

**Board of Supervisors Environmental Committee**

**May 23, 2017 - DRAFT**

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

Board Chair Sharon Bulova  
Committee Chair Penelope A. Gross, Mason District  
Supervisor John Cook, Braddock District  
Supervisor John Foust, Dranesville District  
Supervisor Cathy Hudgins, Hunter Mill District  
Supervisor Jeff McKay, Lee District  
Supervisor Dan Storck, Mount Vernon District  
Supervisor Linda Smyth, Providence District  
Supervisor Pat Herrity, Springfield District  
Supervisor Cathy Smith, Sully District

**Others Present:**

Dave Molchany, CEX  
Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator, CEX  
Noel Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner, DPZ  
James Patteson, Director, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES)  
Randy Bartlett, Deputy Director, Stormwater & Wastewater Management Divisions  
Shahram Mohsenin, Director, Wastewater Planning and Monitoring Division  
Jose Comayagua, Director, FMD  
Peter Shogren, Assistant Director, Energy Management, FMD  
Kate Bennett, MS4 Program Coordinator, Storm Water Planning Division, DPWES  
Ira H. Dorfman, Executive Director, the Greater Washington Region Clean Cities Coalition

May 23, 2017 Meeting Agenda:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/bosclerk/board-committees/meetings/2017/may23-environmental-agenda.pdf>

May 23, 2017 Meeting Materials:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/bosclerk/board-committees/meetings/2017/may23-environmental-meeting-materials.pdf>

The following is a summary of the highlights of the discussion from the **May 23, 2017** meeting.

Today's meeting was called to order at 10:10 A.M.

### **Opening Remarks**

After a brief welcome and introduction from Supervisor Gross, Committee Chair, the minutes from the **February 7, 2017** meeting were accepted into the record.

Gross: Following today's meeting all are invited to attend a demonstration of the benefits of using propane and bio-fuel in the school bus fleet. The demonstration is sponsored by the Clean Cities Coalition and will be located in the parking area in front of the Government Center.

As part of the opening remarks, James Patteson, Director of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, provided a brief update on the status of the fire that broke out at the Covanta Waste-to-Energy facility. James indicated that Covanta is anticipating to be fully operational by the fall. James expressed appreciation to the Fire Marshal's Office for helping to ensure that the rebuilt facility will be state of the art. James also mentioned that the Fairfax County Solid Waste team had consulted with Montgomery County, Maryland staff regarding modernization and lessons learned from a similar situation that occurred there as well.

### **Board Discussion:**

- Committee Chair Supervisor Gross asked how long the plant will be out of service?  
Patteson: Anticipate the plant will reopen this fall.
- Gross: What about our trash going to other counties? What about liability?  
Patteson: Trash is going to other counties (King George and Richmond area) at the moment. We are carefully documenting our and working closely with Risk Management and the county's insurance company.
- Storck: The Covanta CEO made commitments that someone is following up and wants to make sure that this is done before we open the new Covanta Plant.  
Patteson: Will do.
- Foust: Have we reached back to community about updates of Covanta?  
Patteson: Yes. We are meeting with South County Federation and keeping them up-to-date as well as continuing to update our information on the web.

## **Item II**

### **Board of Supervisors Environmental Vision**

The first topic on the agenda was a presentation of the draft updated Environmental Vision. Committee Chair Supervisor Penny Gross began the discussion by reminding the Board's committee that we are nearly 13 years into the original Environmental Vision, which was adopted in June 2004.

Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator, provided the committee with a detailed presentation of the draft updated Vision to include a recap of the original Vision, the Board approved process which included time lines and actions, community and Board member office engagement and highlights of the draft updated Vision. A detailed presentation is provided in the meeting materials link shown above. Kambiz concluded by acknowledging the hard work of the staff coordinating team and recommending that the Board's Environmental Committee endorse the draft vision as presented and direct staff to bring the draft Vision to the Board for formal adoption at the June 20, 2017 Board Meeting.

#### **Board Discussion:**

Gross –I appreciate the hard work of staff. Excellent work!

McKay – Good job, but I have a concern with recycling in the schools. What is recycling not happening in our schools? Get-2-green program – recycling bins – PTA President to support recycling program – how would you evaluate what is going on in schools about re-cycling so that our students/school staff can learn to recycle.

Gratton – The principal sets the tone about recycling – two different vendors collect trash and recycling – schools are not recycling cans or bottles – our agency is willing to help schools anytime – we would love to partner with schools and do a better job – contractors are not responsible for providing recycling bins.

McKay – It is unacceptable that our kids are not learning about recycling – several 2<sup>nd</sup> graders asked me about this issue and we need to help them do more.

Patteson – We work with a lot of teachers in high schools and I will reach out to Schools about recycling.

Gross – We need to get this done without any budgetary issues.

Foust –Discussed about climate energy and suggested that we need a much stronger vision statement to include, “County will continue to improve energy efficiency and increase the use of renewal energy” – also suggested to change the language to, “County will work with community and implement clean energy”.

Bulova – Original vision was pretty concise and it did not have all the details. This vision represents all the technological advances since the original vision.

Cook – Discussed about recycling and expressed that the existing recycling rate is not enough. We need a more aggressive goal and we need to be working on the goal to enhance the program.

McKay– Recycling – our goals were ridiculously low when we started this project. We need to set new goals for recycling.

Patteson – We'll add some additional language, pictures and references to better illustrate the current status of the recycling goals and program. DPWES is working on several recycling initiatives and will report back to the Board on these efforts.

Smith – Discussed about saving energy just like lights go off when you leave room.

Gross – staff will work on adjusting the language and will circulate changes to the Board prior to the June 20 Board Meeting.

### **ITEM III**

#### **Planning Commission review of MITRE's Building Energy Technology Report**

Noel Kaplan, Senior Environmental Planner, provided the committee with a detailed presentation of MITRE'S Building Energy Technology report, the Planning Commission review process and the Planning Commission recommendations. Noel stated that the Planning Commission was asked by the Board to review MITRE'S recommendations which largely supported the county's current Green Building Policy approach of performance over prescription, but recommended the addition of energy benchmarking and reporting and the inclusion of Design to Earn Energy Star (DEES) to support more energy focus in the Green Building Policy.

The Planning Commission recommendations supported the MITRE reports suggestion that performance based measures such as LEED are preferable to technological prescriptions. However, the Planning Commission would support applicants should they express interest in specific technologies such as solar. The Planning Commission recommendation supported the need for a stronger energy emphasis in the Green Building policy and recommended support for a Plan amendment to better highlight energy in the policy. The Planning Commission was opposed to public disclosure of energy tracking data at this time.

Noel concluded that the Planning Commission recommendation was to seek BOS authorization of a Policy Plan amendment consistent with the Planning Commission recommendation to better highlight energy in the Green Building policy.

#### **Board Discussion:**

Gross - Any comments?

Herrity – I fully support

Gross – Authorized for future board meeting – Noel good job!!

#### **ITEM IV**

##### **Cost Share Agreement for Wet Weather Flow Mitigation in Alexandria Renew Wastewater System**

Shahram Mohsenin, Director of Wastewater Planning and Monitoring, provided the committee with an overview of a draft agreement between Fairfax County, the City of Alexandria and the Alexandria Sanitation Authority (AlexRenew), which serves both the city and county. The purpose of the draft agreement is regarding a new requirement to minimize wet weather sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) from the city and county. Shahram indicated that the county has separate sanitary and stormwater sewer systems. The city has both combined sewer overflow (CSO) and separate systems. In his presentation, Shahram noted that Fairfax County, the City of Alexandria, and AlexRenew have been working together for several years on wet weather flow issues. Initially SSO and CSO issues were to be addressed separately; however, recent studies have confirmed efficiencies and cost savings in addressing them together. The draft agreement would include a joint project which includes a tunnel, pumping station, expansion of preliminary treatment, CSO diversion structures and associated facilities. Planning level estimated cost is \$85.2M for this project addressing wet weather flows for 25-year storm and cost is shared as follows:

County – \$29.4 M

City – \$55.8 M

##### **Board Discussion:**

Foust – How would the county be assessed its share of the operation and maintenance cost?

Mohsenin – Costs are determined based on actual metered wastewater flows to AlexRenew. If the county were to address this issue on its own we would have two options: (Option 1) Build storage and pumping facility for 5-year storm - our cost will be \$31.1 M and we will have to buy 3-ac land / easement near Alexandria. (Option 2) Build storage and pumping facility for 25-year storm - our cost will be \$84.2 M and we will have to buy 7-ac land / easement near Alexandria. The staff recommendation - Bring cost share agreement to Board Meeting for authorization to execute.

Bulova – Where will the funding come from?

Shahram – From sewer fund – it is already in our 5-year CIP plan

McKay – This cost is based on opinion and not based on engineering data. Need confirmation from staff – are we putting ourselves in any kind of liability?

Mohsenin – The estimates are planning level estimates and are not based on engineering plans. If we agree to proceed with this agreement, then we will be liable for our share of the project.

McKay– Make sure that we protect ourselves.

Mohsenin – There is a clause in the agreement that allows the county to revisit its options if the costs increase more than 20% of the planning level estimates

Storck – What is the operating cost of the AlexRenew plant verses Noman Cole?

Mohsenin – Approximately 2 dollars per thousand gallon in Alexandria verses about \$1.60 per thousand gallons at Noman Cole.

Foust – Have we had an expert cost evaluator?

Mohsenin – Yes, we have an engineering consulting firm assisting us with this project. But the cost estimates are at planning level not based on engineering plans which have not yet been developed.

Gross – Bring cost share to the Board – we should have better numbers before we go further in next few weeks.

Bartlett – We need to let the city of Alexandria know – they can't move forward and we need to make a decision.

Cook – Sounds like we should go by ourselves.

Foust – It is risky, can we include a cap \$ amount for the county's share in this agreement?

Mohsenin – We have 20% cap based on the estimated costs, as we don't know what the final cost numbers will be.

Patteson – We have the numbers for each item individually – our cost of tunnel construction is very limited.

McKay – We have a fiduciary responsibility and we need more details about this big expense.

Foust – Why do we have to act without proper information – don't like the wording, "As soon as possible".

Gross – We got a power point presentation – we may want to suggest to come to the Board with a memo about this and then take action sooner than waiting for next environment meeting till October.

Bartlett – We will bring it to the Board and answer any questions

Gross – DPWES staff will get back to us in writing.

Mohsenin – We have been working on technical details – what works/what does not work –this is the first attempt at identifying cost – we also consulted with the county attorney in preparing the draft cost share agreement.

Bulova – It has been a problem – Alexandria has a deadline – staff needs to know whether we go in jointly for cost effectiveness and go back to Alexandria or do we need more information.

Patteson – We will write a memo for Board Members and if necessary, meet one on one about our numbers for this project.

Gross – We will get more paperwork from staff and we can discuss more in our next meeting in October 2017.

## **ITEM 5**

### **Update on County Energy Outreach Initiatives**

Kambiz Agazi, Environmental Coordinator, provided the committee with a brief overview of the major energy initiatives that are currently under the county's Energy Action Fairfax (EAF) program. EAF, which was launched in 2012, serves as the umbrella program for the county's energy outreach and education initiatives. For example, under EAF, the county launched a Green Business Partners Program in 2016. In 2016, staff created a public webpage showing the county's energy (electricity and natural gas) consumption. Kambiz also briefed the committee on the county's Solarize Fairfax County campaign and the Thermal Camera Loan Program.

#### **Board Discussion:**

None.

## **Item IV**

### **Update on Energy Management of County Buildings**

Peter Shogren, Facilities Management Department (FMD) Assistant Director for Energy, provided the committee with a brief overview of the strategic comprehensive energy management plan for FMD. The plan consists of the following elements:

1. Set targets/goals
2. Energy use profile
3. Measure/benchmark current energy consumption
4. Develop public access format for utilities
5. Develop strategic action plans for capital renewal and improvement
6. Fund and implement projects

7. Track, measure and report
8. Train, educate and celebrate

Energy conservation strategies currently include:

- Building Energy Management Systems (BEMs)
- Maintenance and retro commissioning
- Utility contracts and systematic utility bill review
- EnergyCap energy tracking software and data analysis
- Temperature/humidity and scheduling/demand management in county buildings
- Review new building designs
- Building systems replacement, specify and manage energy projects

**Board Discussion:**

Bulova – If people go on line, we can pull information from dashboard on line – before end of this calendar year.

Storck – How to save energy/efficiency in some old buildings?

Comayagua – We continuously are looking into it and currently testing new technologies trying to find ways to save energy in older county buildings.

Gross – Thank you to staff, but unfortunately we're out of time. We will discuss this topic in next meeting with more time.

Gross – We are short of time and will discuss the MS4 (item 7) in our next meeting

**Meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.**

**Next scheduled Environmental Committee meeting is TBA**