

Fairfax County Litter Task Force

Final Report



*Submitted to the Fairfax County Board of County Supervisors'
Environment Committee*

December 14, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
Summary of Recommendations	3
INTRODUCTION	5
SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL APPROACH.....	5
Consideration of the No Charge Program.....	5
TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
Short Term/Easy Fixes AKA “Low Hanging Fruit”	7
Medium-Term Opportunities—	10
Longer Term Items for Board consideration as legislative plans are created and updated— ..	12
REVIEW OF OTHER GUIDING PRINCIPLES	12
STAKEHOLDER SURVEY	13
CLOSING	14
APPENDIX.....	15
COMMISSIONING BOARD MATTER	16
LIST OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS AND THEIR AFFILIATIONS.....	19
STAKEHOLDER SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	20
FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES...	22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 15, 2020, the Board of County Supervisors (Board) directed the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) and Clean Fairfax to create a Litter Task Force with the purpose of suggesting ways that Fairfax County could combat the litter found along the road and in streams, creeks, and neighborhoods. This report summarizes a year of Task Force deliberations and presents a set of recommendations for consideration by the Board's Environmental Committee.

The group researched and reviewed available data from various relevant sources (e.g., county, government and NGO sources, other localities' solutions), and in coordination with DPWES leadership identified stakeholders that would implement or enforce recommendations created by the Task Force (if approved by the Board). Stakeholders were also invited to provide suggestions for reducing the amount of litter requiring county management.

The Task Force reviewed Fairfax County's Environmental Vision, Operational Energy Strategy, and Community-wide Energy and Climate Action Plan reports to ensure that all recommendations would be consistent with this document. The Task Force has concluded that the recommendations of this report are consistent with these guiding documents

In April 2021, the group was further tasked by the Board to consider an additional item--whether a "turn-key diversion" program similar to the No Charge program (operated by Augusta County, Georgia) could be implemented in Fairfax County. Based on its research, the consensus of the Task Force is that, because the No Charge program is a post-problem solution, further consideration of the idea as a recommendation would not be consistent with the primary desire of the Task Force to identify *proactive* solutions for the Board to consider. It is also important to note that there is already an abundance of existing programs that duplicate the features of a No Charge approach. While the decision to remove the No Charge concept from further consideration was the consensus of the Task Force since very early in its deliberations, a late-stage objection to the decision was lodged by the EQAC representative on the Task Force, at the Task Force's last meeting in November 2021. As a part of responding to this objection, the Task Force agreed to acknowledge the objecting EQAC representative's dissent in this report.

Summary of Recommendations

Further details on consideration and implementation of the following recommendations being made by the Task Force can be found in the body of this report. For summary purposes, Task Force recommendations are as follows:

Short Term/Easy Fixes a.k.a. "Low Hanging Fruit"--

- 1. Prohibit the use of single-use or disposable items at county facilities and events.**
- 2. Install litter and recycling cans at county facilities, including parks and playing fields.**
- 3. Install water bottle filling stations in county buildings.**

- 4. DPWES-Solid Waste Management Program to review development and re-development plans for waste management adequacy.**
- 5. Participate and promote “Cover/Secure Your Load” Week.**
- 6. Sponsor “free dump” or “Dumpster Days” days at county disposal sites, to discourage illegal dumping of large household items.**

Medium-Term Opportunities--

- 7. Revise applicable ordinances to prohibit the use of bags for overnight refuse set-out.**
- 8. Enforce current standards (“No Garbage On The Ground”) of adequate waste collection service for Medium and High Density Housing.**
- 9. Prohibit waste container placement in close proximity to storm drains.**
- 10. Update ordinance to establish a litter & illegal dumping enforcement unit.**
- 11. Re-evaluate the methodology used to calculate capacity and servicing needs for new and existing developments.**

Longer Term Items--

- Support the Break Free From Plastic Pollution Act Bill in Congress.**
- Support a Statewide Bottle Bill Legislation.**
- Establish circular economy "extended producer responsibility" for county contracts and support source reduction efforts wherever possible.**
- Establish Prince William County-style Flow Control.**

INTRODUCTION

On September 15, 2020, the Board of County Supervisors (Board) directed the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) and Clean Fairfax to create a Litter Task Force with the purpose of suggesting ways that Fairfax County could combat the litter found along the road and in streams, creeks, and neighborhoods. The commissioning Board Matter is reproduced in the Appendix to this report.

SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Litter Task Force assembled a working group of designated representatives from various county agencies and regional non-government organizations (NGOs) that work in either enforcement, planning, compliance, environmental education, law enforcement, or public schools with respect to litter. The make-up of the final Task Force is shown in the Appendix to this report.

The group met monthly from January to June to assess available data from various relevant sources (e.g., county, government and NGO sources, other localities' solutions) and in coordination with DPWES leadership identified stakeholders that would implement or enforce recommendations created by the Task Force (if approved by the Board). Stakeholders were also invited to provide suggestions for reducing the amount of litter requiring county management. The Task Force also met in October and November to finalize this document.

Consideration of the No Charge Program

It should be noted that, in April 2021, the group was further tasked by the Board to consider an additional item: whether a "turn-key diversion" program similar to the No Charge program (operated by Augusta County, Georgia) could be implemented in Fairfax County. The No Charge program uses arrested individuals, before they are charged, to do community service picking up litter instead of going to jail.

The Task Force researched available information about the Augusta County program, including materials previously provided to the Board's Public Safety Committee and discussions with the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney. The group also considered additional research and information undertaken and provided by the EQAC representative.

Through DPWES-Stormwater Management, the County already operates a similar program, Operation Stream Shield (OSS), that cleans up litter in coordination with non-profits serving individuals who are experiencing homelessness. OSS services all four human service regions, by sending out crews of up to ten workers (with one to two supervisors) twice weekly, working for four hours (i.e., up to 80 people per week). Thus, the OSS can tend to eight distinct areas of concern during any given week. During the implementation of OSS, it became apparent that accessibility to private property to conduct cleanups was a time- and resource-consuming obstacle. However, it is acknowledged that similar challenges encountered by other programs such as the Augusta County No Charge program have overcome this obstacle through having the Commonwealth Attorney's office obtain waivers to enter target locations.

Opportunities where OSS can clean up litter have been easily covered by the available resources, and to keep the program fully utilized and sustainable, DPWES has integrated the implementation of other beneficial initiatives into the program (e.g., non-native invasive plant removal, addressing community clean up needs in coordination with other DPWES Divisions, and forming partnerships to tackle litter with the Fairfax County Park Authority, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and the National Park Service). This larger program footprint further enhances the community while building work skills for those involved. If No Charge were to be implemented in Fairfax County, the new program would face similar obstacles as OSS, and could compete for the same opportunities and resources that fund and gainfully employ OSS participants. Moreover, the new program would likely have to supplement cleanups with other sustainability initiatives in order to remain viable. Additional personnel to lead and coordinate between OSS, the Commonwealth Attorney's office, and the new No Charge program would be required although it's unclear under which county department these positions should be housed. A program operating under a 501(c)(3) corporation may also be possible.

Because of legal and resource constraints and implementation complexities, because the No-Charge approach is a "post-problem" solution rather than a proactive strategy, and because there is an existing program that provides similar service, the Task Force does not recommend implementing a similar program in Fairfax County, preferring to draw the Board's attention to solutions and opportunities that are proactive. While community cleanups are an important part of community building and will always have a place in the larger scope of environmental improvement, the Task Force believes that they should not be viewed as a primary solution to litter. To illustrate the facts that underlie this philosophy, Clean Fairfax has been supporting community cleanups for over 30 years, yet there appears to be as much litter now as there was when the organization was first established in 1979 (notably as part of a previous Litter Task Force).

While the decision to remove the No Charge idea from further consideration was the consensus of the Task Force since very early in its deliberations, a late-stage objection to this decision was lodged by the EQAC representative on the Task Force (at the Task Force's last meeting in November 2021). As a part of responding to this objection, the Task Force agreed to acknowledge the objecting EQAC representative's dissent in this report.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force allocated its recommendations into the following three categories:

- Short-term fixes (also termed "low hanging fruit") that can be implemented without onerous legislation that demonstrate the County as leading by example;
- Medium-term opportunities, that require more than the "stroke of the pen" recommendations mentioned above; and
- Longer-term strategies that will require coordination and cooperation with other legislative bodies and/or require statutory change at higher levels of government.

Details of each recommendation and a general overview of implementation considerations are presented under these separate headings below. It should be noted that one of the Task Force's earliest strategies recommended for Board consideration - to implement a single-use bag fee – has already been implemented.

Short Term/Easy Fixes AKA “Low Hanging Fruit”

- 1. Prohibit use of single use/disposables at county facilities and at county events.** Governor Northam recently signed [EO 77](#) which calls for the elimination of single use plastics at Commonwealth offices, and colleges and universities. This is an easy “lead by example” opportunity for the county.

Benefits: Less potential for litter and lower disposal costs from county events; demonstrates community leadership on sustainable practice.

Cost Impact: Estimated cost impact is anticipated to be limited to what it will cost the stakeholders to implement the change.

Resource Needs: Reusable or recyclable food service items to replace single use disposable containers.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): None. This is largely a “stroke of the pen”.

- 2. Install and service litter and recyclables cans at county facilities, including parks and playing fields.**

The substance of this recommendation is drawn from existing duties given by Commonwealth statute. Specifically, under § [10.1-1421](#) of the Code of Virginia, the county can implement this recommendation and assign responsibility to service the receptacles to DPWES-Solid Waste Management or the facility operator where the cans are located. DPWES does not have the resources to service trash and recycling cans at County parks. Also, [9VAC20-190-50](#) sets forth minimum standards for placement and maintenance of litter receptacles and authorizes the county to establish a program for placement and maintenance.

Benefits: Cleaner parks, playing fields, and other county facilities. Reduced incidents of wind-blown litter polluting surface waters.

Cost Impact: Estimated cost impact is anticipated to be limited to what it will cost the stakeholders to implement the change.

Resource Needs: Litter and recycling containers and supporting signage. Personnel and equipment to service the new cans.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): Insufficient trash capacity has caused recycling bins to be used for litter in the past. There is a school of thought that insists no waste bin of any kind will eliminate service costs and better encourage the public to take their trash home, but the Task Force believes that observed levels of litter demonstrate this practice as ineffective.

3. **Install water bottle filling stations in county buildings.** Water bottle filling stations allow for clean, cold, filtered water for drinking by retrofitting the water fountains that currently exist in most buildings, typically on every floor. This opportunity ties into Recommendation No. 1 above, as the county moves away from single use plastic water bottles.

Benefits: Health benefits as well as reducing single use plastic water bottles.

Cost Impacts: TBD, but would be more cost effective if many buildings were done at the same time. Within the scope of planned capital improvement and fixed operations and maintenance costs for county facilities, increased installation and maintenance costs would be a small additional fraction

Resource Needs: Contract for acquisition and installation of the stations.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): None

4. **DPWES-Solid Waste Management Program to review development and re-development plans for waste management adequacy.** DPWES to review plans to ensure that proposed waste management systems for non-residential and multi-family development are adequate to the anticipated volume of waste being generated by new or modified buildings and facilities, and that collection systems are accessible to the public and waste collectors in a safe, effective, and efficient manner. [Section 109.1-3-2](#) of the County Code states that required Municipal Solid Waste Management and Recycling Plans for non-residential and multi-family dwelling properties should be updated every five years. This review should confirm collection containers are placed properly, away from storm drains, and that recycling is as convenient to system users as the disposal option.

Benefits: Ensures sufficient space allowed in building design for recycling. More efficient collection of waste with associated reductions in cost and improvements in collection efficiency. Less general litter and fewer trash overflows to storm drains.

Cost Impacts: The additional review process is not anticipated to increase costs significantly.

Resource Needs: None. It is anticipated that DPWES will be able to absorb the additional duty with existing staff.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): Development review procedures may need to be modified to ensure that waste and recycling plans are submitted and complete

5. **Participate and promote Cover/Secure Your Load Week.** The “Secure Truck Load” regulation/law went into effect October 1988. Some states have a [Secure Your Load Week](#), where police put out public service announcements (PSAs) and social media on ways to secure truck loads and focus on enforcement for that week. Fines could be used to cover the cost of education/outreach and awards/recognition programs.

Benefits: Increased education on the laws around securing truck loads; less litter blowing onto the side of the road from the backs of trucks.

Cost Impacts: Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) time spent enforcing regulation

Resource Needs: FCPD personnel to develop and broadcast PSAs and compile data on outreach program impacts, enforcement statistics, etc. VDOT may also be of assistance here.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): none

6. **Sponsor “free dump” or “Dumpster Days” days to discourage illegal dumping of large household items.** While illegal dumping is a different issue than litter, abandoned appliances are often encountered at the same locations where litter is prevalent. Providing regular and well-advertised one- or two-day opportunities for county residents to drop off large items at county disposal sites a few times per year at no charge would alleviate some of this problem. In Prince William County, there is a similar program, which publishes a schedule of “dumpster dates” (sponsored by individual members of the County Board of Supervisors) and includes remote locations for residents who do not have the ability to get to the county landfill.

Benefits: Less illegal dumping of mattresses, furniture, and similar bulky items on the side of the road and in woods and parks.

Cost Impacts: Potentially increased costs and loss of revenue at County disposal sites. However, these costs may be offset by a reduction in community clean-up expenditures and county resources spent removing illegally-dumped items.

Resource Needs: Minimal, beyond absorbing the cost of disposing of the additional material being collected and some additional public outreach/advertising.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): none

Medium-Term Opportunities—

- 7. Revise applicable ordinances to prohibit the use of bags for overnight refuse set-out.** [Section 109.15-5](#) of the County Code allows the outside storage of trash in plastic bags for 12 hours. When residents leave their trash in plastic bags outside overnight, stray animals and wildlife tear open the trash bags scattering the contents in the street, where it ultimately becomes litter.

Benefit: Trash and recycling are better contained on site.

Cost Impact: This would expand the enforcement scope of DPWES and consume additional staff resources,

Resource Needs: containers, site planning. Communities need to be supplied with adequate trash receptacles to eliminate plastic bags being stored outside of receptacles. Model language for HOAs

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): HOA covenant issues in some communities.

- 8. Enforce current standards (“No Garbage On The Ground”) of adequate waste collection service for Medium and High Density Housing.** Currently, the waste management systems at select higher-density housing developments throughout the county are under-capacity for the residential population living there. As suggested by the earlier recommendation regarding review of development plans, this means overflowing containers lie un-serviced for many days. This results in residents placing trash on the ground near the container or putting trash in the recycling container, rendering those materials unrecyclable.

Benefit: Trash and recycling will be better contained on site.

Cost Impact: Increased service costs for the multi-family residential communities, which will vary according to the degree to which their current containers are undersized or underserviced.

Resource Needs: It is anticipated that DPWES will be able to absorb the additional enforcement duty with existing staff.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): none

- 9. Prohibit waste container placement in close proximity to storm drains.** As noted in earlier recommendations, overflowing containers are commonplace throughout the County. Trash is mobilized by natural pathways (wind, rain) or placed on the surrounding the container (because it’s already full), then trash travels to the path of least resistance which may be a storm drain. This phenomenon appears to be a major source of litter to streams in Fairfax County.

Benefit: Trash and recycling will be better contained on site.

Cost Impact: Minimal additional enforcement costs for DPWES.

Resource Needs: It is anticipated that DPWES will be able to absorb the additional implementation duties with existing payroll. Zoning language.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): none

10. Update ordinance to establish a litter and illegal dumping enforcement unit.

Fairfax County can create a dedicated unit to reduce the flow of waste entering our communities and waterways. Legislation and ordinances are only successful when adequately enforced. Fees from enforcement could fund this new unit.

Benefit: Fairfax will have the ability to stop waste before it enters the environment and create better management practices among businesses.

Cost Impact: TBD

Resource Needs: Potential need for additional employees

Implementation Challenges (Other than cost): Consolidating various ordinances, or creating a framework of statutory authority (or combination)

11. Re-evaluate the methodology used to calculate capacity and servicing needs for new and existing developments.

The calculations of how much trash and recycling capacity is needed for housing units in the county have not been revisited in at least 15 years. While overcrowding in apartments is not within our purview, the number, capacity, and collection frequency for trash and recycling containers needs to be revised to reflect modern consumption patterns, e.g., the amount of cardboard being generated by on-line purchasing.

Benefits: Trash and recycling will be better contained on site. More sanitary living conditions for residents. Reduced vermin and other disease vectors.

Cost Impact: TBD

Resource Needs: Staff time to research current capacity metrics for housing units.

Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): Issues with loss of parking and other space-related conflicts with zoning ordinances. HOA conflicts in some communities

Longer Term Items for Board consideration as legislative plans are created and updated—

1. Support the Break Free From Plastic Pollution Act Bill in Congress

[The Break Free From Plastic Pollution Act](#) is a piece of federal legislation cosponsored by Fairfax Delegate Gerry Connolly. This legislation provides solutions to several litter problems faced by Fairfax County. Said legislation would establish a nationwide \$0.10 fee for single use plastic bags, a nationwide bottle deposit program, extended producer responsibility, and would eliminate several of the most littered single use plastics. Fairfax County is an influential locality and vocal support of the Break Free From Plastic Pollution Act will place the county at the front in ending the plastic pollution crisis,

2. Support a Statewide Bottle Bill Legislation

Bottles and cans make up more than [21% of all litter collected during Virginia clean ups](#). Bottles and cans only account for 8.69% of all litter picked up in states with bottle bills. The most effective bottle bills in the US have redemption rates approaching 90%, while the most successful globally have redemption rates over 97%.

3. Establish circular economy "extended producer responsibility" for county contracts and support source reduction efforts wherever possible

To end the plastic pollution crisis, reduction of waste at the source and having a plan to efficiently dispose of generated waste is necessary. For any single-use items not replaceable with reusable alternatives, Fairfax County can work with suppliers and distributors to create a circular economy. This opportunity could be accomplished through working with suppliers who will take their waste back or by developing a relationship with companies and organizations that work on post-consumer waste up-and-downcycling.

4. Establish Prince William County-style Flow Control.

A fixed service fee is added to business and residential property taxes, providing the revenue source that DPWES' Solid Waste Management Program needs to operate rather than recovering expenses through collecting fees at the disposal site. As a result, residents and county businesses would not pay a tipping fee on arrival at county disposal sites. It seems intuitive to suppose that "free disposal" for county residents and businesses would significantly reduce illegal dumping.

REVIEW OF OTHER GUIDING PRINCIPLES

In developing these recommendations, the Task Force reviewed the [Environmental Vision and Operational Energy Strategy](#) to ensure that all recommendations would be consistent with this important document. Once [the Fairfax County Community-wide Energy and Climate Action Plan](#) became available, the Task Force also ensured the same level of consistency would be present. The Task Force is pleased to note that most, if not all, of its recommendations are consistent with these guiding documents.

The Environmental Vision states that the Board is committed to provide all necessary resources to protect and improve our environment for quality of life now and for future generations. Two of the supporting objectives for the community at-large are to: 1) encourage pollution prevention, source reduction, and waste minimization through public outreach and infrastructure; and 2) promote policies that make recycling as convenient as disposal for all residents, particularly in the schools and in public spaces. By installing and servicing litter and recycling at county facilities, including parks and playing fields; sponsoring “free dump” or “dumpster days”; and reviewing development and redevelopment plans for waste management adequacy, we achieve two important objectives—improving our community, and making resources more equitable.

The Fairfax County Operational Energy Strategy states that the phase out of single-use products and packaging wherever possible will be a county-wide priority to achieving its goals by 2030. By prohibiting the use of single use/disposables at county facilities and at county events now, we can begin to achieve this goal before 2030. The strategy also calls for periodic trash and recycling audits.

A review of Chapter 109.1 - Solid Waste Management of the county ordinance reveals a further opportunity to improve these requirements: the Code allows for the set out of residential refuse overnight in plastic bags (i.e., a rigid container w/ a lid is not required). Animals and inclement weather cause bags to rip or blow open, and thus litter to escape.

The Fairfax County Community-wide Energy and Climate Action Plan recommends stricter enforcement of recycling through monetary penalties. This can be accomplished by establishing (with an ordinance update) a litter and illegal dumping enforcement unit.

Finally, while the Task Force was not blind to the costs associated with its recommendations, it opted not to be bound by them either. Instead, the Task Force created a body of work that includes various options for the Board’s consideration. Some options include easy fixes; others will require more thoughtful discussion and priority setting for the county and the agencies charged with implementing these changes. The above recommendations and opportunities should be viewed as the county’s “best bang for the buck”, and projects that can be accomplished, by and large, within County government operations, but benefit the entire county.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

Following the development of recommendations, the Task Force identified and surveyed County agency stakeholders that would be involved in implementing, overseeing, and/or leading the recommended changes. Stakeholders were asked to estimate what resources would be needed for the recommended changes, and what barriers they anticipated meeting during implementation (apart from cost), considering the resources already being expended by these stakeholders to deal with litter. The request to the stakeholders, and their responses to this survey are presented at the end of this report.

An overarching realization that came out of this process was that while litter is every agency’s problem, it is no one department’s priority. Moreover, the costs of dealing with litter on the “front end” (before it is created) may very well offset or even eliminate the resources currently being spent dealing with it on the “back end” (after it has been created).

Without intending to criticize the fine work of staff from all stakeholder agencies, based on a review of their feedback, the Task Force believes that the infrastructure and organizations currently in place to deal with litter, while motivated and hard-working, are unable to address litter with efficiency or reasonable effectiveness.

CLOSING

Members of the Litter Task Force are honored to have been commissioned for this assignment, and are pleased to deliver this report to the Environment Committee. The Task Force acknowledges that implementing some of these recommendations may be challenging, given the current climate of pandemic-driven financial constraints. However, the potential cost to solve the litter problem sustainably and permanently must be considered against the currently significant but hidden cost of managing litter under current county government practice and policy. What *is* well-known is the level of public complaint and sensitivity to the problem, and indications that litter disproportionately affects marginalized and underserved communities. Litter is therefore an environmental justice issue. Litter affects property values, quality of life, and the health of residents and wildlife.

The Task Force concludes that, absent new initiatives and fresh resources being assigned to the problem, the volume of litter polluting the county will continue unabated, despite the many generous and caring volunteers who come out on Earth Day for litter cleanups and the like. By implementing the recommendations set forth herein, the county would be seizing the opportunity to become proactive towards litter, recognizing the limited success from decades of reacting to litter after it hits the ground. The Task Force hopes that the Board will view these recommendations as the basis for developing a new and more effective process, one that eliminates litter by developing new approaches, tightening up existing policies, and preventing litter from ever hitting the ground in the first place.

APPENDIX

1. Commissioning Board Matter
2. List of Litter Task Force Members and Their Affiliations
3. Stakeholder Survey Instrument
4. Stakeholder Survey Responses

COMMISSIONING BOARD MATTER



Telephone (703) 971-6262
Fax (703) 971-3032
E-mail: leedist@fairfaxcounty.gov
Web Site: www.fairfaxcounty.gov/lee

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
COUNTY OF FAIRFAX

6121 Franconia Road
Alexandria, VA 22310



Rodney L. Lusk
LEE DISTRICT SUPERVISOR

Board Matter

September 15, 2020

Mr. Chairman - Litter is an issue that plagues our county's streets, rivers, neighborhoods, and businesses. When trash is misplaced the residents of Fairfax County pay the price—as does our region's wildlife and ecosystems. Businesses are loath to locate and invest in communities that look messy and unkempt. Every year, litter costs our state and local governments millions of dollars in cleanup efforts; and residents find themselves spending thousands of hours cleaning up their own neighborhoods and streams every spring and fall. I am proud of the proactive measures that our county has taken to address litter in our community, yet there is still so much more that needs to be done to address this persistent challenge.

This past Spring in Lee District we completed the installation of an innovative floating litter trap in Little Hunting Creek, a project that I

know you were instrumental in Mr. Chairman, which has already prevented an enormous amount of trash from continuing through our streams into the Chesapeake.

Additionally, the successful implementation of Operation Stream Shield has proven to be exactly the kind of innovative program we need to ensure we are meeting our environmental goals. I applaud our County staff who are diligently working towards ridding our County of this problem—but we need to do more. I receive calls reporting litter and illegal dumping to our office regularly, and the reality is that there is little we can do. Following consultation with the relevant county staff, the time has come to organize our community in order to supplement the prevention and litter control efforts that our county staff are already undertaking.

With that goal in mind, I move that this board direct the County Executive to assign the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, in coordination with the Clean Fairfax Council, to oversee the creation of a special task force focused on preventing and mitigating litter in Fairfax County. The task force should consist of relevant County departments, state agencies, nonprofit organizations, community groups, schools, and our residents. The task force should study the causes of litter in Fairfax County, evaluate our current policies

and procedures, and investigate neighboring or similar jurisdictions to Fairfax County for proven solutions, such as a plastic bag ordinance. Finally, they should report back with a comprehensive plan for this Board to consider and potentially enact. The plan should include any recommended changes to the County Code, agency operations or reorganization, and development of new programs. This task force should be convened by January of 2021 and report to this Board on their findings in the following Fall of 2021.

Thank you.

LIST OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS AND THEIR AFFILIATIONS

Alice Ferguson Foundation – Sam Battersby*
Clean Fairfax – Jen Cole and Zach Huntington*
DPWES – Charlie Forbes (Solid Waste) and Emily Burton (Stormwater)
DPD – Denise James*
DCC – Gabe Zakkak
EQAC – Clyde Wilbur
FCPD – PFC Michelle Alexander*
FCPS – Ali Culhane*
NVSWCD – Laura Grape

The asterix denote Task Force members who had to be replaced due to relocation to new positions, retirement, or for other reasons. Replacement members were as follows:

Alice Ferguson Foundation – Sarah Kempfer
Clean Fairfax – Emily Foppe
DPD – Joe Gurney
FCPD – Sgt. Harold Morris and PFC Christina Beltran

FCPS did not provide a replacement for Ms. Culhane

The Task Force would also like to recognize the excellent administrative support provided by Tiffany Moore and Neda Ghodsi, both with DPWES-SWMP.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Fairfax County Litter Task Force Stakeholder Survey *Opportunities for Change*

The Fairfax County Litter Task Force (LTF) has been commissioned by the County Board of Supervisors to

1. Study the causes of litter in Fairfax County
2. Evaluate Fairfax County's current policies and procedures
3. Investigate neighboring or similar jurisdictions for proven solutions (incl. plastic bag ban)
4. Develop a comprehensive plan for the Board to consider and potentially enact. The plan should include any recommended changes to the County Code, agency operations or reorganization, and the development of new programs.
5. This task force should be convened by January of 2021 and report to the Board on their findings in the Fall of 2021

The LTF is made up of environmental advocates and policy implementers from around the County and region, representing decades of collective experience, study, and implementation in the area of litter control and remediation, and have come up with three levels of opportunities for Fairfax County to get a handle on its growing litter problem.

The Litter Task Force has been meeting monthly since January to create suggestions for reducing the amount of litter found on the sides of roads, and in our streams. For the most part, all of the suggestions key into the idea that being proactive to the problem will be more successful than continuing to simply react to it. While we were not blind to cost, we opted not to be bound by it either, instead creating a body of work that includes easy fixes, and some that will require more thoughtful discussion and priority setting for the County and the agencies charged with implementing these changes. One overarching realization has come out of this process--that while litter everyone department's responsibility, it is no one department's priority, that the costs of dealing with litter on the "front end" may very well offset the costs currently being paid to deal with it on the back end, and that the infrastructure in place to deal with litter are broken and need fixing. We hope that these recommendations put the County on the right path to creating new paradigms for dealing with the overwhelming litter problems across the county.

Your organization has been identified as one that may be affected by some of these suggestions, and we ask that you read them over with an eye toward solving the problem, letting us know what the barriers may be to achieving these attainable goals (if any).

In order to make this as quick and easy as possible, The Task Force welcomes feedback by email (you may mark up this document where it applies to your agency and return to jen@cleanfairfax.org) or by a short survey <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/B6YLYXMT> in addition we can set up times for you to meet with the Litter Task Force if you have specific questions about this process. We currently meet on the 2nd Tuesday of each month from 10-

11:30 and if you'd like to attend our next meeting (August 10) please email jen@cleanfairfax.org for the link.

In addition, we would ask that you consider your organization's costs for dealing with litter when looking at these recommendations, using the maxim that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

This document and our recommendations will be turned into a dynamic presentation and given to the Environmental Committee of the Board. Please provide qualitative cost data and any comments or concerns by August 6. Thank you for your help with this important project.

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
Respondent	Margaret Travers	Peggy Delean	Jose A. Comayagua Jr.	Bob Birmingham	Amy Moxley	Cathy Muse	Hans Christensen	Susan Hafeli	Keith Snyder	Craig Carinci
Prohibit use of single use/disposables at county facilities and at county events. What are the cost impact and resource needs--what are the implementation challenges, other than cost?	<p>Who will be responsible for monitoring compliance with prohibiting single use/disposables at county facilities? Events can be monitored, but if the expectation is that employees will not use single use/disposables, who will be responsible for monitoring this is followed, and what are the consequences if an employee or facility does not comply?</p>	<p>Public awareness and education. The public needs to be an active participant in this endeavor.</p>		<p>Cost Unknow. For security and safety reasons the juvenile detention center relies on the usage of plastic during meals. If we were unable to use such utensils we would have top go back to medal , reusable items.</p>	<p>at the snack bar, some customers would like to take their food to go, they are not dining in the dining area.</p>	<p>County cafeteria operations contracts do not include a requirement for reusable kitchenware (dishes, utensils, etc.) and the operation is not staffed for dishwashing. The contractor would incur additional costs on already unprofitable operations.</p>		<p>I believe a Procedural Memo would be required to bring attention to this matter. Please note that while we can agree that our agencies can lead by example, I don't believe we can impose this restriction on our cafeteria owner/operators.</p>	<p>FCPA Response: Vending Contract termination damages. List of items impacted by this measure (potential): straws, stirrers, utensils, bottles, bags, cup lids, etc.</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Install and service litter and recyclables cans at county facilities, including parks and playing fields. What is the cost impact and resource needs-- what are the implementation challenges, other than cost?</p>	<p>There could be space limitations depending on where the containers are placed. Most kitchen areas are very small and putting additional containers in them could impact ADA space requirements.</p>	<p>Public awareness and participation.</p>		<p>No challenges other than potential cost.</p>	<p>people don't read recycling signs & mix their items. the recycling bins need to be emptied frequently.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>The cost driver is contamination, not only for this material but any material it's mixed with. Much education is needed, including point of use signage.</p>	<p>Not OEEC responsibilities. But question: who made the finding that the county is out of compliance? In what ways is it out of compliance?</p>	<p>FCPA Response: Upfront cost to install. Long term cost of collection (either by contract or staff) and repair/maintenance. ~500 trashcan per region and ~1,000 recycling bins needed across the FCPA. Tracking system to monitor trash volume (public side to report pickup needed, County side for trash volume monitoring and tracking). FCPA Response: Ability for staff to service increased number of bins may be restrictive.</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Enact Single Use Bag Fee. What is the cost impact and resource needs--what are the implementation challenges, other than cost?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Public awareness and participation</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>educating the consumer & staff</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Administrative and enforcement costs would be high - how high would the bag fee need to be to deter use?</p>	<p>In progress. On 7/27, the Board approved advertisement of a 9/14 public hearing on a plastic bag tax for a 1/2022 effective date. Is a joint OEEC/DTA/OCA effort. Edit proposed because multiple jurisdictions in the state support a plastic bag tax, with Roanoke being the first to enact a local ordinance implementing it.</p>	<p>Agree with listed TBD costs, Tracking system for fund collection and dispersion back to the County Fund. Need to identify where single use bags are used in the FCPA. Would this apply to all food services, camps, retail locations?</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Install water bottle filling stations in county buildings. What is the cost impact and resource needs--what are the implementation challenges, other than cost?</p>	<p>This is a fabulous idea. Employees in our department have been asking for water bottle filling stations for several years.</p>	<p>DCC employees have asked for this but it was cost-prohibitive for the agency. Challenge: Where to put them. If you can't put one on each floor, it may discourage use from those floors that do not have one.</p>	<p>Cost Impacts: \$6.M to replace/repurpose approximately 460 existing water fountains with water bottle stations at County-owned facilities. Installations must follow Federal, State, and local building codes/ordinances, i.e., ADA, plumbing, mechanical and structural building codes. Implementation Challenges (Other Than Cost): For ADA compliance, typically the height and depth of the water fountains need to be modified. In most cases, accommodation for the visually impaired needs to be provided by either having the water fountain recessed in the wall or installing cane detention units. In some cases, the fountain needs to be repositioned to provide the required ADA-mandated approach. Where water fountains are currently installed in Concrete Masonry Units (CMU) walls, the cost to replace or retrofit will be higher. There will also be ongoing maintenance costs. Replacing filters in 460 water fountains every six months. Resource Needs: contract for installation.</p>	<p>No challenges other than cost.</p>	<p>does the station require a special filter or maintenance?</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Significant up-front costs, but probably pays for itself over time.</p>	<p>EIP-funded project will install several water bottle filling stations in DVS facilities. The DVS initiative could be considered a pilot program.</p>	<p>FCPA has previously scoped upgrade to bottler filling stations (~\$2,000-\$3,000 each, depending on design and quantity). Phasing would be needed due to total volume in FCPA. Options for non-cooled fountains (at remote locations) would need to be explored as well. Contract for supplier(s) and long-term maintenance. May be a need for large water container filling for teams or camps (i.e. 3-5 gallon jugs), which are not typically fillable at current bottle filling stations (mentioned in future lookout item #1 below)</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>DPWES-Solid Waste Management Program to review development and re-development plans for waste management adequacy. What are the cost impacts and resource needs? What are the implementation challenges aside from cost?</p>	N/A			N/A	unfamiliar with this	No comment	Significant administrative and delay costs associated with another level of review, and current staff could be trained to review the same criteria.	NA	<p>**NOTE: action seems to be specific to DWPES facility, not to all County facilities. Comments from FCPA are incase action impacts all FCPA locations. ** Costs to renovate collection areas that are not adequate (additional curbing or containment). Potential internal agency staff time needed for FCPA</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD, minimum separation and location criteria should be established in the PFM.</p>
									<p>review and implementat ion.</p>	

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Revise applicable ordinances to prohibit the use of bags for overnight refuse set-out. What are the cost impacts and resource needs? What are the implementation challenges apart from cost?</p>	<p>Who is going to enforce the changes to the ordinance? What are the consequences to those who do not comply?</p>	<p>Agreed!!! DCC receives complaints (mostly in townhouse communities) where bags are used for trash. Those who live right in front of the drop zone complain about rodents and trash from this allowed practice. There is nothing that DCC is able to do to address this type of complaint. When we suggest dumpsters, the management claims that there is no place to put them. Seems that dumpster sites should have been required on the site plan in the first place. Implementation challenge: a change in the conception phase (code change) for these types of communities In addition, if cans are going to be required, where are they going to be placed at each townhouse? There is no room in the front yard and, if they are placed in the rear yard, it may be quite a distance to drag your can to the front yard. I think community dumpsters is the solution.</p>		<p>N/A</p>	<p>educating the public to alternatives</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Moderate cost per residence, especially when combined with a requirement to have trash service and a bulk item option.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Increased cleaning routes or vehicles to match the potentially larger number of containers or overall size. Alternative options to plastic bags for facility users. Increased container sizes at rentable park spaces may be met with complaints (visual impact). If site containers are not emptied properly, facilities may experience more loose trash without plastic garage bags.</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Prohibit waste container placement in close proximity to storm drains. What are the cost impacts and resource needs? What are the implementation challenges aside from cost?</p>	<p>N/A</p>			<p>N/A</p>	<p>educating the public.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Minimal to moderate cost per residence, needs to be combined with use of refuse carts/containers.</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Staff or contractor time to evaluate existing conditions, design solutions, and implement improvements. Number of park locations creates a potential for large amount of improvements needed.</p>	<p>Not Applicable to SWPD, minimum separation and location criteria should be established in the PFM.</p>

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Update ordinance to establish a litter & illegal dumping enforcement unit. What are the cost impacts and resource needs? What are the implementation challenges aside from cost?</p>	N/A	From a code enforcement perspective: there needs to be code changes first to provide tools for the enforcement unit.		N/A	determining who is responsible for the illegal dumping	No comment	Expensive option. Difficult to enforce without clear evidence. Clog up court or administrative process.	NA	Staff time or new staff to help monitor and report for enforcement . With large number of parks users and diverse group events, potential for issues with post event cleanup and future space rentals.	Some of the primary sources of litter vary from inadequate facilities, frequency of pickup, intentional or inadvertent disposal, and material blowing out of vehicles. A group should be formed to establish the agency(s) that would be in the best position to effectively and efficiently enforce the requirements of the ordinance to make a difference in the volume of litter that has the potential to enter our communities and streams.

FAIRFAX COUNTY LITTER TASK FORCE - STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES

Question	Department of Family Services	Department of Code Compliance	Facilities Management Department	JDRDC	DCC & Parks	Procurement & Material Management	SWMP	OEEC	FCPA	SWPD
<p>Re-evaluate the methodology used to calculate capacity and servicing needs for new and existing developments. What are the cost impacts and resource needs? What are the implementation challenges aside from cost?</p>	N/A	<p>Challenges: There needs to be changes to the codes to allow for more stringent trash disposal requirements.</p>		N/A	unfamiliar	No comment		NA	<p>Staff time to evaluate FCPA internal waste streams (both internally and externally generated). Staff time to calculate waste generated by internal purchases (boxes, bags, packing material, etc.) and by external users (purchased materials, items brought into facilities). Improved understanding of capacity needed and potential to better organize waste disposal (i.e. arrange waste removal right after project with a lot of waste). Any change to procurement stream will need County Procurement assistance.</p>	Not Applicable to SWPD