

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
March 10, 2016

Members and Alternates (A) Present

Chris Archer	Henrico County
Timothy M. Davey	Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Richard W. Glover	Henrico County
Kathy C. Graziano, Treasurer.....	City of Richmond
Gloria L. Freye	Chesterfield County
Jimmy Hancock.....	Henrico County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman.....	Chesterfield County
David A. Kaechele	Henrico County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek	Hanover County
Susan Lascolette	Goochland County
Tyrone E. Nelson, Secretary.....	Henrico County
Larry Nordvig.....	Powhatan County
Patricia S. O'Bannon	Henrico County
C. Harold Padgett	Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard	New Kent County
Randall R. Silber (A).....	Henrico County
George Spagna	Town of Ashland
Emily Thomason (A).....	City of Richmond
Carson Tucker	Powhatan County
Christopher Winslow.....	Chesterfield County

Members Absent

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles	City of Richmond
Tommy Branin	Henrico County
Karin Carmack	Powhatan County
Leslie Haley.....	Chesterfield County
Floyd H. Miles, Acting Chairman	Charles City County
Michelle Mosby.....	City of Richmond
W. Canova Peterson	Hanover County
Rodney Poole	City of Richmond
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County
Frank J. Thornton	Henrico County

Others Present

March Altman Powhatan County
 Blair Blanchette Chesapeake Bay Foundation
 Patrick Bradley..... City of Richmond
 Cyane Crump Historic Richmond
 Tyee Mallory..... Office of Sen. Tim Kaine
 Bill Mawyer Henrico County
 Art Petrini..... Henrico County
 Robert Steidel..... City of Richmond

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
 Julie Fry Executive Secretary
 Sulabh Aryal Senior Planner
 Anne Darby Senior Planner
 Billy Gammel Senior Planner
 Chuck Gates Manager, Community Affairs
 Barbara Jacocks Director of Planning
 Jin Lee Senior Planner
 Leigh Medford..... GIS Coordinator
 Kathy Robins Senior Planner
 Greta Ryan..... Senior Planner
 Jackie Stewart..... Manager, Special Projects
 Sarah Stewart..... Senior Planner
 Peter Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator

Call to Order

Ms. Jaeckle, RRPDC Vice Chairman, called the regularly scheduled March 10, 2016 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. She then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Vice Chairman Jaeckle announced that Acting Chairman Miles had been called out of town unexpectedly and would not be in attendance today.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Ms. Shickle, RRPDC Executive Director, reported that a quorum of members was present.

B. Request for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business

Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business. No requests from members were received and Vice Chairman Jaeckle indicated the agenda would stand as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Vice Chairman Jaeckle opened the public comment period, noting that if anyone wished to address the members, to please come to a microphone and provide his or her name, locality of residence, and if appropriate the name of any organization being represented. Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked that any citizen speaker please limit comments to three minutes, and organizations should limit their comments to five minutes.

As there were no requests from the public to address members of the Board, Vice Chairman Jaeckle closed the public comment period.

D. Approval of February 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked Mr. Nelson to present the minutes of the February 11, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Nelson asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the minutes. There being none, Mr. Nelson moved for approval of the February 11, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the February 11, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously as presented.

E. Approval of December 2015 and January 2016 Financial Reports

Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked Ms. Graziano to present the financial reports for December 2015 and January 2016.

Ms. Graziano said if there were no corrections, she would move to accept the December 2015 and January 2016 financial reports as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spagna. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

F. Acting Chairman's Report

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she would not have a report on behalf of Acting Chairman Miles.

G. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 3 and details work being advanced by staff on behalf of the

localities. She said staff will be happy to address any questions on what is included in the report.

Ms. Shickle reported that on February 26, the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) hosted 230 people at the Reynolds Community College Workforce Development Center to hear the RVA Snapshot report for 2016. This is the baseline report for the CRC's eight priority areas. Ms. Shickle reported that staff was very pleased with the turnout as it was standing room only. Press coverage was good, and there continues to be social media chatter with regard to the data presented. Ms. Shickle thanked staff for their work with the required data collection and to Ms. Hall, CRC Manager, for coordinating logistics for the event and developing the agenda.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

There are four items included on the Consent Agenda for this meeting:

- A. Regional Community Development Block Grant Priorities
- B. VDOT Rural Transportation Planning Grant Application
- C. Coastal Zone Management Grant Application
- D. Amendment to ICMA-RC 401 Money Purchase Plan

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she hoped everyone had a chance to review the items. She asked if anyone would like to remove any of the items from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion. There were no requests to discuss any of the items. On motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Nelson, the Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously as presented.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. GO Virginia Initiative

Vice Chairman Jaeckle reminded members that during last month's meeting they were provided with information regarding the GO Virginia Initiative and were asked to take this information back to their localities for additional discussion with their peers and staffs. She asked if anyone wished to report on the discussions held in their localities. Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she understands that the General Assembly will vote on the budget tomorrow, which includes funding for GO Virginia.

Mr. Nordvig reported that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, he noted that there is a gap in funding included in the proposed budget versus the amount that was requested to fund GO Virginia.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said only one member of the Hanover County Board of Supervisors expressed an opinion to her which she characterized as "lukewarm." He thought the funding could be used in other areas. In some of the discussions held by other boards and commissions on which Ms. Kelly-Wiecek sits, the conversations have been that funding

from GO Virginia may provide opportunities for collaboration on regional projects. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she would lean toward a more positive opinion of the initiative.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors felt that because the Richmond Region was sometimes overlooked in transportation funding, GO Virginia may offer another route to fund transportation-related projects.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek added that in looking at some of the other economic development projects around the state, there tends to be more emphasis on those in the Danville area and southwestern Virginia. She said GO Virginia may provide an opportunity to advocate for the Richmond Region.

Ms. Shickle said that in reference to tomorrow's vote in the General Assembly, there are two key issues with regard to membership on the GO Virginia state council that were brought forward. She said she understands these issues have been reconciled, and the Governor is satisfied with the General Assembly's recommendation for membership on the State Council that will be overseeing the GO Virginia program. Assuming that budget discrepancies will be addressed, it is expected that the bill will be signed by the Governor and funding for GO Virginia will be included in the adopted budget.

Ms. Shickle reported that Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions (VAPDC) has been monitoring the process closely. VAPDC was invited by the GO Virginia team to provide input on the geographic boundaries for the various regions that will be created. The legislation calls for between eight and eleven GO Virginia regions to be created. VAPDC was also asked to provide input on the draft guidelines for the process. These draft guidelines have been circulated to various regional groups for review.

All of the VAPDC executive directors will meet on March 30 to continue discussion on the geographical boundaries for newly created regions. Ms. Shickle said it is being recommended that RRPDC join with Crater PDC to create one region to fulfill the GO Virginia goals with regard to regions. Most of the state's PDCs will be paired together with the exception of Northern Virginia, Hampton Roads, and possibly the George Washington regions, which will remain separate.

Ms. Shickle said that concerning the draft guidelines, there is more detail included on the makeup of the regional councils membership. She said discussions on who will be appointed to these councils should begin in the localities – government and business appointee recommendations.

Ms. Shickle said the State Council will be the certifying body but no information has been provided on how the regional councils will be convened. The regional councils will need to determine that aspect of the process.

In the draft guidelines, the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDs) will play a prominent role in project development. CEDs have been established for both the RRPDC region and the Crater PDC region. These will be building blocks for the regional

priorities, workforce related skills gap analysis, and economic development opportunities related to the GO Virginia provisions.

Additional meetings will be held regarding GO Virginia as the legislation moves forward. Ms. Shickle encouraged members to be aware of any of these meetings that may take place in their localities.

Capacity building grants (\$500 thousand) for each region are expected to be available at some point during the July to October (2016) time period. Regional Councils will need to be established and certified by the State Council prior to being able to receive any of the grant funding. GO Grants (project grants) will be available to receive applications next spring with awards being made by July 2017. Ms. Shickle said this is a fairly accelerated timeline.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if it is expected another regional body, to include elected officials and business leaders, will need to be created. She also asked if GO Virginia is related to discussions regarding a "super region" that would combine Richmond with Hampton Roads.

Ms. Shickle replied that yesterday was the first time she had heard reference to a "super region" and that was through news coverage. She said from what she knows about GO Virginia, the two are not related. Hampton Roads, with the exception of Gloucester County, will be its own region for GO Virginia. As for creation of another regional body, Ms. Shickle said she believes there are some regions within the state that will be relying on established organizations to advance the GO Virginia framework while others will be setting up new organizations or developing a hybrid by adding members to an established organization. Ms. Shickle said in the Hampton Roads area, she's fairly certain that The Community Foundation will be the entity that will serve as the Regional Council as it closely mirrors the GO Virginia requirements. In southwestern Virginia, it is expected that PDCs 1, 2, and 3 will join together to form its Regional Council.

Ms. O'Bannon said she didn't understand why a new organization will be created when only \$500 thousand will be received. She said those funds would be depleted through hiring staff or finding office space. Ms. Shickle agreed that building on an already established organization would be more cost efficient.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said it's her understanding that it was not the intention to create a permanent body that will require staff or office space. She said she thought that the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) would be ideal to serve as the Regional Council for this region. Ms. Shickle said she agreed that the membership of the CRC would fit into the GO Virginia requirements, but the footprint would not be the right geographic area. Ms. Shickle noted that she believes there are organizations here in the region that could serve as a Regional Council.

Ms. Lascolette said she didn't follow the legislation as closely as she should have due to the regionalism aspect. She said she thought the legislation indicated that any two localities

could join together. She said she's not sure why more than two would need to form a new region. Ms. Shickle said any two localities can join together to apply for a GO Virginia grant to fund a regional project. The applications must go through a screening process and the project needs to be certified as a priority for the region that has been established. The region refers to one of the eight to eleven GO Virginia regions that will be created. Ms. Shickle said the application vetting process has been incorporated into the legislation.

Ms. Lascolette said that was not the way she understood how the process would work. She said what she's heard today creates a regional body that will be spending taxpayer dollars. Ms. Shickle said she understands the Regional Council will be the entity to review applications to ensure the proposed project is a regional priority for the region. The Regional Council will not necessarily be the fiscal agent for grant funds. Ms. Lascolette said the Regional Council will approve the project which will then receive taxpayer dollars.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she didn't think the Regional Council will award the grant. The Regional Council will act as a sounding board to ensure the project will benefit the region.

Ms. Lascolette asked if the Regional Council does not approve the project, whether the grant would move forward. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said the grant would go to whoever has been designated as the fiscal agent for the project once the project is approved. She said GO Virginia is looking to create regional sounding boards (councils) to ensure that the only applications submitted to the State Council were those that had been fully vetted and consistent with regional priorities.

Ms. Shickle said the State Council will be the entity to award the grant funds. There will be a competitive pool of projects for the Regional Council to vet to ensure the project submitted to the State Council is truly regional in benefit. There is another pool of funding available to each region that the Regional Councils will prioritize for allocating to projects.

Mr. Glover said the RRPDC is already a regional entity. Ms. O'Bannon added that the PDCs were established by the State to do exactly what GO Virginia is saying. She said she felt grant funds should come to the PDCs. Ms. O'Bannon said PDCs already discuss projects and determine regional priorities.

Ms. Shickle said the issues being raised this morning are the same ones that were raised in various meetings she has attended over the past few weeks. Ms. Shickle said she will be glad to forward these concerns on to the appropriate people.

Ms. O'Bannon pointed out that RRPDC has collaborated with Crater PDC on numerous occasions.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked if anyone had suggested using the PDCs as the Regional Councils. Ms. Shickle said the draft guidelines make several references to PDCs. There has been some reluctance to dictate the use of PDCs because not all PDCs have the staff capacity that would be needed to administer this type of program. Ms. Shickle said it's up

to the localities to determine the best way to handle the establishment of a Regional Council.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she thinks there is a potential for two localities to develop a project application that could be submitted to the PDC for review. If the PDC supports the project, Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked if the PDC could submit the application for grant funding.

Ms. Shickle said staff is prepared to operate at the direction of the Board. Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she could not see that anyone seated at the table today would want to create another regional body. Many localities already pay dues to several other organizations that could serve as a Regional Council, such as the Greater Richmond Partnership or the Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek also said the CRC could serve as the Regional Council.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said unless there was any other discussion, she would like to move on to the next agenda item.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Regional Forum Series: Henrico County – Water Resources and Cobbs Creek Reservoir

Vice Chairman Jaeckle asked Mr. Nelson if he would introduce today's speakers.

Mr. Nelson said that in 2002, Henrico County was approached with an idea of constructing an off-stream reservoir in Cumberland County, highlighting the regional water supply aspect of a low-flow augmentation to the James River dam low-flows. Fourteen years later, Mr. Nelson said he is glad to report there is ongoing construction at the Cumberland County site. The reservoir is only one component of Henrico County's story regarding water security covering 35 years.

Mr. Nelson said he is glad to introduce Art Petrini, Henrico County's Director of Public Utilities and Bill Mawyer, Assistant Director of Public Utilities. They will offer information on the story of Henrico County's water supply efforts.

Mr. Nelson noted that Mr. Petrini has been in service to the public sector since college graduation in 1973. He has worked in public works and public utilities in various roles. In Henrico County is he currently responsible for water, wastewater, and solid waste services for 96,000 customer accounts in the County. Mr. Petrini is a registered Professional Engineer and has degrees in both the environmental and business fields. He has held positions in all levels of local, state, and national water and wastewater services.

Mr. Nelson said Mr. Mawyer has served as the Assistant Director of Public Utilities in Henrico County since 2001. He's responsible for supporting work done by Mr. Petrini as well as long-term planning to provide drinking water, refuse, and recycling services to over

320,000 Henrico County residents. Mr. Mawyer holds an undergraduate degree in civil engineering and has served in similar positions in other Virginia localities.

Mr. Petrini thanked Mr. Nelson for his introduction and members for the opportunity to speak before them this morning. Mr. Petrini provided background on the Henrico County Public Utilities Department (DPU) by noting it produces drinking water in its own water treatment plant. Each winter, 28 million gallons of water per day are produced, and in the summer, that figure rises to 46 million gallons per day. The County also collects and treats wastewater. Refuse collection is provided to 46,000 households, and through the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (CVWMA), provides recycling to 85,000 single family residences.

The Henrico County Public Utilities Department has seven divisions with 375 staff members. The Department is a Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund which means the Department is supported entirely by funds collected from its customers through rates and connection fees. The annual operating budget is approximately \$60-62 million per year; annual capital expenditures total between \$50-75 million per year. The Department serves over 96,000 customers supported by over 3,100 miles of water and sewer piping.

Mr. Petrini said his portion of today's presentation is entitled "Water – Dwindling Resource?" He said water is a dwindling resource, but not in Henrico County. Mr. Petrini said that Henrico County is water secure, and he will offer information on the County's efforts to ensure long-term security. Mr. Petrini said his presentation will cover some of the background efforts including the following:

- State Water Resources Plan
- Timeline Highlights for Cobbs Creek Reservoir (CCR)
- CCR Current and Future Activities
- DPU Water Facilities and Capital Investments

Following the state's major drought several years ago, state and local legislators began planning for future water needs. In response to the Water Supply Planning Regulation (9 VAC 25-780), forty-eight local and regional water supply plans were developed. Mr. Petrini noted that the water supply plans include information on existing water usage/sources, future projection of populations and water demand, anticipated water supply deficits, and potential sources of future water supply. This State Water Resources Plan (SWRP) is updated routinely according to changes in population and water demand.

Mr. Petrini provided a chart comparing the population growth and water demand trends from 2010 to 2040.

The SWRP shows that approximately 450 million gallons per day in additional water will be needed to meet the projected demand in 2040. About 77 percent of this water is predicted to come from surface water sources. Mr. Petrini noted that 97 percent of surface water withdrawals are predicted to occur in 25 percent of stream reaches.

The Regional Water Supply Plan (RWSP) was submitted to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) on November 2, 2011. The counties included in this plan are Cumberland County, Goochland County, Henrico County, and Powhatan County. The RWSP includes individual plans and analysis from each of the counties.

The RWSP predicts that in 2055, Henrico County (including Goochland County) will need approximately 110 million gallons of water per day (MGD). Henrico's supply is expected to be 80 MGD. The need in Powhatan County is anticipated to be 10 MGD, while in Cumberland County, the need predicted is 7 MGD. That equates to the need for approximately 47 MGD.

In 1987, Mr. Petrini said Henrico County corresponded with the City of Richmond on Henrico's intent to build a water treatment facility. The existing water agreement between the two localities was scheduled to terminate in 1995. Henrico County based its decision to build the water treatment facility on two key reports:

- December 1992: the "Regional Water Resources Plan for Planning District #15" recommended Alternative #1, which in part stated that Henrico County should construct its own water treatment facility
- 1993: The Metropolitan Richmond Chamber of Commerce appointed a Technical Committee and a Water Review Panel which both concluded that, in part, Henrico County should construct and operate a water treatment plant

A new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Henrico County and the City of Richmond was completed in May 1994. In September 1994, a new water agreement was signed by both localities which would allow Henrico County to build its own facility. The new agreement runs until 2040 and requires Henrico County to purchase 12 MGD from the City of Richmond. The remaining water needs for the County are met by the water treatment facility which produces 80 MGD.

With respect to the development of the Cobbs Creek Reservoir, prior to September 2002, Mr. Petrini said that an energy company and its legal representative met with the Cumberland County Board of Supervisors to discuss the feasibility of a natural gas plant in Cumberland County. The project could not move forward because Cumberland County could not meet the company's 7 MGD requirement. A member of the Cumberland County Board of Supervisors inquired about obtaining a permit to acquire the needed water.

The energy company's legal representative met with DEQ and other interest groups concerned with the overall impact of low river flows. During these discussions, the idea of a side stream reservoir, using the James River as a conduit to downstream users, was developed. Through Cumberland County, the City of Richmond and Henrico County were approached to determine their interest in such a reservoir.

Mr. Petrini reviewed the CCR Project timeline:

- 2002: Cumberland and Henrico Counties, DEQ, Malcolm Pirnie, and Troutman Sanders met to discuss the concept
- 2003: Henrico County commits \$100,000 to the project; Cumberland County previously acquired \$685,000 through the Tobacco Commission and the Virginia Department of Health
- 2004: Powhatan County was approached as a potential team member
- 2005: Henrico County and Powhatan County Boards of Supervisors pass resolutions supporting the Cumberland County Reservoir Joint Permit application; draft Articles of Incorporation and bylaws are distributed for a three-county authority
- 2006: Initial concept of Henrico County as sole owner of the project was proposed
- 2007: US Army Corps of Engineers issues the permit; Cumberland County explores sole ownership of the project
- 2008: Cumberland County introduces a cost-sharing MOU to be signed prior to the reservoir project MOU
- 2009: DEQ contacts the three counties and the Governor is made aware of the impasse and offers to provide a mediator
- 2009: state mediation fails
- 2010: Cumberland County elects a new chairman for its Board of Supervisors; Henrico County issues its own Request for Proposals (RFP) for its own reservoir project; DEQ notifies Cumberland County Board of Supervisors that DEQ intends to terminate the Virginia Water Protection (VWP) permit
- 2010: Negotiations between Cumberland and Henrico Counties yields draft MOU with Henrico County as the sole owner of the reservoir, agreeing to reimbursements to Cumberland County as follows:
 - \$2,104,646 in expended project costs
 - \$550,383 for wetlands mitigation bank costs
 - \$1,131,900 annually for 50 years converting to payments in lieu of taxes in the 51st year
- August 2010: Cumberland and Henrico Counties Boards of Supervisors approve the MOU
- 2011: All permits transferred to Henrico County; Henrico County contacts property owners for access to survey, archeological investigations, stream and wetland delineation
- 2014: Henrico County completes all land and easement acquisitions (1830 acres from 22 property owners)

Mr. Petrini provided a map to show the location of the reservoir as well as a map showing the Henrico County water distribution system. He noted that expansion of the system is completed as new development occurs. Costs for these expansions are typically paid for by the developers. The infrastructure is then donated to Henrico County which operates and maintains the infrastructure.

Mr. Petrini reviewed that Henrico County has an agreement with the City of Richmond until 2040.

Henrico County's capital investments to supply water to its customers includes \$195 million for the water treatment plant and water distribution system (80 MGD); \$276 million for the water reclamation facility and sewer system (75 MGD); and \$280 million for the Cobbs Creek Reservoir. These investments total \$751 million to support economic development prospects to relocate to Henrico County as well as new residents and established business expansions.

Future capital investments include the following:

- \$100 million to upgrade the water treatment facility to 100 MGD
- \$127 million to upgrade the water reclamation facility to 90 MGD
- \$115 million for water transmission main expansion

Mr. Petrini provided a photo of the water treatment facility on Three Chopt Road.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said before Mr. Mawyer continues with his portion of the presentation, she wanted to recognize and welcome former Senator John Watkins to the meeting.

Mr. Mawyer noted that he has been working on the Cobbs Creek project for the past six years. The reservoir will cover 1,117 acres and store 14.8 million gallons of water. Other features of the reservoir include the following:

- 150 MGD river withdrawal facilities
- 72- and 84-inch transfer pipeline
- main dam – 3,850 feet long with maximum height of 160 feet
- saddle dam – maximum height of 25 feet
- 2.6 mile utility realignment corridor

When the river is at high capacity, Henrico County will be allowed to pump water from the James River for storage in the reservoir. When the river is low, Henrico County will be required to release water into the river.

Mr. Mawyer said that there are currently two utilities that run through the footprint of the reservoir – a petroleum gas pipeline and overhead electric wires. A utility corridor is already under construction for the relocation of both utilities' equipment, at a cost of approximately \$5.5 million.

Over the past six years, the County has conducted geotechnical and historic resource investigations at the site. As the dams will be earthen, there was a need to ensure that the correct types of soil were present. Two small historic sites were located and must be protected during construction.

All 1,830 acres of land were purchased with no condemnations required. Mr. Mawyer said it took about three years to complete the purchase negotiations and the cost was

approximately \$10 million. There was only one structure that will be located in the pool, and the residents have already moved out of the structure.

Mr. Mawyer provided a map showing the green areas, buffer zones, and easements around the reservoir site. He pointed out that the buffers must remain in their natural states.

A communications tower will be constructed to allow water pumps to be controlled remotely. The tower will be 195 feet high and located on the reservoir property.

Mr. Mawyer reviewed the project schedule, which is as follows:

- June 2015: utility corridor preparation
- February 2016: complete utility corridor preparation
- March 2016: begin utility relocations
- February 2017: complete utility relocations
- June 2017: construct dams and facilities
- Late 2021: complete dam and facilities

Mr. Mawyer provided illustrations of the main dam water conveyance system, the inlet/outlet tower, the inlet/outlet tower bridge for maintenance access, and the pump station and operations building. Also provided were illustrations of the types of intake pipes and filters that will be used, which will contain screens to prohibit vegetation, fish, and fish eggs from flowing into the reservoir.

Mr. Mawyer said there are many recreational opportunities that can be developed by Cumberland County, including a floating dock, public access points, and picnic areas. He said boats with gas engines no larger than 10 horsepower will be allowed on the reservoir. The Department of Game and Inland Fisheries will stock the reservoir with fish. The reservoir will be open from dawn to dusk at no charge to the public.

Mr. Mawyer said for comparison, Lake Chesdin is 3,100 acres and Lake Anna is 13,000 acres. The Cobbs Creek Reservoir will be about one-third the size of Lake Chesdin. Lake Chesdin holds about 10 million gallons of water compared to the approximately 15 million gallons that will be stored in the Cobbs Creek Reservoir. Mr. Mawyer said it is Henrico County's understanding that Cobbs Creek Reservoir will have the largest capacity to retain water from a municipally owned reservoir in the state. Lake Anna is owned by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Up to 100 MGD will be released into the James River when there is a need to do so. This release will make a significant difference in the river level during times of drought.

Mr. Mawyer showed a video of ongoing construction for the utility corridor at the Cobbs Creek Reservoir site.

Mr. Petrini asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Silber asked how long it will take to fill the reservoir. Mr. Mawyer said it will take about six to eighteen months to fill. With optimal conditions and cost (power supplied by Central Virginia Electric Cooperative), he believes it will take approximately 100 days to fill the reservoir with 15 million gallons of water.

Mr. Petrini added that as an Enterprise Fund, the project is being financed through Henrico County's Department of Public Utilities with revenues from rates and fees paid by customers. No taxpayer dollars are being used for the project.

Mr. Elswick asked how many gallons of water must be released back into the James River in order to withdraw the permitted additional amount of 30 MGD. Mr. Mawyer said Henrico County currently has a permit to withdraw an additional 30 MGD. As the reservoir is not built, no water is being released. The County is not using that 30 MGD at this time.

When the reservoir is completed, he said there is a sliding scale agreement with DEQ that says when the James River is at 30 percent of normal flow, Henrico County will release approximately 50 MGD. When the river drops to five percent of normal flow, the County must release 100 MGD. Mr. Mawyer said the current permit does not require the County to release an amount equal to what it takes.

Vice Chairman Jaeckle said she would like to commend Henrico County for being forward-thinking. As elected officials, one of the prime responsibilities is to ensure citizens have an adequate water supply and that there is infrastructure in place to provide that water.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Vice Chairman Jaeckle announced for those members who are staying for the New Member Orientation, the presentations will begin within the next few minutes.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Vice Chairman Jaeckle adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:05 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Dorothy Jaeckle
Vice Chairman