

**Attachment 1A
MEETING SUMMARY
MEETING OF
DIRECTORS OF UTILITIES COMMITTEE
September 4, 2013
Newport News**

1. Summary of the August 7, 2013 Meeting of the Directors of Utilities Committee

There were no comments on, or revisions to the summary of the August 7, 2013 Committee meeting.

ACTION: The summary of the August 7, 2013 meeting of the Directors of Utilities Committee was approved.

2. Regional Sewer Consolidation Study Update

Mr. Ted Henifin, Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD), provided an update on the regional sewer consolidation study. The HRSD Commission has requested a briefing on the final report, which was completed in August 2013. It is anticipated that the HRSD Commission will take action on the study recommendations at the September 24, 2013 Commission meeting.

The Committee noted the limitations of the study scope and discussed alternatives that have emerged as a result of the report recommendations. The Committee agreed governing boards should be briefed as soon as possible and that correspondence from individual localities to HRSD Commissioners urging consideration of additional alternatives would be beneficial.

ACTION: No action.

3. Water and Wastewater Rate Structures Project

The final water and wastewater rate structures report was provided for Committee review on August 29, 2013 in anticipation of action at the September 4, 2013 meeting. The Committee approved the final report, which will be distributed to the HRPDC Executive Committee as part of the agenda packet for the September 19, 2013 Commission meeting.

ACTION: The final water and wastewater rate structures report was approved for presentation and distribution to the HRPDC Executive Committee.

4. Mission H2O Virginia Update

The HRPDC staff summarized the August 26, 2013 [Mission H2O Virginia](#) conference call and planning efforts for the group's presentation to the State Water Commission on September 11, 2013. The presentation will note that it is premature to contemplate legislative action, that ideas and proposals must be vetted in the near term by the technical community, and that a Ground Water Advisory Committee should be established to evaluate data gaps, develop policy options, evaluate feasibility and funding options for reuse, propose reuse incentives, develop recommendations for management through the State Water Resource Plan, and evaluate DEQ funding and staffing needs and priorities.

The Directors of Utilities Committee had no objections to the Mission H2O Virginia recommendations.

ACTION: No action.

5. HRPDC FY2014 Unified Planning Work Program – Water Resources

The Committee discussed and prioritized the following ideas for major FY14 HRPDC projects that are not recurring program elements:

- **Rate Structure Outreach:** Increase HRPDC newsletter articles, outreach to media, promote issue via community groups (civic leagues, Rotary, and others).
- **Create Groundwater Subcommittee:** Subcommittee would vet policy recommendations to support Mission H2O and recommend research or modeling efforts to HRPDC staff.
- **Affordability research:** A) Use U.S. Counsel of Mayors worksheets to evaluate affordability metrics for all localities, and B) Identify subsidy program models and present pros/cons of different models.
- **Update Groundwater Mitigation Program:** Revisit the MOA and technical guidelines for evaluating mitigation claims.
- **Source Water Protection Update:** Update map of likely sources of contamination and revisit recommendations in the regional plan. Examine land uses surrounding reservoirs and potential impacts water quality (see Attachment 1C).

HRPDC staff will incorporate feedback and present a proposed work program at the October Committee meeting.

ACTION: The Committee identified projects for staff to include in FY14 work program. Staff will present a proposed work program at the next meeting.

6. Draft FY2015 Wastewater and Water Program Budgets

The Committee discussed the draft FY15 budgets for the Wastewater and Water Programs, which are the same as the FY14 program budgets.

The Committee generally supported the flat budgets as proposed. No changes were recommended. During the discussion, it was noted that the schedule for the budgeting process is so far in advance that work program priorities are often not yet identified; upon development of program priorities, work must be scaled to accommodate the approved budgets. Media buys for education programs are typically reduced with input from utility staff via subcommittees.

The locality proportion of the budget is primarily based on the number of active water and sewer accounts. Reporting of account information is being done through the FY14 rate data call, which is due September 16, 2013. The draft budget will be amended based on the number of reported number of accounts and locality portions may therefore change slightly. The revised draft FY15 budgets will be presented to the Committee for approval at the October 2, 2013 meeting.

ACTION: Per discussion.

7. Staff Reports

HRPDC staff provided the following updates to the Committee:

1. **Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan:** HRPDC responded to the Department of Environmental Quality's request for additional information to support to the agency's compliance evaluation of the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Plan. A copy of the submittal is attached to the meeting agenda.
2. **Building Code Provisions for Rainwater Non-Potable Water Systems:** The HRPDC Regional Environmental Committee is considering draft comments (September 5, 2013 meeting) on the proposed building code amendments for scope and design of rainwater non-potable water systems. A copy of the draft comment letter is attached to the meeting agenda. The Directors of Utilities Committee did not have any comments on the draft comment letter. HRPDC provided a comparison of the existing 2009 code provisions and the proposed 2012 code provisions, as well as a summary of the proposed amendments (see Attachment 1D). The Committee noted that the Virginia Department of Health's implementation of certain requirements for make-up water supplies and cross-connection protection is creating significant obstacles for projects trying to

incorporate rainwater harvesting. HRPDC staff will research the issue and report back to the Committee.

ACTION: No action.

8. Other Business

- The Committee agreed that Mr. Reed Fowler will serve as the alternate representative on the Hampton Roads Urban Area Working Group.
- It was noted that VDH has indicated interest in utility emergency response plans for water line breaks.
- Feedback was requested on how different utilities reference the Special Order by Consent in bond sales and in annual audits. Specific questions will be distributed by email to the Committee for comment.
- Virginia Beach is experiencing problems with premature asset aging in laterals and manholes associated with restaurants and microbreweries. It is suspected that cleaning products containing acetic acid and hydrochloric acid are the cause of decay, and Virginia Beach Public Utilities is working with HRSD on testing and analysis.
- HRPDC staff requested feedback on future meeting topics, including business practices, outside speakers, and other ideas. Comments can be emailed to staff.

Committee Meeting Sign-In Sheet
September 4, 2013

Attachment 1B

Locality/Agency	Representative	Representative	Representative	Representative
HRSD	Ted Henifin			
Chesapeake	Bill Meyer			
Franklin				
Gloucester	Martin Schlesinger			
Hampton	Tony Reyes	Jason Mitchell		
Isle of Wight	Frank Haltom			
James City County	Larry Foster			
Newport News	Reed Fowler			
Newport News	Scott Dewhirst			
Newport News	Everett Skipper			
Norfolk	Kristen Lentz			
Poquoson	Bob Speechley	Ellen Roberts		
Portsmouth	Bryan Foster			
Smithfield	Bill Hopkins			
Southampton				
Suffolk	Al Moor	Craig Zieseemer		
Surry				
Virginia Beach	Tom Leahy			
Williamsburg				
Windsor	Michael Stallings			
York	Brian Woodward			
HRPDC	Whitney Katchmark	Julia Hillegass	Tiffany Smith	
HRPDC				
New Kent				
DEQ				
EPA				
USGS				
VDH				
VDH				
VDH				
AECOM				
AquaLaw				
Brown & Caldwell				
CH2M-Hill				
Christian Barton				
CNA				
HDR				
Hurt & Proffitt, Inc.				
McGuire Woods				
Rice Associates				
REMSA				
Troutman Sanders				
Virginia Fusion Center				
Virginia WARN				
URS	Ali Mahan			
Watermark Risk Management				
Private citizens				

DESCRIPTION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF HR SOURCE WATER ASSESSMENT PLAN

Project Tasks

The following is a brief description of the major project tasks:

- **Delineation of Watershed and Well Assessment Area:** Surface water intakes and well locations were plotted in a Geographic Information System (GIS).
- **Development of Land Use Coverage:** A regional land use classification was developed from land use information provided by the jurisdictions. GIS was used to compile regional data and generate maps of land uses within the drinking water supply watersheds and wellhead assessment areas.
- **Inventory and Field Verification of Land Use Activities:** In addition to 24 State and Federal database searches, use of a commercial database containing Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Codes and positional information enabled the majority of Land Use Activities (LUA) in the assessment areas to be obtained. Field verification of more than 2000 LUA in Zone 1 improved the accuracy of the data. Each LUA inventoried was assigned a relative risk classification based on state-wide standards of the pollution potential of the LUA.
- **Development of a Regional Source Water Assessment Data Management System with a Real-Time Mapping Component:** The HRSWAP Database contains all source water assessment data. A source water assessment mapping component links the database to GIS information for easy generation of risk maps and other maps and reports.
- **Determination of the Susceptibility for the Source Waters:** Source water susceptibility ratings to contamination were assigned based on VDH requirements. The susceptibility ratings ranged from Very Low to High, depending on the presence of specific LUA and the nature of the source.
- **Preparation of Technical Memoranda:** CH2M Hill prepared two technical memoranda and an HRSWAP Data Management System User's Guide to document the procedures and results of the various tasks for each of the eight public utilities.
- **Preparation of Source Water Assessment Reports:** In addition to the technical memorandum documenting the processes used to collect and analyze the land use data, the VDH SWAP requirements call for development of a Source Water Assessment Report (SWAR) for each community water system. One purpose of the SWAR is to provide a concise report of the results of each source water assessment. Through the HRSWAP Subcommittee process, a SWAR was developed for each of the eight utilities.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For all HRPDC jurisdictions, watershed areas are more susceptible to contamination than wellhead areas. Watersheds are easily subjected to contaminants from air and land sources, whereas wells in confined aquifers will not likely be affected by contaminants on or near the land surface. Continuing efforts are necessary to ensure that the sources of water for the Hampton Roads are protected. Some of the steps to toward source water protection are:

1. Source Water Protection Plan

- A. Determine water quality goals. This should include an evaluation of regulatory requirements and comparison to anticipated treatment performance and long-term reliability. The impact of potential changes to surface water quality should be assessed to formulate fundamental water quality goals.
 - B. Develop watershed protection strategies to meet those goals
 - Prioritize problems and implement controls for existing development,
 - Control amount and quality of runoff from new development through existing and future programs, and
 - Compare protection strategies to potential treatment alternative costs, implementation issues and economic benefits of proposed land uses.
 - C. Develop (or refine) a water quality monitoring program for early warning detection and prediction of contaminants. Prioritize implementation of source water protection techniques to maximize effect and minimize cost.
2. **Hazardous Spill Response Plan:** Develop a hazardous spill response plan that includes communication among hazard response teams, Department of Emergency Services, Department of Health, Department of Environmental Quality, industry, Department of Transportation and watershed personnel. This is especially important for reservoirs with road, rail and utility crossings.
 3. **Source Water Protection Education Program:** Educate the residents, business owners, local elected officials and city/county staff in the area about how they can protect drinking water supplies. Efforts should be concentrated at high-risk LUA sites first. The regional education programs can serve as models for a regional source water protection education program.
 4. **Pollution Loading Estimates:** Develop estimates of nonpoint source pollutants of concern for each surface water watershed. This information is necessary to facilitate water quality modeling. Based on monitoring results, six Hampton Roads localities have already estimated nonpoint source pollutant loadings as part of the Stormwater NPDES permit program. This information could be used as the starting point for other communities.

5. **Land Use Management:** Reduce the effects of new development within the source water and well assessment areas through interjurisdictional agreements that could include site plan reviews, and other methods of input. The Watershed Principles approved by the HRPDC in 1997 should be used as the basis for interjurisdictional cooperation on watershed issues. The Model Watershed Ordinance approved by the HRPDC in 1999 provides a regionally accepted tool for managing and reducing the effects of new development in a water supply watershed.
6. **Assessments for New Water Sources:** Perform a source water assessment for new water sources before they become part of the water supply.

These recommendations and other source water protection options should be further evaluated for the jurisdictions to determine the most efficient and cost effective solution to watershed protection. Many of these steps can be more efficiently, easily, and cost-effectively accomplished through teamwork. The Hampton Roads jurisdictions should continue working together to achieve source water protection goals.

Rainwater Harvesting: 2009 vs. 2012 Proposed VA Building Code

2009 Existing

Appendix O, Gray Water and Rain Water Recycling Systems:

- For rain water recycling systems, the term **“rain water” shall be substituted for “gray water.”**
- Uses limited to flushing of water closets/urinals and subsurface landscape irrigation
- **Flushing of water closets and urinals:** disinfection and makeup water required; reservoir retention time limit of **72 hrs**
- **Subsurface landscape irrigation:** disinfection and makeup water not required; reservoir retention time limit of **24 hrs**

2012 Proposed

Chapter 13 (New), Non-Potable Water Systems

- **“Nonpotable fixtures and outlets” defined:** may include, but are not limited to water closets, urinals, irrigation, mechanical equipment, and hose connections for vehicle washing and lawn maintenance.
- **“Nonpotable water systems” defined:** gray water, rainwater, and reclaimed water systems.
- **Nonpotable water allowed to serve nonpotable fixtures:**
 - Chapter 13 “Nonpotable Water Systems”
 - General provisions (1301)
 - Gray Water Systems (1302)
 - Rainwater systems (1303)
 - Reclaimed Water systems (1304)

*Appendix O references deleted.

2012 Proposed – Ch. 13 Nonpotable Water Systems

General provisions (Ch. 1301):

- Scope, design, materials, makeup water, sizing, signage, cross-connection protection, insect and vermin control, freeze protection, and storage tank size/testing/ location.

Gray water systems (Ch. 1302):

- Minimum water quality requirements (filtration required; disinfection and treatment as needed for intended use)
- Treated gray water retention time limited to 24 hrs

Rainwater systems (Ch. 1303):

- Minimum water quality requirements (filtration required; disinfection and treatment as needed for intended use) unless superseded by other state agencies.
- Not specified: limits on retention time and above ground/subsurface irrigation
- Collection surface requirements

Reclaimed water systems (Ch. 1304):

- Water Reclamation and Reuse Regulation provides for system design, allowable uses, and permitting.
- Applies to the plumbing fixtures, piping, storage tanks, drains, appurtenances, and appliances that are part of the reclaimed water distribution system.

REGIONAL WASTEWATER PROGRAM
FY 2013-2014 BUDGET

Locality	Sewer Accounts - July 2012	Percent								PROGRAM TOTAL
			\$84,000	\$25,000	\$109,000	\$50,000	\$64,771	\$30,000	\$144,771	
			239000 Technical Support	239000/71000 SSORS Consultant	Wastewater Subtotal	239200 HR FOG Direct	239300 HR FOG Staff	239300/71000 HR FOG Consultant	HR FOG Subtotal	
Chesapeake	60,449	6.48%	\$ 5,445.32	\$ 1,620.63	\$7,065.96	\$ 3,241.26	\$ 4,198.80	\$ 1,944.76	\$9,384.82	\$16,450.78
Franklin	3,460	0.37%	\$ 311.68	\$ 92.76	\$404.44	\$ 185.52	\$ 240.33	\$ 111.31	\$537.17	\$941.62
Gloucester	1,302	0.14%	\$ 117.29	\$ 34.91	\$152.19	\$ 69.81	\$ 90.44	\$ 41.89	\$202.14	\$354.33
Hampton	44,253	4.75%	\$ 3,986.37	\$ 1,186.42	\$5,172.79	\$ 2,372.84	\$ 3,073.82	\$ 1,423.70	\$6,870.36	\$12,043.15
Isle of Wight	2,297	0.25%	\$ 206.92	\$ 61.58	\$268.50	\$ 123.16	\$ 159.55	\$ 73.90	\$356.61	\$625.11
James City Cty	21,488	2.30%	\$ 1,935.67	\$ 576.09	\$2,511.76	\$ 1,152.18	\$ 1,492.56	\$ 691.31	\$3,336.05	\$5,847.81
Newport News	54,197	5.81%	\$ 4,882.14	\$ 1,453.02	\$6,335.15	\$ 2,906.03	\$ 3,764.53	\$ 1,743.62	\$8,414.19	\$14,749.34
Norfolk	62,365	6.69%	\$ 5,617.92	\$ 1,672.00	\$7,289.92	\$ 3,344.00	\$ 4,331.88	\$ 2,006.40	\$9,682.28	\$16,972.21
Poquoson	4,724	0.51%	\$ 425.54	\$ 126.65	\$552.19	\$ 253.30	\$ 328.13	\$ 151.98	\$733.41	\$1,285.60
Portsmouth	31,598	3.39%	\$ 2,846.39	\$ 847.14	\$3,693.53	\$ 1,694.28	\$ 2,194.80	\$ 1,016.57	\$4,905.65	\$8,599.18
Smithfield	3,356	0.36%	\$ 302.31	\$ 89.97	\$392.29	\$ 179.95	\$ 233.11	\$ 107.97	\$521.03	\$913.31
Southampton	1,289	0.14%	\$ 116.11	\$ 34.56	\$150.67	\$ 69.12	\$ 89.53	\$ 41.47	\$200.12	\$350.79
Suffolk	20,921	2.24%	\$ 1,884.59	\$ 560.89	\$2,445.48	\$ 1,121.78	\$ 1,453.18	\$ 673.07	\$3,248.03	\$5,693.51
Surry	-	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00
Virginia Beach	130,818	14.03%	\$ 11,784.26	\$ 3,507.22	\$15,291.47	\$ 7,014.44	\$ 9,086.64	\$ 4,208.66	\$20,309.74	\$35,601.22
Williamsburg	2,870	0.31%	\$ 258.53	\$ 76.94	\$335.48	\$ 153.89	\$ 199.35	\$ 92.33	\$445.57	\$781.05
York County	23,104	2.48%	\$ 2,081.24	\$ 619.42	\$2,700.65	\$ 1,238.83	\$ 1,604.81	\$ 743.30	\$3,586.94	\$6,287.59
Subtotal	468,491	50.24%	\$ 42,202.28	\$ 12,560.20	\$54,762.48	\$ 25,120.40	\$ 32,541.47	\$ 15,072.24	\$72,734.12	\$127,496.60
HRSD	464,000	49.76%	\$ 41,797.72	\$ 12,439.80	\$54,237.52	\$ 24,879.60	\$ 32,229.53	\$ 14,927.76	\$72,036.88	\$126,274.40
Total	932,491	100.00%	\$ 84,000.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$109,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 64,771.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$144,771.00	\$253,771.00

Note: All Amounts allocated according to local share of total regional active sewer accounts. Accounts reported as of 07/12.

SSORS budget was reduced from \$35,000 to \$25,000 based on past maintenance needs. FOG Consultant was reduced from \$50,000 to \$30,000 based on reduced maintenance needs.

REGIONAL WASTEWATER PROGRAM
DRAFT FY 2014-2015 BUDGET

Locality	Sewer Accounts - July 2013	Percent								PROGRAM TOTAL
			\$88,680	\$25,000	\$113,680	\$50,000	\$66,066	\$30,000	\$146,066	
			239000 Technical Support	239000/71000 SSORS Consultant	Wastewater Subtotal	239200 HR FOG Direct	239300 HR FOG Staff	239300/71000 HR FOG Consultant	HR FOG Subtotal	
Chesapeake	60,831	6.52%	\$ 5,782.45	\$ 1,630.14	\$7,412.59	\$ 3,260.29	\$ 4,307.91	\$ 1,956.17	\$9,524.38	\$16,936.97
Franklin	4,500	0.48%	\$ 427.76	\$ 120.59	\$548.35	\$ 241.18	\$ 318.68	\$ 144.71	\$704.57	\$1,252.92
Gloucester	1,391	0.15%	\$ 132.23	\$ 37.28	\$169.50	\$ 74.55	\$ 98.51	\$ 44.73	\$217.79	\$387.29
Hampton	44,861	4.81%	\$ 4,264.38	\$ 1,202.18	\$5,466.56	\$ 2,404.36	\$ 3,176.95	\$ 1,442.62	\$7,023.94	\$12,490.50
Isle of Wight	2,364	0.25%	\$ 224.72	\$ 63.35	\$288.07	\$ 126.70	\$ 167.41	\$ 76.02	\$370.13	\$658.20
James City Cty	20,549	2.20%	\$ 1,953.34	\$ 550.67	\$2,504.01	\$ 1,101.34	\$ 1,455.23	\$ 660.80	\$3,217.38	\$5,721.39
Newport News	49,073	5.26%	\$ 4,664.76	\$ 1,315.05	\$5,979.82	\$ 2,630.11	\$ 3,475.24	\$ 1,578.07	\$7,683.41	\$13,663.23
Norfolk	66,399	7.12%	\$ 6,311.73	\$ 1,779.36	\$8,091.09	\$ 3,558.71	\$ 4,702.23	\$ 2,135.23	\$10,396.16	\$18,487.25
Poquoson	4,799	0.51%	\$ 456.18	\$ 128.60	\$584.78	\$ 257.21	\$ 339.85	\$ 154.32	\$751.38	\$1,336.17
Portsmouth	31,624	3.39%	\$ 3,006.10	\$ 847.46	\$3,853.56	\$ 1,694.92	\$ 2,239.54	\$ 1,016.95	\$4,951.40	\$8,804.96
Smithfield	2,830	0.30%	\$ 269.01	\$ 75.84	\$344.85	\$ 151.68	\$ 200.41	\$ 91.01	\$443.10	\$787.95
Southampton	1,301	0.14%	\$ 123.67	\$ 34.86	\$158.53	\$ 69.73	\$ 92.13	\$ 41.84	\$203.70	\$362.23
Suffolk	20,692	2.22%	\$ 1,966.93	\$ 554.50	\$2,521.43	\$ 1,109.01	\$ 1,465.36	\$ 665.40	\$3,239.77	\$5,761.20
Surry	-	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00
Virginia Beach	129,417	13.87%	\$ 12,302.07	\$ 3,468.11	\$15,770.18	\$ 6,936.21	\$ 9,165.02	\$ 4,161.73	\$20,262.96	\$36,033.14
Williamsburg	2,870	0.31%	\$ 272.82	\$ 76.91	\$349.73	\$ 153.82	\$ 203.25	\$ 92.29	\$449.36	\$799.08
York County	23,907	2.56%	\$ 2,272.54	\$ 640.66	\$2,913.20	\$ 1,281.32	\$ 1,693.04	\$ 768.79	\$3,743.14	\$6,656.35
Subtotal	467,408	50.10%	\$ 44,430.68	\$ 12,525.57	\$56,956.25	\$ 25,051.13	\$ 33,100.77	\$ 15,030.68	\$73,182.58	\$130,138.83
HRSD	465,500	49.90%	\$ 44,249.32	\$ 12,474.43	\$56,723.75	\$ 24,948.87	\$ 32,965.65	\$ 14,969.32	\$72,883.84	\$129,607.59
Total	932,908	100.00%	\$ 88,680.00	\$ 25,000.00	\$113,680.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 66,066.42	\$ 30,000.00	\$146,066.42	\$259,746.42

Includes 2% increase to fund salary increases for Water Resources staff and \$3000 for training, hospitality and travel.

Includes 2% increase to fund salary increases for Education staff

Note: All Amounts allocated according to local share of total regional active sewer accounts. Accounts reported as of 07/13.

As of August 2013, HRPDC has a reserve fund of \$9K for the Technical Support/SSORS.

**REGIONAL WATER PROGRAM BUDGET WORKSHEET
FINAL FY 2013-2014 BUDGET**

		\$97,000.00	\$64,771.00	\$7,500.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$187,000.00		\$376,271.00		\$ (50,000.00)	\$326,271.00	
		HR WET					Water Technical Staff						
Water Utility	Active Water Accounts	Percent	234300 Direct (media, materials)	234000 Staff	235500 Water Quality Advertise	235700 H2O Envelopes	USGS	Base (30% budget divided in equal parts)	Pro Rata (70% budget based on % accs)	Total Program Budget	Percentage of Total Program Budget (%)	Adjustment (reserve funds credited based on % of Total Budget)	Total Contribution
Chesapeake	62,333	13.17%	\$ 12,772.16	\$ 8,528.51	\$ 987.54	\$ 2,633.43	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 17,235.83	\$ 45,230.80	12.02%	\$ (6,010.40)	\$ 39,220.40
Franklin	3,500	0.74%	\$ 717.16	\$ 478.88	\$ 55.45	\$ 147.87	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 967.79	\$ 5,440.48	1.45%	\$ (722.95)	\$ 4,717.53
Gloucester	4,525	0.96%	\$ 927.18	\$ 619.12	\$ 71.69	\$ 191.17	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 1,251.22	\$ 6,133.71	1.63%	\$ (815.07)	\$ 5,318.65
Hampton	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	0.82%	\$ (408.39)	\$ 2,664.94
Isle of Wight	2,921	0.62%	\$ 598.52	\$ 399.66	\$ 46.28	\$ 123.41	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 807.69	\$ 5,048.88	1.34%	\$ (670.91)	\$ 4,377.97
James City Cty	20,070	4.24%	\$ 4,112.38	\$ 2,746.01	\$ 317.97	\$ 847.91	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 5,549.60	\$ 16,647.21	4.42%	\$ (2,212.13)	\$ 14,435.08
Newport News	117,634	24.85%	\$ 24,103.44	\$ 16,094.89	\$ 1,863.67	\$ 4,969.78	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 32,527.22	\$ 82,632.34	21.96%	\$ (10,980.43)	\$ 71,651.91
Norfolk	64,440	13.61%	\$ 13,203.89	\$ 8,816.79	\$ 1,020.92	\$ 2,722.45	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 17,818.44	\$ 46,655.82	12.40%	\$ (6,199.76)	\$ 40,456.06
Poquoson	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	0.82%	\$ (408.39)	\$ 2,664.94
Portsmouth	31,990	6.76%	\$ 6,554.82	\$ 4,376.93	\$ 506.82	\$ 1,351.51	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 8,845.62	\$ 24,709.02	6.57%	\$ (3,283.41)	\$ 21,425.61
Southampton	830	0.18%	\$ 170.07	\$ 113.56	\$ 13.15	\$ 35.07	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 229.51	\$ 3,634.68	0.97%	\$ (482.99)	\$ 3,151.70
Smithfield	3,135	0.66%	\$ 642.37	\$ 428.94	\$ 49.67	\$ 132.45	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 866.87	\$ 2,120.28	0.56%	\$ (281.75)	\$ 1,838.53
Suffolk	24,729	5.22%	\$ 5,067.02	\$ 3,383.46	\$ 391.78	\$ 1,044.75	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 6,837.87	\$ 19,798.21	5.26%	\$ (2,630.85)	\$ 17,167.37
Surry	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -
Virginia Beach	133,100	28.12%	\$ 27,272.46	\$ 18,210.97	\$ 2,108.70	\$ 5,623.19	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 36,803.76	\$ 93,092.41	24.74%	\$ (12,370.39)	\$ 80,722.01
Williamsburg	4,190	0.89%	\$ 858.54	\$ 573.28	\$ 66.38	\$ 177.02	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ 1,158.59	\$ 5,907.14	1.57%	\$ (784.96)	\$ 5,122.18
York County	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	\$ -	\$ 3,073.33	0.82%	\$ (408.39)	\$ 2,664.94
HRSD			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	2.66%	\$ (1,328.83)	\$ 8,671.17
Total	473,397	100.00%	\$ 97,000.00	\$ 64,771.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ 56,100.00	\$ 130,900.00	\$ 376,271.00	100.00%	\$ (50,000.00)	\$ 326,271.00

Note: All Elements are allocated according to local share of active water accounts except Water Technical Staff.

Water Technical Staff combines Groundwater Management, Regulatory Assistance, Priority Projects and HR SWAP. Budget was reduced by \$40,000 to reflect shift in workload from Drinking Water to Stormwater issues.

1) Base is 30% of the budget divided into equal share for 15 participating localities plus \$10,000 from HRSD.

2) Pro Rata allocated remaining budget based on percentage of active water accounts.

Adjustment: Transfer \$50,000 from program reserve funds to FY14 program budget (recommendation from 10-3-2012 Committee meeting).

Surry County is not participating.

Active Water Accounts based on Local reporting as of 07/12.

**REGIONAL WATER PROGRAM BUDGET WORKSHEET
DRAFT FY 2014-2015 BUDGET**

		\$97,000.00	\$66,066.42	\$7,500.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	\$193,740.00		\$384,306.42		\$ (50,000.00)	\$334,306.42	
		HR WET					Water Technical Staff						
Water Utility	Active Water Accounts	Percent	234300 Direct (media, materials)	234000 Staff	235500 Water Quality Advertise	235700 H2O Envelopes	USGS	Base (30% budget divided in equal parts)	Pro Rata (70% budget based on % accs)	Total Program Budget	Percentage of Total Program Budget (%)	Adjustment (reserve funds credited based on % of Total Budget)	Total Contribution
Chesapeake	62,504	13.18%	\$ 12,785.02	\$ 8,707.84	\$ 988.53	\$ 2,636.09	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 17,875.04	\$ 46,200.66	12.02%	\$ (6,010.91)	\$ 40,189.75
Franklin	3,500	0.74%	\$ 715.92	\$ 487.61	\$ 55.35	\$ 147.61	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 1,000.94	\$ 5,615.56	1.46%	\$ (730.61)	\$ 4,884.95
Gloucester	4,609	0.97%	\$ 942.76	\$ 642.11	\$ 72.89	\$ 194.38	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 1,318.09	\$ 6,378.37	1.66%	\$ (829.85)	\$ 5,548.52
Hampton	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	0.83%	\$ (417.39)	\$ 2,790.74
Isle of Wight	3,534	0.75%	\$ 722.87	\$ 492.34	\$ 55.89	\$ 149.05	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 1,010.66	\$ 5,638.95	1.47%	\$ (733.65)	\$ 4,905.29
James City Cty	20,549	4.33%	\$ 4,203.24	\$ 2,862.82	\$ 324.99	\$ 866.65	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 5,876.65	\$ 17,342.48	4.51%	\$ (2,256.34)	\$ 15,086.15
Newport News	114,380	24.12%	\$ 23,396.12	\$ 15,935.03	\$ 1,808.98	\$ 4,823.94	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 32,710.67	\$ 81,882.87	21.31%	\$ (10,653.33)	\$ 71,229.53
Norfolk	68,445	14.43%	\$ 14,000.24	\$ 9,535.52	\$ 1,082.49	\$ 2,886.65	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 19,574.07	\$ 50,287.10	13.09%	\$ (6,542.58)	\$ 43,744.52
Poquoson	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	0.83%	\$ (417.39)	\$ 2,790.74
Portsmouth	32,019	6.75%	\$ 6,549.40	\$ 4,460.78	\$ 506.40	\$ 1,350.39	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 9,156.87	\$ 25,231.97	6.57%	\$ (3,282.79)	\$ 21,949.18
Southampton	833	0.18%	\$ 170.39	\$ 116.05	\$ 13.17	\$ 35.13	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 238.22	\$ 3,781.10	0.98%	\$ (491.94)	\$ 3,289.16
Smithfield	2,946	0.62%	\$ 602.60	\$ 410.43	\$ 46.59	\$ 124.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 842.50	\$ 2,026.37	0.53%	\$ (263.64)	\$ 1,762.73
Suffolk	24,380	5.14%	\$ 4,986.86	\$ 3,396.54	\$ 385.58	\$ 1,028.22	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 6,972.25	\$ 19,977.59	5.20%	\$ (2,599.17)	\$ 17,378.41
Surry	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -
Virginia Beach	132,324	27.90%	\$ 27,066.51	\$ 18,434.92	\$ 2,092.77	\$ 5,580.72	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 37,842.33	\$ 94,225.40	24.52%	\$ (12,259.15)	\$ 81,966.25
Williamsburg	4,195	0.88%	\$ 858.08	\$ 584.43	\$ 66.35	\$ 176.92	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ 1,199.70	\$ 6,093.61	1.59%	\$ (792.81)	\$ 5,300.80
York County	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	\$ -	\$ 3,208.13	0.83%	\$ (417.39)	\$ 2,790.74
HRSD			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ 10,000.00	2.60%	\$ (1,301.05)	\$ 8,698.95
Total	474,218	100.00%	\$ 97,000.00	\$ 66,066.42	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ 58,122.00	\$ 135,618.00	\$ 384,306.42	100.00%	\$ (50,000.00)	\$ 334,306.42

Note: All Elements are allocated according to local share of active water accounts except Water Technical Staff.

Water Technical Staff:

1) Base is 30% of the budget divided into equal share for 15 participating localities plus \$10,000 from HRSD.

2) Pro Rata allocated remaining budget based on percentage of active water accounts.

Includes 2% increase to fund salary increases for Water Resources staff and \$3000 for training, hospitality and travel.

Includes 2% increase to fund salary increases for Education staff

Adjustment: Transfer \$50,000 from program reserve funds to FY14 program budget (recommendation from 10-3-2012 Committee meeting).

Surry County is not participating.

Active Water Accounts based on Local reporting for 07/13.

As of August 2013, HRPDC has a reserve fund of approximately \$320K for Water Technical Staff.