

Catlett / Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team Meeting
October 21, 2010

I. Introductions

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
Ted Bullard	Health Department
Wayne Stephens	FCWSA
Barney Durrett	FCWSA
Jim Stone	Fauquier Planning Commission
Danny Hatch	Dominion Soil, Catlett Farms LLC
Charlie Riedlinger	Resources International
Sue Rowland	Project Consultant
Eldon James	Project Consultant

Tony commented that we should add a review of the past meeting's minutes at the beginning of the meeting agendas for future meetings.

II. Report on the October 14th Board Work Session and Public Hearing

Tony led the review of the presentation made on the project to the Board at its Work Session. He noted that overall the presentation went well, and established the project as a viable alternative for solving the wastewater problems, with or without the proposed development, especially when compared to the previous efforts by the County in years past.

In discussion and on the question about the SBR or MBR method of treatment, Barney Durrett agreed that either method would work, and that the decision as to which method is most efficient and economical for this project can be made down the road. Issues remaining include decisions on where the drip dispersal system would be located. In addition, decisions about what monthly costs to the user might be need further discussion, and that will occur later in the development of the project.

Danny Hatch thought the presentation went well. About the plans to use the drip dispersal system, he noted that this method is being used around the state now, and with the new plan put out recently by DEQ in response to the Chesapeake Bay water quality improvement plans, additional discussion on that method should be held.

On the public hearing, Tony opined that the paper covered the hearing well.

Next, he summarized where the Board is now in its review of the Catlett Farms LLC proposal. The Board has announced it will not consider the plan at the size as currently proposed, and is working on assessing what number would be acceptable. The developer will decide if that size of a project would be acceptable to them and could they continue to provide sewer to the villages. The decision could be made within about 60 days. At the next Board's November 11th meeting, the Catlett Farms LLC will present on the development.

The decisions on the developers' proposal could have impact on this project, Tony said. For example, should a smaller version of the development be approved, the developers could contribute toward the wastewater project's costs in Catlett, or the developers could work with the County to assure that both Catlett and Calverton are served by any new wastewater system. Jim Stone commented that he heard a commitment from the Board to accomplishing sewer in the existing Catlett and Calverton communities.

Carolyn Hartmann expressed concern that some residents outside of the service area are under the impression that they are guaranteed connection to any new system. Staff reminded everyone that under current county policy, if a residence has a failing system within 300' of a sewer line it is to be hooked-up to the system.

Barney reminded the group that there are liaisons between the Service Authority's board and the Board of Supervisors. They had asked that presentations be made in a way to allow for easy comparisons. Using the service areas as they are now being used allows for that; a criterion for the Service Authority is that the rate and availability fee needed to be studied with the assumption that the Service Authority would own the system (that is not a criterion county wide).

Other questions were generally discussed by the group, and included topics such as preparing for the peaks in usage at the churches that have periodic revivals, understanding the surety bonds held by the Service Authority on community wastewater projects, and the WSA's current monthly fees.

III. Review of draft Community Newsletter

Sue Rowland reviewed the draft of the first Community Newsletter. After discussion, a paragraph will be added that answers the question, "Why aren't you mentioning costs?" The focused remediation areas are defined as such because of high incidence of failing septic systems. There was discussion about what map to include with the Newsletter, and Kristen Slawter and Charlie Riedlinger will work together to provide a map that shows the areas to be served.

IV. Review of Design Features

Charlie described the grinder pump that he is proposing the current recommended design. The pumps require a 240 single-phase line, similar to what an electric stove requires. The pumps hold about 50 gallons, which should the power be out, would equate to about 10 flushes. The pumps pull very little power, and can pump at a large

range of pressures to efficiently move effluent to the collection system lines. Charlie also provided a comparison of the grinder pump model to the STEP system model. The grinder pumps work well and are sized for single-family homes to commercial establishments to schools. In answering questions, Charlie noted that garbage disposals are fine to use with grinder pumps.

V. Open Questions Yet to be Resolved

One outstanding question to be resolved relates to the land to be used for the drip dispersal system. Tony is working with the County's soil scientist to identify land that would be appropriate for the dispersal field. Individual owners of property have not been approached.

VI. Next PMT Meeting

The week after the Board's next work session (November 18th, probably).

Discussion on Open Questions continued. Barney asked that the minutes reflect that the Service Authority remains skeptical about some of the capital costs included in the draft PER. Tony commented that these discussions will continue, with the goal being an agreement on the assumptions included in the PER.

As time required, Tony called the meeting closed, again thanking everyone for attending and active participation in the discussions.

Minutes prepared by Sue Rowland and approved by the PMT on December 2, 2010.