

VIRGINIA: A REGULAR MEETING OF THE SURRY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE GENERAL DISTRICT COURTROOM OF THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER ON NOVEMBER 15, 2011 AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: SUPERVISOR JOHN M. SEWARD, CHAIRMAN
SUPERVISOR ERNEST L. BLOUNT, VICE-CHAIRMAN
SUPERVISOR M. SHERLOCK HOLMES
SUPERVISOR JUDY S. LYTTLE
SUPERVISOR DAVID A. HARRISON

ALSO

PRESENT: MR. TYRONE W. FRANKLIN, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MR. BRENDAN HEFTY, HEFTY & WILEY, COUNTY ATTORNEY
MS. RHONDA R. MACK, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING
MR. GEORGE EDWARDS, CLAREMONT MAYOR
MR. ROBERT WINFREE, CLAREMONT VICE-MAYOR
MRS. LOUISE HANSCH, CLAREMONT TOWN COUNCIL
MRS. BRIGID JONES, CLAREMONT TOWN COUNCIL
MRS. YVONNE PIERCE, DENDRON MAYOR
MS. NANCY OVERTON, DENDRON TOWN COUNCIL
MR. WILL GWALTNEY, SURRY MAYOR
MR. BENNIE SAVEDGE, SURRY TOWN COUNCIL
MR. WILLIAM ROACH, SURRY TOWN COUNCIL
MR. WAYNE SPROUSE, SURRY TOWN COUNCIL
MR. ROBERT BERRYMAN, SURRY TOWN COUNCIL

CALL TO ORDER/MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Seward. Mayor Gwaltney called the Surry Town Council to order; Mayor Pierce called the Dendron Town Council to order, followed by Mayor Edwards who called the Claremont Town Council to order. Chairman Seward then asked for a moment of silence. Following the moment of silence, he asked the citizens to stand and say the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Tyrone Franklin introduced Mr. Greg Brittingham, Senior Consultant with the Performance Management Group, who invited the Board to be seated in the audience. Mr. Brittingham stated that the Performance Management Group was there to facilitate discussion of a Surry County Sanitary Authority and to encourage open productive discussion to that end.

Mr. Earl Sutherland, Vice President of Patton, Harris, Rust and Associates, addressed the elected officials present, stating that he had assisted with the 2008 Surry County Master Water and Sewer Plan. Mr. Sutherland gave a brief overview of the 2008 report and a summary of the available resources. ***(A copy of Mr. Sutherland's presentation is attached as an integral component of these minutes.)***

Following some initial discussion and general questions from the audience, Mr. Brittingham asked the elected officials to separate into four work teams to address (1) their top 5 to 7 concerns/critical questions and (2) the perceived advantages/opportunities of creating a county-wide water/sewer authority. At the end of each exercise, Mr. Brittingham reviewed each team's responses to determine themes and to provide clarification.

Concerns and Questions: What are your top 5-7 concerns or critical questions about the establishment of the Surry County Sanitation Authority?

Group I

What compensation to the town for their existing infrastructure?

County has problem handling trash why should we trust them to handle water and sewer?

Will there be uniform utility rate over all the districts?

How will towns share in revenue growth from the economic upturn in the county?

Will the towns lose their control in the decision to participate in the process?

Concerned about loss of revenue to towns – where can they develop other revenue?

Concerned about appointment and composition of the Sanitization Board – suggested two members from the Board of Supervisors, a representative from each Town.

Concerned about short-term goal of improvements.

Operational costs and efficiencies may worsen for Town of Surry.

Group II

Cost of system – who will pay to put into place? County, Towns, Residents?

Who will manage day-to-day operations – continue contracting with Sussex Service Authority or create jobs to manage.

Can individual areas (i.e. Claremont) adopt only sewer or water authority and not both?

Will this be mandatory for residents – mandated by the state?

Fees? Cost to members?

Group III

Finance

Structure – terms

Hook-up – “must”

Cost of living

Talk to Sussex Service Authority

Group IV

Maintain water quality

Cost to customer

Cost to towns and county – start-up

Who will fill positions within service authority?

Representation on authority

Who are upgrade costs passed on to? – Certain groups of whole system?

Advantages: What are the advantages of establishing a Surry County Sanitation Authority?

Group I

None, for towns

Lower cost to operate and maintain for some

Serve as a catalyst to achieve the stated land use goals of the County's Comprehensive Plan (County advantage)

Group II

Better ability for funding

County wide rates possibly lower

Economy of scale – construction, operation

Economic development

Greater communication between localities

Group III

Reduced fees?

Central authority

Grants

Maintenance

Improved economic development opportunities

Group IV

More financial resources to make improvements and upgrades

Handle and react to problems more quickly

Economic growth

Jobs within the county

Mr. Brittingham then asked officials what they thought the next steps should be in moving the discussion forward. Supervisors Lyttle suggested that, since the needs of each entity were different, consideration should be given to determining how the development of an authority would meet everyone's needs. Chairman Seward suggested that a discussion regarding the initiation of the idea of an authority might be prudent to circumvent the perception that this could be a "county take-over"; Mr. Franklin agreed with this suggestion. Mrs. Brigid Jones (Town of Claremont) stated that it would be helpful in further discussions to move beyond the hypothetical and present some actual cost projections. Mr. Franklin agreed that it would be helpful to look more closely at lost revenue and its impact on the towns.

Mr. Sam Edwards, President of S. Wallace Edwards, Inc., added that the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality would mandate changes to water and wastewater systems if corrections to the existing systems were not made. He further suggested that the DEQ could take over the existing systems and manage them independent of the county or towns at higher cost to county and town users.

Mr. Brittingham agreed that officials should look at the potential of state mandates if an authority is not created.

Following further discussion, officials involved in the discussion agreed to meet again in January 2012 with Mr. Franklin's office coordinating a meeting date.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to conduct, Mr. Chris Anderson made a motion that the Surry Town Council adjourn. Mr. Robert Berryman seconded the motion; all present voted affirmatively.

Ms. Nancy Overton made a motion that the Dendron Town Council adjourn. Mayor Yvonne Pierce declared the Council adjourned.

Mr. Robert Winfree made a motion that the Claremont Town Council adjourn. Mrs. Brigid Jones seconded the motion; council members voted unanimously to approve the motion.

Supervisor Blount made a motion that the Surry County Board of Supervisors adjourn. Supervisor Lyttle seconded the motion; Supervisors Seward, Holmes, Harrison, Lyttle and Blount voted in favor of the motion.



Surry County 2008 Master Water and Sewer Plan

After examining the institutional options available for managing the existing and future water and wastewater infrastructure in Surry County, the Master Water and Sewer Plan recommended that the Board of Supervisors create the Surry County Sanitation Authority to plan, operate, and acquire water and wastewater utilities within the County. A Sanitation Authority will provide the maximum degree of planning and operational focus in the execution of the water and sewer planning while limiting the obligations of those not directly benefiting from the activities of the Authority.

The Plan recommended that the Authority have the same number of members as the Board of Supervisors and be appointed for four year terms. Terms should be staggered to permit institutional continuity.

The Plan recommended that the Authority begin negotiations to assume the ownership of and operational responsibility for the existing municipal water systems with the respective Towns.

At present the need for improvements to the wastewater treatment infrastructure is more urgent than for wastewater collection or water supply systems. Thus the plan recommended that the Authority concentrate on the modernization, expansion, and operation of the wastewater treatment facilities throughout the County during the initial years of its existence.

The Authority should begin negotiations to assume ownership of the existing Town of Surry wastewater treatment facility. Likewise the Authority should assume ownership of the small wastewater system that serves a portion of Claremont.

The Master Water and Sewer Plan recommended that the Authority initiate planning for the following near term utility improvement projects:

Expand the Surry County Wastewater Treatment Plant to 130,000 GPD.....	Estimated Cost	\$492,000
Refurbish the Town of Surry Wastewater Treatment Plant	Estimated Cost	\$579,000
Divert a portion of the Town of Surry Wastewater to the County System	Estimated Cost	\$1,098,000

Following are brief descriptions of the water and wastewater infrastructure in Surry County:



Wastewater Infrastructure

Surry County

Constructed in 1999; Design capacity is 65,000 gallons per day (GPD), expandable to 130,000 GPD. At present the plant is treating approximately 35,000 GPD but the County has made commitments for service that total 74,500 GPD. The plant is operated under contract by the Sussex Service Authority and serves the Surry County Industrial park, the Surry County School Complex, and the Town of Dendron.

Town of Surry

Constructed in 1982. The design capacity is 60,000 GPD. The treatment equipment is worn out and the plant has had many effluent permit compliance problems. In addition, the wastewater collection system has a severe infiltration/inflow problem and the plant frequently exceeds its design capacity. In 2007 the Town requested 70,000 GPD of capacity in the County plant but, in combination with other requests for capacity, there was insufficient reserve capacity, even if the County plant was doubled in size. The 2008 Master Water and Sewer Plan recommended that the Town of Surry plant be refurbished and retained in service. The Town has decided to pursue the upgrade alternative and to undertake a program of infiltration/inflow reduction.

Town of Claremont

A small wastewater collection and treatment system serving the Claremont Beach area within the Town was constructed in 2008 in the wake of damage from Hurricane Isabel. The project serves approximately 40 existing dwellings and other structures located along the James River. The design capacity of the system is 15,000 GPD. Ultimate effluent disposal is to 11 mass drainfields located around the treatment units.

Town of Dendron

A new wastewater collection and transport system serving all of Dendron was completed and placed in service in 2009. The system is owned by Surry County and operated by the Sussex Service Authority. The main pumping station discharges to the force main that transports wastewater from the Industrial Park to the County treatment plant.



Water Utility Infrastructure

Surry County

Industrial Park – Constructed in 1999, 125 GPM well; 150,000 gallon elevated storage tank; full fire suppression.
School Complex – Two wells, 124 GPM and 34 GPM, pneumatic water storage tanks; provides fire protection.

Town of Surry

The system is rated to serve 310 connections. Constructed in stages over many years with major improvements in 1984: three wells 110 GPM, 45 GPM, 35 GPM (reserve), 100,000 gallon elevated storage tank; partial fire suppression. Some distribution lines are undersized. The system also serves the Surry Village Apartments located west of the Town.

Town of Dendron

The system is rated to serve 150 connections; there are 134 connections to the system at present. Two wells 225 GPM, each; 40,000 gallon ground storage tank; system is old and outdated. No true fire suppression is provided. The system does not conform to current State Department of Health standards. A 2008 preliminary engineering report estimated the cost of needed improvements to be \$1.76 million.

Town of Claremont

The system is rated to serve 118 connections. Two wells, 365 GPM and 138 GPM; 5,000 gallon pneumatic water storage tank and a very short elevated tank; system is old and in very poor condition; no fire suppression is provided. The nearby Cypress Point subdivision is also served. The system does not conform to current State Department of Health standards.

Minor Privately Owned Systems

Scotland Heights - 25 GPM well, 1,000 gallon pneumatic storage tank.
Guilford Heights - 50 GPM well, 5,000 gallon storage tank.



