

Catlett / Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team Meeting
October 7, 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
Bobbie Trenis	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
Butch Farley	FCWSA
Jim Stone	Fauquier Planning Commission
Jim Sawyer	Fauquier County Soil Scientist
Danny Hatch	Dominion Soil, Catlett Farms LLC
Mara Seaforest	
Charlie Riedlinger	Resources International
Sue Rowland	Project Consultant
Eldon James	Project Consultant

II. Status Report: The Preliminary Engineering Report (P.E.R.)

Charlie Riedlinger provided the group with a handout detailing the status of the P.E.R. development and four maps: Figure 8, Potential Site Location For Effluent Disposal Catlett/Calverton; Figure 11, Catlett Service Area STEP or Grinder Collection System; Figure 14, Calverton Service Area STEP or Grinder Collection System; And Figure 15 Combined Grinder Collection System. (Attached)

Charlie presented refinements to the PER since the last meeting. He explained the addition of the Pearson School, and lines taken out. The initial build-out is still set to achieve about 80,000 gallons/day in treatment, with room for 50-60 additional customers added over time. Kristen noted that the presentations are in line with the designated sewer remediation areas and would provide for some infill development.

He noted that the grinder system remains the most cost efficient option of the considered collection systems. In terms of the treatment system, Charlie noted that while the Sequencing Batch Reactors (SBR) treatment system is the least expensive, the Membrane Batch Reactors (MBR) treatment system is the best to operate and best suited to the dispersal system proposed.

The engineers (primarily Barney Durrett and Charlie) discussed the pros and cons of the MBR v. SBR treatment systems. FCWSA staff has more experience with the SBR systems; Charlie briefly described the experience with MBR systems in Northumberland County and by the HRSD (Hampton Roads Sanitary District). Barney and Charlie agreed that using a vendor-engineered system is not desirable, and agreed that visits to existing MBR plants would be beneficial. For the dispersal of effluent, the drip system remains the preferred method.

In reviewing the estimated costs, Charlie highlighted the addition of land costs (20 acres). Tony pointed out that the site highlighted for effluent dispersal is for the purposes of example and pricing only. Other properties in the area around the shown dispersal site also have potentially viable soils for the dispersal; the selected site is centrally located and the final site may not be the same. The site used for demonstration in the PER is in the county's purchase of development rights (PDR) program and has a conservation easement. In response to questions from Mr. Burton, Tony noted that the County is exploring if this prevented the property from being used for effluent dispersal. The county's PDR program does not prohibit this use; however, research is necessary to determine if the conservation easement would prohibit this use.

In response to other community member questions, Charlie described the physical features of the plant (primarily underground) and the lines used for the drip dispersal system, and the amount of ground disturbance required for installation of the plant and the lines. Jim Sawyer noted that the county holds a significant amount of information about the soils in the areas being considered for dispersal that have allowed Charlie to run the numbers contained in the PER.

There remain a number of other decisions to be made that will impact on the overall costs of the project, particularly related to the Operations & Management (O&M) costs. One example is the number of staff required to appropriately maintain the system proposed. Today, VDH uses the DEQ estimates for operation of a system over 40,000 GPD for full time equivalents (FTE) required. A waiver could be awarded if the final system design warrants less staff oversight. In discussions, the engineers agreed that that level of staff oversight seemed excessive for the overall system as presented in the PER draft.

III. Outline for Presentation to Board on October 14th

Tony opened the discussion on the presentation to the Board. He noted that at the October 14th evening meeting, the Board will conduct a public hearing on the Catlett Farm LLC development proposal, including wastewater services to the Catlett portion of the service area. If the board approves the private development proposal, Tony noted that this project to serve both Catlett and Calverton would not go forward. The presentation on this project will be part of the afternoon work session, expected to begin between 1:30 to 4:00; the order of items on the agenda is not yet set. The purpose of the presentation of this project is to update the Board on the project initiated by the Board.

Eldon presented an outline of the presentation. He said it would contain three elements. He would open the presentation with an overview of the state's water policies that are pertinent to this discussion. He will describe what is known and what is not known as the Chesapeake Bay clean-up initiatives are further refined, primarily in response to federal requirements of all states in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Eldon noted that the state's changing regulations and policies are encouraging the use of community onsite systems, such as that included in the draft PER.

The second element will focus upon the PER itself. Charlie will present the PER in a manner similar to the way he has presented his findings to the PMT. The last element of the presentation will focus on the potential funding opportunities to support the project construction, and the associated timelines.

Tony reported that the afternoon work session will be held at the Board Room at the Warren Green Building in Warrenton. In the evening, there are a number of public hearings on the agenda, including proposed amendments to the county's Comprehensive Plan and the Catlett Farm LLC proposal. That meeting will begin at 6:30 p.m. and be held at the Fauquier High School, due to the expected large number of public participants. Tony expects the agendas to be available online on Tuesday, October 12th.

In response to a question from David Burton Tony noted that should the Catlett Farms LLC project be approved, a determination of how Calverton should be served would remain to be made.

IV. Plans for the First Community Meeting

In light of factors discussed previously, Tony opined that to hold the Community Meeting on November 1st (as was decided at the last PMT meeting) would be too early, with too many factors remaining undetermined at that time. For example, typically the Board would not make a decision on a proposed development at the same meeting when the public hearing was held. The group agreed, and after discussion, agreed to send a newsletter to the residences/businesses in the Catlett and Calverton service areas. The purpose of the newsletter is to provide information on this project, and it should be sent out shortly after the October 14th report to the Board on the project. In addition to the mailing, the newsletter should be posted at the Post Office, the Bank(s), Southern States, and the Butcher Shop.

Mr. Burton expressed concern that Calverton may not be served, particularly if the Board were to approve the Catlett Farms, LLC development project. Tony assured everyone that the needs in Calverton were as high a priority as Catlett to the Board, and that should the development be approved, services to Calverton would need to be pursued. In discussions, FCSWA staff acknowledged that while the Calverton village is not currently in the developers' proffer plans for wastewater service extension (Catlett is), there would be sufficient capacity in the treatment plant should the County ask that the owners work with the county to add Calverton.

The group agreed to work on the agenda for the Community Meeting later, after a clearer idea is at hand of when the meeting should be held.

In response to concern about the questions yet to be answered on this project, Tony noted that the Board has much more and better information on the possibilities to bring wastewater to Catlett and Calverton than in the past. He noted that in the County's approved Capital Improvements Plan, \$16 million is the price tag assigned to this project. That amount could be reduced, or even dropped from a future revised CIP as a solution appears to be closer at hand than ever before.

V. Next PMT Meeting

Thursday, October 21, 2010 from 10:00 – 11:30 at WSA offices

Tony called the meeting closed, thanking everyone for attending and their active participation in the discussions.

Minutes prepared by Sue Rowland