

Catlett / Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team Meeting
September 23, 2010
Final Meeting Notes

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
Ted Bullard	Health Department
Wayne Stephens	FCWSA
Barney Durrett	FCWSA
Jim Stone	Fauquier Planning Commission
Mary Sherrill	Fauquier County
Charlie Riedlinger	Resources International
Sue Rowland	Project Consultant
Eldon James	Project Consultant

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

Charlie Reidlinger provided the group with a handout detailing the status of the P.E.R. development thus far. (Attached) Charlie began his review by focusing on the treatment element of the system. He explained the concept behind "EDU's" (Equivalent Dwelling Units) – EDU's being the methodology used to give common measurements to the amount of effluent that would be introduced into a system's treatment facility by different types of buildings (homes, light commercial, heavy commercial, etc.). He explained that in the study area that includes Catlett and Calverton, 294 potential EDU's are identified, with a potential total of 362 Future EDU's. This count leads to a flow estimate from initial users of 62,140 gallons per day (GPD) and 77,480 GPD in planned potential or future flow. Charlie noted that after more detailed review, the EDU count is different from what was presented at the last meeting due to the location of some homes and the high costs to serve those locations. The size of the plant is somewhat smaller, yet still provides for growth with infill. His team is currently evaluating the collection system options.

Turning to the disposal or dispersal systems, Charlie worked with Jim Sawyer (the County's soil scientist) to identify potential areas. At this stage of the process there are parcels identified that are centrally located within the areas with appropriate soils, and allows him to give some reasonable idea of the costs of dispersal.

Charlie then explained that the disposal method for this project is designed without direct discharge to any streams. Two options of dispersal – spray irrigation or drip dispersal – are considered. In this case, drip irrigation appears to be the best choice. That method requires a “very, very, very high degree of filtering,” Charlie said, to prevent any solids from clogging the drip lines. This method meets the State’s surface discharge rules for the Chesapeake Bay, and provides advantages in cost, less concern about the quality of the effluent (very high degree of treatment prior to disposal), and is put into the ground year round.

In turning to the “Opinion of Total Project Costs” contained in the handout, Charlie explained the elements considered and answered questions from the PMT members. Initial total construction costs are just under \$5 million, with additional costs for contingencies, legal and engineering fees, administrative costs and capitalized interest, leading to a total project cost of about \$6.5 million.

In reviewing operational costs, Charlie noted that a number of questions remain outstanding that would affect the operating costs, including the amount of personnel time required by WSA to maintain the system. The group discussed elements that will impact on the project’s costs, depending on the direction taken in the project, such as the use of easements and work at the houses themselves, whether the homeowner or the WSA would do maintenance on the elements of the system that are located at the home itself, if the destruction of existing septic systems is included or born by the homeowner, and other similar elements. In terms of the personnel costs, Charlie said that this system as designed requires minimal time to maintain outside the drip system and the plant itself. Without a discharge to a stream, a DEQ permit is not required, nor the DEQ staff requirements. Similar systems are currently operating well in Virginia with between 4-8 hrs/week of maintenance time.

In general questions from the PMT, Charlie was asked to look to include the Pearson School. Questions were asked about the membrane technology being used in the plant as currently designed, with discussion about its use and lifespan (related to maintenance and replacement cycles). Barney Durrett noted that a 30 year life cycle for plants is a reasonable assumption, as technologies advance and replacements provide opportunities for moving to higher technologies with improved treatments.

Kristen Slawter brought maps to show the comprehensive plan’s growth designations for the two villages, and to show the utility service areas as contained in earlier utility studies.

Eldon led an overview of funding options, and highlighted the timetables that are likely for various funding sources. CDBG funding from the Department of Housing and Community Development applications are due in the Spring; DEQ applications are due in the summer; and DCR nonpoint funding applications are generally due in the fall. He noted that Rural Development funding applications are submitted as completed with specific deadlines; however, it is not likely that RD would be a good source for a grant, but could serve to provide a low interest loan for this project. Eldon also commented on the value of federal EPA budget appropriations for projects such as this one, commonly known as STAG (State and Territorial Assistance Grants).

To questions about local funding for the project, Tony responded that the county has in the past assisted financially with the New Baltimore collection system and the Vint Hill waste water treatment projects. He noted that such contributions of county funds may be possible where other public interests, such as economic development or protection of public health, are at hand.

The PMT was reminded that the PER status will be presented to the Board at its October 14th work session. One more PMT meeting will be held prior to that presentation, and an outline of the presentation would be presented for PMT review and comment.

Sue and Eldon shared with the PMT a draft logo for the project. Following general discussion, Sue will ask the artist to redesign the logo with some houses in front, moving the agricultural scene into the background.

III. Planning for the First Community Meeting

Sue reminded the group that at the last PMT meeting, November 1st was selected for the First Community Meeting. The group agreed that Pearson School should be the location, and 6 to 7:30 pm the time (with 6:30 to 8:00 being a back-up time if that worked better for the school). Tony would check with the school to reserve the space.

It was also agreed the fliers advertising the meeting should not go out sooner than 2 weeks before the meeting – target being October 15th. The county will distribute the fliers advertising the Meeting. Sue said that she would prepare a draft first newsletter and flier by October 1st, sharing that with the PMT via email.

Sue suggested that work on the agenda for the Community Meeting would begin at the next PMT meeting, and conclude at the October 21st PMT meeting.

IV. Discussion on the First Newsletter

(This item was discussed above)

V. Next PMT Meeting

Thursday, October 7, 2010 from 10:00 – 11:30 at WSA offices

Tony called the meeting closed shortly after 11, thanking everyone for attending and their active participation in the discussions.

Minutes prepared by Sue Rowland