

Catlett / Calverton Sewer Project
Project Management Team Meeting
September 9, 2010

I. Introductions

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
Ted Bullard	Health Department
Jim Sawyer	Fauquier County Soil Scientist
Wayne Stephens	FCWSA
Butch Farley	FCWSA
Barney Durrett	FCWSA
Jim Stone	
Mary Sherrill	Fauquier County
Charlie Riedlinger	Resources International
Sue Rowland	Project Consultant
Eldon James	Project Consultant

Sue also noted that a number of other community members were planning to be members of the PMT and were unavailable for today's meeting: Carolyn Hartman, Sarah Lee and William Armstrong, and Bobbie Trennis. Will Russell and Julia Amsler also plan to attend when they are available.

II. The Project's Purpose

Tony Hooper provided the group a brief overall of the Board's efforts to provide public sewer to the villages of Catlett and Calverton, and the Board's intent at this time. For these two villages, the Board is looking to:

- Examine the systems options available, particularly in light of new rules;
- Support a project that is cost effective;
- Serve first existing homes and business; and
- Develop a system(s) that is consistent with the County's current plan for limited growth in and around these villages.

III. The PMT's Purpose

Eldon James (County's consultant) reviewed the purpose of the Project Management Team (the PMT) as a means to provide clear communications between and among the County, its advisers and consultants, and the resident and business communities of Catlett and Calverton about finding a way to provide public wastewater treatment facility (or facilities) for the two towns.

Eldon commented on the various factors that would be addressed with the replacement of the septic systems in the towns, including the release of the draft

Watershed Implementation Plan (“WIP” for short) by DEQ to EPA and the strategies to remove aging and failing septic systems from the watershed.

IV. Review of the Catlett and Calverton Service Areas and Comprehensive Plan Designations

Kristen Slawter provided a review of the Catlett and Calverton district and service areas for consideration in this project. For Catlett, Kristen noted that the Board of Supervisors is currently reviewing a “down planning” of that district. She also noted that in previous plans for wastewater in Catlett, priority was first placed on existing buildings and problem septic systems (Phase 1) and then infill (Phase 2). She next reviewed the Calverton maps.

In response to questions, Kristen explained that the lines defining the service areas were drawn following the 1996 survey of residents in the two towns (and also Midland, though that town is not included in today’s project). The team tried to include an area that would address the bulk of the problem areas known at that time.

Kristen explained that the “down planning” activity now underway is a county-sponsored activity in support of the public sewer interests. By looking to reduce the defined service district, the public service area would be more practical to need and costs. The first public hearing on that activity is set for October 14th in the evening.

Again, in response to questions, the group was updated on the proposal of the Village of Catlett LLC to develop 645 units just outside of Catlett. The Board will hold a public hearing on this proposal also on October 14th. While the proposal includes an offering of wastewater to Catlett, Calverton is apparently not included. The engineers noted that the planned capacity of the Village of Catlett’s wastewater treatment facility would have capacity to treat wastewater from Calverton, however, there are no plans to collect and get the Calverton wastewater to that facility.

Barney Durrett (Service Authority) reminded the PMT that the Authority has extensive infrastructure analysis from 2004 that included an analysis of failed drainfields in the area. Called the “Corp Study,” Jim noted that the analysis was actually completed by the planning district commission. There was discussion about what elements of a collection system in Catlett that may or may not be included in the developer’s proffers; Barney noted that a meeting to learn these details was scheduled with the Authority.

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

Charlie Reidlinger PE (County consultant) provided the group with a report on the status of the P.E.R. development. Charlie highlighted that the “study area” doesn’t match the “service areas” of the two towns; further study will answer questions about the feasibility to hook-up all users. He outlined the current study area numbers:

Catlett – 124 homes (both open and vacant), 13 commercial establishments.

Calverton – 130 homes (including 1 apartment complex), 7 commercial buildings.

Total – 294 potential EDU's + 25% future growth = 362 EDU's

For treatment, he is planning for a 100,000/day treatment facility. This study area is consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan, and consistent with the extra capacity that is being planned by the developer for that treatment plant.

The P.E.R. is being prepared to meet the USDA Rural Development PER standards which includes a requirement for 24 year period of growth, and the requirements to demonstrate the cost effectiveness of the plans. A number of alternatives are being considered for collection, and include conventional gravity, a vacuum system, a STEP system, and a grinder system.

Eldon noted that the PMT will have the opportunity to discuss balancing between the funders' requirements (i.e. RD's minimum monthly fee requirement) and the homeowner's costs.

Charlie noted that the treatment phase alternatives will be included, and also dispersal alternatives. Discussion ensued around the option of spray irrigation. In this alternative, the treatment can allow more solids to be moved into the effluent for dispersal than is allowed when using drip system dispersal methods that tolerate no solids in the effluent. Charlie described a spray irrigation system that is in use in Westmoreland county, and the changes he negotiated with DEQ to allow a greater total amount of effluent to be discharged through the spray system (accounting for evaporation in dispersal and the need of the water in the fields. Charlie reported that they are now looking at costs for each of the three stages, and looking for dispersal sites.

Questions from the group included the following:

What limitations are there on the use of the land when using spray irrigation? What impact does prescription drugs and vitamins in the sewage have on this dispersal method? What limitations are imposed on commercial discharges when spray irrigation is used? How do the DEQ and VDH requirements on spray irrigation differ? Should the PMT include representatives from the Extension Services? Will tap fees be included in the overall costs?

VI. Discussion on the First Community Meeting

As time was limited, Sue suggested that more conversation about the first community meeting would occur at the next meeting. However, selecting a date needed to happen at this meeting. After discussion, the group selected November 1st for the Community Meeting, and suggested that it be held at the elementary school.

VII. Next PMT Meeting

Thursday, September 23, 2010 from 10:00 – 11:30 at WSA offices