

AGENDA
HAMPTON ROADS PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING
October 17, 2013

1. Call to Order
2. Approval/Modification of Agenda

CLOSED SESSION

3. Personnel

WORKSHOP AGENDA

4. 2014 Legislative Agenda
5. Economic Impact of the Department of Defense
6. FY 2013 Audit Report

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Employee Recognition
8. Submitted Public Comments
9. Public Comment Period
10. Approval of Consent Items
 - A. Minutes of September 19, 2013 Meeting
 - B. Treasurer's Report
 - C. Regional Reviews – Monthly Status Report
 1. PNRS Reviews
 2. Environmental Impact Assessment/Statement Review
 - D. FY 2013 Audit Report
11. Nominating Committee Report/Election of Officers
12. HRPDC Three-Month Tentative Schedule
13. Project Status Reports and Advisory Committee Summaries
14. Correspondence of Interest
15. For Your Information
16. Old/New Business

ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #1: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting will be called to order by the Chair at 9:30 a.m.

ITEM #2: APPROVAL/MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

Members are provided an opportunity to add or delete items from the agenda. Any item for which a member desires consideration from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission should be submitted at this time, as opposed to under “Old/New Business.”

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM # 3: CLOSED MEETING – PERSONNEL

SUBJECT:

In accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission will go into a closed meeting in accordance with Virginia Code §2.2-3711.A.1 for the purpose of discussing the performance and salary of the Executive Director.

BACKGROUND:

The Personnel and Budget Committee will meet with the Executive Director on October 17, 2013 prior to the Annual Commission Meeting for purposes of an annual performance review. The results and recommendations of that meeting will be discussed with the Commission in a closed meeting under §2.2-3711.A.1 of the Code of Virginia.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Convene a closed session of the HRPDC to discuss the performance and salary adjustment of the Executive Director. This closed meeting will be restricted to only those matters specifically exempted from disclosure.

AGENDA NOTE - HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #4: 2014 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

SUBJECT:

Develop a legislative agenda for the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for the 2014 Session of the Virginia General Assembly.

BACKGROUND:

In preparation for the 2014 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, the HRPDC staff recommends the HRPDC adopt a legislative agenda.

The HRPDC staff has developed the attached agenda with input from the various advisory committees to focus on issues and programs being carried out by the HRPDC in cooperation with the region's localities. However, this draft legislative agenda is not inclusive of all potential state and federal legislative matters that are of interest to the region's localities. It reflects the legislative statements and agendas of the Virginia Municipal League (VML), Virginia Association of Counties (VACO), American Planning Association – Virginia Chapter and the member localities.

HRPDC Public Information and Community Affairs Administrator, Ms. Julia Hillegass, will provide an overview of the proposed Legislative Agenda.

Attachment 4

Note: This item will be considered for action by the Commission at the November 21, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting

HAMPTON ROADS PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION 2014 LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

In preparation for the 2014 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, the staff of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission has developed this 2014 Legislative Agenda. It outlines, based on ongoing HRPDC projects, prior HRPDC legislative positions and work of the region's localities, a series of issues that warrant regional attention during the upcoming legislative session. It also provides a recommendation or recommendations addressing each of the issues for consideration by the HRPDC.

Uranium Mining

In September 2012, the HRPDC adopted Resolution 2012-02 reaffirming its opposition to uranium mining and to the lifting of the moratorium on uranium mining. Based on review of the several scientific studies that have been completed and the ongoing work of the state's Uranium Mining Work Group, the HRPDC does not believe that an adequate regulatory framework to address mining operations and waste disposal is either in place or likely to be developed and funded. The Hampton Roads region is dependent upon water from Lake Gaston as an integral component of the region's water supply. A catastrophic incident associated with uranium mining upstream from Lake Gaston, while of small probability, would result in enormous and unacceptable adverse consequences to this region.

The General Assembly of Virginia is requested to maintain the existing moratorium on uranium mining in Virginia.

Virginia Housing Trust Fund

Housing trust funds are distinct funds established by city, county, or state governments that receive ongoing dedicated sources of public funding to support the preservation and production of affordable housing opportunities for families and individuals to access decent affordable housing. Virginia received a total of \$66 million from the National Mortgage Settlement funds. The General Assembly created the Virginia Housing Trust Fund last year utilizing \$7 million of this settlement to provide funding in the second year of the 2012-14 biennium. The HRPDC supports legislation that would appropriate a dedicated funding stream to the VHTF for future housing programs and projects.

Emergency Management Funding

The frequent occurrence of natural disasters affecting the Hampton Roads area has stretched the budgets and capacity of local emergency managers. HRPDC supports the Virginia Emergency Management Association's intention to propose the establishment of a dedicated funding stream for emergency management to provide adequate funding.

Emergency Planning

HRPDC supports legislation, proposed previously by the Virginia Emergency Management Association, requiring back-up power, development and certification of emergency plans for nursing homes, assisted living facilities, adult day care centers, and child day centers. The HRPDC supports efforts to minimize or eliminate costs for the required emergency planning for these facilities.

State Support for Readily Deployable Assets

The HRPDC supports efforts to provide liability coverage, hold harmless, and workers compensation to emergency responders. Additionally, the HRPDC supports the use of State resources for sustaining and replacing used/damaged equipment and supplies for the Hampton Roads Medical Metropolitan System Strike Team (HRMMST), Hampton Roads Incident Management Team (HRIMT), and other regional readily deployable assets, without activating the State Mutual Aid agreement and/or obtaining a federal emergency declaration.

Stormwater Management Program

In 2012, the General Assembly passed HB1065/SB407 that integrated the Erosion and Sediment Control Act, Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, Virginia Stormwater Management Act and expanded the requirement to administer a qualified local program to all localities within the Commonwealth. While the HRPDC supported the intent of these Bills, their implementation has created confusion at the local level and identified inconsistencies in language. The HRPDC supports continued revision of the integrated stormwater management laws to provide clarity and consistency.

HRPDC also supports amending the Stormwater Management Act to provide localities required to adopt VSMP for land-disturbing activities with the authorities necessary to implement and enforce the provisions of 10.1-603.3 and associated regulations, including the Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater from Construction Activities. Localities may need explicit authority to conduct post construction inspection of stormwater BMPs on properties outside of MS4 permit boundaries.

Expansion of the Nutrient Credit Exchange Program

In 2012, the General Assembly directed the Soil and Water Conservation Board to adopt regulations to establish statewide procedures for the certification of nutrient credits other than those generated by waste water point sources or certified by the State Water Control Board. HRPDC supported this action as it will allow the certification of credits generated by urban stormwater improvements and plans to actively participate in the development of these regulations. Due to the development of these regulations the HRPDC does not anticipate that any nutrient trading legislation will be proposed during the 2014 session. However, we continue to advocate for a nutrient trading program that protects local water quality and allows localities the authority to review any trading proposed within their jurisdiction.

Water Quality Funding

Virginia's local governments face mounting costs for water quality improvements for sewage treatment plants, urban stormwater, combined sewer overflows (CSOs), and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs). In response to federal and state legislation, regulation and policies, the federal government and the Commonwealth should provide adequate funding for these water quality improvements.

The HRPDC urges the General Assembly to maintain its commitment to water quality through dedicated and adequate state appropriations to the Water Quality Improvement Fund and to make full and timely payments under point source upgrade contracts with local governments. Concurrently, the General Assembly should address costs associated with the permit requirements of Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permits, associated new EPA regulations and the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Virginia Watershed Implementation Plan. In 2013, the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund was established with a \$35M budget in order to reduce non-point source pollution from stormwater runoff. The HRPDC encourages the General Assembly to approve a second appropriation for the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund and increase the funding to support the installation of additional stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs).

VDOT Requirements for Locality-owned Drainage Easements

VDOT has recently determined that drainage easements that convey runoff from the State maintained roadways must be owned by the locality. In counties, the secondary highway system, including streets developed for subdivisions and accepted into the secondary system, are County roads for which VDOT has operational control. If the locality will not accept the drainage easements, then VDOT will not accept maintenance responsibilities for these roads. Localities currently require homeowners associations to own the drainage easements and sign a maintenance agreement with the locality. VDOT is unnecessarily burdening localities with additional maintenance responsibilities.

Advertising of Required Public Notices

Many provisions of the Code of Virginia require the advertising of public notices in a "newspaper published or having general circulation in the locality." As newspaper circulation continues to decline and citizens look increasingly to the internet for news and information, it appears that alternative means of providing public notice would be appropriate. Increasingly, state agencies are using their websites and other electronic media to handle public notice requirements. The HRPDC supports legislation that would allow local governments, planning district commissions and other regional agencies to publish legal advertisements and public notices on their website and to use other media outlets, such as local public access channels, in order to meet legislative requirements for public notices.

Federal Facilities

The Hampton Roads region relies significantly on the defense sector. Proposals are moving forward from Hampton Roads localities to maintain state support for the industry and for protection of existing facilities. To assist its member localities to ensure the continued viability of the defense presence in Hampton Roads, the HRPDC supports proposals to:

- Maintain state funding for the land acquisition program supporting mitigation of encroachment around NAS Oceana in Virginia Beach and NALF Fentress in Chesapeake.
- Maintain state funding for the land acquisition program supporting mitigation of encroachment around Joint Base Langley-Fort Eustis in Hampton.
- Amend legislation governing the Federal Action Contingency Trust (FACT) Fund to clarify that such funds are to be used to encourage business growth and protect existing military resources and use of these funds is not contingent upon a new Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round or BRAC-like action.
- Ensure that DoD encroachment concerns are given full consideration when making onshore and offshore land use decisions affecting military bases in Hampton Roads. Specifically, carefully monitor all onshore and offshore energy proposals; support the development of any needed JLUS and all anti-encroachment activities.

Higher Education

The HRPDC recognizes the important role that public institutions of higher education play in contributing to the economic vitality of the Commonwealth and the well-being of its citizens. Hampton Roads is home to several public institutions with clear commitments to providing access to a top-quality and affordable higher education experience. The HRPDC supports proposals to ensure adequate funding to hire enough full-time faculty to bring the faculty student ratios in line with the average of 17-1. In addition, the HRPDC supports elevating the Base Adequacy Funding percentage of all institutions in the region.

Recycling Requirements

Each locality in the Commonwealth, individually or through a regional collaboration, is required to achieve a 25% recycling rate. A key constraint to local ability to achieve or exceed this recycling rate has been the lack of markets for the materials as well as access to industries that recycle or reuse the material. Recycling is an economic development tool as well as an environmental tool.

Despite increased public awareness of the benefits of recycling, beverage container recycling has been declining in recent years, while the amount of beverage containers that are being sold and consumed has increased over time.

The HRPDC supports legislation that would:

- Grant localities the authority to require certain businesses to recycle glass.
- Prioritize incentives to businesses that recycle materials, such as glass, paper and electronics, while concurrently providing new employment opportunities.

Plastic Bags

Plastic bags that are not properly disposed of contribute to unsightly littering of Virginia's landscape, contaminate various agricultural crops, contribute to mortality of aquatic species and birds and contribute to urban stormwater problems. While voluntary recycling programs and substitution of reusable shopping bags has had some success in reducing the volume of plastic bags that must be disposed of, improper disposal of plastic bags appears to be increasing. In reaction to the problems associated with improper disposal of plastic bags, restrictions on the use of plastic bags by localities throughout the country is becoming more widespread. The HRPDC supports legislation that would provide localities the option of restrictions on the use of plastic bags through increased voluntary programs, incentives, taxes or outright bans.

Septic Tanks

The Chesapeake Bay TMDL establishes limits on the amount of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment that can enter the Bay. As part of the effort to meet the nitrogen limits set forth in the TMDL, reductions in the nitrogen load from the onsite sewage system sector must be achieved. Monitoring of septic tank pump out (once per 5 years), as required by the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, should be conducted by the Virginia Department of Health not by localities. The HRPDC supports the following recommendations:

- Seek legislative changes necessary to establish state tax credits for upgrade/replacement of existing conventional systems with nitrogen reducing systems, or connection to existing sewer.
- Look into steps for gaining General Assembly approval to grant all counties the authority to require hook-ups to existing sewer lines when appropriate.
- Develop, in cooperation with state agencies, a legislative proposal to establish a cost share program, similar to what is done with the Agricultural BMP Cost Share Program, to assist with the cost of required upgrades or replacements and incentivize non-failing septic system owners to upgrade to a denitrifying system.
- Amend the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act to require that regulation and enforcement of septic tank pump out requirements be conducted by the Virginia Department of Health. Localities would continue to maintain an inventory and tracking system for septic tank locations.

Sea Level Rise and Coastal Flooding

The HRPDC has identified the issue of sea level rise as a critical issue facing Hampton Roads. HRPDC staff studies to date have focused on the magnitude of the problem and its potential implications for the region. Ongoing work is addressing options for adaptation. The Virginia Institute of Marine Science, in cooperation with coastal localities and planning district commissions, recently finished a one-year study examining the severity of recurrent flooding in Tidewater Virginia. The Secure Commonwealth Panel has established a sub-panel to consider how to implement the recommendations from the VIMS report.

The HRPDC requests that the appropriate natural resource and emergency management agencies of the Commonwealth work in partnership with Virginia's coastal planning districts to investigate and implement the VIMS study's recommendations. The HRPDC supports this proposed initiative as the next step, along with the Secure Commonwealth Panel's work, in addressing the critical issue of coastal flooding in Hampton Roads and the rest of Tidewater Virginia.

Agriculture Programs

HRPDC supports a well-financed and fully staffed state program to address the problem of non-point source runoff from agricultural operations. The program continue to include cost-share assistance to agriculture and should effectively encourage and incentivize implementation of priority best management practices such as nutrient management planning, use of cover crops, continuous no-till farming, development of forested riparian buffers, livestock stream exclusion and other practices essential to meeting agriculture's share of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and Virginia Watershed Implementation Plan.

Expand Authority for Tree Canopy Requirements

HRPDC supports the amendment of Virginia Code Section 15.2-961.1 that would enable all Virginia localities to adopt an ordinance containing a set of tree canopy preservation requirements based on development density. Section 15.2-961.1 was adopted during the 2008 General Assembly session and is currently applicable only to the localities within Planning District Eight. Increasing the urban tree canopy is an inexpensive method to reduce nutrient loading through runoff reduction and will allow localities to reduce the cost of achieving nutrient reductions for urban stormwater.

Increase Funding to PDCs

In FY 2001, HRPDC received \$366,628 or \$0.24 per capita in basic funding from the Commonwealth's budget through the Department of Housing and Community Development. The legislative agenda of the Virginia Association of Counties supports overall funding of Virginia's Planning District Commissions at a level of \$0.35 per capita or a minimum of \$100,000 per commission, whichever is greater.

The Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) is relying on PDCs to facilitate the development of locality specific nutrient reductions in Phase II of the State's Watershed Implementation Plan.

HRPDC supports an increase in funding to Virginia's Planning District Commissions by \$500,000.

Collaborative Government Initiative

The Collaborative Government Initiative seeks to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Virginia government by improving the capacity of Planning District Commissions (PDCs) to explore opportunities for additional collaboration and thereby reduce the overall cost and scope of governing. This proposal is not about regional government. This proposal seeks to incent local governments to think regionally in approaching common problems and services they already provide. In some instances, the initiative can help state and local government more effectively approach new services where they are needed or mandated.

To take advantage of the potential of costs savings and more efficient and effective regional collaboration, JLARC recommended that the General Assembly may wish to consider "providing financial incentives to encourage local governments, including local school divisions, to voluntarily pursue collaboration opportunities.

The CGI seeks to implement that recommendation in two ways. First to increase the base funding of PDCs by \$500,000 per year and second to implement, as suggested by JLARC a series of pilot program grants that in JLARC's words "demonstrate the potential to yield state benefits."

Transportation

The HRPDC supports the transportation proposals contained in the Legislative Agenda of the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization.

State Fees on Local Government Services (water, sewer, solid waste)

HRPDC strongly opposes the imposition of a state fee, tax or surcharge on water, sewer, solid waste or any service provided by a local government or authority to finance the nutrient reductions imposed by the Chesapeake Bay TMDL.

Unfunded Mandates

HRPDC opposes unfunded mandates by the Commonwealth. When funding for a mandated program is altered, the mandate should be suspended until full funding is restored. When legislation with a cost to localities is passed by the General Assembly, the cost should be borne by the state, and the legislation should contain a sunset clause providing that the mandate is not binding on localities until funding by the Commonwealth is provided. Furthermore, HRPDC opposes the shifting of fiscal responsibility from the state to localities

for existing programs. Any unfunded mandate or shifting of responsibility, such as maintenance of state transportation facilities or litter control, should be accompanied by a full fiscal and program analysis to determine the relative costs to the state and to the locality and to assure the state is meeting its full funding responsibility before taking effect.

DRAFT

AGENDA NOTE - HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #5: ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT:

Report on the economic impact of the defense presence in Hampton Roads

BACKGROUND:

The Department of Defense (DoD) is an integral component of the regional economy. Fluctuations in defense spending and changes in defense strategy can have a significant impact on the region's economic well-being. To gain a better understanding of the current and potential impact of the defense presence, staff has conducted an in-depth analysis of the DoD's regional economic footprint. This analysis will enable a more accurate assessment of the economic role of the DoD as well as the impact of future DoD actions.

Mr. James A. Clary, Senior Economist, will present to the Commission the impacts of the defense presence in Hampton Roads.

STAFF COMMENTARY:

The HRPDC staff periodically conducts in-depth analysis to gain a more complete understanding of the regional economy. As the sources and availability of data are constantly changing, it is important re-evaluate existing information and assess the validity of new data to ensure that information and analysis are presented in an accurate manner. The analysis of the DoD presence in Hampton Roads represents staff's most recent effort to fully understand the role of the defense presence in the regional economy.

Enclosure 5 – Economic Impact of the Department of Defense in Hampton Roads

Note: This item will be considered for action by the Commission at the November 21, 2013 Executive Committee Meeting.

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #6: FY 2013 AUDIT REPORT

SUBJECT:

The FY 2013 Audit Report has been completed.

BACKGROUND:

Dixon, Hughes, Goodman LLP has completed its annual review of the FY 2013 financial statements of the HRPDC and their Independent Auditors' Report states that they present fairly (*formerly known as an Unqualified Opinion*), in all material respects the financial position of the HRPDC. There were no material weaknesses or deficiencies in any of the internal controls or processes of the HRPDC financial activity, and all information was free of any material misstatements.

HRPDC Chief Financial Officer, Ms. Nancy Collins, will brief the Commission on the audit. Both Ms. Collins, and Ms. Christine Duncan, Dixon, Hughes, Goodman, will be available to address any questions the Commission may have.

Enclosure 6-A – Report to the Board of Directors

Enclosure 6-B – Financial Statements for Year Ended June 2013 and 2012

Note: This item will be presented for action under Agenda Item #10-D

AGENDA NOTE - HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #7: EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION

The employees noted below will be recognized for years of service on a plaque prominently located at the HRPDC. These employees reached milestone anniversaries between November 1, 2012, and October 31, 2013.

Five Years

James Clary
Sharon Lawrence
Ben McFarlane
Jessica Nappi
John Sadler
Chris Vaigneur

Fifteen Years

Nancy Collins
Julia Hillegass
Kelli Peterson
Tara Walker

Twenty Years

Rob Case

Thirty-Five Years

Dwight Farmer

Forty-Five Years

Joe Paulus

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Acknowledge individuals.

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #8: SUBMITTED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There are no recently submitted written public comments. Any new written public comments will be distributed as a handout at the meeting.

ITEM #9: PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Members of the public are invited to address the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission. Each speaker is limited to three minutes.

ITEM #10: APPROVAL OF REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

A. MINUTES

The Minutes of the HRPDC Executive Committee meeting of September 19, 2013 are attached.

Attachment 10-A

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The HRPDC staff recommends approval of the minutes.

B. TREASURER'S REPORT

The Balance Sheet and Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for August 2013 are attached. This statement reflects the financial status of the HRPDC as a whole.

Attachment 10-B

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The HRPDC staff recommends the Treasurer's Report be accepted.

C. REGIONAL REVIEWS

1. PNRS

The HRPDC staff is routinely involved in the review of applications for grants to support projects involving federal or state funding. To ensure that all Commissioners are aware of projects being reviewed, brief summaries of these projects and anticipated review schedules are included in the Agenda. The HRPDC staff will continue to request comments directly from staff in localities that appear to be directly affected by a project. Review and comment by more than one locality is requested when a project may affect the entire region or a sub-regional area. There were no applications submitted this month.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: None required.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT/STATEMENT REVIEW

The HRPDC staff is routinely involved in the review of environmental impact assessments and statements for projects involving federal funding or permits as well as state development projects. To ensure that all Commissioners are aware of projects being reviewed, brief summaries of these projects and anticipated review schedules are included. The HRPDC staff will continue to request comments directly from staff in localities that appear to be directly affected by a project. There were no outstanding comments as of October 4, 2013 on these projects.

Attachment 10-C2

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

None required.

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes of September 19, 2013

The Executive Committee Meeting of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission was called to order at 9:30 a.m. in the Regional Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Thomas Shepperd, Chairman (YK)
Kenneth Wright, Vice Chairman (PO)
James O. McReynolds, Treasurer (YK)
Dr. Ella P. Ward (CH)
Randy Martin (FR)
Brenda Garton (GL)*
Will J. Moffett (HA)
Dee Dee Darden (IW)

Mary Jones (JC)
McKinley Price (NN)
Marcus Jones (NO)
J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)
Michael W. Johnson (SH)
Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)
Tyrone Franklin (SY)
Louis R. Jones (VB)
Jackson C. Tuttle, II (WM)

Executive Director:

Dwight L. Farmer

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ABSENT)

Christopher Stuart (HA)

Paul D. Fraim (NO)

OTHER COMMISSIONERS:

Debbie Ritter (CH)*
Barry Cheatham (FR)
Douglas Caskey (IW)
Robert Middaugh (JC)
Jim Bourey (NN)
Sharon Scott (NN)

John L. Rowe (PO)
Barry Porter (SH)
John Seward (SY)
Robert Dyer (VB)
Barbara Henley (VB)
Clyde Haulman (WM)

*Late arrival or early departure.

OTHERS RECORDED ATTENDING:

Bryan Pennington, Jeff Raliski, Ron Williams (NO); Michael King, Jerri Wilson, (NN); Paige D. Cherry, Nita Mensia-Joseph, Sherri Neil (PO); Sherry Hunt, Albert Moor, Eric Nielsen (SU); Dave Hansen, Robert Matthias (VB); Steve Romine, LeClair Ryan; Ellis James, Sierra Club Observer; Peter Huber, Willcox & Savage; Cathy Aiello, Aiello Enterprises, Inc.; John Gergely, Citizen; Staff: Randy Keaton, Camelia Ravanbakht, Shernita Bethea, Curtis Brown, Rick Case, Jennifer Coleman, Nancy Collins, Katie Cullipher, Rebekah Eastep, Kathlene Grauberger, Greg Grootendorst, Julia Hillegass, Jim Hummer, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Mike Long, Jai McBride, Benjamin McFarlane, Kendall Miller, Tiffany Smith, Jennifer Tribo, Joe Turner, Chris Vaigneur.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Chairman Shepperd recognized and thanked Commissioner W. Douglas Caskey for his dedication to the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC).

Commissioner Caskey expressed his gratitude and reiterated the importance of the HRPDC to the Hampton Roads region.

Commissioner Brenda Garton arrives.

APPROVAL/MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

Chairman Shepperd asked if there were any modifications or additions/deletions to the agenda.

Commissioner Kenneth Wright Moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner McKinley Price. The Motion Carried.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

HRPDC EXTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS POLICY

Mr. Randy Keaton, HRPDC Deputy Executive Director, briefed the Commission on the newly developed external communications policy for the HRPDC and the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO). The Executive Director is the primary spokesperson and handles all non-routine media requests, which can include sensitive or personnel topics. Subsequent spokespersons include the Deputy Executive Directors and Principals, who have the ability to address routine media requests.

Authorized sites, such as the HRPDC and HRTPO websites, are defined and guidelines are provided on including other websites contained within those sites. Social networking sites attain the same level of importance as authorized sites and will be monitored by staff on a daily basis. Additionally, all social media must be coordinated through the Public Communications Department.

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) has been included in the new policy and details the following:

- FOIA rights
- Making a request from the Agency
- Responding to requests
- Associated costs

Mr. Keaton outlined the personal use of media during both working and non-working hours. He stated employees need to be cognizant about negative comments in regards to their employer, harassment and discrimination, respecting copyrights and providing disclaimers.

The security guidelines which encompass the password policy and disciplinary actions for any policy violations were also included. In addition, Ms. Susan Blackman of Willcox and Savage P.C., extensively reviewed the policy.

Chairman Shepperd reiterated the unintended consequences of not possessing a quality external communications policy, and reminded the Commission the Chairman does not speak for the Commission, but passed Resolutions publically stating the Commission's positions.

Commissioner Debbie Ritter arrives

FY 2012-2013 ANNUAL REPORT TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Randy Keaton, HRPDC Deputy Executive Director, informed the Commission the annual report is required by the Regional Cooperation Act and is organized around the duties of Planning District Commissions (PDC) outlined in the State code.

Strategic plan development and implementation includes the development of a comprehensive strategic plan, entitled Envision Hampton Roads, the Long Range Transportation Plan and Regional Water Supply Plan.

The HRPDC participated in over 30 initiatives, examples include, but are not limited to:

- The State of Transportation in Hampton Roads
- Hampton Roads Regional Benchmarking Study
- Climate Change in Hampton Roads

Mr. Keaton stated the HRPDC provides cost savings for localities through a regional staff to coordinate on local effort, such as economic analysis, regional housing and technical transportation assistance. Additionally, the coordination of local interests is a duty of PDCs. Examples include:

- Regional Construction Standards
- Environmental Committees
- Hampton Roads Housing Consortium
- Mayors and Chairs
- Chief Administrative Officers

The HRPDC supports limited implementation of services, such as askhrgreen.org, Hampton Roads' Help to Others Program and Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS). He also stated technical assistance provided to member localities encompass:

- Staff Presentations
- Comprehensive plans
- Graphic and printing services
- Providing data, maps, and facilitation

The report details the various advisory committees, regulatory panels and state agencies the HRPDC served in a liaison capacity. Furthermore, staff reviews local government aid applications and assists in developing regional functional plans.

Various departments contribute in the development of sub-state plans. The HRPDC also acts as an affiliate of the State Data Center and is an active member of the state-wide Geographic Information System (GIS).

Mr. Keaton noted the highlight section of the report and described the 22 programs which are the highest achievements of the HRPDC in the previous year.

WATER/WASTEWATER UTILITY RATE STRUCTURE REPORT

Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC Principal Water Resources Engineer, detailed to the Commission the declining use of water in Hampton Roads. The Commission was shown various graphs depicting the data collected by the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) and Newport News Waterworks displaying the trend of increasing population in the Region with a declining demand for water.

The establishment of current rate structures are leading to a revenue gap. This occurs because 80% of revenue generated is variable and 20% by fixed fees. The costs to operate are 80% fixed, such as, debt service, operations, and the other 20% is variable.

Common factors for declining demand include the following:

- Economic conditions
- Community Education Campaigns
- New regulations on low flow fixtures and appliances

Ms. Katchmark noted the costs are expected to rise in order to meet the increased regulatory requirements and aging infrastructure. She additionally noted some rate structures have started to change to match the rising costs, but historically, the goals of conservation and affordability have guided the rates. The Commission was shown a chart comparing water and sewer bills to other common household bills.

Regional utility options for the future include: moving to a model of selling a service and not a commodity, ensuring utilities meet financial goals and balancing the need between financial stability of utilities while maintaining affordability for customers.

Ms. Katchmark outlined the next steps:

- Distribute the HRPDC whitepaper: *Water and Wastewater Utilities: Designing the Rate Structure for the Future*
- Develop a public outreach campaign

Chairman Shepperd observed the potential backlash of a fixed rate for water usage. He subsequently noted the lack of public education and questioned the planned public outreach effort.

Ms. Katchmark answered the rates need to be structured to maintain the system and not for a profit margin. She also stated the public outreach campaign needs to underscore people are buying a service, not just water.

Commissioner Wright asked if the utilities have tried to reduce the number of fixed costs.

Ms. Katchmark responded many have researched ways to be more efficient, but the underlying mission is maintaining infrastructure and reliability.

Chairman Shepperd underscored communication with the public is fundamental.

REGIONAL SEWER CONSOLIDATION STUDY

Chairman Shepperd reminded the Commission this agenda item was for information purposes only and no action was required.

Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC Principal Water Resources Engineer, informed the Commission the Regional Sewer Consolidation Study was completed and submitted by the consultants, HDR, to the EPA in August.

The key recommendations of the study are:

- Regionalization will save money
- HRSD Commission structure be changed
- If localities agree to regionalize, additional staff would be required

Each individual locality needs to agree to regionalize. If approved, assets must be transferred in February 2015 and the Regional Wet Weather Management Plan submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by October 2016. If regionalization does not occur, the Regional Wet Weather Management Plan submittal date is moved to October 2015.

Chairman Shepperd asked who the correct HRPDC staff member would be to answer any member locality questions.

Ms. Katchmark replied she would be the correct point of contact, and HRPDC staff planned on monitoring localities' actions.

Mr. Dwight Farmer, HRPDC Executive Director, confirmed HRPDC staff has been engaged with HRSD throughout this whole process and reminded the localities this is a locality - specific decision

REGULAR AGENDA

Public Comment

One person requested to address the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission.

Ellis W. James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ellis W. James. I'm a lifelong resident of Norfolk, and I wish to pick up real quick on the remarks that were made on the water report. The report was an excellent review in my view, but the real basic underlying issue that needs to be addressed in this conversation, and thank you very much for the Commission getting the conversation going, is going to be water withdrawal and availability. If you recall a couple of months ago, I called to your attention the remarks from Secretary Domenech, and his concerns along those lines, I believe was the correct reference. So I hope we will pay close attention to that aspect of it. I'm not unsympathetic, I understand Mayor Wright's question fully, and I know that that is of great concern. Now, I had put on my card that I wanted to note two things. Climate change and the warming of our area is now fully happening, and I would urge each of the communities to please pay close attention to the progress of the West Nile virus, and my good friends in Virginia Beach know a lot about what's happening. I think that we all in the Hampton Roads area need to pay close attention to this. In addition to that, it is ironical that the discussion about chickens in our neighborhoods is happening right at the moment that one of the most virulent viruses is now being noted also in the Virginia Beach area with respect to chickens down in, I believe the Black water area. If I'm wrong on that somebody over here will correct me I'm sure. This is a major, major potential problem and we need to pay close attention to it because it is a public health issue. The last point I'd like to make is the ocean acidification report that has just come out, is going to impact all of Hampton Roads in my view, and I would hope that each of the communities will review that report and pay close attention to what the implications of it are. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Submitted Public Comments

Chairman Shepperd indicated there was no submitted public comment.

Approval of Consent Items

Chairman Shepperd asked for approval of the following consent items:

- A. Minutes of July 18, 2013 Meeting
- B. Treasurer's Report
- C. Regional Reviews – Monthly Status Report
 - 1. PNRS Reviews
 - 2. Environmental Impact Assessment/Statement Review
- D. askHRgreen.org: Annual Report – Final Report
- E. Water/Wastewater Utility Rate Structure Report
- F. Comments on Building Code Revisions, Rainwater Non-Potable Water Systems
- G. HRPDC External Communications Policy
- H. Coastal Zone Management Program-FY 2014 Grants
- I. FY 2012-2013 Annual Report to Department of Housing and Community Development

- J. Stormwater Regional Cooperation Summary Report
- K. Memorandum of Understanding with Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance (HRMMFA)
- L. Resolution for Day of Service

Commissioner Barry Cheatham Moved to approve the consent items, seconded by Commissioner Ella Ward. The Motion Carried.

HRPDC Three Month Tentative Schedule

Chairman Shepperd outlined the three month agenda schedule and noted the election of officers, legislative agenda, and Envision Hampton Roads. He also reminded the Nominating and Personnel and Budget Committees they were scheduled to meet prior to the beginning of the October Annual Commission meeting.

Project Status Reports

Chairman Shepperd highlighted the Project Status Reports section of the agenda.

Correspondence of Interest

Chairman Shepperd stated there were items in the Correspondence of Interest section of the agenda.

For Your Information

Chairman Shepperd noted the For Your Information section of the agenda.

Old/New Business

Chairman Shepperd identified the Old/New Business section of the agenda

Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chairman

Dwight L. Farmer
Executive Director/Secretary

**FISCAL YEAR 2013
8/31/2013
BALANCE SHEET**

ASSETS		LIABILITIES & NET ASSETS	
Cash & Cash Equivalents	151,145	Current Liabilities	1,574,428
Accounts Receivables	762,970	Net Assets	3,551,033
Investments	2,836,269		
Other Current Assets	664		
Net Capital Assets	<u>1,374,413</u>		
Total Assets	<u><u>5,125,461</u></u>	Total Liabilities & Equity	<u><u>5,125,461</u></u>

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

REVENUES	Annual Budget	Current Month	YTD
Grant and Contract Revenue	4,591,533	223,290	373,055
VDHCD State Allocation	151,943	-	-
Interest Income	18,000	540	775
Local Jurisdiction Contributions	1,340,182	-	-
Other Local Assessment	1,548,624	-	-
Sales and Miscellaneous Revenue	94,350	2,390	2,510
Special Contracts/Pass thru	1,889,236	-	-
Total Revenue	<u><u>9,633,868</u></u>	<u><u>226,220</u></u>	<u><u>376,340</u></u>
EXPENDITURES			
Personnel	4,499,834	351,458	683,577
Standard Contracts	202,945	12,332	24,955
Special Contracts / Pass-Through	4,199,391	432,893	438,774
Office Services	731,698	35,635	54,484
Capital Assets	-	-	-
Total Expenses	<u><u>9,633,868</u></u>	<u><u>832,318</u></u>	<u><u>1,201,790</u></u>
Agency Balance	<u><u>-</u></u>	<u><u>(606,098)</u></u>	<u><u>(825,450)</u></u>

Environmental Impact Reviews

Received 9/20/2013 **Number** 13-170S

Name Parole Board Building

Sponsor Department of General Services

Description

The Department of General Services submitted an environmental impact report for construction associated with a build-to-suit lease for office space in the City of Virginia Beach. The Department of Corrections' Parole Board plans to occupy a proposed 11,185 square-foot, one-story building on land owned by Courthouse Marketplace Parcel 7, LLC, adjacent to the existing courts complex. The project site is vacant undeveloped land. Landscaping is maintained along Nimmo Parkway. The rest of the site is overgrown with a variety of vegetation that is periodically mowed. The property contains a storm drain system, and municipal and private utilities, including electric, water and sewer.

Affected Localities Virginia Beach

Finding

Comments Sent

Final State Comments Received

Received 9/20/2013

Number 13-169F

Name Waste Confidence Rule (Spent Fuel Storage After Licensed Life)

Sponsor DOI/Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Description

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is responding to past court decisions regarding the NEPA analysis required to support the rules concerning the storage of spent nuclear waste. The analysis must address, for reactor licensing, the generation of spent fuel and the continued storage of it, following the expiration of the license of the facility in question. For storage facilities, the analysis must address the impacts of storage until ultimate permanent disposal. Accordingly, the Draft Generic EIS addresses impacts of continued storage of spent nuclear fuel over the following time frames: Short term – a maximum of 60 years past the expiration of the licensed life of the reactor; Long term – a maximum of 160 years, as above; or Indefinite storage at the reactor site or at a separate storage installation. NRC believes the short-term time frame is most likely, because it understands that the Department of Energy will have a permanent disposal solution ready by the year 2048. The Draft Generic EIS does not include site-specific analysis. Additional information is available in the NRC's Federal Register notice, dated September 13, 2013, Volume 78, Number 178, pages 56621-56622.

Affected Localities Surry County

Finding

Comments Sent

Final State Comments Received

Received 10/7/2013

Number 13-176F

Name Joint Logistics Over-the-Shore Activities at Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Fort Story

Sponsor DOD/Department of the Navy

Description

The Navy is proposing to conduct annual JLOTS training at Joint Expeditionary Base (JEB) Little Creek-Fort Story. Logistics over-the-shore is the process of transporting cargo and personnel from ships to shore in areas that do not have existing deep-draft fixed port facilities. JLOTS training consists of several coordinated field training exercises (FTXs). An FTX is any exercise conducted under the conditions in which the activity would normally occur (as opposed to classroom or simulated training). The proposed action consists of a combination of FTXs into a full scale integrated JLOTS event lasting for up to 60 days and smaller sets of unit-level FTXs that would be conducted separately and independently from the full JLOTS event. The Navy finds that the proposed action would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program.

Affected Localities Virginia Beach

Finding

Comments Sent

Final State Comments Received

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #10-D: FY 2013 AUDIT REPORT

SUBJECT:

The FY 2013 Audit Report has been completed.

BACKGROUND:

Dixon, Hughes, Goodman LLP has completed its annual review of the FY 2013 financial statements of the HRPDC and their Independent Auditors' Report states that they present fairly (*formerly known as an Unqualified Opinion*), in all material respects the financial position of the HRPDC. There were no material weaknesses or deficiencies in any of the internal controls or processes of the HRPDC financial activity, and all information was free of any material misstatements.

This item and related enclosures were presented in Workshop Agenda item #6

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the Audit Report.

AGENDA NOTE - HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #11: NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT/ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SUBJECT:

The HRPDC Bylaws provide that, at its Annual Meeting, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission will elect a Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary and Treasurer and recognize the local jurisdiction appointments to the Executive Committee.

BACKGROUND:

Mr. Shepperd, Chair of the Nominating Committee, will present the report of the Nominating Committee for the names of those recommended for Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer as well as those recommended for appointment to the Executive Committee by their local governments.

The Nominating Committee Members include:

Chesapeake:	Ella P. Ward
Franklin:	Barry Cheatham
Gloucester:	Carter Borden
Hampton:	Will Moffett
Isle of Wight:	Dee Dee Darden
James City:	Mary Jones
Newport News:	Sharon Scott
Norfolk:	Thomas Smigiel
Poquoson:	W. Eugene Hunt
Portsmouth:	Kenneth I. Wright
Southampton:	Barry Porter
Suffolk:	Linda T. Johnson
Surry:	John M. Seward
Virginia Beach:	Louis R. Jones
Williamsburg:	Clyde Haulman
York:	Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.

The Chair and Vice Chair must come from separate Subdivisions and be elected officials. The offices of Treasurer and Secretary shall be elected for a term of one year or until their successors are elected or until they resign or are removed from office. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected for two one-year terms or until their successors are elected or until they resign or are removed from office. Both the Chair and Vice-Chair are eligible for re-election. The offices of Secretary and Treasurer must be voted on an annual basis but need not be elected officials and may succeed themselves.

As provided in the Bylaws, the Executive Committee is a standing Committee of the Commission. It consists of sixteen members, each from a different participating jurisdiction.

The Executive Committee members include:

Thomas G. Shepperd (YK)	Christopher G. Stuart (HA)
J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)	Mary Jones (JC)
Dee Dee Darden (IW)	Michael W. Johnson (SH)
Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)	Louis R. Jones (VB)
Randy Martin (FR)	Ella P. Ward (CH)
Paul D. Fraim (NO)	James O. McReynolds (YK)
McKinley Price (NN)	Kenneth I. Wright (PO)
Tyrone W. Franklin (SY)	Jackson C. Tuttle, II (WM)
Brenda G. Garton (GL)	

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The Bylaws provide that election of officers shall be by voice vote, unless changed by a majority of those present. Each member of the Commission is entitled to one vote.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Elect a Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and Secretary for the next year and recognize the appointments of the local jurisdictions to the Executive Committee.

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #12: THREE MONTH TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

The HRPDC staff has developed a tentative schedule of issues that will come before the Commission for action over the next three months. These issues are the primary action items the Commission will be considering. Other items may be added depending on new priority requests from the Commission, state and federal legislative and regulatory activities and new funding opportunities.

November 2013

Defense Analysis

Regional Mitigation Plan Update

Emergency Management Sustainability

Envision Hampton Roads

CZM 309 Final Report

December 2013

Planned Cancellation

January 2014

Economic Forecast

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #13: PROJECT STATUS REPORTS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUMMARIES

A. DIRECTORS OF UTILITIES COMMITTEE SUMMARY MINUTES

The Directors of Utilities Committee Summary Minutes from the October 2, 2013 meeting is attached.

Attachment 13-A

B. REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

The Regional Environmental Committee Meeting Summary from the October 3, 2013 meeting is attached.

Attachment 13-B

C. PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Attached are the project status reports on other HRPDC programs.

Attachment 13-C

MEETING OF THE DIRECTORS OF UTILITIES COMMITTEE

The Directors of Utilities Committee met on October 2, 2013. The following items were addressed during the meeting:

- The Committee discussed the September 24, 2013 Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) Commission action on the regional sewer consolidation study and next steps. HRSD is sending correspondence to localities to explain the action to accept the recommendation of the regionalization study with phased implementation. HRSD would fund the implementation of the regional wet weather capacity improvements. HRSD will be meeting with DEQ and EPA in October to discuss the concept, local government support, and potential next steps.
- The HRPDC staff provided an update on FY14 program activities for water awareness education and fats, oils and grease education. Highlights include new messaging for holiday cooking and garbage disposals, what not to flush, infrastructure, TapIt Hampton Roads, and outdoor watering. Initiatives include search engine marketing and search engine optimization, outreach through HRSD bill messages, and multi-family property outreach.
- The Committee discussed priority projects for the FY14 water and wastewater work programs. It was agreed that staff will focus initially on projects related to water and wastewater rate structures outreach, affordability, and groundwater policy and mitigation; the source water protection project will be undertaken later in the fiscal year.
- The Committee members present unanimously endorsed the proposed FY15 water and wastewater program budgets as included in the agenda packet.
- HRPDC staff briefed the Committee on the following:
 - September 11, 2013 State Water Commission meeting discussion of the State Water Supply Plan and groundwater management.
 - September 2013 revised final draft of the DEQ Ambient Groundwater Quality Monitoring Strategy and draft FY14 implementation plan.
 - Summary of water and wastewater rate data from FY05 to FY14.
 - HRPDC's September 19, 2013 approval of the water and wastewater rate structures report for distribution.
- The Committee discussed citizen concerns regarding the addition of fluoride to public water. It was agreed that this topic will be included on the agenda for the December 4, 2013 joint meeting of the Directors of Utilities Committee and Health Directors.

MEETING SUMMARY
REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITTEE

The Regional Environmental Committee met on October 3, 2013. The following items were discussed.

- Mr. Clifton Bell, Brown and Caldwell, gave a presentation to the Committee on DEQ's Chlorophyll A study for the James River.
- Ms. Kelly Burks-Copes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, gave a presentation to the Committee on a study of the vulnerability of Naval Station Norfolk to sea level rise and storm surge.
- Ms. Jenny Tribo and Mr. Benjamin McFarlane, HRPDC, updated the Committee on the status of the HRPDC's Section 309 Grant Project.
- Mr. McFarlane updated the Committee on the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program.
- Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC, briefed the Committee on a proposal to allocate unspent money from the HRPDC stormwater program budget to a stormwater monitoring study for the PCB TMDL for the James and Elizabeth Rivers. HRSD estimates that the cost to collect samples will be \$20,000. The Committee voted to approve this allocation of unspent funds.
- Ms. Katchmark briefed the Committee on the proposed stormwater budget for FY 2014-2015. Eleven localities voted in favor of the budget and two abstained. Votes from the abstaining and absent communities will be obtained via email.
- Status reports and updates from HRPDC staff and locality staff.

PROJECT STATUS REPORTS

1. Regional Economics Program

Technical Assistance

Economics staff routinely provides technical assistance and support to member jurisdictions and regional organizations. Both the HRPDC Data Book and the Commission's Benchmarking Study provide easy access to a great deal of regional information. Staff also provides special reports and newsletter articles on topics of timely significance, such as payroll and unemployment reports. Over the past month, staff has provided briefings to member localities (per request), provided interviews and presentations for information purposes, and has responded to information requests from individuals, member localities, regional organizations, and the media.

Analysis of Department of Defense Presence

The Department of Defense plays a significant role in the Hampton Roads economy, a role that is continuously being re-defined. In an attempt to better understand the economic impact of the DoD on the region, staff have worked to provide an in-depth analysis of the federal presence in Hampton Roads, specifically as it relates to defense activities. A report on the DoD presence in Hampton Roads will be presented at the October Commission meeting.

Hampton Roads Data Center

In keeping with the state mandate that calls for Planning District Commissions to collect and maintain demographic, economic, and other data concerning the region and member localities, and to act as a state data center affiliate in cooperation with the Virginia Employment Commission, staff routinely collect and maintain a variety of data sets. This year, as per the Commission's work program, staff is moving from the publication of data in an annual Data Book, to an online data repository that will enable efficient access for those seeking regional data. Staff is in the process of moving to an online system; a process that is expected to be ongoing as new information is released.

2. Housing & Human Services Technical Assistance

The Housing & Human Services Staff continues to work with the Hampton Roads Disability Board, formerly the South Hampton Roads Disability Board. In observance of October as Disability Awareness Month, the HRDB will host a symposium on October 22, 2012 entitled; ***"The Americans With Disabilities Act: For Everyone, Every day."*** This free seminar will provide an overview of the basic principles and core concepts of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 (ADAAA). This event will also include a facilitated discussion on how the region can address accessibility needs more effectively.

Staff members also continue to work with the Hampton Roads Housing Consortium and the planning of its Seventy Annual Housing Awards. The following regional housing providers and organization were recently honored:

HRHC Housing Warrior: Excellence Award

Shelia Doplemore, Business Development Office, Virginia Housing Development Authority

HRHC Housing Partner: Special Project Award

Virginia Supportive Housing, Heron's Landing SRO Project

HRHC Across the Region Award

Catholic Charities of Eastern Virginia, Inc.

HRHC Lifetime Achievement Award

Lori Miller- Executive Director, Our House Families

Hampton Roads Loan Fund Partnership

The staff is continuing to provide down payment and closing cost assistance to qualified first-time homebuyers in the region through HOME Funding from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). DHCD has changed its funding cycle to a calendar year. Staff is working on completion of the 2013 loan cycle.

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #14: CORRESPONDENCE OF INTEREST

A. Letter to Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC Principal Water Resources Engineer from State Delegate Ron Villanueva, 21st House District, August 14, 2013.

Attached is a letter to Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC Principal Water Resources Engineer from State Delegate Ron Villanueva, 21st House District, congratulating her appointment to the Virginia Water Resources Research Center Statewide Advisory Board.

Attachment 14-A



COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
HOUSE OF DELEGATES
RICHMOND

RONALD JOHN A. "RON" VILLANUEVA
POST OFFICE BOX 61005
VIRGINIA BEACH, VIRGINIA 23466

TWENTY-FIRST DISTRICT

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:
COURTS OF JUSTICE
TRANSPORTATION
FINANCE

Whitney Katchmark
The Regional Building
723 Woodlake Drive
Chesapeake, VA 23320

August 14, 2013

Dear Ms. Katchmark,

I would like to congratulate you on being appointed to the Virginia Water Resources Research Center Statewide Advisory Board. I know you will serve honorably, and I thank you for your willingness to make that personal sacrifice on behalf of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Please call on me as a resource whenever you feel my experience would be helpful. My office and my aide, Carrie Hoffmann, will gladly help you in any way we can.

Again, congratulations on your well-deserved appointment. I look forward to working with you to make Virginia a great place to live.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ron Villanueva".

Ron Villanueva
State Delegate, 21st House District

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2013

HRPDC

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #15: FOR YOUR INFORMATION

A. Tentative Compliance Determination, Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan

The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) completed a review of the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan for compliance with Sections 70 through 130 of the Local and Regional Water Supply Planning Regulation, §9VAC25-780, et seq. DEQ issued a tentative determination of compliance for the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan on August 30, 2013. DEQ did not receive any comments on the Plan during the August 30, 2013 to October 1, 2013 public comment period, and the agency anticipates issuing a final compliance determination by the end of 2013. A copy of the public notice and DEQ's tentative compliance letter is attached.

The HRPDC, on behalf of member localities, submitted the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan to DEQ on October 31, 2011. DEQ contacted HRPDC staff on July 22, 2013 to request additional information, and HRPDC staff and DEQ staff met on July 24, 2013 to review DEQ recommendations. As a result of the meeting, DEQ provided a draft compliance checklist and recommendations on August 2, 2013. As requested, the HRPDC provided a written response to DEQ's information request on August 27, 2013.

Attachment 15-A

PUBLIC NOTICE – HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY PLAN

PURPOSE OF NOTICE: To seek public comment on DEQ's determination of tentative compliance for the regional water supply plan developed by the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for the cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and Williamsburg; the counties of Gloucester, Isle of Wight, James City, Southampton, Surry, and York; and the towns of Boykins, Branchville, Capron, Claremont Courtland, Dendron, Ivor, Newsoms, Smithfield, Surry, and Windsor, known as the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan, in accordance with §9 VAC 25-780, et seq., Local and Regional Water Supply Planning regulation.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: August 30, 2013 to October 1, 2013

DESCRIPTION OF WATER SUPPLY PLAN: The Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan (the "Plan") dated July, 2011 identifies existing water sources, estimates current and future water demand, and assesses the need for additional sources for future water supply in the region. The planning region is located within Virginia's Coastal Plain physiographic province and all localities within the region, with the exception of Gloucester County, are in the Eastern Virginia Ground Water Management area. The area is served by surface water reservoirs, stream intakes, and ground water sources. All surface water and some of the ground water sources have a high susceptibility to contamination, including elevated concentrations of fluoride. Most users within the planning region are served by publicly- or privately-owned community water systems, with the exception of the more rural Western Tidewater sub-region where most users are self-supplied from ground water sources. Demand is expected to increase as population in the region continues to grow; however, projected supply is anticipated to meet projected demand for the region through 2050. There is potential for demand to exceed supply by 2040 in the York-James Peninsula sub-region as the projections are within a 10% margin of error and alteration of the assumptions could result in revised projections. Alternatives considered to meet the potential need in the Peninsula sub-region include additional surface water storage, additional ground water withdrawals, desalination, aquifer storage and recovery, interconnection, reuse, and system optimization.

All of the localities within the planning region have adopted "water supply emergency ordinances" for the implementation and enforcement of the drought response and contingency plan in the event of a drought.

DEQ ACTION: DEQ has issued a tentative determination of compliance to Mr. Dwight L. Farmer, Executive Director of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission. Upon review of written comments submitted in response to this public notice, DEQ staff will make a final compliance determination decision.

HOW TO COMMENT: DEQ accepts written comments by e-mail, fax or postal mail. Written comments should include the name, address and telephone number of the person commenting and be received by DEQ during the comment period. The regional water supply plan is available from the contact below or on the DEQ website at <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/Programs/Water/WaterSupplyWaterQuantity/WaterSupplyPlanning.aspx>.

CONTACT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Ms. Tammy Stephenson, Program Coordinator, Office of Water Supply, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, 3019 Peters Creek Road, Roanoke, VA 24019; Phone: 540-561-6828; E-mail: tammy.stephenson@deq.virginia.gov; Fax: (540) 562-6725.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Street address: 629 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mailing address: P.O. Box 1105, Richmond, Virginia 23218

TDD (804) 698-4021

www.deq.virginia.gov

Douglas W. Domenech
Secretary of Natural Resources

David K. Paylor
Director

(804) 698-4020
1-800-592-5482

August 30, 2013

Mr. Dwight L. Farmer, Executive Director
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
723 Woodlake Drive
Chesapeake, VA 23320

RE: Tentative Compliance Determination
Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan

Dear Mr. Farmer,

The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality ("DEQ") has received the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan program documents dated July, 2011. The Department has reviewed this program for compliance with Sections 70 through 130 of the Local and Regional Water Supply Planning Regulation, §9VAC25-780, et seq. **Based on the review of the information submitted, DEQ has reached a tentative decision to find the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan compliant with the water supply planning regulation, pending other state agency review and public comment.**

The Plan is currently undergoing an evaluation and comment period by State agencies, as required by §9VAC25-780-140B and 150B. In addition, a 30-day public comment period, as required by §9VAC25-780-150C, will follow this tentative decision for compliance. DEQ will make a final decision concerning program compliance with the water supply planning regulation after evaluation and response to written comments received from the public. Subsequently, a final determination letter will be issued by this agency.

DEQ's review of the submitted program documents is itemized in the Checklist for Review of Local and Regional Water Supply Plan Program Documents ("Checklist"), which has been enclosed with this correspondence. Heather Mackey of DEQ's water supply planning staff is assigned to your planning region to assist in meeting the review and re-submittal requirements for your program. **The five-year review and ten-year re-submittal periods will begin once a final determination of compliance is made for your program.**

This tentative compliance review determination does not preclude DEQ from requesting additional information if needed for the purposes of developing the State Water Resources Plan. In addition, this compliance determination does not supersede the need to apply for a Virginia Water Protection Permit for surface water withdrawals or a Virginia Groundwater Permit for groundwater withdrawals, where necessary for a specific project. Nor does this determination ensure issuance of a permit for any particular alternative identified in the Plan or planning program documents.

Please share this tentative compliance determination with your partners in your planning region, and contact me at 540-562-6828 or email tammy.stephenson@deq.virginia.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Tammy D. Stephenson
Water Supply Planning Program Coordinator

Electronic Distribution:

Whitney Katchmark, Principal Water Resources Planner, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

Heather Mackey, Water Supply Planner, Department of Environmental Quality

Enclosure:

Compliance Checklist for review of Local and Regional Water Supply Plan program documents



Compliance Checklist for review of Local and Regional Water Supply Plan program documents

Locality / Region: HAMPTON ROADS PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION ("HRPDC")

If planning regionally, list localities included in WSP

- Cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and Williamsburg
- Counties of Gloucester, Isle of Wight, James City, Southampton, Surry, and York
- Towns of Boykins, Branchville, Capron, Claremont, Courtland, Dendron, Ivor, Newsoms, Smithfield, Surry, and Windsor

Reviewing WSP Planner: Heather Mackey

Reviewing WSP Team Member: Mary Ann Massie

Reason for Compliance Evaluation:

- Initial Review**
- 5 years after Compliance Determination, if circumstances have changed or new information has been made available**
- 10 year revision and resubmission**

The *Compliance Checklist* ("*Checklist*") is used by Water Supply Planning staff as a tool for evaluating local program elements required by §9 VAC 25-780, et seq., the Local and Regional Water Supply Planning regulation (the "Regulation"). The checklist is completed by Department of Environmental Quality ("DEQ") staff, based upon information and materials provided by locality or regional staff. "Yes" and "No" indications for making a reasonable effort to meet specific requirements are generally followed by staff comments that may be helpful in developing future iterations of water supply plans.

The *Compliance Checklist* is composed of the following parts:

- **Part I – Program Background and Adoption Process**
- **Part II – Water Supply Plan and Required Program Elements**
- **Part III – Compliance Review and Consistency Determination Process**
- **Part IV – Requirements for Compliance, Areas In Need Of Improvement, Preliminary Identification Of Conflicts, Items of Interest, DEQ Action Items**

PART I. PROGRAM BACKGROUND and ADOPTION PROCESS

PART I of the checklist reviews the documents that constitute a local or regional water supply program and the planning process that was undertaken. The Regulation requires that local or regional water supply plans ("WSP" or "Plan") (§9 VAC 25-780-40) be developed through a planning process that includes a public hearing by all participating localities (§9 VAC 25-780-50) and local adoption. Once an adopted Plan is submitted to DEQ, the Plan(s) are reviewed to determine compliance with the Regulation.

A. Describe the WSP development process (§9 VAC 25-780-140 A and C): HRPDC was the lead in development of the regional plan. A Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the localities in 2007 stating their intention of planning together. The Plan was prepared with the oversight of a standing committee of the directors of utility departments from the localities. All localities adopted the Plan and a drought ordinance. There are 27 localities included in the planning area; the data chapters of the WSP have been organized into three sub-regions: Peninsula, Southside, and Western Tidewater.

1. What entity was lead for Plan development? (i.e. local planning or utility department or service provider, planning district commission, etc.) HRPDC with support from CH2M Hill

2. Was a technical advisory or stakeholder group involved in the process? yes no
If "Yes," then describe membership and level of expertise and involvement. Directors of Utilities Committee with representatives from each participating locality

B. What documents constitute the water supply program (§9 VAC 25-780-50 A)? (e.g. comprehensive plan amendments; a map or maps identifying important elements such as existing environmental resources, existing water sources, significant existing water uses, and proposed new sources; water supply plan(s); water and sewer plan(s); and other local plans/ordinances. Provide a list of document title(s), adoption date(s), and local code citations:

1. Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan, July 2011

2. Hampton Roads Local Program Adoption Documents, October 2011

C. Have copies of all adopted program documents itemized above been submitted and received by DEQ for evaluation of compliance (§9 VAC 25-780-50 C 9)? yes no
If "No," which document(s) is missing? _____

D. Describe the WSP adoption process (§9 VAC 25-780-140 A and C):

1. Public Hearing/Adoption Date(s) for all localities participating in the planning effort:

a. Peninsula Sub-Region

Hampton 8/10/11

Newport News 8/9/11

Poquoson 8/22/11

Williamsburg 9/8/11

Gloucester 8/2/11

James City 9/27/11

York County 9/20/11

b. Southside Sub-Region

Chesapeake 9/27/11

Norfolk 10/11/11

Portsmouth 8/23/11

Suffolk 9/7/11

Virginia Beach 10/11/11

c. Western Tidewater Sub-Region

Franklin 9/12/11

Isle of Wight 10/6/11

Southampton 8/22/11

Surry 9/1/11

Boykins 8/9/11

Branchville 8/15/11

Capron 8/1/11

Claremont 9/14/11

Courtland 8/9/11

Dendron 9/12/11

Ivor 9/12/11

Newsoms 8/1/11

Smithfield 8/2/11

Surry 9/1/11

Windsor 8/9/11

2. Has a copy of all program adoption resolution(s) been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-50 C 10)?
 yes all resolutions mention adoption of the WSP, which includes a section dedicated to the drought plan, and the holding of a public hearing; however, none of the resolutions mention submission of written comments. Minutes are provided for each locality and include comments/responses made during public hearings where applicable no

3. Has a record of public hearing(s) been provided, including copies of all written comments and comment responses (§9 VAC 25-780-50 C 11)? yes no
If "No," which localities have not provided copies of public hearing record? _____

4. COMMENTS: HRPDC prepared a separate document with all resolutions and public hearing minutes for each locality, which described the planning process and indicated that none of the localities in the planning region received any written public comments.

- E. Was a Drought Response and Contingency Plan ("DRCP") (§9 VAC 25-780-120) required (see Part II D)? yes §5 pgs. 5-20 thru 5-34 of the WSP no

1. If "Yes," was a drought response ordinance adopted? yes no

2. Has a copy been provided for review? yes no

F. Has a *WSP Review Checklist* previously been submitted for grant purposes? yes no

N/A

1. If "Yes," have all outstanding or inadequate items been addressed? yes no

2. If "No," list any outstanding or inadequate items to be addressed by the locality/region:

HRADC Tentative Compliance

PART II: WATER SUPPLY PLAN and REQUIRED PROGRAM ELEMENTS

PART II of the checklist pertains to the required elements of each water supply plan, as outlined in §9 VAC 25-780-70 through 130. The Regulation requires that Plans be developed using “existing, readily available information.” Additional, detailed studies were not required to be performed per the Regulation. If data gaps are identified during Plan review, it may be that the information did not exist or was not readily available at the time of Plan development, in which case a notation to that effect should be made in the “COMMENTS” area provided for each subsection below.

A. Describe **Existing Water Sources** (§9 VAC 25-780-70) as follows:

1. Summarize existing water sources as identified in the Plan: The planning area is located within Virginia’s Coastal Plain Province and, as of June 17, 2013 when the State Water Control Board voted to approve its expansion, all localities within the planning area are included in the Eastern Virginia Ground Water Management Area (“EVGWMA”). The area is served by surface water reservoirs, stream intakes, and ground water sources. All surface water sources and some of the ground water sources have a high susceptibility to contamination, including elevated concentrations of fluoride.
 - a. Peninsula sources: seven reservoirs and the Chickahominy River, ground water wells, 26 publicly-owned CWSs, 7 privately-owned CWSs (5 of which have wells that are highly susceptible to contamination). 23 active ground water withdrawal permits. 8 of the publicly owned CWSs rely solely on ground water, three systems are conjunctive use systems using both surface and ground water. Majority of population served by publicly-owned CWSs; portions of Gloucester, James City, and York do not have public water service. 20 SSUs withdrawing more than 300,000 gallons per month for non-agricultural purposes. No large agricultural users.
 - b. Southside sources: ground water wells, reservoirs, Lake Gaston, Northwest Blackwater, and Nottoway rivers. The majority of the population served by 15 publicly-owned CWSs, most of which use both surface and ground water. 9 privately-owned CWSs, all rely on ground water, and 7 of which have a well or wells with a high susceptibility to contamination. As of 2010, three privately-owned CWSs in Suffolk and two systems in Chesapeake were under a VDH fluoride consent order. 38 SSUs withdrawing more than 300,000 gallons per month for non-agricultural purposes. 3 large agricultural users.
 - c. Western Tidewater sources: ground water wells, Blackwater and Nottoway rivers. This sub-region is mostly rural with scattered, small population centers. The majority of the population is served by private residential wells. 24 publicly-owned CWSs, all but one served by ground water and 11 of which have a well or wells with a high susceptibility to contamination. At the end of 2010, 2 publicly-owned systems were under a VDH fluoride consent order. 40 privately-owned CWSs, all relying on ground water, and 13 under a VDH fluoride consent order. 12 large, non-agricultural SSUs, 13 large agricultural SSUs.

2. Date and source of data used to provide the following information: Virginia Department of Health ("VDH") and/or DEQ
3. List other sources of data, the date or date range of the data: 2007 USGS report *Private Domestic-Well Characteristics and the Distribution of Domestic Withdrawals among Aquifers in the Virginia Coastal Plain.*
4. For community water systems ("CWS") using ground water, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 B)? If a CWS is not using ground water, so note in the "COMMENTS."
- name and ID number of all wells in locality yes no
 - well depth yes no
 - casing depth yes no
 - screen depth (top and bottom) or water zones yes no
 - well diameter yes no
 - design capacity for the average daily and maximum daily withdrawal yes no
 - system capacity permitted by VDH yes no
 - annual and monthly permitted amounts contained in ground water withdrawal permits (for all wells located within ground water management areas) yes no N/A
 - COMMENTS: Although the information required above was provided for most CWS's using ground water, gaps in the data provided exist for private CWS's in some localities. Brackish water in the region treated by reverse osmosis. Aquifers: Potomac, Chickahominy-Piney Point, Aquia, Yorktown-Eastover
5. For CWS using reservoirs, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 C)? If a CWS is not using reservoirs, so note in the "COMMENTS."
- name of the reservoirs yes Lee Hall, Harwood's Mill, Skiffe's Creek, Little Creek, Diascund Creek, Beaverdam, Lake Gaston, Norfolk's Western Reservoirs (Western Branch, Lake Prince, and Lake Burnt Mills), Intown Reservoirs (Lake Smith, Lake Lawson, Lake Whitehurst, and Lake Wright), Lake Meade, Lake Cahoon, Speights Run, Lake Kilby, Lone Star Lakes Reservoir, Crumps Mill Pond Reservoir, no
 - sub-basins in which the reservoir(s) are located yes no
 - drainage area above dam yes no
 - amount of on-stream storage available for water supply yes no
 - design capacity for average daily and maximum daily withdrawals from the reservoir(s) yes no
 - safe yield of the reservoir(s) yes no
 - capacity of any associated water treatment plant yes no
 - VDH permitted capacity of the systems yes no
 - any limitations on withdrawal established by permits issued by the SWCB, VDH, or any other agency yes no N/A
 - COMMENTS: Although the information required above was provided for most CWS's using reservoirs, gaps in the data provided exist in some localities.

6. For CWS operating a system of interconnected reservoirs, is the following information provided either for the entire system, or as a subset of the system (§9 VAC 25-780-70 C)?
- reporting of the design capacity for withdrawals yes no
 - designed average daily withdrawal yes no
 - designed maximum daily withdrawal yes no
 - safe yield yes no
 - Does the Plan designate which reservoirs and which intakes constitute a system? yes Norfolk's Western Reservoirs (Lake Prince, Lake Burnt Mills, Western Branch reservoirs) and the Intown Reservoirs (Lake Lawson, Lake Smith, Little Creek Reservoir, Lake Whitehurst, and Lake Wright), City of Portsmouth (Lake Meade, Lake Cahoon, Speights Run, Lake Kilby) no
 - Does the Plan report the drainage area and amount of storage available for water supply from each reservoir independently? yes no
 - COMMENTS: Although most of the information required above was provided, gaps in the data provided exist for some CWS's using interconnected reservoirs.
7. For CWS using stream intakes, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 D)? If a CWS is not using stream intakes, so note in the "COMMENTS."
- name of the stream or river yes Chickahominy, Northwest River, Blackwater River, Nottoway River no
 - drainage area above the intake yes no
 - sub-basin in which the intake is located yes no
 - design capacity for average daily and maximum daily withdrawal from the stream yes no
 - safe yield yes no
 - lowest daily flow of record yes no
 - design capacity of the pump station yes no
 - design capacity of the water treatment plant yes no
 - capacity of the system permitted by VDH yes no
 - any limitation on withdrawals established by permits issued by the SWCB, VDH, or any other agency yes no N/A
 - COMMENTS: Although most of the information required above was provided for most CWS's using stream intakes, gaps in the data provided exist in some localities.
8. For all non-agricultural, self-supplied users (SSU) of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface water, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 E)? If none exist, so note in the "COMMENTS."
- name of the water body utilized yes no
 - design capacity for average daily and maximum daily withdrawal yes no
 - any limitations on withdrawals established by permits issued by the SWCB, VDH, or any other agency yes no N/A
 - COMMENTS: Although the information required above was provided for most non-agricultural SSU's using surface water, gaps in the data provided exist for some SSU's.

9. For all non-agricultural, self-supplied users of more than 300,000 gallons per month of ground water, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 F)? If none exist, so note in the "COMMENTS."
- name and ID number of the well or wells yes no
 - well depth yes no
 - casing depth yes no
 - screen depth (top and bottom) or water zones yes no
 - well diameter yes no
 - design capacity for the average daily and maximum daily withdrawal, and yes no
 - any limitation on withdrawal established by permits issued by the SWCB, VDH, or any other agency yes no N/A
 - COMMENTS: Although the information required above was provided for most non-agricultural SSU's using ground water, gaps in the data provided exist for some SSU's.
10. For ground or surface water to be purchased from water supply systems outside the geographic boundaries of the planning area, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 G)? (NOTE: 'to be purchased' presumes an existing contract with an entity outside of the planning region)
- amount to be purchased, on a maximum daily and average annual basis yes no N/A
 - any contractual limitations on the purchase of the water, including but not limited to:
 - term of any contract or agreement yes no
 - recipient(s) or areas served by the water purchased yes no
 - name(s) of the supplier(s) yes no
 - COMMENTS: There are many water sales between jurisdictions in the region. The information above is provided both in the narrative and in tabular form by jurisdiction.
11. For water available to be purchased outside the planning area from any source with the capacity to withdraw more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 H)? (NOTE: 'available to be purchased' presumes no contract is in place but could be in the future with an entity outside the planning region)
- amount available for purchase, reported on a maximum daily and average annual basis yes no N/A
 - any contractual limitations on the purchase of the water, including but not limited to:
 - term of any contract or agreement yes 11/17/87 - open ended no
 - geographic region(s) that receive the water purchased yes Chesapeake no
 - name(s) of the supplier(s) yes City of Virginia Beach no
 - COMMENTS: Chesapeake has a contract with Virginia Beach to purchase water from their Lake Gaston source. Lake Gaston is the only water source available outside of the planning area (pg. 1-23).

12. For agricultural self-supplied users (SSU) of more than 300,000 gallons per month, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 I)? If none exist, so note in the "COMMENTS."

- a. a list of agricultural users yes no
- b. an estimate of total agricultural usage by source yes no
- c. whether the use is irrigation or non-irrigation yes no
- d. whether the source is surface or ground water yes no

13. For self-supplied residential and business users withdrawing less than 300,000 gallons per month, is the following information provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 J)? If none exists, so note in the "COMMENTS."

- a. an estimate of the number of residences yes no N/A
- b. an estimate of the population served by individual wells yes no N/A
- c. an estimate of the number of businesses supplied by individual wells yes no N/A
- d. COMMENTS: Aquifers: Yorktown-Eastover, Piney Point, Potomac aquifers

14. Has a summary of findings and recommendations from source water assessment plans and/or wellhead protection programs been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-70 K)? yes no

- a. COMMENTS: All surface water and some ground water sources have a high susceptibility for contamination in the planning area; several sources are under a VDH fluoride consent order.

15. COMMENTS: A significant amount of water is bought and sold between localities within the region. Section 1, pgs. 1-1 thru 1-70, and App A. Nice maps, tables, and figures. Data is presented by locality, within localities by publicly- and privately-owned CWSs, then SSUs. Localities are grouped into 3 sub-regions; includes an overview of numbers of CWSs and SSUs for each sub-region and summaries of sources by locality. Section 9 VAC 25-780-50.C.1 of the Regulation requires "a description of existing water sources in accordance with the requirements of 9 VAC 25-780-70." Although an effort to provide this information has been made, data gaps exist for CWS's and SSU's in some localities. Please provide all of the data requested by 9 VAC 25-780-70 for all CWS's and SSU's in all localities. Examples of missing source data include well construction data, such as average and max daily design capacity; casing, screen and well depth; and well diameter.

B. Describe Existing Water Use (§9 VAC 25-780-80) as follows:

- 1. Summarize existing water use as discussed in the Plan: Most users within the planning area are served by publicly-owned CWSs, with the exception of the more rural Western Tidewater sub-region where most users are self-supplied. §2, pgs 2-1 thru 2-35, App. A.
 - a. Peninsula sub-region use: 94% of the population in this sub-region is served by publicly-owned CWSs. Private, rather than publicly-owned, CWSs serve the populations of Gloucester, James City, and York counties. In addition, private residential wells serve ~33,384 people in Gloucester, James City, and York counties. An estimated 54 businesses were served by private wells in 2007, 36 of which were located outside of

CWS boundaries. In 2007 there were 20 large, non-agricultural SSUs and no large agricultural SSUs.

- b. Southside sub-region use: 92% of population is served by publicly-owned CWSs including the entire populations of Norfolk and Portsmouth. Public CWSs in Chesapeake, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach serve dense population centers but not the entire cities. Areas not served by the public CWSs in these cities are served either by private residential wells or private CWSs. Chesapeake and Suffolk are the only localities in the sub-region with privately-owned CWSs (there are 9 serving ~1% of the sub-region population). Private residential wells are found in the southern and western portions of Chesapeake, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach with the majority being in Chesapeake. About 5% of the sub-region's population was served by private wells in 2007. 49 businesses were served by private wells. 38 large, non-agricultural SSUs and several agricultural SSUs.
- c. Western Tidewater use: a significant portion (49%) of the population in this sub-region is served by private residential wells (35 businesses are served by private wells). Franklin, Smithfield and Windsor are the only localities in the sub-region where the majority of the population is served by publicly-owned CWSs. 24 publicly-owned CWSs serve 41% of the population; the remainder is served by one of 40 privately-owned CWSs. The majority of the privately-owned CWSs are located in Isle of Wight and Southampton counties. 12 large non-agricultural SSUs; 13 large agricultural SSUs.

2. Source of data used -- Source: VDH waterworks permit compliance reports, ground water permit compliance reports, and/or water use reports (§9 VAC 25-780-80 A).
Date or date range of data used: 2007-08

3. For each CWS, has the following information been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-80 B)?

- a. Population served yes no
- b. Number of connections yes no
- c. Average and maximum daily withdrawal yes no
- d. Water usage by CWS on an average monthly and annual basis, expressed in terms of million gallons per day ("MGD") yes no
- e. Peak day water use by month yes no
- f. Within each CWS service area, have the following estimates been provided?
- i. An estimate of the water used on an average annual basis by self-supplied nonagricultural users of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water yes no N/A
- ii. An estimate of the amount of water used on an average annual basis by self-supplied agricultural users of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water yes no N/A
- iii. An estimate of the number of self-supplied users of less than 300,000 gallons per month of ground water and an estimate of the total amount of water used by them on an annual average basis yes no N/A

- g. An estimate of the disaggregated amounts of water used in categories of use appropriate for the system, as follows:
- i. Residential use yes no
 - ii. Commercial institutional and light industrial ("CIL") use yes no N/A
 - iii. Heavy industrial use yes no N/A
 - iv. Military water use yes no N/A
 - v. Water used in water production processes yes no N/A
 - vi. Unaccounted for losses yes no
 - vii. Sales to other community water systems and the names of such systems
 yes no N/A
 - viii. Subtotals of the above categories for all community water systems yes no
 - ix. Other: _____
- h. For each CWS using stream intakes, has a qualitative description of existing in-stream beneficial uses either within or outside the planning area that may be affected by the point of stream withdrawal been provided? yes Peninsula, pg. 2-6; Southside, Pg. 2-14 no N/A
4. Has an estimate of the water used on an average annual basis by self-supplied non-agricultural users of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-80 C)?
 yes no N/A
5. Has an estimate of the amount of water used on an average annual basis by self-supplied agricultural users of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-80 D)?
 yes no N/A
6. Has an estimate of the number of self-supplied users of less than 300,000 gallons per month of ground water and an estimate of the total amount of water used by them on an annual average basis outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-80 E)?
 yes no N/A
7. COMMENTS: Section 9 VAC 25-780-50.C.2 of the Regulation requires "a description of existing water use in accordance with the requirements of 9 VAC 25-780-80." Although an effort to provide this information has been made, gaps in the data provided exist for CWS's and SSU's in some localities. Please provide all of the data requested by 9 VAC 25-780-80 for all CWS's and SSU's in all localities. Examples of missing use data include peak day use by month. For estimates of small SSUs, domestic water use was assumed to be 75 gallons per person, household size was based on 2000 census estimates. Annual use by small business based on VDH guidelines for public drinking water supply needs assessments. Data is presented by publicly- and privately-owned CWSs within each locality, then SSUs. Localities are grouped into 3 sub-regions; includes a summary of total water use for each sub-region and by CWS, SSU, and use type for each locality. Section 2, pgs. 2-1 thru 2-35, and App. A
- C. For Existing Water Resources (§9 VAC 25-780-90), has the following information been provided?

1. Summarize existing water resources as identified in the Plan: The planning area is located in Virginia's Coastal Plain Province and all localities but the County of Gloucester are in the Eastern Virginia Ground Water Management Area. All surface water sources and some ground water sources in the planning area are highly susceptible to contamination.
 2. List sources and dates of data provided: US Geological Survey, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), DEQ, Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Department of Historic Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Coastal Change Analysis program, Virginia Fish and Wildlife Service National Rivers Inventory, DCR Virginia Outdoors Plan, US Department of Agriculture, US Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, 2008 Virginia Water Quality Assessment.
 3. Existing geologic, hydrologic, and meteorological conditions within the locality, and in proximity to the point of withdrawal if it is outside the planning area (§9 VAC 25-780-90 A).
 yes pgs. 3-1 thru 3-12 no
 4. Existing environmental conditions that pertain to, or may affect, instream flow, instream uses, and sources that provide the current supply, as follows (§9 VAC 25-780-90 B):
 - a. State or federal listed threatened or endangered species or habitats of concern
 yes pg. 3-13 no N/A
 - b. Anadromous, trout, and other significant fisheries yes pg. 3-15 no N/A
 - c. River segments that have recreational significance, including state scenic river status
 yes pg. 3-17 no N/A
 - d. Sites of historic or archaeological significance yes pg. 3-22 no N/A
 - e. Unusual geologic formations or special soil types yes Chesapeake Bay impact crater no N/A
 - f. Wetlands yes pg. 3-25 no N/A
 - g. Riparian buffers and conservation easements yes pg. 3-32 no N/A
 - h. Land use and land coverage, including items such as percentage of impervious cover within a watershed and areas where new development may impact water quality of the source
 yes 10% impervious cover; pg. 3-38 no N/A
 - i. The presence of impaired streams and the type of impairment yes pg. 3-42 no
 N/A
 - j. The locations of point source discharges yes pg. 3-48 no N/A
 - k. Potential threats to the existing water quantity and quality, other than those from above
 yes solid waste management facilities, underground storage tanks, superfund sites, uranium mining, fluoride no N/A
 5. COMMENTS: Thorough research, documentation, and analysis. Section 3, pgs. 3-1 thru 3-61.
- D. Describe **Projected Water Demand** (§9 VAC 25-780-100) based upon accepted methodology (as outlined in the American Water Works Association ("AWWA") or American Society of Civil Engineers ("ASCE") manuals), as follows:
1. Summarize changes in projected water demand as provided in the Plan: Demand is expected to increase as population continues to grow. Southside will see the most growth followed by

Peninsula and Western Tidewater. Publicly-owned CWS demand is anticipated to increase by 44%; the majority of development is expected to occur within CWS service areas. Demand in privately-owned CWS service areas is anticipated to decrease as some of these systems opt for service from publicly-owned CWSs and as development occurs in publicly-owned CWS service areas. Small SSU demand is expected to increase by 27%, most of which is anticipated in the Southside sub-region. Large SSU demand is deemed too difficult to predict, so demand levels remained constant through the end of the planning period.

2. Are water demand projections included (§9 VAC 25-780-100 A)? yes projections were developed by HRPDC or provided by locality utility departments no
- a. List source and date or date range for population estimates: U.S. Census Bureau Weldon Cooper Center Virginia Employment Commission ("VEC") Other
- b. Dates and description of any other accepted source of population information used, including local or regional sources: For publicly-owned CWSs, HRPDC staff or locality utility departments provided projections using Regional Economic Models, Inc. software developed for long-term regional transportation plans. Other projections were based on specific assumptions and data deemed appropriate for use by utility departments, including historic use and safe yield studies (Pg. 4-1). Demand numbers for small privately-owned CWSs were based on analysis include in ground water withdrawal permits.
- c. Is documentation of information sources and methodologies provided? yes documentation of assumptions and methodology is provided for each subset (publicly- and privately-owned CWSs, large and small SSUs). no
3. Is an estimate of water demand within the planning area for 30 to 50 years into the future provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 B)? yes no
4. Is an estimate of future water use projected at the beginning of each decade (2010, 2020, 2030, etc.) provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 C)? yes no
5. Are the following projections provided for CWS within the planning area (§9 VAC 25-780-100 D)?
- a. An estimate of population within the locality served by each CWS yes no
- b. A map depicting the proposed service area of each existing or proposed CWS yes Maps of existing and proposed CWS service areas are located in Section 1 Existing Sources no
- c. Estimated water demand for each existing or proposed CWS on both an annual average and peak monthly basis yes no
- d. Estimated water demand for each existing or proposed CWS disaggregated into categories of use appropriate for the system, such as:
- i. Residential use yes no
- ii. Commercial institutional and light industrial use yes no N/A
- iii. Heavy industrial use yes no N/A
- iv. Military water use yes no N/A

- v. Water used in water production processes yes no N/A
- vi. Unaccounted for losses yes no N/A
- vii. Sales to other community water systems and the names of such systems yes
 no N/A
- viii. Subtotals of the above categories for all community water systems yes
 no
- e. Total projected water demand for all existing or proposed CWS disaggregated into the categories mentioned in subdivision d, above. yes no
- f. Were current conservation practices, techniques and technologies considered in the above water demand projections (§9 VAC 25-780-110 B)? yes no
- g. COMMENTS: publicly-owned CWS data presented on pgs. 4-1 thru 4-5; privately-owned CWS data presented on pgs. 4-6 thru 4-7.
6. Has a projection of water demand on an annual average basis for each existing and any proposed self-supplied nonagricultural user of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water located outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 E)? yes no N/A COMMENTS: Demand not expected to increase over 2007 numbers.
7. Has a projection of the amount of water use on an annual average basis for each existing and any projected self-supplied agricultural user of more than 300,000 gallons per month of surface and ground water located outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 F)? yes no N/A COMMENTS: Demand not expected to increase over 2007 numbers.
8. Has a projection of the number of self-supplied users of less than 300,000 gallons per month of ground water and a projection of the amount of water used on an annual average basis outside the service areas of CWS been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 G)? yes Numbers are projected to remain constant no N/A
9. Has an explanation of how the projected needs of domestic consumption, in-stream uses, and economic development have been accounted for in the demand projection for the planning period been provided (§9 VAC 25-780-100 I)? yes no
10. COMMENTS: Projected population estimates and water demand are organized by CWS (public and private), and SSUs over and under 300,000. Good explanation of assumptions and methodologies; nice summary of regional projected demand on pg. 4-11. Section 4, pgs 4-1 thru 4-14.
- E. Describe proposed **Water Demand Management** actions (§9 VAC 25-780-110), as follows:
1. Does the Plan describe practices for more efficient use of water? yes no
- a. If "Yes," which of the following are used: adoption and enforcement of Uniform Statewide Building Code ("USBC") sections requiring maximum flow of water closets, urinals, and appliances; lower-water use landscaping; increases in irrigation efficiency (§9 VAC 25-780-110 A 1)?; other

- b. Describe additional water use efficiency practices: wasteful water use ordinances, water loss awareness education, and WaterSense partnership.
2. Does the Plan describe water conservation measures used to conserve water through the reduction of use? yes no
- a. If "Yes," which of the following are used: technical, educational, and financial programs (§9 VAC 25-780-110 A 2)? other provide retrofit kits and leak detection kits as part of HR WET (Hampton Roads Water Efficiency Team) program; active water reuse/reclamation programs in some localities.
3. Does the Plan describe practices to address water loss in the maintenance of systems to reduce unaccounted for water loss? yes no
- a. If "Yes," which of the following are used: leak detection and repair, old distribution line replacement (§9 VAC 25-780-110 A 3)? other leaking fixtures ordinances, metering of all uses and meter testing/replacement programs, unauthorized connection ordinances.
4. COMMENTS: Hampton Roads has a long history of water conservation and water demand management (almost 40 years) due to relatively small tributary watersheds that feed the region's reservoirs, and limited natural water supply reserve. Due to the coastal nature of the region, most of the surface water is salty and not readily available for drinking water. In addition, ground water sources are vulnerable to excessive use and saltwater intrusion. Section 5, pgs. 5-1 thru 5-19.
- F. **Drought Response and Contingency Plan** (§9 VAC 25-780-120) for CWS and self-supplied users withdrawing more than an average of 300,000 gallons per month of surface or ground water.
1. Does the DRCP address unique characteristics of the water source being utilized and the nature of the beneficial use of water (§9 VAC 25-780-120.1)? yes no
2. Does the DRCP contain the following graduated stages of response to the onset of drought conditions, at a minimum (§9 VAC 25-780-120.2):
- a. Drought watch stage responses, intended to raise awareness: yes no
- b. Drought warning stage responses, voluntary water conservation practices intended to reduce water use by 5 to 10%: yes no
- c. Drought emergency stage responses, mandatory water conservation practices intended to reduce water use by 10-15%: yes expect a 10 to 25% reduction, pg. 5-33 no
- d. Describe any additional drought response stages included in the DRCP: Extreme Drought Emergency occurs when only critical supplies of water are available (pg. 5-33).
3. Does the DRCP contain references to adopted local ordinances and procedures for implementation and enforcement (§9 VAC 25-780-120.3)? yes no
- a. If "Yes," list code citations or describe policy: all localities in the region adopted "water supply emergency ordinances"
- b. If "No," describe DRCP implementation and enforcement policy: _____

4. COMMENTS: Section 5, pgs. 5-20 thru 5-34.

G. **Statement of Need and Alternatives Analysis** (§9 VAC 25-780-130), is the following provided:

1. Statement of Need: based upon the analysis of the above information derived from §9 VAC 25-780-70 through 110, are existing water sources adequate to meet current and projected demand (§9 VAC 25-780-130 A): yes projected supply for the region is anticipated to meet projected future demand through 2050; however, demand may exceed supply in the Peninsula sub-region by 2040 as projections are within a +/- 10% margin of error. In addition, while most of the region depends upon conjunctive use systems (using both surface and ground water), 23% of the raw source water for publicly-owned CWSs is from ground water, and some localities rely exclusively on ground water (most in Western Tidewater). With the exception of Gloucester County, the entire planning area is located within the Eastern Virginia Ground Water Management Area because of the vulnerability of the source. In addition, there are indicators of a relationship between ground water withdrawals and land subsidence in the region and DEQ has encouraged several public CWSs in the region to reduce the amount of withdrawal requested in their permit renewal applications, effectively reducing the available water supply for those facilities. no
2. If future demand is determined to exceed current supply, then has an analysis of alternative sources been provided, as follows (§9 VAC 25-780-130 B)?
 - a. A description of potential water savings through demand management actions
 yes no
 - b. A description of potential new supply sources yes no
 - c. A description of potential resource issues and impacts (based upon §9 VAC 25-780-140 G) for each potential new source yes no
 - d. Is a description of various alternatives provided, including (§9 VAC 25-780-130 C):
 - i. water demand management and conservation measures yes no
 - ii. traditional supply increases such as wells, reservoirs, impoundments and stream intakes, etc. yes reservoir, increased surface water storage, additional ground water withdrawals no
 - iii. Nontraditional means of increasing supply such as interconnection, desalination, reclamation and reuse, etc. yes desalination, interconnection, reuse, and system optimization no
 - iv. Describe any other alternatives considered: Aquifer storage and recovery
 - v. Does the alternatives analysis include a combination of short and long term alternatives? yes no
3. Provide a list of preferred water supply alternatives for the planning area, if applicable: N/A
4. COMMENTS: Statement of Need is organized by sub-region in Section 6, pgs. 6-1 thru 6-10. The Alternatives Analysis addresses the potential for demand to exceed supply by 2040 in the Peninsula sub-region. A wide range of possibilities is reviewed as are associated impacts and costs. Alternatives is Section 7, pgs 7-1 thru 7-11.

PART III: COMPLIANCE REVIEW and CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION PROCESS

PART III of the checklist pertains to the compliance review to be conducted by DEQ. This review includes program evaluation by state resource management agencies, identification of conflicts between submitted programs, and assessment of program compliance with the Regulation. Once DEQ assessment is complete, a tentative statement of compliance will be prepared for public review and comment.

- A. **Finding of Tentative Compliance with §9 VAC 25-780-50** as reviewed in PART II of the checklist:
1. Tentatively Compliant – proceed to public notice, as per §9 VAC 25-780-140 and 150.
 2. Noncompliant – Part IV outlines reasons and steps to address noncompliance
 3. Date Finding of Tentative Compliance letter sent: _____
 4. Record of informal proceeding (when requested) pursuant to Article 3 (§2.2-4018, et seq.) of Chapter 40 of the Virginia Administrative Process Act: _____
- B. **Determine local/regional program consistency with the following (§9 VAC 25-780-140 C):**
1. §9 VAC 25-390-20 – SWCB Water Resources Policy: The Plan tentatively complies with the Local and Regional Water Supply Planning Regulation (§9VAC25-780, et seq.), and therefore provides the Board with the information necessary to fulfill its responsibilities under the Water Resources Policy (§9VAC25-390-20).
 2. Section 62.1-11 of the Code of Virginia (“COV” or “Code”) – declaration of Virginia’s waters as a natural resource, use of which can be limited: The Plan provides the information necessary for meeting the mandates put forth in this section of the Code, and recognizes the need for authorized withdrawals for water supply while protecting other beneficial uses.
 3. Section 62.1-44.36 of the Code of Virginia – SWCB assigned duty of planning for the development, conservation and use of Virginia’s water resources: The Plan tentatively complies with the Local and Regional Water Supply Planning Regulation (§9VAC25-780, et seq.), and therefore provides the Board with the information necessary to fulfill its responsibilities under this section of the Code.
- C. **Evaluation/inventory of conflicts (§9 VAC 25-780-140 C 3 and 140 G)**
This portion of the checklist will be relevant after development of the State Water Resources Plan.
1. Cumulative demand impact analysis (“CIA”): _____
 2. Evaluation of conflicts between potential alternatives: _____
 3. Evaluation of potential use conflicts between projected water demand and estimates of in-stream flow requirements: _____
 4. Evaluation of relationship between local/regional plan(s) and State Water Resources Plan:

5. Describe any identified conflicts between jurisdictions, regions, and/or partners:

6. COMMENTS: _____

D. **Program evaluation by State Agencies:** Department of Conservation and Recreation ("DCR"), the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries ("DGIF"), the Department of Historic Resources ("DHR"), the Virginia Marine Resources Commission ("VMRC"), and VDH (§9 VAC 25-780-140 B and 150 B)

1. Dates of 90 day Agency comment period: 3/11/13 – 6/11/13

a. DCR written comments received on 3/14/13

b. DGIF written comments received on _____

c. DHR written comments received on 5/13/2013

d. VMRC written comments received on _____

e. VDH written comments received on 2/27/13

2. Written Agency comments and DEQ responses attached.

3. Record of Technical Evaluation Committee meeting (if applicable): N/A

E. **Record of public notice(s), public comment period(s), and/or public meeting(s)** concerning DEQ findings concerning tentative program compliance (§9 VAC 25-780-150 and §9 VAC 25-780-160):

1. Dates of 30-day public comment period: _____

2. Date notice posted to DEQ website: _____

3. Were written public comments received: yes no

4. Written public comments and DEQ responses attached.

5. Record of requested public meeting(s) including notice and record of comment

6. COMMENTS: _____

F. **Date of final determination of compliance with §9 VAC 25-780, et seq.** _____

G. **State Water Resources Plan**

1. Applicable text incorporated into SWRP: yes no

2. Applicable data input into Cumulative Impact Analysis ("CIA") model: yes no

PART IV: REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLIANCE, AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT, PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF CONFLICTS, ITEMS OF INTEREST, DEQ ACTION ITEMS

PART IV of the checklist includes areas in need of improvement by the next iteration of the plan and a listing of future water source alternatives identified in the Plan that may conflict with neighboring plans or regions, as identified by the reviewing planners. In addition, it is a place for notable items of interest that may deserve special recognition.

A. REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPLIANCE

B. AREAS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (These items should be addressed by the localities by the next iteration of the WSP).

1. Section 9 VAC 25-780-50.C.1 of the Regulation requires “a description of existing water sources in accordance with the requirements of 9 VAC 25-780-70.” Although an effort to provide this information has been made, data gaps exist for CWS’s and SSU’s in some localities. Please provide all of the data requested by 9 VAC 25-780-70 for all CWS’s and SSU’s in all localities. See Part II, Section A.
2. Work with privately owned community water systems to better represent water use information required by Section 9 VAC 25-780-80 of the Regulation for their systems. See Part II, Section B, and the items highlighted in yellow on the spreadsheet entitled “HRPDC_dataack_080213.xlsx.”

C. PRELIMINARY IDENTIFICATION OF CONFLICTS

1. None

D. ITEMS OF INTEREST

1. Though not mentioned in the HRPDC Plan, the Lake Country Water Supply Plan indicates continued growth in Hampton Roads is seen as a potential threat to Lake Gaston as regional demand increases.
2. The PDC put together a nice submission package, with all adoption documentation packaged separately. The primary WSP document was well organized into three sub-regions, has excellent mapping, tables, and figures.
3. The long term, ongoing regional commitment to active water conservation use and demand management through technical, financial, and educational efforts is a sterling example for other regions.

E. DEQ ACTION ITEMS

1. Develop clear, consistent guidance to aide localities in responding to regulatory requirements.

2. Develop an online tool for use by localities when updating the data requirements of the regulation.
3. Continue efforts to improve participation in water withdrawal reporting by agricultural and nonagricultural users through direct contact with users and coordination with other applicable agencies.
4. Continue efforts to create an inventory of DEQ permitted surface water withdrawals and to share this inventory with planning entities.
5. Continue efforts to create an inventory of ground water source (wells and springs) information, including DEQ permitted ground water withdrawals and to share this inventory with planning entities.

HRPDC Tentative Compliance

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [1=Yes,0=No]	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Agricultural	1100 Cattle (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Agricultural	1500 Horses (USDA NASS data for Suffolk)	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.28
WSP - SSU Agricultural	1800 Beef Cows (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.01
WSP - SSU Agricultural	1900 Horses (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Agricultural	2600 Horses (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.84
WSP - SSU Agricultural	3100 Cattle (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Agricultural	3200 Horses (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.93
WSP - SSU Agricultural	3700 Cattle (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Agricultural	500 Beef Cows (USDA NASS data)	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.1
WSP - SSU Agricultural	8200 Cattle (USDA NASS data for Suffolk)	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.88
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Bennett Creek Wholesale Nursery	N/A	N/A	N/A	146
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Bennetts Creek Nursery	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Cox Farm	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Davis Farm	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.2
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Franklin Turfgrass Inc., River Road Farm	N/A	N/A	N/A	219
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Gray Lumber Company - Bacons Castle Farm	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.85
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Greenbrier Farms Nursery	N/A	N/A	N/A	930.75
WSP - SSU Agricultural	John T. Butler, Jr.	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.25
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Murphy Brown, LLC - Smithfield Carroll's Farms 16-17	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.6
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Murphy Brown, LLC - Smithfield Carroll's Farms 6-8	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.9
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Murphy Brown, LLC - Smithfield Carroll's Surry Farms 9, 10, 21	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Murphy Brown, LLC Isle of Wight Farms - Carrolls 1-5	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.8

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Philip Edwards	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Southern Belle Turf Farms	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Sunset View Farm	N/A	N/A	N/A	105.85
WSP - SSU Agricultural	Williams Cattle Co., LLC	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.9
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Albert G. Horton, Jr. Veterans Cemetary	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	BASF (Ciba Specialty Chemicals) - Suffolk Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	BASF Corporation	N/A	N/A	N/A	87.6
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	BASF Corporation Williamsburg	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Bayshore Concrete Products	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Bayville Golf Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.6
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Bow Creek Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Broad Bay Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.95
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Busch Gardens Williamsburg	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cahoon Plantation Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.25
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Capital Concrete Incorporated - Stapleton Street Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cavalier Golf & Yacht Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	51.74
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cedar Point Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Chesapeake Energy Center	N/A	N/A	N/A	190 165.00000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cintas Corporation / Omni Services, Inc.	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.9
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cogentrix Virginia Leasing Corporation	N/A	N/A	N/A	605.9
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Colonial Williamsburg Inn	N/A	N/A	N/A	175.2
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Cypress Point Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Deer Run Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.2
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Dominion Power Nuclear Power Plant - Surry	N/A	N/A	N/A	647 612.00000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Dominion Terminal Associates - Pier 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.8

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Eagle Haven Golf Course, NAB Little Creek	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.95
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Elizabeth Manor Golf and Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	51.1
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Golden Horseshoe Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Hell's Point Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	36.5
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Hercules Incorporated	N/A	N/A	N/A	1 919.90000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Heron Ridge Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	54.75
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	International Paper - Franklin Mill Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	13 355.30000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	J.H. Miles and Company - Norfolk Processing Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	54.75
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	James River Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.95
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Kempville Greens Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Kinder Morgan Bulk Terminal - Pier IX Terminal Company	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.85
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Kingsmill Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	102.2
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Narricot Industries Incorporated	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.85
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	National Linen & Uniform Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding	N/A	N/A	N/A	2 974.75000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Oceana Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Outdoor World Campground Williamsburg	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Princess Anne Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	69.35
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Redwing Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	43.8
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Richmond Cold Storage	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Sanifill of Virginia - Big Bethel Landfill	N/A	N/A	N/A	29.2
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Servitex Division of Alisco	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.95
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Sewells Point Golf Course, U.S. Navy, Norfolk Naval Base	N/A	N/A	N/A	47.45
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Siemens Automotive - Newport News	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.6

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Smithfield Foods, Inc. - Gwaltney	N/A	N/A	N/A	492.75
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Smithfield Foods, Inc. - Ham and Products Division	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Smithfield Foods, Inc. - Packing Company	N/A	N/A	N/A	182.5
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Southampton County Agri-Business Industrial Park	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	SPSA Regional Landfill	N/A	N/A	N/A	10.95
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Surry County Public Schools	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	The Pines Golf Course - Fort Eustis	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.9
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Tidewater Area Central Hospital Laundry, Inc. (Shared Hospital Services)	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.9
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Titan Ready Mix Plant - Rip Rap Road	N/A	N/A	N/A	7.3
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Titan Virginia Ready-Mix, LLC - Campostella Ready-Mix Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.93
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Titan Virginia Ready-Mix, LLC - Oceana Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Titan Virginia Ready-Mix, LLC - Port Norfolk Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.65
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	TPC of Virginia Beach, LLC (now Virginia Beach National Golf Course)	N/A	N/A	N/A	91.25
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Two Rivers Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	25.55
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Valley Proteins Incorporated	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Williamsburg Country Club	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.25
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Williamsburg National Golf Course	N/A	N/A	N/A	18.25
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Over 300K	Yorktown Fossil Power Plant	N/A	N/A	N/A	298 205.00000
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Chesapeake Small SSU Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.69563
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Chesapeake Small SSU Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.0884
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Chesapeake Small SSU Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	919.8

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Franklin Small SSU - Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	14.6
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Franklin Small SSU - Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.13104
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Gloucester Co Small SSU-Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	41.4421
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Gloucester Co Small SSU-Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.657
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Gloucester Co Small SSU-Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	628.53
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Isle of Wight Small SSU - Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	23.6418
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Isle of Wight Small SSU - Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.03315
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Isle of Wight Small SSU - Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	385.248
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Isle of Wight Small SSU - Residential INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	64.3039
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	James City County Small SSU - Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	28.105
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	James City County Small SSU - Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	75.7375
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	James City County Small SSU - Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	197.757
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Newport News Small SSU-Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.92
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Portsmouth small SSU Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.06862
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Smithfield Small SSU - Residential INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.50175
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Southampton Small SSU - Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	33.4924
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Southampton Small SSU - Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.06245
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Southampton Small SSU - Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	332.661
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Suffolk small SSU Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	13.6875
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Suffolk small SSU Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.08485
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Suffolk small SSU Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	551.99
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Surry Small SSU - Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.4492
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Surry Small SSU - Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	151.493
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Virginia Beach Small SSU Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	30.3388
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Virginia Beach Small SSU Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	79.6284
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Virginia Beach Small SSU Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	132.796

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	Windsor Small SSU - Residential INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.14431
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	York County Small SSU-Business	N/A	N/A	N/A	21.6628
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	York County Small SSU-Business INSIDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.3798
WSP - SSU Non-Ag Under 300K	York County Small SSU-Residential	N/A	N/A	N/A	87.6
WSP Community Water System	Ashby Subdivision	0.062	0.111	1	22.81
WSP Community Water System	Bethel Heights	0.004	0	1	1.46
WSP Community Water System	Birdsong (formerly Byrdtown Subdivision)	0.007	0.011	1	2.555
WSP Community Water System	Bob Steele Waterworks	0.004	0.012	1	1.46
WSP Community Water System	Brewer's Creek	0.029	0.063	1	10.74
WSP Community Water System	Brooks' Duplexes	0.002	0.003	1	0.73
WSP Community Water System	Camptown Development Service District	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF FRANKLIN			
WSP Community Water System	Cannon Acres	0.015	0.028	1	5.475
WSP Community Water System	Capron, Town of	0.021	0.026	1	1.69
WSP Community Water System	Carrisville	0.016	0	1	5.91
WSP Community Water System	Cherry Grove Acres	0.015	0.028	0	5.475
WSP Community Water System	Chesapeake - Northwest River System	11.173	25.1	1	4 078.04000
WSP Community Water System	Chesapeake - South Norfolk System	2.63	3.9	1	958.63
WSP Community Water System	Chesapeake - Western Branch System	2.923	3.9	1	1 067.05000
WSP Community Water System	Claremont, Town of	0.026	0	1	11.23
WSP Community Water System	Clydes Dale Mobile Home Park	0.027	0.042	1	9.82

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP Community Water System	Courtland, Town of	0.131	0	1	58.72
WSP Community Water System	Dam Neck - US Navy	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Darden's Mill Estates	0.012	0.02	1	4.38
WSP Community Water System	Days Point Subdivision	0.011	0	1	4.98
WSP Community Water System	Deer Run	0.007	0.01	1	2.555
WSP Community Water System	Dendron, Town of	0.026	0.035	1	9.57
WSP Community Water System	Duck's Trailer Court	0.001	0.001	1	0.365
WSP Community Water System	Edward's Trailer Park	0.011	0	1	4.015
WSP Community Water System	Fieldcrest Manufactured Home Community	0.008	0.011	1	2.92
WSP Community Water System	Fort Story - US Army	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Franklin, City of	1.1	1.9	1	424.88
WSP Community Water System	Gatling Pointe Subdivision	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH TOWN OF SMITHFIELD			
WSP Community Water System	Gloucester County WTP	1.38	3.17	1	502.49
WSP Community Water System	Greensprings Mobile Village	0.011	0.014	1	4.015
WSP Community Water System	Guilford Heights	0.0085	0	1	3.1025
WSP Community Water System	Heaths Mobile Homes	0.003	0.004	1	1.095
WSP Community Water System	Hobson Mt. Lebanon Waterworks	0.008	0	1	2.92
WSP Community Water System	Hobson Village Waterworks	0.005	0	1	1.825

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP Community Water System	Indian River Water Co - Aqua Virginia, Inc.	0.116	0	1	42.49
WSP Community Water System	Ivor, Town of	0.055	0.074	1	20.58
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Central System	5.82	10.998	1	1 837.11000
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Glenwood Acres	0.006	0.011	1	2.28
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Kings Village	0.01	0.021	1	3.77
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Racefield	0.011	0.021	1	3.88
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Retreat	0.014	0.038	1	5.17
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Stonehouse	0	0	0	
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Upper County				SYSTEM ELIMINATED
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Ware Creek Manor	0.012	0.022	1	4.38
WSP Community Water System	James City Service Authority - Wexford Hills	0.028	0.053	1	10.05
WSP Community Water System	James River Shores	0.012	0.017	1	4.38
WSP Community Water System	Kingsdale Subdivision (Artis)	0.006	0	1	2.19
WSP Community Water System	Kingsdale Subdivision (Moseley)	0.003	0	1	1.095
WSP Community Water System	Laurelwood Estates Trailer Park	0.001	0	1	3.72
WSP Community Water System	Lawne's Point				SERVED 4 CONNECTIONS, 10 PEOPLE IN 2010; GW0047000
WSP Community Water System	Little Creek Amphibious Base - US Navy				NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK
WSP Community Water System	Longview Acres	0.014	0.028	1	5.11
WSP Community Water System	NAS Oceana - US Navy				NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK
WSP Community Water System	Naval Support Activity - NW Annex	0.11	0.17	1	39.89
WSP Community Water System	Newport Development Service District				NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH WTWA

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP Community Water System	Newport News Waterworks	51.63	67.39	1	18 843.20000
WSP Community Water System	Newport News Waterworks - Lightfoot / Skimino Hills	0.328	0.46	1	119.87
WSP Community Water System	Newsoms, Town of	0.037	0	1	13.57
WSP Community Water System	Norfolk Naval Base	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Norfolk, City of	79	101.73	1	7 093.61000
WSP Community Water System	Norfolk, City of - In-Town Reservoirs	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Norfolk, City of - Western Branch Reservoirs	NUMBERS INCLUDED WITH CITY OF NORFOLK			
WSP Community Water System	Nottoway Gardens	0.02	0.039	1	7.2
WSP Community Water System	Nottoway Shores	0.008	0	1	2.92
WSP Community Water System	Owen's Subdivision	0.008	0	1	2.92
WSP Community Water System	Plantation Mobile Home Park	0.007	0	1	2.55
WSP Community Water System	Portsmouth, City of	16.85	20.65	1	5 098.70000
WSP Community Water System	Queen Anne's Court	0.009	0	1	3.285
WSP Community Water System	R&L Trailer Park	0.004	0	1	0.97
WSP Community Water System	Red Oaks Mobile Community	0.039	0.087	1	14.2
WSP Community Water System	Rescue Waterworks	0.011	0.017	1	4.1
WSP Community Water System	Rollingwood	0	0	0	

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP Community Water System	Rushmere - Burwell's Bay	0.011	0	1	4.13
WSP Community Water System	Rushmere Shores	0.006	0.009	1	2.19
WSP Community Water System	Scotland Heights	0.012	0	1	4.38
WSP Community Water System	Scottswood Subdivision	0.03	0	1	13.15
WSP Community Water System	Sedley	0.028	0	1	12.94
WSP Community Water System	Shodon Mobile Estates	0.002	0	1	3.14
WSP Community Water System	Silverleaf Mobile Home Park	0.01	0	1	3.65
WSP Community Water System	Smithfield Apartments	0.009	0.015	1	3.285
WSP Community Water System	Smithfield Heights - Sandy Mount Manor	0.029	0	1	10.6
WSP Community Water System	Smithfield Mobile Home Park	0.008	0	1	2.92
WSP Community Water System	Smithfield, Town of	0.908	1.967	1	331.3
WSP Community Water System	Southampton - Boykins-Branchville System	0.05	0	1	40.47
WSP Community Water System	Southampton - Drewryville System	0.011	0	1	3.86
WSP Community Water System	Southampton - Edgehill System	0.018	0	1	6.77
WSP Community Water System	Southampton Correctional Complex	0.268	0.295	1	101.06

HRPDC DATA CHECK

Type	System Name	Avg. Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	Max Daily Withdrawal (MGD) for CWS [-80B3]	At least one Average Monthly value (MGD) for CWS? [-80B4] (1=Yes,0=No)	Estimated Annual Average (MG) [80B4,80B6, 80B7, 80B8, 80C, 80D, 80E]
WSP Community Water System	Southampton County Jail Farm	0.006	0.008	1	2.19
WSP Community Water System	Southampton Meadows Mobile Home Park	0.067	0.094	1	24.15
WSP Community Water System	Springfield Downs Subdivision	0.012	0.019	1	4.38
WSP Community Water System	Suffolk, City of - G. Robert House WTP	0	0	0	
WSP Community Water System	Suffolk, City of - Holland System	0.039	0.056	1	14.3
WSP Community Water System	Suffolk, City of - Main System (Western Tidewater Water Authority)	4.99	10.75	1	2 792.88000
WSP Community Water System	Suffolk, City of - Whaleyville	0.041	0.092	1	14.85
WSP Community Water System	Sunray Artesian Water Supply	0.004	0.007	1	1.46
WSP Community Water System	Sunray Water Company	0.005	0	1	1.825
WSP Community Water System	Surry, Town of	0.049	0.057	1	20.76
WSP Community Water System	The Oaks Mobile Estates Trailer Court	0.011	0	1	4.015
WSP Community Water System	Thomas Park Community	0.005	0.15	1	1.819
WSP Community Water System	Tormentor Creek Estates	0.005	0	1	1.825
WSP Community Water System	Turner Property	0.007	0.013	1	2.555
WSP Community Water System	VDOC - Saint Brides Correctional Center	0.228	0	1	83.32
WSP Community Water System	Virginia Beach, City of	36.066	60.05	1	13 236.30000
WSP Community Water System	Waterview Mobile Home Park	0.008	0.26	1	3.07
WSP Community Water System	White Tail Park	0.008	0	1	2.93

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #16: OLD/NEW BUSINESS