  
**Green Bank Update**

John Morrill, Acting Director, OEEC, updated the Board on the formation of the Fairfax County Green Bank. He said staff continues to work on the establishment of a county Green Bank and has been working with stakeholders and the Office of the County Attorney on an ordinance. Given the complexity of the issue and the fact that this is the first Green Bank in the state, the County Attorney's office is engaging external council to assist.

Board Discussion:

Supervisor Storck asked if the county anticipates providing its first loan in late 2023 or early 2024.

Mr. Morrill replied affirmatively but added that this depends on the market. He explained that a part of what a green bank does is engage in market development and promotion.

Chairman McKay asked for clarification that the program the county is working on would not preclude future participation in a regional green bank.

Mr. Morrill confirmed that the goal is to create a county entity first, while understanding the potential to expand to include regional partners. He added that this will be carefully explained within the ordinance.

Chairman McKay stated that the county would not want to be in a position where they would need to start over should the Green Bank grow into something larger.

Bryan Hill, County Executive, stated that the county has been working with other local and regional entities to ensure that when the Fairfax County Green Bank is created, there could be a potential for others to work with the county to move forward.

Supervisor Storck adjourned the meeting at 3:15 P.M.