

**TOWNS AND COUNTY UTILITIES PROJECT
PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEETING
AUGUST 18, 2010, 7 to 8:30 PM**

MEETING NOTES

INTRODUCTIONS & CORRECTIONS TO AUGUST 4th MINUTES

Members present:

See attached sign-in page.

Sue Rowland opened the meeting shortly after 7, with introductions all around.

No changes were noted to the August 18th meeting.

“SINCE THE LAST MEETING...” (And the rest of the Agenda as well)

Eastern Shore Public Service Authority

Katie Nunez announced that the first meeting of the PSA is scheduled for August 24th. This will be the PSA's organizational meeting, and Katie reviewed what she expected would occur at that first meeting.

Status of PER Work

Joe Turner, Hurt & Proffitt presented an overview of the status of work on the Northern Node PER, distributing a map of the Northern Node dated 8/17, for review of the service area designations. Joe facilitated discussion about the proposed service area, and answered questions about the map. In one question, he clarified that while the Southern Node PER is completed, the recommendations contained therein are not locked in stone, and should circumstances require could be changed (i.e. it is not uncommon for service area designations to change during the course of construction of projects such as these).

[Sue asked that while taping meetings is perfectly allowable, that if taping of the meeting is underway that a general announcement be made as a courtesy to everyone present.]

In looking at soils to identify potential dispersal areas, landowners provided permission for the soil borings to take place and understood the purpose of the sampling. At a recent PMT meeting, it was asked that the Pine Tree Road community be looked at for inclusion in the service area. Joe presented some preliminary cost per customer data (materials only) of \$8,000, compared to the Bayside Rd extension (also requested at a previous PMT meeting) of \$4,500/customer (again, materials only). Overall, the group objected to the use of this data as a factor for the decision on inclusion.

A request that the Weirwood community be considered for inclusion was discussed. Options for providing that community with a separate small cluster or package plant

versus a direct tie-in to the overall Northern Node was suggested. Katie reminded the group that these areas are beyond the scope of the Planning Grant. She offered to bring information from an earlier study of this area to inform the PMT at its next meeting. Other areas were discussed, including Brownsville Road and Rogers Drive. The group recommended that the Rogers Drive be added back into the service area.

One member suggested that the Tower Hill area be incorporated into the Southern Node. That led to a discussion about the requirements of funding sources and what factors might make the service areas more interested in funding the projects. Sue provided the group with a refresher on the differences between DHCD, SERCAP, Rural Development, and DEQ methods of defining need in a community.

Extensive discussion took place on reasons considered for including or omitting communities from service areas, the hospital's current plant, and the options being considered by the Hurt & Proffitt engineers in preparation of the Northern Node PER. Joe emphasized that no recommendation has yet been developed, but that 2 alternatives being considered at this point include: using one plant to serve both Exmore and Nassawadox, or two separate plants with one in each town. Additional discussion time allowed members to express opinions on options to be considered, and to answer questions from the PMT members.

One question asked if an assessment of the hospital's current system was being made to determine what would be required to fix it up; the reply being that this is not in the scope of the engineer's contract. Others asked what information about failing septic systems is already known by the Health Department; James Davis responded that in an earlier review of the records in preparation of the PER, 308 system repair applications had been reviewed in the County since 2005. James noted that this is not a complete reflection of the system failures in the county, but rather reflects the number of users who were prepared to pay the costs of repair.

Another question was whether any grant money to cover monthly utility fees; the contractors are focusing on finding capital cost grant and loan funding. Again, significant discussion followed on how low income residents in the service areas would participate in a public sewer system.

In response to a question about how septic system treatment compares with / differs from treatment accomplished by the proposed systems, Joe volunteered to write that up.

Funding

Eldon James gave a general overview of the status of the funding search. He reported that a meeting is being scheduled with DHCD to meet the new Deputy, and to begin discussions about the funding application due in the Spring 2011. Eldon also discussed the implications of the Governor's recent announcement of a funding surplus and Water Quality Improvement Fund (WQIF), a potential source of funding for this project. He also reviewed funding available through the Department of Conservation and Recreation, and the Southern Rivers funding managed by DHCD.

In discussions about the value of informing the two state representatives of Northampton and the Lt. Governor's office about the project, one member noted that the PSA will have a government affairs committee. That group would play an important role in keeping elected officials informed.

Sue noted that a series of questions Granville Hogg submitted to Katie that relate to the PSA's functions will be discussed at the PSA's first meetings. She also noted that it would be helpful to the PMT to hear a regular report from the PSA members at future PMT meetings to help insure open information sharing between the two groups. Another PMT member asked about the relationship between the PSA and the PMT. Katie noted that the PMT is an integral component of the DHCD Planning Grants received by the County to support the PER development as well as the communications with the affected communities (in this case, the four towns and areas in the County surrounding the towns), and that the PMT will continue to meet.

In another question about whether or not water lines could be run simultaneously with the sewer lines, it was noted that this project is to focus on wastewater, and that the PSA could examine the questions of water at a later date.

Community Surveys

The meeting had already run over the designated time and in light of that, no discussion on the status of the community surveys was held, other than to note that Exmore had sent out surveys with its last utility bill and solicited responses, clarifying that surveys were needed from current users, too. Sue noted that the next PMT meeting would focus first on the status of the survey collection.

NEXT MEETING - PURPOSE AND DATE

The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, September 1st, at 5 PM.**

The purpose will include a review of the household survey collection, a report from the PSA on its first meeting, and a report on the meeting with DHCD.

The meeting adjourned at about 9 PM.

Minutes drafted by Sue Rowland