

schneider, marchant

From: Bayless, Glen
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 9:22 AM
To: schneider, marchant
Subject: Potomac Interceptor

Marchant,

I apologise for the late note but I have a couple questions that I would like to ask about the Potomac Interceptor application.

1. What is the purpose of the well? If there will be a restroom on site. will it be open to the public?
2. Is there a plan for protecting the playground and access to the playground from construction traffic?

Thanks

Mr. Glen Bayless
Planning Commissioner
Sugarland Run District

schneider, marchant

From: Robinson, Gigi
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2010 3:47 PM
To: schneider, marchant
Cc: Merrithew, John E.; Keirce, Clifford; Austin, Erin; Bayless, Glen; Syska, Helena; Ruedisueli, Kevin; Maio, Peggy; Klancher, Robert; Ronis, Valdis
Subject: Potomac Interceptor Odor Abatement Site
Attachments: Potomac Interceptor.docx

Marchant,

Attached are the questions I wanted to get amplification on at the hearing or before!

Thanks,

Gigi Robinson
Planning Commission
Leesburg District

Potomac Interceptor

Page 9

Please explain what is meant by Community Connection and how the location contributes to the odor control

Location and site selection on different criteria. Why is that?

Please give us a run down on the proffers from ZMAP-1986-0013 that pertain to this site.

Page 11

Why is this coming to us before the referrals are addressed? It is a problem getting stuff at the hearing and have to read it, absorb it and vote on it while both Staff and the Applicant are presenting.

Since there is not another plant installed how did you determine that it "demonstrated its effectiveness"?

Page 12

Based on the analysis above...location character and extent. Well if the mitigation, LID, etc. aren't met, what is the second site proposed. See page A9 #2 and answer on A45. The answer again does not actually address the floodplain construction but rather the preference for the location based on convenience for PI and existing proffers.

Our plan does not envision nor encourage building in the floodplain. Page 5-10 Policy 18 b. "Utilities and utility rights-of-way (only when the environmental objectives of the RSCOD can be maintained or enhanced).

With the CPAM that was just forwarded to the BOS, not only do we not encourage building in a floodplain, but we don't want it in the RPA buffer of 100'.

Why is this site deemed so "suitable"?

Are these structures on stilts to allow water to move through beneath the building?

Page A3

If granular activated carbon is highly flammable and a fire suppression system would have to be installed in the facility, should there be an additional condition about yearly inspections of the fire suppression system?

Page A4

Applicant's response to River and Stream LID (Page A48) is inadequate. At a minimum, the Applicant should either commit to it or move to a less sensitive site.

Page A9

1. Applicant's answer is not clear enough. please explain fuller at the hearing. (Answer Page A45). If the plumbing fixtures are above the flood elevation, why is it activated by high water?
2. Answer on A45 repeats itself multiple times. Until you get to the end and "maximum operational effectiveness" comes into play. Please explain at the hearing what are the reasons this could not be moved. Please provide a comparison between this site and another that would be outside the floodplain...pros/cons, difference in dollars, etc.

If odor is a problem whether you treat it there or another location out of the floodplain, it should become odor free.

If containing and dispersing gases to protect the cement pipes, again a location out of the floodplains should not make a difference.

Surely a site can be found that precludes rolling over floodplains.

4. Please include in the conditions of approval.

Page A22

I don't find the answer on mitigation of impact solved by scheduling vehicle entrance and exit (A44). Please elaborate at the hearing

Page A23

Please elaborate at the hearing about the Wood Turtle and what VDGIF has to say.

Page A27

Answer on page A47 does not address the special material to be used if well is within 35 feet of the PI. would like the applicant to elaborate on that and include both that response and the height included in the conditions of approval.

Lastly,

We are the first in a group of 6 sites to have the PI opened and the gases blown out through carbon filters into the air.

1. We don't know what are in those gasses.
2. We don't know if this is sufficient to catch all the gases.
3. We don't know if there might be a small amount of malingering odor that will now be more pronounced because it is being blown into the air.
4. Hopefully LW will not be in charge (paid for on a contract) for removing and replacing the filters. It will then be up to the County to dispose of those items.
5. What assurances do we have that this site will shut down if odor or gases prove more than the residents or air quality indexes can stand?
6. As the effluent gets more concentrated because of LW and others selling recycled water for cooling systems, what assurances do we have that the carbon filters will be able to handle the load?