

Catlett / Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team Meeting
December 2, 2010

I. Introductions & Review of Minutes

Tony Hopper opened the meeting, and introductions were made all around.
Attending were:

Tony Hooper	Fauquier County, Deputy Administrator
Kristen Slawter	Fauquier County Planning Office
David Burton	Catlett / Calverton Community Member
William Armstrong	Catlett / Calverton Community Member
Carolyn Hartman	Catlett / Calverton Community Member
Wayne Stephens	FCWSA
Butch Farley	FCWSA
Jim Stone	Fauquier Planning Commission
Danny Hatch	Dominion Soil, Catlett Farms LLC
Suzanne (Sue) Sheer	Friends of Fauquier
Charlie Riedlinger	Resources International
Sue Rowland	Project Consultant
Eldon James	Project Consultant

The group reviewed the minutes from the last meeting (October 21, 2010); they were accepted without objection.

II. Since the October 21st PMT Meeting

Community Newsletter

Tony reported that the newsletter was mailed by Kristen. She reported mailing almost 300 copies to both tax payers with addresses in the service areas and directly to the address in Catlett and Calverton. The newsletter was also posted at the post office, the banks, and several stores including the Exxon station, and the meat market. She received a couple of calls in response. Kristen also reported that the website is up and running, and includes all the materials distributed as part of the PMT's meetings.

Update on Catlett Farms LLC Permit Review

Tony reported that the expectation that the Board would act on the Catlett Farms LLC previous application has been amended with the submission by the developers of a revised application, submitted to approval of 450 units (down from 645 units). Not all details have been provided, and it is not clear when the Board will ultimately decide on the application. He commented that his general sense is that the modified application may still be viewed as having too many units. He commented that the technical reviews generally take a couple of months to complete before the application is presented to the Board action.

The Board of Supervisors may, at some time in the future, decide whether to combine the PMT's work with that of the developer, but for now the PMT's work is on a separate path for the Board to consider. Tony explained that he expected to revisit

the question with the Board in January to gain guidance on how to proceed with the PMT's project.

In questions from PMT members representing Catlett and Calverton, the group discussed the capacity of the developer's application including: treatment plant, proffers (what proffers are included with the modified application are not known at the time of this meeting), expectations that the number of units may well be further reduced, concerns that Calverton would be omitted, the capacity of the treatment plant, planned growth in Catlett and Calverton, the use of water required by the system (is sufficient water available?), and maintenance cost implications depending upon the size of the system, .

A question was raised about if the developer system or the County system would meet the same level of treatment for nutrient removal from an environmental perspective.

III. Review of Grant Options

Sue Rowland and Eldon James distributed a one-pager that described the grant / loan application options with a timeline on due dates. Sue verbally reviewed the handout, and she and Eldon fielded questions from the PMT. Sue emphasized the importance of community involvement in the development of certain of the applications, and the role of the PMT in strengthening the applications.

IV. Project Cost Options

Tony shared work of County staff and consultants on its review of capital and operating costs of a wastewater treatment facility. He shared a handout, and emphasized that the information therein is not a representation of final cost figures (in fact, a long way from that), and that it shows the importance of the county's significant financial participation to allow the project to go forward and the importance of obtaining a large number of connections to the system. The handout does not show what the fees to the customers may be but rather shows the impact on monthly fees with different funding mix scenarios.

In questions from the PMT, it was confirmed that currently the WSA monthly rates are standard throughout the County. Wayne Stevens asked about the reserve assumption; Charlie Riedlinger asked that Wayne share with him the assumptions required by the WSA. Tony again noted that the monthly rates shown on the handout are for discussion purposes only, and should not be viewed as the project's proposed monthly rates. There are still many decisions the Board of Supervisors needs to make before the PMT can better-estimate monthly rates.

V. Next PMT Meeting

All agreed to hold January 6th for the next meeting.

Minutes prepared by Sue Rowland