November 8, 2015

Fairfax County Delegation to the Virginia General Assembly
Cc: Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

Dear Fairfax Delegation Official,

The Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations forwards to you its 2016 Legislative Issues for your consideration, use and action. We are available to assist you on any issue.

These issues are compiled from the Federation’s annual Fall survey of Fairfax residents. Residents were asked to rank eight general public services so the Delegation may understand the areas of most concern. Tied for highest rank is Education, Budget/Finance, and Transportation, followed by Public Safety, Conservation/ Environment, Land Use/Development, Human Services, and Citizen Associations Services.

The survey also asked how residents feel about the prospect of tolling on I-66 inside the Beltway: 54% Strongly Disagree or Disagree, 22% had Neutral Opinion, and 24% Agree or Strongly Agree. The survey recorded over 500 comments and concerns. These were consolidated, researched, and evaluated by nine Federation committees resulting in eighteen proposed issues. The Federation membership approved eleven in the final 2016 Legislative Issues, enclosed.

The Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations membership is 93 home owner, civic, and condo associations representing over 60,000 households. Survey respondents live in at least 35 of the 44 Fairfax County zip codes.

The Federation officers and members appreciate you representing our communities. We know you understand our citizens’ concern about these issues and will give them your qualified attention while communicating their status to the Federation.

Queries regarding a specific issue may be directed to the respective issue preparer or to the Legislative Committee Co-Chairs at FedLegislationChr2016@fairfaxfederation.org.

Respectively submitted,

Enclosures:
Summary of the Issues
Legislative Issue Evaluations
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Issue ID: 16E01 - Increased Tobacco Tax for Schools and Health Care

Date Submitted to Federation Board: October 22, 2015

Issue: Because tobacco products sold in Virginia are taxed at a much lower rate than in neighboring states, Virginia is missing the opportunity to earn additional funding.

Background: In Virginia, the cigarette tax per pack is 30 cents. It was increased to this amount in 2004. Even so, Virginia has one of the lowest tobacco taxes in the U.S.

Existing Conditions/Impacts: Among all states, the average cigarette tax per pack is over $1.50. Our neighboring major tobacco-growing states have a higher cigarette tax per pack than Virginia (Kentucky is 60 cents per pack, North Carolina 45 cents, and Tennessee 62 cents). The Campaign for Tobacco Free Kids says: “Tobacco prevention measures also have strong public support in the tobacco growing states as demonstrated by the 71 percent of Virginia voters who supported a 75-cent per pack increase in a January 2004 poll.”

Preferred Position: Support legislation to increase tobacco taxes, allocating the increased revenue to education and health care.

Benefits: Increasing tobacco taxes could help reduce smoking, especially among our youth, and thus reduce smoking related illnesses such as cancer. Young people are disproportionately affected by smoking, and education funding has become increasingly reliant on local property taxes. Thus, we recommend using these funds for education and health care.

Potential Supporters (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations): Educational and health related organizations.

Lead Federation Committee: Education

Prepared by: Nancy Trainer and Ed Saperstein

Email & Phone: edsaperstein@cox.net and ntrainer@cox.net
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**Issue ID:** 16T02 - Limited Transportation Options  

**Date Submitted to Federation Board:** October 22, 2015

**Issue:** A regional transportation network, which is designed with only automobiles in mind, significantly limits traveler’s transportation options, causes severe congestion, and overburdens jurisdictions O&M resources.

**Background:** The Federation recognizes and applauds the tremendous strides made in the previous General Assembly to implement HB2, which provides guidance on investing limited transportation funds for the right projects. Moving ahead, jurisdictions should be required to conduct a more in-depth analysis of potential impact and affects to adjacent roads and local communities. This holds true especially for major transportation improvement and regionally significant projects such as the Fort Belvoir BRAC Program, Transform I-66, and Metro rail expansions.

**Existing Conditions/Impacts:** Residents are concerned with increase traffic congestion, poorly maintained roadways and inadequate transportation management systems. Local roads are experiencing heavy congestion, due to spill-over traffic from 1-95/395/I66/Rt50/Rt29 congestion, significant population growth increase, and a lack of or limited transportation mode options. However, there are no coordinated plans on how to accommodate the traffic increase outside of the major projects.

**Preferred Position:** The Federation supports transportation policy, options and funding for mobility, connectivity, and accessibility to facilitate the easy movement of people and goods throughout Fairfax County. The laws, policies and regulations of the Commonwealth should promote transportation priorities, which include public transportation modes as well as safe, and continuous pedestrian and bicycle transportation throughout the entire transportation network. Priority and funding should be given to the following transportation facilities that are/will be burdened by increased demand, but not limited to:

- **Major Roadway Improvement**
  - Route 1 – Multimodal Expansion
  - Arlington Blvd (US Rt. 50)—
  - Seven Corners interchange complex
  - Lee Highway (US Rt. 29)
  - Old Dominion Dr. (VA Rt. 309)
  - Wilson Avenue
  - General – Complete Street Design for all new and major retrofitting project

- **Public Transportation**
  - Increase Bus Service
  - Metrorail Expansion
  - Metrorail Governance
  - Additional Metro Rossyln station and Metro tunnel from Rosslyn to DC

**Benefits:** Less congestion, safer roads, increased access to affordable transportation options and improves the efficiency and capacity of existing roads.

**Potential Supporters** (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations): Fairfax commuters, Fairfax communities, Transportation

**Lead Federation Committee:** Transportation

**Prepared by:** Karen Campblin, Jeff Parnes

**Email & Phone:** Fedtransportationchr2016@fairfaxfederation.org
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Issue ID: 16P01 - Virginia FOIA Amendment

Date Submitted to Federation Board: 10-22-2015

Issue: Amend the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (VFOIA) to:
1. Specifically allow Law Enforcement reports of incidents involving police shootings to be released to the public.
2. Specifically allow the release of all Law Enforcement records, unless an Exemption 7 is specifically named, is evident, and is demonstrable.

Background:
The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA; 5 U.S.C. §552) allows any person—individual or corporate, citizen or not—to request and obtain, without explanation or justification, existing, identifiable, and unpublished agency records on any topic. Pursuant to FOIA, the public has presumptive access to agency records unless the material falls within any of FOIA’s nine categories of exception.

Exemption 7 [5 U.S.C. §552(b)(7)(A) - (b)(7)(F)] Permits withholding investigatory records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes where:
(A) Interference with law enforcement proceedings can be reasonably expected.
(B) A person would be deprived of a fair trial or an impartial adjudication.
(C) An unwarranted invasion of personal privacy could reasonably be expected.
(D) Revealing a confidential source or information provided by a confidential source could reasonably be expected.
(E) Techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions would be disclosed or guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions would be disclosed, provided such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law.
(F) Endangering the safety or life of any individual could reasonably be expected.

The Virginia Freedom of Information Act (VFOIA), § 2.2-3700 et seq. of the Code of Virginia, guarantees citizens of the Commonwealth and representatives of the media access to public records held by public bodies, public officials, and public employees. A public record is any writing or recording -- regardless of whether it is a paper record, an electronic file, an audio or video recording, or any other format -- that is prepared or owned by, or in the possession of, a public body or its officers, employees, or agents in the transaction of public business. All public records are presumed to be open and may only be withheld if a specific statutory exemption applies.

Existing Conditions/Impacts: Pursuant to the VFOIA, all public records are presumed to be open to the public and may only be withheld if a specific statutory exemption applies; however, on many occasions, police records have been withheld on the basis of a “statutory exemption” regarding the release of Law Enforcement information. Such lack of openness has created an atmosphere of deep distrust of Police and open resentment within the public.

Preferred Position: Amend the Virginia FOIA to specifically allow public release of information related to police-involved shootings and other police practices and procedures related to official police activities. The amended act should additionally encourage transparency and accountability by establishing a culture of disclosure within the organizations.

Benefits: The purpose of the VFOIA is to promote increased awareness of governmental activities. In furthering of this policy, VFOIA already requires that the law be interpreted liberally and in favor of access, and that any exemption must be interpreted narrowly. However, time and time again, access to police records has been denied. The amendments would ensure the specific release of certain information, thus encouraging renewed public trust in Law Enforcement activities and policies.

Potential Supporters (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):
Fairfax County Board of Supervisors; Northern VA State Delegates; Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations (FCFCA);

Lead Federation Committee: Public Safety

Prepared by: Patrick Smaldore and Daniela Cockayne

Email & Phone: patricksmaldore@live.com, 703-528-3935; d3a1@aol.com; 361-739-4836
**Issue ID:** 16E03 - County-City Revenue Equalization

**Date Submitted to Federation Board:** October 22, 2015

**Issue:** Equalizing the revenue-generating authority of counties with that of cities.

**Background:** The distinction between the taxing authority of Virginia’s cities and counties has been a source of contention for many years. Many believe the distinction has lost any rational basis. Fairfax County serves over one million citizens, and yet is tightly constrained in its ability to address the fiscal needs of its community, whereas municipalities serving a fraction of that number enjoy much greater taxation flexibility.

**Existing Conditions/Impacts:** Virginia caps the amount that counties (but not cities) can apply to meals, lodging, cigarettes, and admissions, and requires that meals taxes in counties (but not cities) be subject to approval by referendum. To cite one example: While Fairfax County has been authorized by the Commonwealth to charge a county tobacco tax up to the state amount of $0.30 per package of cigarettes, the city of Alexandria charges $1.15 per package, the city of Fairfax charges $0.85 per package, and the city of Falls Church charges $0.75 per package. Counties have become increasingly reliant on real estate taxes for their revenues. As the state’s financial support for K-12 education has shrunk, county school systems are particularly vulnerable to relying on counties for funding, and counties are (in turn) limited in their ability to raise taxes other than real estate taxes.

**Preferred Position:** The Federation should support legislative efforts to equalize the revenue-generating authority of counties with that of cities.

**Benefits:** Counties increasingly experience the same kinds of pressures as urban areas, such as higher poverty levels and crime, and the costly solutions require a more flexible revenue-generating approach. Equalizing the tax treatment of counties and cities would permit a much-needed diversification of revenue streams in county budgets, and would better allow counties to match their communities’ needs with appropriate resources.

**Potential Supporters** (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations): Educational organizations and county governments.

**Lead Federation Committee:** Education

**Prepared by:** Ed Saperstein and Nancy Trainer

**Email & Phone:** edsaperstein@cox.net and ntrainer@cox.net
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Issue ID: 16T01 - Transportation Funding

Date Submitted to Federation Board: October 22, 2015

Issue: Additional funding sources to support major transportation improvement and service projects are needed to address today’s demands, but it should not create undue financial burden on taxpayers.

Background: Commuters are traveling greater distances to get to their jobs, places of worship and recreation. As such, our limited transportation network and funding sources is significantly overburdened and unable to meet the current transportation demand. However, major improvements to the existing transportation network, particularly I-66, is crucial to maintaining the economic vitality and allure of Fairfax County to businesses and residents.

Existing Conditions/Impacts: Current transportation improvement needs are more than available funding sources. The Virginia Department of Transportation is looking for alternative ways to finance Transform I-66, metro rail extension, tunnel expansion and bridge development projects and is considering (1) Authorizing private entities to develop and operate the expanded highway, and (2) introduce toll-lanes (outside the beltway on I66, inside VDOT will manage the tolling).

Preferred Position: The Federation supports transportation policy, options and funding for mobility, connectivity, and accessibility to facilitate the easy movement of people and goods throughout Fairfax County. While the Federation understands both Fairfax County and the region’s Transportation Planning Board voted to accept additions to its long-range plan including to toll stretches of I-66 both inside and outside the Beltway, we implore careful consideration to the potential financial burden placed on our residents that is being proposed.

1. If a Public-Private Partnership is identified as the most viable alternative, provisions should be made to protect the taxpayer’s investment such as, solicitation should be made through a transparent Competitive Bidding process; Private entities must be made accountable (this includes enforcing fines and other penalties for project failures and delays); Careful consideration that limitations to future transportation projects do not forestall other needed improvements; and Assurances should be made that all identified long-term goal are achievable.

2. Prior to levying tolls on I-66, all efforts must be made to improve alternative transportation options. This includes improving adjacent roads, expanding public transportation (bus and rail service), tunnel expansion and bridge development. Additional analysis and a disparity study should be conducted before determining toll prices.

3. It must be re-emphasized that currently no non-HOV traffic can travel on I66 inside the beltway inbound in the morning or outbound in the evening; so the inside the beltway HOT-lanes proposal as just described is not imposing tolls on currently existing commuters, rather it is allowing those who wish to make use of the HOT lane feature the ability to travel where they could not before. Although tolling is being proposed in the opposite directions where it has not been imposed in the past, the tolls are not expected to be anywhere as steep as the predominate traffic tolling is expected to be.

Benefits: Provision of more affordable travel options, increase roadway safety on adjacent roads, and protect taxpayers.

Potential Supporters (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations): Fairfax commuters, Fairfax communities, Voters, Transportation

Lead Federation Committee: Transportation

Prepared by: Karen Campblin, Jeff Parnes

Email & Phone: Fedtransportationchr2016@fairfaxfederation.org
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### Issue ID: 16E02 - School Opening Date

**Date Submitted to Federation Board:** October 22, 2015

**Issue:** Local school boards are not permitted to set their own opening date of the school year.

**Background:** The “Kings Dominion” Law was adopted by the Virginia General Assembly in the 1980s to help amusement parks and other tourism attractions staff their businesses with a summer labor pool of high school age workers. Today’s economy has changed; the tourism industry is attracting various workers in other age groups. But now the tourism industry contends that a change of law would hurt tourism. Almost all states allow schools to start before Labor Day, including states whose economies are heavily dependent on tourism such as Florida and California. As Virginia Beach Public Schools said in supporting a change in law, “If a pre-Labor Day start was really damaging to a state’s economy, it would have been banned across the country a long time ago.”

**Existing Conditions/Impacts:** The Code of Virginia mandates under the so-called “Kings Dominion” Law that schools open after Labor Day. As a result, FCPS students have less classroom time before standardized tests such as the nationwide Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) tests. The AP and IB tests, for example, figure substantively in college admissions, scholarships, course selection and advanced standing. The current law puts our students at a competitive disadvantage as almost all states allow schools to start before Labor Day. Over half the school divisions in Virginia get waivers to start school before Labor Day, but FCPS does not qualify to participate in the early openings.

**Preferred Position:** Support legislation permitting local school boards to set the opening date of the school year.

**Benefits:**

This would help our FCPS students as it would most likely provide more instructional time before major tests such as the AP and IB.

**Potential Supporters** (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):

FCPS and about 120 of the 130+ school districts in Virginia, the Virginia PTA and Fairfax County PTA, and Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce.

**Lead Federation Committee:** Education

**Prepared by:** Nancy Trainer and Ed Saperstein

**Email & Phone:**  [edsaperstein@cox.net](mailto:edsaperstein@cox.net) and [ntrainer@cox.net](mailto:ntrainer@cox.net)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Issue ID:</strong></th>
<th>16B03 – Taxation Fairness for Fairfax County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Submitted to Federation Board:</strong></td>
<td>10/23/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue:</strong></td>
<td>Fairfax County, part of the Northern Virginia region, is not treated fairly in the distribution of state tax collections and its ability to raise revenue to meet its needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background:</strong></td>
<td>Fairfax County is limited in its sources of tax collection, which limits its options to increase revenue, and sends more money to the state than it gets in return in services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Conditions/Impacts:</strong></td>
<td>1. Fairfax County primarily raises revenue through property taxes and sales taxes. The state limits the sales tax rate that can be charged. There are a few other Business, Professional and Occupational taxes. 2. Suggestions for other taxes include a meals tax, tobacco tax, and local control of sales tax rates. 3. Taxes collected from Fairfax County by the state are not returned in an equal amount of services to the region. As a result Fairfax County residents are subsidizing services in other parts of the state while their own services are not being adequately met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Position:</strong></td>
<td>1. Allow Fairfax County the flexibility to set its own sales tax without state interference. 2. Revise the formulas for allocating state resources so that a greater share of taxes collected in Fairfax County are returned to the local jurisdictions and citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td>1. Fairfax County will be able to decide the appropriate level of taxation for itself. 2. Fairfax County will be able to maintain and improve local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Supporters</strong> (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):</td>
<td>Northern Virginia Boards of Supervisors; local chambers of commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Federation Committee:</strong></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepared by:</strong></td>
<td>Curtis M. Anderson, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email &amp; Phone:</strong></td>
<td><a href="mailto:curtisanderson@cmamlc.com">curtisanderson@cmamlc.com</a>  703.867.4487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Issue ID:
16H01 - Medicaid Expansion

### Date Submitted to Federation Board:
October 25, 2015

### Issue:
Medicaid Expansion involves receiving funds to allow the increase of Waivers that Virginia is entitled to. For the estimated 400,000 that include low income workers, unemployed and disabled individuals who have no insurance, they are at risk without stabilized insured care, which impacts their long term health outcomes as well as the current resources, to cover it all.

### Background:
Virginia has been eligible for the return of taxpayer funds from the Federal government as mandated under the Affordable Health Care Act for 2 years. The House of Delegates has continued to vote down any expansion in the budget. In the meantime, the increase to hospitals’ impacted by this turndown to the Federal Funds which they would also receive, are more taxed than ever, with two hospitals in SW Virginia, having to close their doors due to lack of funds to operate.

### Existing Conditions/Impacts:
Statistics out July 2015 show that in Virginia, 962,183 were enrolled and receiving Medicaid and Chip benefits. The number of eligible citizens right now in addition to this number for Medicaid waivers is approximately 400,000. The argument against the waiver expansion is when the Federal funds cease that the increased waivers will cost the state as much as the Federal payments returned and with such high enrollment, they claim there would be no end in sight. This thinking is flawed and neglects the most important statistics that without any stabilized healthcare being uninsured, that healthcare escalates period. It is a fact that individuals with early stage and treatable chronic diseases do not get care in time. Because they cannot afford any fees for treatment or prescriptions, these individuals put off getting care and then, when diseases are much more serious, they end up in hospital emergency rooms which elevates the overall costs significantly. Treating often an end stage condition is at least 3x the cost versus treatment if caught earlier. With Medicaid Expansion, more individuals would get early intervention, reducing the cost of overall care. More importantly, by having access to health care, individuals with Medicaid can enroll in many more state and federally funded wellness and prevention programs. One example would be nutrition, where bad habits can kill especially those with diabetes, hypertension, and many more conditions, all very treatable without hospital intervention, if monitored.

### Preferred Position:
The Fairfax Federation of Citizens Associations appeals to the House of Virginia legislators to accept the Federal Taxpayer return of monies that 31 other States, as mandated under the Affordable Care Act, have accepted so The Commonwealth of Virginia can underwrite more Medicaid Waivers for the qualified waiting, uninsured, individuals who are qualified under the terms of Medicaid.

### Benefits:
A reduction of costly health care treatment for more moderate health conditions that is now being met through the use of emergency healthcare will be the first benefit. The second but the most important will be that chronic conditions that might have ended in early death because of delayed treatment due to income disadvantages, will change and advantages to have more prevention and wellness with those changing lifestyles can and should, keep health costs at a level that is not more than the current enrollment funded.

### Potential Supporters:
(Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):
Every elected official in the State of Virginia who is a democrat, including the Fairfax BOS, are behind Expansion acceptance. The large majority of faith based advocacy organizations also have joined behind the vote “for”. The professional healthcare industries in the state also support the vote to expand.

### Lead Federation Committee:
Cherie Lejeune, Human Services Co-Chair

### Prepared by:
Cherie Lejeune

### Email & Phone:
latripp24@gmail.com  203-400-3668
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Issue ID:</strong></th>
<th>16C02 - Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Submitted to Federation Board:</strong></td>
<td>10/24/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue:</strong></td>
<td>Virginia needs to reduce greenhouse gas (GhG) emissions and adapt to climate change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**
1) Virginia is already experiencing the effects of climate change in the form of increased flooding in Hampton Roads and elsewhere in Virginia.
2) The EPA has proposed regulations that will require the Commonwealth to develop regulations to reduce greenhouse gasses from existing power plants.

**Existing Conditions/Impacts:**
Failure to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions will cause drastic impacts to the economy of the Commonwealth. Climate Change is causing sea level rise which has lead to increase flooding in tidewater Virginia. Increased carbon dioxide concentrations in the ocean causes acidification which will be devastating to the oyster and crab industry. Warmer ocean waters will lead to more intense or more frequent tropical storms.

**Preferred Position:**
Virginia should join the North Eastern States in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) and use the proceeds from the sale of GhG emission credits to:
- Help communities like coastal Virginia adapt to climate change,
- Help consumers reduce their energy consumption through energy efficiency, and
- Help southwestern Virginia adapt a low carbon economy.

**Benefits:**
The Coastal Protection Act will encourage the development of a domestic renewable energy economy and fund adaptation and energy efficiency purchases.

**Potential Supporters** (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):
In the 2015 session The Coastal Protection Act was introduced in both houses; HB2205 was introduced by Villanueva and SB1428 was introduced by McEachin. The bill failed in this year’s session it has been building support.

**Lead Federation Committee:** Environment

**Prepared by:** Flint Webb, Environment Chair.

**Email & Phone:** FHWebb@aol.com, (h) 703-560-5203, (w) x571-526-7706, (c) 703-582-8094
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**Issue ID:** 16G01 – Fair Redistricting  
**Date Submitted to Federation Board:** 22 October 2015  

**Issue:** The current redistricting process is biased and, therefore, unfair.

**Background:** Current redistricting frequently has as one of its goals ensuring that current legislators will be re-elected. Re-election is ensured by grouping precincts on the basis of their party votes. The process is called gerrymandering.

**Existing Conditions/Impacts:** Gerrymandering frequently groups people of considerably different interests and persuasions and frequently deprives voters from electing new officials. Virginia’s Congressional Districts 10 and 11 are typical of the results of gerrymandering. Voters would be better represented if all elections for political office were competitive.

**Preferred Position:** Redistricting should be done such that most political races are competitive. A constitutional amendment might be used or the Iowa plan might be used. The Iowa plan would be the easier method. If it does not result in competitive races, a constitutional amendment would be used. The constitutional amendment might require that the district have a ratio of north-south to east-west dimensions of, for example, between 0.8 and 1.25.

**Benefits:** The beneficiaries of the resolution would be the voters.

**Potential Supporters** (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations): Voters, including the League of Women Voters

**Lead Federation Committee:** Governance / Land Use  
**Prepared by:** Fred Costello  
**Email & Phone:** fac@facinc.com 703-620-4942
**Issue ID:** 16C03 - Chesapeake Bay Protection

**Date Submitted to Federation Board:** 10/24/15

### Issue:
Additional funding sources and tighter regulations to protect the waters of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries from “nonpoint source pollution” also known as polluted runoff throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

### Background:
Previously, the protection of the Chesapeake Bay was acknowledged as the primary responsibility of Counties east of the I-95 corridor. The evolving consensus by conservation groups now recognizes the contribution of storm water pollution from other parts of the Commonwealth and their tributaries that drain to the bay either directly or indirectly through other tributaries. The rivers and streams in the Chesapeake Bay watershed send about 51 billion gallons of fresh water into the Bay each day. Almost 90 percent of this fresh water comes from just five of these tributaries - four of which are in or border the Commonwealth: the Potomac, Rappahannock, York and James.

### Existing Conditions/Impacts:
Though responsible for greater percentages of pollution, agriculture and sewage treatment plants have made progress to minimize their environmental impact on our local water resources. Now, urban and suburban polluted runoff is the only major source of nitrogen pollution in the Bay still growing. Better stormwater management through public/private partnerships and individual/community practices are becoming increasingly necessary to improve local stream conditions as well as the overall health of the Bay. Almost three-fourths of the state's 8 million residents live within the watershed with over half of Virginia's streams and rivers flowing to the Bay. According to [2012 305(b)/303(d) Water Quality Assessment Integrated Report](#), 71% of assessed rivers in the Commonwealth are considered impaired.

### Preferred Position:
1.) Require all counties with streams that directly or indirectly drain to the Chesapeake Bay to have more strict regulations reducing sediment and nutrient loads.
2.) The Federation encourages continued funding of the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund (SLAF) and includes supporting the position of Senator Emmett Hanger and Delegate Ed Scotts’ proposed budget amendments in early this year (2015) that would authorize an additional $40 million in Virginia Public Building Authority bonds to support the fund. Note that the additional grant funding would assist localities in accomplishing mandated upgrades to their urban stormwater systems.

### Benefits:
Improvement of stormwater systems would help localities meet mandated water quality standards and improve flood control. There are hundreds of thousands of creeks, streams and rivers in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. These tributaries send fresh water into the Bay and offer vital habitat to aquatic plants and animals. These tributaries also provide people with public access points where they can fish, boat and swim. Local stormwater management can conserve the health of local streams, serve in flood protection, provide recreation, fish and wildlife benefits and increase overall community wellness.

### Potential Supporters (Community leaders, Public/Private Partnership Opportunities, Organizations):
Potentially - community “Friends of” organizations, homeowner organizations, local conservation groups, recreational sport organizations, fishing and wildlife organizations, Plant NoVa Natives, NVSWCD, FCRP, FCFCA

### Lead Federation Committee:
Environment & Conservation

### Prepared by:
Flint Webb & Monica Billger

**Email & Phone:** [fedEnvironmentchr2016@FairfaxFederation.org](mailto:fedEnvironmentchr2016@FairfaxFederation.org), Webb 703-582-8094, Billger 571-278-5535
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