Catlett – Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team
Golden Rule Builders, 3409 Catlett Road
October 1, 2014
Meeting Notes

Welcome & Introductions – Sue welcomed everyone and asked for self-introductions (sign in sheet attached).

Follow up from September 10 meeting -

Recent Project Progress:
Update on Status of the Catlett-Calverton Decentralized Sewer PPEA – Comprehensive Agreement Negotiations.
Gary Schwartz said that he and Sue Monaco are currently drafting the proposed Comprehensive Agreement (CA). It will be reviewed by County legal and then sent to NWC. Then a public hearing will be held on November 13. PMT community members are encouraged to attend and participate. It is anticipated the Board would be asked to approve the CA at its December meeting.

Mr. Padgett asked about the October 9 Board meeting and what is to be done at that meeting. It was explained that the scheduled work session is the opportunity to discuss what we know and don't know about rates and what options exist to make the project affordable for the customers and the county. It was agree that members would be advised when we know the time of the work session. It is anticipated the Board could set the fees at its November meeting.

A discussion of Catlett Day came up. In addition to the materials already planned, it was suggested that a comment box be available and a question and answer handout be available.

Operating Charges – Discussion & Input to Board
Project Next Steps through October –
Sue began the discussion by recapping the discussion at the previous PMT meeting when capital costs and tap fees were reviewed. Sue talked about the high cost of connecting to the system without the Board offered incentives. She said that we are working to determine an appropriate incentive package.

She moved the conversation to the operating or monthly utility fees, and said that it would be necessary to include a fee for those in the service districts who choose not to connect. She explained that Gary Schwartz has developed a model to test different fee options. We have also been working with Community Development to identify how many parcels, structures and buildable lots exist. Sue asked what members thought the difference should be between user and non-user fees. Roy Anderson suggested 10%, to get discussion started. Jim Craun said non-users need to pay and 10% is not enough. William Russell said for some, the non-user fee would be a problem. The question was asked what the ratio is for WSA for water. In answer to a question about little Washington, Gary Schwartz said that community has a user and non-user monthly fee. It was pointed out by Amanda Woodward that little Washington does not have then same household income mix as these villages. Mr. Padgett suggested that the non-user fee for existing structures be the same as the user fee. After considerable discussion with all PMT community members participating, there was general consensus that the non-user fee be the same in order to encourage people to connect.

Mr. Craun asked how the county would handle those who choose not to pay. Discussion of several tools the county has to manage non-payment. Action by the County Attorney to take customers who don't pay to court would be one option.

Sue next explained how the vacant lots are built into the model. There will be non-user fees for buildable vacant lots and there could be a separate fee for vacant lots that would require a variance before being buildable. The need for a variance, granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), was explained. As an example, there are a number of very small non-conforming lots that were platted and recorded prior to the current zoning ordinance. Those lots now are too small to build on and meet current setback requirements. That is considered a hardship beyond the control of the property owner so the owner has the right to request the BZA to grant a variance from the setback requirements.

Sue moved the conversation back to the tap fees. She reminded everyone that during the last discussion the full cost tap fee was in the $23,000 to $28,000 range due to the simplistic calculations that were used to illustrate how the overall cost could be recovered. The PMT previously supported the option of providing an "incentives period" for users to sign up at a discounted or lower tap fee. Sue asked for suggestions on how much of an incentive should be offered during the initial signup period. After some discussion the general consensus was that a fair incentive could be somewhere between 50 to 75% of the standard fee. It was also suggested that the WSA tap fee is about $16,000 and that might also be a reasonable amount.

Next PMT Meetings –

October 29, 2014

i. Conclude discussions/input on rates

November 12, 2014

ii. AOSS Rules and Regulations – VDH

CATLETT - CALVERTON PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM
PROGRESS MEETING
October 1, 2014

Attendees:

NAME	Email or Phone
Eldon James	on file
Charles Padgett	540-905-2150
Andrew Hopewell	andrew.hopewell@fauquiercounty.gov
Jim Cvaun	540-788-4126
Don Del Rosso	don.delrosso@fauquier.com
Arthur Roy Anderson	540-316-6276
Katherine Merten	(540)316-6274
Virginia M Copeland	540-788-4609 Avalonia@earthlink.net
William E. Russell Sr.	540-788-9023
Lee Sherbeyn	540-878-3068
Gary Schwartz	540-422-8489
Sue Rowland	
Amanda Wedeel	540-788-9365
Jeanne Puricelli DEQ (by phone)	