MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Environmental Committee, Tuesday, October 29, 2024

Date	Tuesday, October 29, 2024
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 28m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/3580
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-31. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:02] All right. Good afternoon. Welcome back, everyone. Welcome to the October 29th, 2024 meeting of the Environmental Committee. Board members have the agenda. First item is acceptance of the meeting summary from our July meeting. And if there are no changes to that summary from board members, we'll consider that accepted.

[00:00:27] We have three big topics to cover today. The first, we're going to hear from Fairfax Water on the PFAS Challenge. We'll then get another update on our 20-year solid waste plan and then get a quick update on some, I think, exciting news with our operational energy strategy implementation.

[00:00:48] And we're going to start with the PFAS Challenge at Fairfax Water, and we're very fortunate to have with us Jamie Hedges, the general manager of Fairfax Water, and I want to congratulate her in advance for taking a very, very complex topic and fitting it into the 15 slides I asked for, which was, I know, not easy, but thank you for doing that, and thank you for being here.

[00:01:15] Sorry. Appreciate the time you've given us today to talk about this very significant topic for Fairfax Water, and that is PFAS or PFAS compounds. We'll get into that a little bit more.

[00:01:37] But my plan today, with the time allowed, is just kind of give you a little bit of background on PFAS and then kind of walk through where we are today at Fairfax Water and how we're working with

Occoquan Watershed stakeholders to address PFAS, which is an emerging environmental challenge.

[00:01:56] So Fairfax Water, as many of you know, has grown significantly since we were founded in 1957, and today we provide highly treated drinking water for over 2 million residents of northern Virginia. About a million of those we serve directly on a retail basis in Fairfax County and the cities of Falls Church in Fairfax, and then we serve another 1 million residents indirectly through our wholesale partners in neighboring jurisdictions. Roughly 40 percent of the water that we treat comes from the Occoquan Reservoir and about 60 percent from the Potomac

[00:02:34] River. The Potomac is a shared regional resource with roughly 9,000 square miles of watershed upstream of the metro area water supply intakes. The Occoquan, on the other hand, is a much smaller, highly urbanized watershed comprised of roughly 600 square miles of land located in Fairfax, Prince William, Falkir, and Loudoun counties, and the city of Manassas. The Occoquan is also the nation's first indirect potable reuse system. And Fairfax Water's ability to meet future water

[00:03:10] supply demands in the region relies heavily upon preserving the Occoquan source and the growing return flows from the Upper Occoquan Service Authority Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant. So what are PFAS? They are poly and perfluoral alkyl substances, or PFAS for short, and they are a group of thousands of man-made chemicals, many of which have been in use since the 1940s.

[00:03:39] And they possess unique physical and chemical properties that impart water and temperature resistance into the products that use them. One of the earliest uses of PFAS was in aqueous film-forming foam, or AFFF, that was used to combat fires started by flammable liquids.

[00:04:01] PFAS are also used in a variety of manufacturing processes, and they can be found in many common household and consumer products, such as nonstick cookware, waterproof clothing, and cosmetics, as well as medical devices and food packaging. PFAS have been called forever chemicals because they do not break down readily in the environment.

[00:04:23] They move through the water cycle easily and have been found in rainwater, as well as remote locations such as the Arctic. Scientific studies have shown that PFAS compounds can bioaccumulate in humans and lead to a number of different health impacts.

[00:04:46] PFAS circulate through the water cycle in a variety of ways. Discharges from industries using or manufacturing PFAS can make their way to groundwater and surface waters, as can firefighting foam, which has been used extensively at military bases, airports, and fire training facilities.

[00:05:06] PFAS in consumer products make their way to landfills and can be found in leachate. Industrial, commercial, and residential sources discharge PFAS in their wastewater. And wastewater treatment plants, like water treatment plants, were not designed to remove PFAS.

[00:05:25] So that PFAS flows through the treatment process and ends up in the wastewater effluent being discharged back to receiving waters, and it also ends up in wastewater plant biosolids. Despite its circulation in the water cycle, it is important to note that two-thirds or more of a human's exposure to PFOA and PFOS, which are two of the most common PFAS compounds, come from diet, and less than a quarter comes from drinking water.

[00:05:58] EPA is responsible for promulgating national drinking water regulations under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The act requires them to collect data for unregulated contaminants and determine if

there is a sufficient reason to regulate those contaminants in drinking water. In 2012, for the first time, EPA required water utilities nationally to monitor for PFAS under its third unregulated contaminant monitoring rule. At that time, Fairfax Water was unable to detect PFAS in its water and

[00:06:36] had no cause for concern or action when a few years later, EPA issued a health advisory for PFOA and PFOS at 70 parts per trillion. However, laboratory analytical methods for PFAS progressed, and now those compounds can be detected at much lower levels. EPA issued new health advisories in 2022 at roughly one-tenth or less of those that they issued in 2016 because of these improved laboratory analytical methods. EPA's final drinking water regulation was published earlier this year

[00:07:15] for six PFAS compounds. PFAS are the first contaminants to be regulated by EPA to levels of parts per trillion. All other contaminants regulated by EPA are at levels of parts per million or parts per billion. So Fairfax Water has been voluntarily monitoring for PFAS on a quarterly basis since 2021. And we have continued to update the results of those monitoring efforts on our website and publish some preliminary information about PFAS in our customer newsletters.

[00:07:54] And while the data that we've collected for the Potomac source indicate that that facility will meet the new drinking water regulation, the story at the Occoquan is different, and it will not be able to meet EPA's PFAS regulation when it becomes effective in 2029.

[00:08:12] Our results for PFOA are approximately one and a half parts per trillion above the regulatory limit for PFOA and just under the limit for PFOS. Four other PFAS compounds are also being regulated by EPA. However, our sampling results to date for those compounds in the Occoquan indicate they are below the limits. Earlier this year, Fairfax Water completed its preliminary screening of the only three PFAS removal technologies that are available at our scale, and those are granulated activated

[00:08:49] carbon filtration, or GAC, ion exchange, and reverse osmosis. I'd like to note that none of these technologies actually destroy PFAS. All they do is move them from one media, water, to another.

[00:09:05] We will soon begin a year-long pilot test of GAC filtration and ion exchange to understand PFAS removal performance in these technologies over a range of varying source water quality in the aquaquan. And that pilot testing will inform our final treatment technology selection, and then the project will move forward to design and construction. EPA's rule provided a compliance time frame of five years, which is really inadequate for the type of infrastructure we

[00:09:41] are going to have to build at Griffith. An aggressive schedule would have us bringing cold treatment online in 2030. Complying with this regulation is going to be costly. The capital required to comply with the regulation is estimated at nearly $400 million, and this estimate is without benefit of a design, and the costs may increase based on competition for consulting engineers, contractors, and material suppliers who are all competing to

[00:10:15] bring their plants in line with the regulation. Annual operating costs will be significant because the filter media required to remove these compounds must be replaced frequently. In our case, we're estimating multiple times per year.

[00:10:32] Additionally, EPA has designated PFOA and PFOS as hazardous substances under CERCLA, and we anticipate that disposal of the PFAS-laden spent filter media may become more challenging and therefore more expensive as fewer landfills may accept those materials.

[00:10:54] Keeping PFAS out of the Occoquan Reservoir will result in savings to our customers over time as filter media will last longer with lower source water concentrations. Lower PFAS levels in the reservoir also reduced the amount of PFAS taken up by aquatic life, sent downstream to the Chesapeake Bay, or cycled through UOSA and treated effluent and biosolids.

[00:11:19] Earlier this year, Fairfax Water initiated a PFAS monitoring effort with the Aquaquan Watershed Monitoring Lab, which is a part of Virginia Tech. This lab also performs analysis for the Aquaquon Watershed Monitoring Program under the Commonwealth's Aquaquon policy.

[00:11:38] Our program includes monthly monitoring for PFAS at fixed sites, as well as rotating sites of interest in an effort to track sources of PFAS further upstream. Ten months into the program, we have found PFOA and PFOS at levels exceeding the drinking water regulations at several locations throughout the watershed, including Bull Run and Cub Run in Fairfax County, and South Run and Broad Run in Prince William County. As we try to identify sources of PFAS, we are in close collaboration with the Upper

[00:12:13] Occoquan Service Authority. They have required PFAS monitoring from their industrial pretreatment permittees, and from those efforts, we know that there are concentrations of PFAS exceeding the drinking water regulations in discharges from the Micron Semiconductor Facility in Manassas, and from Free State Farms, which is a regional composting facility.

[00:12:35] Groundwater monitoring by the Virginia Department of Health and others have identified high levels of PFAS in groundwater supplying areas around the former Vent Hill military installation. On this slide, you can see other potential sources of PFAS, which have been identified through lists prepared by EPA and other water experts.

[00:12:58] And I did want to note, through some of the coordination and collaboration we've had with county staff to date. We have learned that Fairfax County, thankfully, has already transitioned their fire training facility away from fluorine-containing firefighting foams to something that's more friendly to the Occoquan Reservoir, so we appreciate that. There are more than one fire training facility in the Occoquan watershed, so we have some more work to do.

[00:13:27] To reduce PFAS in the Occoquan, we really have to connect the dots from the reservoir and tributary data that we're collecting to the actual PFAS sources. Some of the PFAS we're detecting may be from legacy uses, and some of it may be from ongoing uses. We want to find as many sources as we can and start to work with those sources through voluntary or other mechanisms to reduce the PFAS contamination in the Occoquan. To that end, we have engaged with Occoquan watershed stakeholders, including Fairfax County and Prince William County staff, our wholesale partner Prince

[00:14:03] William Water, academics, and regulatory agencies. It will require all of us working together to identify these PFAS sources. While PFAS is a drinking water issue today, it may become a regulatory issue for wastewater, biosolids, and stormwater tomorrow. The PFAS regulatory landscape is evolving, and vigilance in source water protection is critical to ensuring the entire burden of PFAS removal from water resources does not fall on drinking water customers.

[00:14:37] Earlier this year, the General Assembly reviewed several PFAS bills, including one sponsored by Delegate Bulova and Senator Marsden. A PFAS source assessment process was enacted as a first step to collect data from potential PFAS sources in impacted drinking water supplies across the state.

[00:14:57] DEQ will be leading this effort with support from the Virginia Department of Health and an expert advisory panel. These efforts are expected to take several years, and there are limited state resources, an as-yet undetermined number of water utilities that will not meet the regulation.

[00:15:16] In parallel with the DEQ effort, Fairfax Water will continue its collaboration with regional partners to reduce PFAS. Characterizing PFAS in wastewater and stormwater discharges is essential to this effort. Once sources are identified, actions like product substitutions and best management practices to reduce PFAS releases can be explored. More study is needed to understand the potential PFAS contributions from biosolids that are being land applied in the watershed.

[00:15:49] And reducing industrial PFAS discharges to UOSA is critical. And I'd like to acknowledge our colleagues at UOSA who've been actively engaged in leading those efforts today. PFAS will be a challenge for many years to come, and it is a watershed issue that requires a watershed approach and the efforts of all the stakeholders.

[00:16:10] As I wrap up, I did want to provide some potential actions for the committee and the board's consideration. First, supporting additional funding to monitor for PFAS under the Occoquan Watershed Monitoring Program. Robust PFAS monitoring is essential to understanding changes in PFAS levels over time and in identifying potential sources.

[00:16:32] The program is funded 50% by Fairfax Water and 50% by the watershed jurisdictions. Supporting county staff efforts to collect wastewater and stormwater samples to help Fairfax Water identify potential PFAS sources at existing commercial sites.

[00:16:50] requiring initial storm and wastewater monitoring for proposed land uses that are known or likely users of PFAS to assess if new sources may be entering the watershed, supporting PFAS product replacement programs and general assembly initiatives to protect drinking water supplies from PFAS, and lastly, supporting the Water Systems PFAS Liability Protection Act, which would protect drinking water and wastewater utilities and their rate-paying customers from CIRCLA liability for proper disposal of PFAS-laden treatment residuals like spent filter

[00:17:29] media. So I know that was a lot, and I appreciate your time, and I'd be happy to answer any questions. Okay, thank you, Jamie. Obviously, sobering topic on a lot of levels. We also, I asked Assistant Chief John Walzer to join us here in case there are any questions about our fire department and the use of these foams specifically. And John, actually, maybe why don't I just give you the chance to speak to that, to share what you shared with me previously. Sure. Thank you. And John Walser with the Fire and Rescue Department. And the

[00:18:03] fire department did replace the PFAS containing foams about three years ago. So where we used to use the alcohol-resistant aqueous film-forming foams, we now use aqueous triple F film-forming foams. So it's a very big distinction, and it's an important one that we did three years ago when this became an issue because of the impact not only in the environment, but also on our firefighters, because being exposed to that PFAS-containing materials over time does build up in the body, and we do want to make sure that our firefighters are protected as well. So it's

[00:18:40] very important that we get these materials out of the equipment that we use. All right. Thank you, john and we won't go jurisdiction by jurisdiction but suffice to say not every other fire department in our region has taken that step that is correct they're moving that way but have not gotten there yet okay all

right let's go ahead and open it up mr chairman yeah thank thank you uh great presentation jamie it is sobering obviously this is a nationwide problem not a fairfax county specific problem and i think we just you know we need to make that clear uh to your customers our constituents to make sure we set the stage correct.

[00:19:18] The $389 million is a staggering figure over six years, and so I guess, you know, number one, is that already built into Fairfax Water's capital program, or is that in addition to what your baseline capital program would be doing over that six-year period of time?

[00:19:39] Fairfax Water operates on a calendar year, fiscal year, so we just completed our CIP process. For the first time, it reflects the required treatment facilities for PFAS. So that is in addition to the capital improvement that was in place before. So that will start getting reflected in forward-looking rate projections for our customers sometime next June, July.

[00:20:09] Okay. And I guess related to that, did the authority have to, or the board, I should say, look at postponing or rearranging the capital program? In other words, this we're prioritizing now for obvious reasons, but is there something that we're not going to be able to do as a result of the sudden intrusion of that figure of that magnitude?

[00:20:33] Yeah, I mean, you know, one thing to keep in mind is that one of the great aspects of Fairfax Water being a regional supplier is that all of our customers are participating in this capital improvement, so it's not just our retail customers. Our wholesale customers will be paying for roughly half of that. So it is a staggering number, but the impact of what's falling to our retail customers is roughly half of that number. At this point, the capital improvement program has not taken something off the table in order to replace it with PFAS. We have taken a look at rate

[00:21:08] projections over the next 10 years as part of our normal strategic financial planning process. So we know what projected rates look like for our retail customers with PFAS treatment and then the ongoing O&M. We are looking at, you know, larger than what would be anticipated rate increases, but still less than 10% over a three to four year period, and then falling back down to around five to six percent. So we also take a look at those numbers in the context

[00:21:42] of EPA's affordability guidelines, and we're still well within the affordability guidelines for water rates. Okay. And then lastly, the federal legislation that you're asking us to support here, does that have funding attached to it that might help alleviate some of that $389 million? It does not. It has no funding attached to it, and I'm presuming there's not an instrument that you're aware of in the general assembly that has that either and we know about the past bills but there's not an effort afoot to help fund this this by the commonwealth there

[00:22:17] is not um there has been some federal money that that has flown to this uh gone down to the states um but our inquiries of virginia department of health which is who those monies would flow to for fairfax water um there's really not anything appreciable available for us okay And one thing, you know, that is important long-term on the costs, obviously the $389 million is the short-term costs, but there is the potential to reduce the long-term costs by reducing the amount of PFAS in our region, right?

[00:22:56] So addressing sources as you're attempting to identify through the monitoring, et cetera. So, you know, for us, starting today, really that has to be an important project in terms of the monitoring, in

terms of our legislative agenda, and the legislation from Delegate Bulova that you mentioned requires monitoring but does not require mitigation.

[00:23:20] So that's really going to be the next step we're going to have to encourage the General Assembly to move towards because long term, that's the solution here. that's safer and healthier for everybody and less expensive for ratepayers long-term. And if I may, one of the other reasons we want to focus on the sources is typically the volumes of PFAS and their wastewater streams are much smaller.

[00:23:44] And so there are technologies available to those smaller flows that actually destroy PFAS, and they're much less expensive because the scale is much smaller than what we're doing. So for all the reasons you mentioned, going after the sources and reducing PFAS at the source makes all the sense in the world. Okay, let's start at the end and work down. Supervisor Bierman. Thanks so much. So Micron, you just mentioned that you could reduce PFAS at the source.

[00:24:14] How and, you know, what would the cost of that look like to your knowledge? So our colleagues at UOSA have been leading the dialogue with Micron. Micron has been receptive so far. They understand that PFAS is a significant issue in the Occoquan and they are exploring treatment technologies. At this point in time, there is no firm commitment as to the timing of that, but the expectation would be that Micron is funding that removal. And what is exactly Free State Farms? You mentioned earlier. So Free State Farms, my understanding is it's a regional

[00:24:53] composting facility. I'm not sure I'm the best person to go much beyond that. You might be able to ask that in our next presentation actually my only is it is it private is it public is it I think it's I think it's Eric come on up Eric Forbes solid waste management program Supervisor Beerman is free for state farms it was actually just acquired by a company called convertis it's a public private partnership with Prince William County as the host they leased the land to the private company and it is a regional partnership we take our yard waste there

[00:25:26] for instance. Okay. And IBM and Atlantic Research, or is Atlantic Research, I'm assuming, is a private company as well? Yes. So both of those facilities are no longer operating in that mode. They are declared CERCLA hazardous waste sites. They are pumping groundwater and treating it for land uses that previously existed at those sites. They're treating for other types of contaminants. They are something that we want to look into more with the state because given the

[00:26:04] land uses in the past, it is likely they were using PFAS compounds. But when they were designated as circle of sites, PFAS wasn't on the radar screen and nobody would have been able to measure for it. So we'd like to go back and reevaluate those sites. So it just, it seems like actually we identified one location where we could reduce PFAS, our fire department. We took a step there.

[00:26:30] We invested in it. We've done something to help. But we're looking at, frankly, a bunch of private companies for the most part, which are going to lead to a $389 million tax bill for us. And maybe the person we should be also talking to is our county attorney here. What about all of options here to potentially make sure that we are holding the people responsible who are contributing to this problem responsible. Thanks. Supervisor Jimenez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[00:27:09] This is a pretty bleak situation that we're in. It's something that's so large. As Chairman McKay mentioned at the very beginning, we are not the only ones who are impacted, but this is a problem across the country and when you look at the money that it's going to cost it's overwhelming and it's something

that this county can't carry on its shoulders without assistance from the state or from the federal government and at the end of the day those most impacted are our residents which is not great my

[00:27:44] question I guess is given the potential health impacts what measures are in place to keep the public informed because I don't think I've seen much information out there and reassured about PFAS in their drinking water. Thank you, Supervisor Jimenez.

[00:28:02] So we are gearing up to begin communicating more on this issue through our customer newsletters. There is extensive information on our website as well. I would, you know, I think some context is important here. We're talking about one and a half parts per trillion. That's like one drop in 20 Olympic-sized swimming pools. Most of the utilities that you hear about who have already implemented treatment for PFAS have had PFAS concentrations in the hundreds or thousands of

[00:28:37] parts per trillion, and we are at five and a half. EPA has set this regulation effectively at the limits of detection. So the other aspect is less than a quarter of a human's exposure is coming through their drinking water. And we are moving towards compliance, but I think there are some opportunities to communicate to constituents about reducing PFAS exposure in other ways, like the food that they're eating or the products that they're using. It's not just drinking water.

[00:29:17] The other thing I just wanted to say is that Fairfax Water, all of our operations and our capital programs are funded through our rate payers. So this is, we appreciate any help that the Board of Supervisors is willing to give us in terms of moving forward with reducing sources and placing the removal of these compounds where they appropriately belong. But this is not going to result in a tax burden or a budget issue for the county. Okay. I was just going to say, sorry.

[00:29:51] Sure. Just thank you for that. I wish more people would just randomly go to the website. I don't I believe that's going to happen in the next 10 to 15 years. There's going to be more litigation on this than asbestos. So this is a mounting problem that's not going away, and it's very scary.

[00:30:07] Supervisor Lusk. Thank you, Mr. Sherman. My question is around the diet. So what can we do to help people learn about the exposure that's coming from the diet, and how can we mitigate that?

[00:30:23] Because if that's the largest percentage, that's where we're going to get the biggest bang in terms of reducing PFAS in our water source. So can you help me understand what about the diet that's causing this? I can make a couple of comments.

[00:30:39] I think there are probably experts better suited to address your question more fully. But PFAS get uptaken through crops so they can end up in, you know, vegetables. They end up in the animal food chain. They are in, you know, greaseproof wrappers that people wrap their food in, so they're getting into the food supply and the ingestion pathway through a lot of different mechanisms.

[00:31:05] But it may be an opportunity with the county health department working with Fairfax Water to put together some more communication, education for the community on how to reduce exposure throughout the entire spectrum. Yeah, my thought was that packaging was going to be partially to blame because we certainly package so many things.

[00:31:27] I appreciate that answer. And then the second thing I'll just make a statement is I recognize how important it is if you get support from the federal and the state governments to help us address this issue because we're not going to be able to just do this solely on our own. So thank you very much.

[00:31:43] Okay, Supervisor Palcic. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I was going in a similar direction as my colleague here, Supervisor Luskin. It's that larger piece. I mean, I think it's a great opportunity, right? Because you're going to have very active avidians. Clearly, all of your rate payers will be able to have access to the information.

[00:32:03] And in a very perfunctory Google search, I was not able to find easy answers. There has been change to the packaging. But how do we really work with the health department? I think that's a great suggestion. to help understand the impact and the outreach and what it means.

[00:32:21] I mean, there are a lot of things that we deal with these days. Nowhere near Superfund days. I was not here for those. Those are still being cleaned up. And I think understanding where this comes into play for our community and in addition to the support you need to use every source possible to try to limit the monetary impact on our community as you move forward, I'm happy to help support you or work with Fairfax Water on a partnership on the education piece.

[00:32:53] Thank you. Thank you. Okay, Supervisor Stork? Airports, MWA. Do we know if MWA is still using chemicals? We do not. We have reached out to them and are trying to set up a meeting with them to understand what their current situation is.

[00:33:12] Okay, and then USAR, the USAR facility, I know you mentioned the foam, But is there any other part of USAR facility itself that we utilize things that might include or contain? Not in and of itself. Just because PFAS containing materials are so ubiquitous, it is very hard to say one piece over the other.

[00:33:34] But I will say adhesives really contain oftentimes a lot of PFAS-type materials. And when those are used in manufactured wood products and the burning of those wood products, that is a problem, at least for the airborne contaminants.

[00:33:52] We don't use those in our facilities where we burn wood to train our firefighters. We don't burn furniture. We don't burn the typical things that you would expect to see the PFAS-containing man-made products.

[00:34:08] So those are largely off the table, but I couldn't say across the board that that's the case just because they're everywhere. And we have Covanta and now what's called ReWorld. It's their new name, and obviously they burn all those things. And whether or not, it doesn't sound like there's any methodology that would contain those emissions.

[00:34:28] So are those things that we should also be aware of? I know that it is ubiquitous, and I'm with you, and I think that's a larger conversation that we should have, as well as I think the liability issues here we should get on with, and I think maybe, if nothing else, some advocacy letters on our part to folks who maybe are more likely users and get them to go on the record.

[00:34:54] I know that, Jamie, I'm with you, that's one piece of it, and maybe some of the hardest pieces, but I think we have to start with where we start, and then we need to be talking to each of our restaurants that we go to and ask them about what they use. I mean, it's a huge education issue, but it's also an advocacy issue that I think the board needs to get more involved with.

[00:35:14] Thank you. Okay, Supervisor Alcorn. Thank you. Jamie, just to confirm, unlike other parts of the country, we've not had widespread application of sewage sludge on the land, on farms, or is that correct that you're aware of in terms of sources of this?

[00:35:31] So there are roughly, I want to say, 15,000, 20,000 acres generally in Falk here and maybe Western Prince William that are permitted for biosolids application. That's something we really need to study more, whether they're permitted and actually getting the solids applied, maybe two different things, and then how much PFAS may or may not be in those biosolids, and then what happens to them when they're land applied.

[00:35:58] Are they running off into the receiving waters? So there's a lot more research required on that. Okay. Thank you. That wasn't the answer I was hoping I'd hear. I was thinking of us and no, but I think that's all the other.

[00:36:13] Yeah. And I guess the one thing I would encourage Fairfax Water to think about, the $389 million in capital costs is a very, very big number. And I'm thinking of the old Hudson River Valley example of what New York City Water did.

[00:36:31] um, to basically avoid the, the cost of, of a new treatment facility. Um, please keep that in mind. If we find that they're on the edge of my seat, what did they do? Uh, basically they went up and they, uh, they, they took away the polluting sources up there and they, uh, so they didn't have to build a treatment facility down in it. You know, so, um, if we find that there are say a limited number of sources, because we're not that far above the MCL.

[00:37:00] We're pretty darn close. And if there's a way to bring the MCL down, you know, by spending money maybe on something else and not letting anybody off the hook at all. But I'd encourage you to think about that. Thank you, Supervisor Alcorn.

[00:37:16] That is the hope. I just want to be realistic that we may not be able to get there. And one of the reasons we really appreciate the opportunity to meet with you today is Fairfax Water doesn't have any, We have no ability to go on, you know, go further upstream and sample on private property to try to identify these things.

[00:37:34] So we need support from local and state government to do that. In a perfect world, we find enough sources to not have to treat. That would be great. And I would say whatever we could do to help you with that, let us know. But it's important to note the timeline that the EPA has laid out is a tight one for that to happen unless, and I think we're going to be advocating for this in the General Assembly next year, but unless Richmond acted very quickly to provide stronger monitoring and

[00:38:10] mitigation, a regulatory regime that doesn't exist currently, it's unlikely that that could happen in time for the EPA's, the implementation of the EPA's rule. Is that correct? I think from where we sit today, that is correct. I mean, we have a year of pilot study to do, and after that, we've got to move pretty quickly into design and construction. So the next 12 to 18 months are really trying to dig in to identify sources and eliminate them. Great. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's possible in 12 or 18 months to have Fairfax water back to get an update. That would

[00:38:47] be great. This is a big issue. Yep. We'll look at that. No one else? Okay. Supervisor Stork, final word. Do we have, I mean, since the Potomac River has lower levels, is there some, and I assume you've looked at this, is there some way to utilize more water from the Potomac lease in the short term, offset what you may withdraw less from the aquapon? Have you looked at that and identified maybe that as a short term solution that ultimately would maybe give us more time to address the larger issues?

[00:39:21] So we have not looked at necessarily splitting the load. Certainly we could look at that. There are limitations within the transmission system that would preclude us from completely relying on the Potomac. The Potomac, while we don't have a PFAS issue there, comes with a different set of regulatory challenges for another day. But I do want to assure you that we are moving forward with a stopgap treatment that has multiple uses that we hope will tide us over for a period of time.

[00:39:59] It's not the ultimate solution because it generates a lot of solid waste. We're going to have a lot of solid waste regardless, but even more with this stopgap measure. But we are very actively involved in discussions with UOSA. UOSA is looking at things. There may be a suite of interim solutions. I'm not really prepared to discuss them today, but we are looking at every available option. Okay. All right. Thank you, everyone. This will not be the last conversation we'll have on this topic, I'm sure. Ms. Hedges, thank you so much for coming and for

[00:40:37] your work, and we look forward to working with you. And let's go ahead and change out for our

[00:40:41] solid waste management plan update. Okay. Welcome Mr. Adams. Gently. There we go.

[00:41:31] I just had a try a couple times. All right. Good afternoon, everyone. Chairman McKay, members of the board. My name is Matthew Adams with the Solid Waste Management Program. Today's update is a report out in summary of our recent public engagement activities and public input survey completed earlier in October in association with the 20-year Solid Waste management plan update. I will quickly recap some of our initial responses compiled through our participation in our focus groups that was completed by Fairfax County in collaboration with our consultant RRS, which is Resource Recycling Systems, with members of very specific groups

[00:42:11] inside of the public. Next, I will go through and discuss some of the public input campaign, a summary of that activity, then review the responses for the online public input campaign, and the data that was associated to the open comment section at the end.

[00:42:27] Finally, I'll provide another update on the timeline, and hopefully there will be time for questions and comments at the end. As was previously presented, shown here is a list of all of the critical partners we solicited for feedback as focus groups. If any member of the board would like a more detailed analysis of any one group or a final summary, Fairfax Solid Waste Management Program can provide at request.

[00:42:50] The three most important comments that were captured was the importance of creating an equitable system where all residents get access to convenient and available services. The second thing that we heard the most out of was that government oversight and regulation drives change in the commercial and multifamily space in association to diversion and sustainability.

[00:43:18] And finally, there is a substantial opposition to the creation of commercial sanitary districts from the collector community. We heard these items consistently across multiple focus groups. Shifting to the online community-wide public engagement survey, the public input campaign platform was used to launch the survey and to solicit feedback from the community about the strategies being explored by the Solid Waste Management Program to meet the Community-Wide Energy and Climate Action Plan policy goal.

[00:43:54] The survey outreach and engagement campaign utilized multiple tools to get the message out to the community, such as the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services and Office of

Public Affairs social media platforms. YouTube and Facebook ads were purchased. Bus stop ads were posted on major hubs and was shared on several community websites and newsletters.

[00:44:13] The survey was viewed over 16,000 times, and almost 5,000 people completed the survey, and over 2,000 comments were provided in association to the plan and our strategies. Now, looking at the results of the survey, there is some standout information that is important to be presented here to the Environmental Committee.

[00:44:32] It is also important to note that after the BOSEC Committee, a complete analysis of the survey information will be available on the website, the engage.fairfaxcounty.gov slash zero waste website. The map provided shows participation by zip code with an overlay of supervisory districts.

[00:44:50] The number of responses by supervisory districts is an estimate as the zip codes and the districts do not line up perfectly. This is the best we could try to zero in on. I'll present the findings of the survey on the next slides. The most important question asked on the survey and a critical strategy fundamental to the success of Fairfax County's CCAP Zero Waste Initiative is that of unified sanitary districts or countywide standardized collection of waste.

[00:45:19] This model will expand waste collection to all residents, ensuring that residents receive similar waste collection services and empowered Fairfax County solid waste management, the authority to negotiate for the lowest price for collection through the economy of scale for the entire county.

[00:45:35] The idea of a standardized waste collection model is supported by 53% of surveyed residents. Only 18% of residents did not agree with the initiative. It is also important to note that similar counties that went to a community-wide model had their overall rates lowered by about 25 percent. So this is also in agreement with the idea that it's important to note that similar county-wide services, the number one reason why that residents would like to do that is that they want similar services across the county.

[00:46:11] Reviewing the data and association to residents' responses on how much they pay for waste collection. 7% of customers reporting paid at over $700 per year. That's the listed in the other category. So this is well over the estimated average of $560 per customer per Fairfax, I mean, per year. This is also above the Fairfax County program's current rates for county collection, which is $555 per year. So going back to that number of 25% reduction, applying that to the

[00:46:46] average today, the average resident would save $140 per year for waste collection in the community. These savings come from a community-wide model where you pick up efficiencies because trucks do not have to drive all over. They don't skip houses. There's not three trucks in a neighborhood.

[00:47:09] They're very clearly going from one stop to the next to pick up that efficiency. Connected to the unified sanitary districts, the cost and the cost to residents, the survey asked how residents felt about a pay-as-you-throw model or a model that's based around the idea that the more or the less you waste, the more you save.

[00:47:34] This is one of those key strategies that we believe is going to make the most difference in the behavioral change of residents so that they stop generating as much waste. So this will be, this is paired up and kind of in participation, it shows the promise of behavioral change, right?

[00:47:57] 44% of residents approved of this method. They approved that this was a potential, and it shows that there's, you know, 25% of residents would recycle more. Applying that across the 1.3 or 1.2

million residents, that's a significant change in our recycling rate.

[00:48:17] As part of the survey, a question about the community's willingness to invest in the future of Fairfax County was asked. Out of the 4,136 residents that answered the question, 64% of participants were willing to put some amount of money monthly towards sustainability and solid waste management initiatives.

[00:48:38] The average per resident household was $38.64, so $38.64 per year. The Solid Waste Management Program currently is requesting $10 to $12 in fiscal year FY27 to start some of these solid waste initiatives, whether it's zero waste centers expanding into unified sanitary districts.

[00:49:00] And the idea is that we envision that as we move potentially into commercial or multifamily, that those individual sectors would also have a fee, as well to facilitate some of the important initiatives and programs that are necessary to get that program a higher diversion rate, then this will help us meet our 2040 goal. Looking at data surround what stops people from recycling, there's clear leaders to the cause. The strategies presented in the solid waste management plan directly addresses each of the major categories as we focus on recycling education with additional community-based

[00:49:40] recycling and sustainability educators and professionals that will reduce the amount of confusion around recycling, making it easier and more convenient for residents to participate in solid waste management programming, and figure out what they're supposed to do with the materials that they do have to find an alternative means for the resources that they have. There is additional resources allocated for the evaluation of the recycling system to better show the resident that when they throw their waste away, where it goes, what happens to it, what is it turned into.

[00:50:14] These are very important questions that we hear a lot from the residents, and especially inside of the comments about they are very curious about where this goes and what we're doing with that material. So finally, presented here is a graph of the open comment box at the end of the survey.

[00:50:30] These are the five most referenced areas of support and concern for strategies in the plan. It is important to note that the comments that address an expanded recycling, approximately 25 percent specifically supported enhanced and expanded recycling capabilities for plastic waste generated in Fairfax County. And of those approving of extended producer responsibility, 24 percent specifically mentioned plastic bands, plastic bottle bills, and other EPR or extended producer responsibility measures to address plastic waste specifically. Comments associated to the zero

[00:51:05] waste centers were overwhelmingly positive. 92% of individuals that commented on the zero waste approved of them, of the zero waste centers. Additionally, we heard from the community that illegal dumping, organics collection issues, cost and equity concerns were leading concepts that they were concerned about. So the solid waste management program has taken this approval feedback and are conscious of the community's concerns. We believe addressing these issues as a holistic solid waste system is the best path forward. An example of this is that

[00:51:41] if the community invests in community-wide sanitation districts or collection and also has convenient drop-off locations for hard-to-recycle materials, the necessity to illegally dump is drastically decreased. They have a place to take these things and there are means for them to dispose of them that can be conveniently collected. These strategies specifically help those concerns.

[00:52:07] There's an idea of bundling things together to address the cause, not the symptom, right? So finally, this is an updated milestones timeline that currently reflects the status of the solid waste management plan and the upcoming critical dates associated to its delivery.

[00:52:24] The important things to note is that the solid waste will be requesting to provide an update at the December Board of Supervisors Environmental Committee with a summary of the plan and a draft copy of the item to be submitted for review.

[00:52:40] A request for authorization for a public hearing will be presented to the Board of Supervisors in January of 2025 to hold a public hearing in February of 2025. This is to approve the plan that we are currently working on.

[00:52:56] The deadline for submission to DEQ or to the Department of Environmental Quality is April of 2025. So the timeline and the dates are very critical that we meet, that we hit those deadlines so that we can submit our required deadline date.

[00:53:14] So questions? All right. Thank you, Matt. And I want to start just by congratulating you all and the board and everyone who helped spread the word about the survey. I mean, 5,000 responses to a survey is pretty significant.

[00:53:33] clearly did a great job of getting out into the community and sharing this information and sharing the survey. And we have some really strong data as a result. And I know a lot of work went into that. So thank you all for that. Obviously, you know, the opportunity for our residents to save on average $140 per year is pretty significant. If you could just go to slide six, I'm going to posit that it could be even more significant than that. The 27% unsure category, those were folks who

[00:54:11] weren't able to, I guess, recall how much annually they're paying to their private hauler. I'm going to go out on a limb and suggest that it's likely that folks who aren't quite sure how much they're paying might be at the higher end of that, of what folks are paying, because the only way you get to the lower end, and I just went through this every couple of years, is to call around to the different companies and play one against the other to negotiate that lower rate. So I suspect folks who don't remember haven't looked at it in a while, and if you don't look at it in a while,

[00:54:48] your rate goes up each and every year with the haulers hoping you don't notice it. So So regardless, $140 per year is pretty significant. Let's go ahead and open it up.

[00:55:03] I'll start with Mr. Chairman. Yeah, so first a question and then a statement. On the pay-as-you-throw element, I'm just seeing an inconsistency that I hope you can explain to me through the surveying results Because when I look at it on its standalone slide, it seems like people feel pretty good about it.

[00:55:24] But then when I look at it in the open comments, it's the second highest number of comments you got that were negative. So can you help me understand that a little bit better? This is Matthew Adams with Solid Waste. So it's not that they're negative so much as that there are concerns around how it may be implemented, whether it's equitable, how it may affect their cost, how individuals may come through.

[00:55:52] And for example, their neighbor is a bad actor and they want to throw their garbage in your bin to save them money. That's some of the comments that we got. So it's not that they disagree with it. It's that there are concerns around how it would be implemented.

[00:56:10] And again, that's kind of why we have to look at the system as a whole. it helps because out of context, it looks like a contradiction. And the statement I'll make is, you know, not to disparage all the work that went into the survey, because I think it's really important, but it confirms what I think a majority of us already knew, which is that we live in a county that believes in this stuff. We even live in a county where people are willing to pay more for it, even though the result of this might be they're going to pay less. We live in a county where people believe things like the bag tax are not punitive they're actually helpful and helping

[00:56:45] the environment and helping the planet and that we're not going to just be able to recycle the conventional way we do it now our way out of this challenge and so I find this to be a breath of fresh air in terms of confirming many of the reasons why we do this work and why we look forward we don't just rest on our laurels of where we are but we look forward to what is the next chapter going to be to try to reduce the amount of things that we have to recycle as opposed to just a fixation on recycling them alone. And so I really appreciate all the work that was done here. And this is one of the things I said on Tuesday, which is, you know, we have a

[00:57:22] lot harder choices to make in the future than just celebrating recycling. And this one, in my mind, is one of the easiest ones because we can do the right thing, give our constituents more confidence that, you know, there's a regulatory framework in place that they can support and potentially save them a pretty sizable amount of money in the process. And so definitely support the aggressive timeline you have here and, you know, we need to make sure that we adhere to it, as you said. So good presentation. Thank you. Okay, we'll go in this direction this time. Supervisor, I can come

[00:57:59] back if you're not ready. Okay. Supervisor Herdy? You may have to come back to me too. So I understand I get the saving $174 and the, you know, doing the single route. It all makes a lot of sense. My question is, you're going to be bringing us back a plan. Does that include, is that going to include a requirement for pay as you throw, organics, you know, and all that kind of stuff or is this just going to be the plan to move forward with the sanitary districts

[00:58:35] is it going to be all together or is it going to be separate chris errington director of public works we're looking for direction from the board of what you would like to see in that plan okay that's and i think there are kind of two parallel processes here you know one is the plan that's required that has to go to deq that's kind of a kitchen sink whatever we want to have in the kitchen sink and then which the districts would presumably be part of that if that's the board's will but then there's also a parallel process necessary for the just the unified district correct and so we are proceeding forward and with as we communicated in one of our most recent

[00:59:14] non-package memo to the board with going towards a county-wide model and we're looking for direction from the board as to who is included in the county-wide model so residential or commercial and multifamily. Okay. But in that unified thing, are we wrapping into that the pay as you throw or organics or any of that, the requirement to do that? Is this a part of the unified model or is that again? I'll attempt to clarify my response. So based on the direction we understand from the board to date is that the board is interested in moving to a countywide model for residential collection. So we are ready to move forward with that after adoption of the solid waste plan in

[00:59:52] early 2025 that would start the five-year clock that is required by state law before we could actually implement the county-wide procedures we can submit whatever is the will of the board in the

plan to the department of environmental quality in addition as chair walkenshaw mentioned we can do whatever we need to through the usd implementation as well as other county programs to achieve the diversion goals of ccap so we're looking for do you want to include the commercial and multifamily sectors in the countywide implementation now do you want us to not move forward with the residential collection on the current timeline that we're proposing so starting

[01:00:29] in 2025 the five-year clock and then are there options that are more appealing or less appealing for us to consider as mr adams laid out in terms of the other all of the things the zero waste centers as you throw to achieve the diversion goal got it and and so i don't i'll go i thank you for the clarification. And I think residential makes a lot of sense, as it is now. The caution I'll give you is we just made a comparison and talked about saving $174. What is our current

[01:01:00] cost models based on what pickups? So Eric Forbes, Solid Waste Management Program, Supervisor Heritage. So it's trash, MSW collection, yard waste, and recycling per the county requirement and collection. We haven't identified future unified sanitary district service model.

[01:01:23] Our existing county service model includes things like five free bulk pickups. All that would be under consideration with a new program that would go countywide. As you start to incorporate ideals to reduce waste generation, five free bulk pickups might not be the best option for consideration. So all those would be on the table in terms of identifying the service level for the Unified Sanitary Districts.

[01:01:49] So that current model doesn't include additional pickups for organics or weighing trash or any of that kind of stuff right now? That decision has not been made yet. Oh, okay. Yeah, I know. I know the decision had been made, but when we're talking about this saving money, that doesn't include what it's going to cost to do all those other things.

[01:02:09] It's an apples-to-apples comparison on cost. Today, today. That makes sense. Correct. That's all I had to know. Okay. uh thank you mr chairman i do want to make sure that and first of all let me say i totally support this approach i do support moving forward uh with residential maybe multi-family i think we maybe need to look a little bit more into the multi-family i do want to make sure that we um well frankly there are a number of folks including me who live in communities that uh that are townhouse

[01:02:44] communities or condominium communities that get service through their association. And I do want to make sure that, again, on an apples-to-apples basis, that we're not unreasonably pushing them into a more expensive service that doesn't have the equal number of services, if that makes sense, whether it's yard waste or organics or whatever. So I would want to make sure that there is a way to opt out from associations that are currently providing the service as long as that

[01:03:22] opt out does not mean that they're providing less services on things like recycling, organics, that kind of thing. Because I know most of us are coming from a perspective of the single family homeowner, but half of our county doesn't live that way. So I want to make sure we take a look at that. I think that's a very good conversation to have. I mean, one of the things I'm going to recommend, assuming we have the bandwidth to do this, is to do another round of one-on-one meetings with board members to really dive into some of these questions, because I've asked that

[01:03:58] very question. There is a challenge in that when you start carving out particular groups or communities then it becomes less efficient and more more costly potentially for everyone so there's a there's a push and a pull there that i think would be good to to talk through in great detail mr jim thank you

yeah i totally understand and we have to be very careful how we think that through again i totally support the approach i just don't want to be in a situation where raising costs on people that have less expensive homes so that's all thank you stork thank you i

[01:04:36] I absolutely support the approach residential and I'm I'm still open still trying to figure out about a family Well, not it's I think we'd work effectively And and be helpful in the industry overall I I think it's critical that we use a franchise kind of model for the countywide I don't know that's that's not explicitly said when you talk about the countywide model and I just for me area of franchises or Or and I so that's the assumption that I should make as real. Okay. Got it

[01:05:06] The other part of this is what we talked about really in the previous one, which is we know we have, it's a regional-wide issue, and how are we integrating, interacting to create some of the region-wide models that will support this in an efficient and effective way that doesn't result in other emissions or mitigations that would be required at some day in the future.

[01:05:32] So that's kind of the only other thing I wanted to, just to make sure, because we're talking about a huge county, Fairfax County, a lot of volume, a lot of opportunity to kind of drive some of those issues. And I'm just, I'm winning. I'm putting my elbows in the same way, saying we need to be the 800-pound gorilla on some of this stuff and make sure that we're moving things along effectively in that way.

[01:05:52] So thank you. Okay, Palchuk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, thank the three of you on your team again. I very much appreciated the one-on-one and your work on this probably from day one. I think Chris and Eric and your teams and Matt have been looking at what are responsible ways to do this.

[01:06:10] And, again, having both a district that's about half and half residential, commercial, real estate, having looked at the responses we received and making sure that we're setting it up for success, definitely support the plan to move forward with residential.

[01:06:27] I think we can maybe look at pilot study from that if we wanted to move forward for some services or possible paths forward. There are so many different types of commercial, right, without impacting what is working now, which is excellent.

[01:06:46] Having lived both on single-family private, multi-family private, and now single-family county, I've experienced a lot of them, and I think county is the best so far. So I want to make sure we keep that and that we look for, you know, equitable and also efficient ways to expand it.

[01:07:06] It does seem like pay-as-you-throw, we should continue just to study a little bit more if we can, if there's time for that. I don't know if we're able to do a smaller pilot on that. Again, we're huge, and not only are we huge, but luckily we're also surrounded by, I know at least a few jurisdictions, you probably have the whole list, that already have their own full jurisdiction components.

[01:07:35] I don't know that they're doing it the way we want to do it yet, but I assume we've learned a lot from our surrounding jurisdictions and cities and towns across the nation, but also here in the region as we talk about the regional work. And then I guess if we were to, and the zero waste fee, I think you said this to me in our 101, but it could include commercial that are not included because we're going to be building facilities that everyone will have access to in building up a system.

[01:08:07] So it wouldn't just be for residential? Yes, Supervisor Pouchjack, Eric Forbes. That is a decision that the ward can make based on a systematic approach when we build these large-scale facilities for

diversion of materials, the waste sector in terms of the commercial waste is 60% of the waste stream.

[01:08:29] It would be really short-sighted for us to just consider the residential waste as the footprint that we would want to capture and build facilities to or at least expansion ability to. So as we or you decide on fees and how we set them through the zero waste plan, that's definitely part of the consideration is a fee for both sectors to support new infrastructure ultimately that could lead to further diversion for them.

[01:08:55] The glass program is a very similar setup that we have today where glass disposal is a much cheaper rate now per ton than it is for MSW or recycling. So if private sector companies wanted to divert their glass separately, they could definitely do that at a savings.

[01:09:12] And so it would be a similar kind of concept going forward. I think that's fabulous because, as you know, for my district, We're so far away from the two collection sites that I think having easier access and across the county for public or private residents or private owners to be able to have, make it easier, right, to access these sites, to have personnel there to ensure that we're maintaining them and to learn from those and hopefully tie into state and federal incentives moving forward.

[01:09:47] So I support all of this. I guess I just want to be clear that we're going to come back for both of these, both for DEQ and for our program, correct? Okay. And as long as we're sticking to the five-year timeline and the clock as you've designated, I think this is excellent work.

[01:10:08] So thank you. Okay. Supervisor Lusk. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two quick questions on slide nine. You list the most challenging point being confusing messaging. So first is what feedback that we get that was kind of the most specific about what was confusing to our residents around recycling.

[01:10:38] So the thing that we hear the most is, again, is around plastics. What is recyclable? Ones, twos, fives, sometimes sevens, maybe nines. It changes consistently and especially across jurisdictional boundaries.

[01:10:55] So if, you know, living in Fairfax County, you know, I live in Fairfax County and I work in Fairfax County, so the rules are the same when I come to where I am. But if I commute from Prince William to here, they may be different. That's the thing that we hear the most. And that there is also some inconsistencies, and we're working on this as a program, between what the haulers or the collectors are putting out because they're national companies, right? So they say they take some things in this region that they made in Baltimore, but they don't hear. So we're working on that messaging, but that's something that we're hearing consistently. Okay. And that was the second part of my question is what new methods

[01:11:31] or things are we going to deploy to try to address these questions around recycling? Right. So the idea inside of the solid waste management plan currently is the idea of, you know, the zero waste centers and enhanced education and evaluation and outreach programs so that we have staff that are specifically in each magisterial district to be a part of those communities as well as, you know, at the recycling center where people can, it's not just a place to throw your stuff away. It's a place to get questions answered because there are professionals there that know what they're doing and can tell you the long-term life of that process.

[01:12:06] Okay. That makes perfect sense. So I appreciate the response. And then I also want to include multifamily in this effort as well. So thank you. Okay. Supervisor Smith. Thank you. I do think we should go to a unified sanitary district. I do think it's probably fine to start with residential so we can kind of

figure out what we're doing and move forward. You know, you've heard me say before, I do have concerns with the pay as you throw. Equity on that from a lot of different

[01:12:40] levels, you know, the economic situation of a family, the size of a family. There's just a lot of issues there that I have a lot of questions about that. So stepping back big picture about this and how far down the road we go, zero waste is 2% of C-cap. We have a lot of things we want to do. We want to get rid of our cars. We want to have buildings better. And knowing that we only

[01:13:15] have so much money. I think as we move forward, I want to be cautious of where we put those limited dollars and how we do some of this. I think there's a lot of benefits to a unified sanitary district to get into emissions and all those things when you don't have three or four different trucks coming into a neighborhood. So I'm supportive of that. I'm concerned, and I reflect on our last conversation, about you have parts of the country where the state, bigger areas are putting in those centers that you need, right? But if that burden comes just to us, where is the cost

[01:13:50] of that and what can we do? God, I had one more point. Oh, and I got to talk about the purple can, right? We have one in Sully. And you look at the ability of people to come. People come to the Sully Governmental Center in their cars. And so we have a lot of equity issues to solve. We have a lot of communication issues to solve. I think it's good that we're starting on this first route with the unified sanitary districts, but we have a lot of work to do. So thank you very much for all the

[01:14:23] work you've done on this. Okay, thank you. So I think we have a consensus on moving forward with the district, at least residential, still questions around commercial slash multifamily. I do want to encourage everyone to, between now and our December meeting, to have another one-on-one meeting with Matt to, you know, ask the specific questions and raise specific concerns that you have. You know, I will say for me on the pay as you throw, I do think it is important that we

[01:14:57] find a way to incentivize people to produce less waste because the waste is not free. It's not free to us, whether that's through our contract with re-world or other implications of that waste, I think it is hard. I think one of the things we're maybe struggling with is wrapping our heads around exactly what it would look like and how it would be implemented. And I know there's some suggestions or concepts in the NIPs and material, but I think that's something for you all to think about coming back to us with something that's a little bit more specific so we can actually

[01:15:34] understand what it would look like. For me personally, I think simpler is better. Creating a complicated regulatory regime that some might perceive as intrusive or might be intrusive is problematic. But I would love to see a situation where, you know, everybody, people pay the standard rate, which would be 100 and whatever it is per year savings. And if you choose to produce less waste and have a smaller can, you can pay less. To me, that seems like a simple system that could

[01:16:07] incentivize people to use less and produce less waste without punishing anybody for the waste that they produce even currently. But maybe that's more difficult to implement than I know. But I think we need to paint a picture of that for the board before we can make a decision in terms of how to move forward. Okay. All right. Thank you all. We've got 10 minutes left and we

[01:16:34] have a quick operational energy strategy implementation update. Okay. Welcome. We have

[01:17:10] 11 minutes for a 20-minute update, but I think we can get it done. Eight minutes. Is your clock where you need to reset the clocks here? Thank you and good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of

the Board of Supervisors. I am Kevin Smith, Division Manager for Energy Programs in the Office of environmental and energy coordination. My primary role is to lead the implementation of the county's operational energy strategy, and so today I will be presenting updates and highlights

[01:17:43] regarding implementation progress. We're pleased to share that the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments has been awarded a $3.9 million grant from the Federal Highway Administration under the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant Program. Fairfax County government is a subrecipient under COG, and we're eligible for up to $2.5 million over the next six years.

[01:18:08] The CFI grant is a multi-year program that aims to accelerate the installation of publicly accessible charging stations for electric vehicles in locations on public lands with an emphasis on increasing EV access in vulnerable communities and communities whose residents have limited access to at-home charging. Fairfax County's award will fund the installation of charging stations at 25 county-owned properties. These sites are county-wide, but especially in the eastern and southern areas of the county, including the government center, the Monument Drive parking

[01:18:43] garage, and other county office buildings, community centers, libraries, rec centers, and parks. This grant will be a significant boost to our EV charging station rollout, augmenting funds for the installations that we already have planned. Currently, the county has 118 charging ports at 15 county sites. Including other planned projects, we have more than 250 charging ports in the pipeline, which would bring the county total to around 370 charging ports at nearly 60 sites,

[01:19:17] with more than 200 of those ports available to the public by 2030. And these numbers don't even factor in installations that we haven't yet planned or sites in future rounds of the CFI grant program. The CFI grant affords the county an opportunity to accelerate EV infrastructure rollout. Furthermore, the grant funding supports progress towards our CCAP transportation sector goals, since more charging stations will make it more convenient for drivers to own an EV in Fairfax County. It's also worth noting that plans to meet these goals are being developed in the

[01:19:52] forthcoming EV readiness strategy, and the CFI grants will certainly be tied into development of that strategy. In December 2023, an energy upgrade project under the county's Energy Savings Performance Contracting, or ESPC, program was completed at the Department of Housing and Community Development's Pender Building. This was a joint effort between Fairfax County Redevelopment and Housing Authority, HCD, OEEC, and the county's contractor, CMTA. The project

[01:20:25] included installation of a 90-kilowatt rooftop solar system, replacement of rooftop air handling units with high-efficiency models, lighting upgrades to LEDs, and installation of low-E window film. The performance contract includes a guaranteed minimum 22% reduction in annual energy use, and so far in 2024, the building's actually on pace to achieve a 41% reduction.

[01:20:52] That equates to more than $44,000 in avoided utility costs, and it's the equivalent greenhouse gas emissions reductions of taking about 85 gas-powered cars off the road. As part of the performance contract, CMTA is obligated to maintain that savings for a 20-year period, troubleshooting equipment, and along the way to optimize energy performance.

[01:21:18] The long-term nature of the contract also provides the opportunity to explore further upgrades at the facility over time. Recently, the project was awarded a 2024 Leadership Award by the Virginia Energy Efficiency Council. The project really exemplifies effective collaboration with the FCRHA and Fairfax

County government sharing the costs, OEEC and HCD coordinating the project, and CMTA implementing the work.

[01:21:47] This is our first project to combine holistic energy efficiency measures with solar, but it's not the last. The success of this project has led to more projects in various stages of development and construction. And just several weeks ago, another ESPC project was completed at the Reston Community Center, Hunters Woods.

[01:22:08] The project started out as just a solar installation more than two years ago. When RCC expressed their interest in solar to OEEC, we connected them to CMTA, who performed an energy audit at the building. RCC and CMTA identified many more energy efficiency measures in addition to solar.

[01:22:28] Ultimately, the project included a 100-kilowatt rooftop solar system, hot water plant and control system upgrades, lighting upgrades to LEDs, as well as EV charging infrastructure to support a future RCC electric vehicle.

[01:22:44] Being a special tax district, Reston Community Center self-funded the project, and as a result, they will enjoy the energy savings on their utility bills. The project is a great case study for private sector and other community organizations wishing to follow suit, and in fact, the McLean Community Center is pursuing an energy savings performance contract at their facility as well.

[01:23:08] Deep energy retrofits like these at RCC and the Pender Building are an integral part of the strategy to achieve the energy efficiency targets in the OES, so it is important that we replicate the successes at other county buildings. To date, nine ESPC projects have been completed with an average energy savings guarantee of 16%.

[01:23:28] An additional 11 projects are in design or construction, and 10 projects are in the scoping phase after the spring 2024 round of building energy audits. Staff are currently identifying buildings for a spring 2025 round of audits. And finally, I want to put a few key milestones on the committee's radar. First, in the February 2025 BOSEC meeting, OEEC will provide a more in-depth OES update, including reporting on FY24 greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

[01:24:02] Additionally, we will share results from a U.S. Department of Energy analysis of the government's emissions scenarios through the Better Climate Challenge, of which the county is a partner. At an April 2025 full Board of Supervisors meeting, if not before, OEC will present an apply-accept board item for the CFI grant. The exact timing of that meeting will depend on the progress of COGS grant contract negotiations. And at the May 2025 BOSEC meeting, OEEC will provide updates on CCAP and resilient Fairfax implementation,

[01:24:39] including updated metrics and program highlights for 2024. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions. Okay, thank you, and big congratulations on the Energy Efficiency Council's Leadership Award. That's a big deal, so great job, everyone. Any questions from board members, as Mr. Smith shared we're going to have a full update at our feb february 2025 meeting but wanted to give this interim update supervisor palchuk no uh first of all congratulations and and um i see we've got our head of cog here in the room so congratulations um we probably need a sheet of all the acronyms

[01:25:17] that's the only thing you did an excellent job and there were so many there's so much happening very much appreciate your update and any one pagers or a cheat sheet on everything that's Very much appreciated excellent work. Okay Supervisor stork. I think he was chairman I know it's not part

of our operational energy strategy But I know it's essential to the county reaching its goals is how we're doing with schools Park Authority and RHA in there and their efforts obviously parks RHA or us, but but

[01:25:52] Is there some is there some kind of overview that you're doing in some way of knowing how they're So we can get some updates on that as well. I realize we're not the school board, but I think we still need to know how they're doing and whether or not they're moving along consistent with their commitments that we've all made for 2030, 35, and 40.

[01:26:13] Supervisor Storg, I'll speak to the superintendent again on this topic, but I believe Parks and ACD are working well with us. I know that for a fact. Okay. And I've heard from, it's roundabout, so it's not direct, but RHA and Park Authority, I've heard maybe they have issues or concerns or limited disabilities, hurdles, boundaries, and whatever that- I think what Supervisor Smith was alluding to earlier, the issues are the costs, and we have to really hold in on those costs.

[01:26:50] Can't we can't give them something to do without being able to fund them. So we're working through a lot of those little things that Yeah, the board made a commitment down. So I want to come back to that and I think at a minimum the board needs to know if there's some limitation That achieving those goals We need it need to understand that at least be able to either reef reaffirm the goals or I Redo the goals. I do believe during the budget process. You're going to see a lot of the things that we can and cannot do

[01:27:20] Okay, great. Thank you. And, you know, just with respect to schools, Supervisor Historic, as I think you know, I have a meeting pending with the schools on this very topic. So we're in the process of scheduling that meeting. But exactly, your question will be the topic of that meeting.

[01:27:41] Excellent. Thank you. Okay, Supervisor Lesk, final word. Yeah, just real quick. Just interested in, on slide three, you talk about the different 11 county energy projects. If we could, at the next meeting, when you come back, provide kind of the value of the savings from those projects and or, you know, how much energy they'll be able to produce.

[01:28:06] And then on a personal note, I'd love to have a conversation about the Beulah facility location only because it's right adjacent to where the new government center is going to be. So I might want to move that one just based on the adjacency of another facility.

[01:28:25] So thank you. Okay. All right. Thank you, everyone. We're adjourned.