



695 MOORES CREEK LANE  
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902-9016  
TEL: 434.977.2970  
FAX: 434.293.8858  
WWW.RIVANNA.ORG

---

**RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**August 25, 2015**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, August 25, 2015 at 2:15 p.m. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

**Board Members Present:** Mr. Ken Boyd, Mr. Tom Foley, Mr. Mike Gaffney – presiding, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Maurice Jones, Ms. Judith Mueller and Mr. Gary O’Connell.

**Board Members Absent:** None.

**Staff Present:** Mr. Tim Castillo, Ms. Victoria Fort, Mr. Tom Frederick, Rich Gullick, Ph.D., Ms. Teri Kent, Mr. Philip McKalips, Mr. Scott Schiller, Ms. Michelle Simpson and Ms. Jennifer Whitaker.

**Also Present:** Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Counsel, members of the public, and media representatives.

**1.0 Call to Order**

The regular meeting of the RWSA Board of Directors was called to order by Mr. Gaffney on Tuesday, August 25, 2015 at 2:15 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

**2.0 Minutes of Previous Board Meeting**

*a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on July 28, 2015*

**Mr. O’Connell moved that the Board of Directors approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Board held on July 28, 2015. Ms. Mueller seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0.**

### **3.0 Executive Director's Report**

#### *Sugar Hollow Reservoir Update*

Mr. Frederick provided an update regarding the Sugar Hollow Reservoir, following up on previous Board discussion. He stated that pursuant to their July meeting discussion, staff had been monitoring the ecological conditions upstream from the dam on a weekly basis and recorded rising water temperatures in the zones where there was sufficient oxygen for aquatic life. He stated that staff met with representatives from the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF), who indicated that while these conditions were ideal for some species in the reservoir, the conditions represented a potential problem for brook trout, which DGIF stocked in the reservoir every spring. Mr. Frederick stated that on August 4, the RWSA halted the transfer of water from Sugar Hollow to Ragged Mountain, and the transfer valve had been closed since that date. He stated that continued monitoring was not suggesting that habitat for brook trout was improving; instead such unfavorable habitat was remaining static or even declining slightly. Mr. Frederick stated that there was no evidence of trout stress or fatality, and DGIF had indicated that they are unable to quantify how many species of trout are in the reservoir. He indicated that it was assumed the trout were staying in the area of the reservoir where oxygen levels were sufficient, but the water temperatures were higher than the trout were comfortable with.

Mr. Frederick stated that the RWSA was keeping the transfer off and was continuing with the Tier 3 release<sup>1</sup> to the Moorman's River, with water levels in the Sugar Hollow Reservoir continuing to decline even without the transfer of water to Ragged Mountain. He stated that evaporation was very small given the current surface area of the reservoir, and there was no evidence of large seepage, so it was assumed that the release to the river was more than compensating for the true stream inflow coming into Sugar Hollow. Mr. Frederick stated that staff was hoping for some rain and cooler temperatures, and as soon as DGIF concurred that water transfer could resume, the RWSA would make a decision administratively, unless the Board felt they needed to be involved with that decision.

#### *Discussion on Climate Forecast*

Mr. Frederick reported that the Climate Prediction Center was suggesting a strong El Nino in the Pacific this winter, which increased the probability of a cooler and wetter than normal winter for Central Virginia. He stated that a wet winter could complete the refilling of all reservoirs by next spring.

#### *Board Questions and Discussion on Executive Director's Report*

Ms. Mueller stated that she did not understand why the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, since they stock the reservoir with brook trout, could not determine the number of them in the reservoir.

---

<sup>1</sup> Editor's Note: "Tier 3" describes the condition in the DEQ Water Protection Permit requiring RWSA to release from the Sugar Hollow Reservoir to the Moorman's River the calculated "natural inflow" of the stream at that location, up to a maximum release of two million gallons per day. The permit includes a formula for calculating "natural inflow" based upon the reading of the USGS gage on the Mechum's River.

Mr. Gaffney responded that DGIF did not place trout in the reservoir, instead the placement was upstream.

Mr. O’Connell clarified that further that DGIF placed the trout both within and upstream of the reservoir, and the placement was a mix of fish – including brown trout.

Mr. Gaffney stated that as you walked up the trails, there were “signs” for about a mile that the waters were stocked.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the RWSA was releasing two million gallons every day, or releasing natural inflow.

Mr. Frederick explained that the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) permit required either two million gallons per day (MGD) or the calculated natural inflow, whichever was less<sup>2</sup>. He stated that there was a formula in the permit that explained how to calculate natural inflow, and the lowest that number had gotten was 2.1 MGD. Mr. Frederick stated that the level was based on a correction to the flow in the Mechum’s River, and it was apparent that the Sugar Hollow Reservoir watershed was quite a bit drier this year than the Mechum’s River watershed. He noted that unless approved otherwise by DEQ and requested a change in that procedure, they were required to follow the proscribed release – which over the summer has been two million gallons per day.

Mr. Boyd asked about the water level in Ragged Mountain and whether it was still filling.

Mr. Frederick responded that Ragged Mountain was slightly dropping, and had been as high as 9.5 feet below the spillway.

Mr. O’Connell asked when he anticipated Sugar Hollow to fill, based on weather predictions and the 10-year average.

Mr. Frederick explained that Sugar Hollow had refilled in every year on record, with the most challenging year being the winter of 2001, which preceded the 2002 drought. He said that the reservoir had reached the bottom of the lowest operable intake (estimated at 38 feet below the spillway) in December 2001 and the reservoir did not refill until May 2002. Mr. Frederick noted that in most years the reservoir would refill with fall rains and stay full until late spring.

#### **4.0 Items from the Public**

Mr. Gaffney invited comments from the public.

Mr. Keith Ford of Cavalier Septic Service addressed the Board, stating that there was presently “better coverage” at the treatment plant than in previous years and he was pleased with the RWSA personnel, but he was concerned about having to pay overtime if haulers arrived after

---

<sup>2</sup> Editor’s Note: During the meeting Mr. Frederick mistakenly stated “greater” instead of less, the minutes have been corrected to reflect the correct condition as stated in the DEQ permit.

5:00 p.m. He stated that his service paid the RWSA approximately \$68,000 in fees last year, with Allied Portable Toilet paying about \$40,000, and his concern was that “fly-by-nighters” would not pay the extra \$65 to unload and would simply dump their sewage haul anywhere they could, such as streams and railroad tracks, if they started getting charged overtime. Mr. Ford opined that he was worried about the congestion at the plant and traffic safety issues caused when waste haulers were trying to beat the clock to arrive by 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Boyd asked what the impact would be of starting later in the morning, so that they could keep the eight-hour shift, and if it would impact haulers to start at 10:00 or 11:00 a.m. and go until 6:00 or 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Ford responded that they went from 7:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m., and they could go to 8:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m., and it would be a whole lot better if they did not have to pay overtime. He also mentioned that they should consider the financial impact of the waste from the Lock’n Music Festival and other out-of-town events that were coming into Albemarle County. Mr. Ford added that his business served over 1,000 local houses per year.

## **5.0 Responses to Public Comments**

Mr. Frederick stated that as long as he had been at the RWSA, there had been septage fees for the 7:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. hours and a higher fee for after hours. He stated that in reviewing this matter recently, he discovered that someone had made the decision to temporarily suspend the extra fee for after hours, while the Enhanced Nutrient Removal Project was underway and the contractor was keeping the gate open for longer periods. Mr. Frederick noted that the charges were reinstated after completion of the project, and the reason after hours fees had been levied was that RWSA had limited staff at this facility, yet there were required functions to monitor the treatment process. Mr. Frederick explained that if a septage truck called after hours, an operator had to stop his assigned work and open the gate to allow trucks to enter. He stated that this took time away from an operator doing his job of monitoring the treatment process or performing maintenance tasks, and while one or two trucks was tolerable, more would have an impact such as a need to hire additional staff. Mr. Frederick stated that the fee was established not to cover additional costs, but to discourage after-hours usage except for emergencies. He stated that the after-hour charges were established at a time when the system receiving service was manually administered, and an operator had to stay with the truck as long as it was dumping. Mr. Frederick noted that a few years ago RWSA installed an automated system, as a part of the odor-control project that developed a fully enclosed septage receiving facility. He stated that RWSA was able to reduce staffing by one position as a result of the automation, and there may be a legitimate question if the full amount of the approved after-hours charges were still appropriate under the new automated equipment. He stated that after-hours arrival of septage trucks still caused an interruption of the wastewater treatment operator’s duties and could still have a negative impact if done excessively.

Mr. Frederick invited the Board to discuss the matter while stating that they should strive to reduce after-hours usage so that existing staff levels could be maintained and costs minimized. He reminded the Board that the last time they had discussed septage and odor control in the context of implementing the new automated station, the Board agreed that it would be unfair for

the wholesale rate that the RWSA charged the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County Service Authority to subsidize septage receiving. Mr. Frederick stated that former County Executive Bob Tucker went to the Board of Supervisors and it was decided that the County would pay for the automated receiving facility out of their capital improvement fund. Following that same logic today, RWSA would need to make certain that added costs to serve septage haulers after-hours were not part of the expenses paid by wholesale rates.

Mr. Boyd asked how often the after-hours disposal occurred.

Mr. Frederick responded that in the month of June, there were 37,442 gallons discharged after hours out of a total 338,000 gallons, so just over 10% of the total. He stated that from information in front of him, he did not know how many trucks that represented.

Mr. Ford stated that his trucks held 2,400 gallons.

Mr. Frederick stated that from assuming 2,400 gallons per truck, that would equate to approximately 15 trucks, but there were companies other than Cavalier using after-hours services and truck sizes used by other companies may vary.

Mr. Gaffney asked how many of the after-hours trucks were close to 5:00 pm.

Mr. Frederick stated that the information in front of him did not answer Mr. Gaffney's question and would have to be brought back to the Board later.

Mr. Castillo stated that it would require further analysis to be able to answer Mr. Gaffney's question.

Mr. O'Connell stated that it sounded as though the trucks were filled during the day and disposed at the end of the day, perhaps the haulers needed to change the schedule "a bit".

Mr. Gaffney commented that the other question was whether there were incidents of dumping in the County.

Mr. Boyd responded that he had not heard of that happening, but the potential for it happening was a concern.

Mr. Gaffney stated that it would be good to get additional information for the next Board meeting.

Mr. Frederick agreed.

## **6.0 Consent Agenda**

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items that Board members wanted to pull for comments or questions from the Consent Agenda.

- a) *Staff Report on Finance*
- b) *Staff Report on Operations*
- c) *Staff Report on Ongoing Projects*
- d) *Contract – Telecommunications Management Services*

Mr. O’Connell asked if there was an update on the Schenk’s Branch easement beyond what was in the Board report, as RWSA was under a Consent Order to build the complete project.

Mr. Foley responded that the County had been doing some engineering study of County property, which had recently been reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and would be communicated to City Council within the next week.

Mr. O’Connell asked when the wholesale metering design would be completed.

Ms. Schiller responded that it would likely be completed by early September.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were in the midst of easement acquisition with about half of them signed, and many others being very close.

**Mr. Boyd moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. O’Connell seconded the motion, which passed by a 7-0 vote.**

## **7.0 Other Business**

- a) *Waiver Extension for University of Virginia Rowing*

Ms. Andrea Terry addressed the Board, stating that gas-powered boats were prohibited on all reservoirs unless granted an exception by the Board, as had been given to the University of Virginia (UVA) Rowing program and the Rivanna Rowing Club. She said that the rowing program had been before the RWSA Board in 2013, and had added two more efficient gas-powered boats since then<sup>3</sup>.

Mr. Kevin Sauer, UVA Women’s Rowing Team coach, addressed the Board and stated that they had made good progress with electric boat technology, and German company Torpedo had developed a motor that was working well. He presented photos of the boats, noting the technological improvements and the narrowness of the pontoons, and said that the investment in the lithium battery packs and motors were about \$25,000 per unit. Mr. Sauer said that the electric boat could keep up with the slower, smaller boats, but not the women’s “eight-seater”, so UVA was going to try to put two motors on each boat while Torpedo continued to come up with new electric technologies. He thanked the Authority for granting the previous exemption and discussed the recent success of the team in winning medals, noting that the team had been invited to a reception at the Governor’s mansion along with other UVA sports teams.

---

<sup>3</sup> Editor’s Note: The exception granted to the University of Virginia allows the rowing coaches to use gas-powered boats to keep up with the row boats used by the team during practice.

**Ms. Mueller moved to approve a new two-year waiver extension for University of Virginia Rowing through August 2017. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a 7-0 vote.**

*b) Amendment No. 1 to 1973 Service (“Four Party”) Agreement Regarding Wholesale Rates and Debt Service Charges*

Mr. Frederick provided a summary of the amendment and stated that the original Service Agreement was adopted one year after the RWSA was formed, with the parties including the City of Charlottesville, Albemarle County, the ACSA and RWSA. He stated that Article 7 was the focus of the amendment and addressed how the RWSA set wholesale rates and how the ACSA was billed in certain outlying areas like Crozet and Scottsville. Mr. Frederick stated that the focus of the amendment was on the urban area, where the agreement specified that RWSA was to estimate the sum of all needed revenue that covered operation and maintenance costs, debt service and capital improvement costs, then estimate how much consumption in water and wastewater the City and the ACSA would use, then compute a dollar per one-thousand gallons rate. He emphasized that in theory this made sense but in practice it was problematic as many costs – such as debt service – were fixed costs, but there were always variances between estimated and actual water and wastewater consumption. Mr. Frederick stated that in dry weather, drinking water consumption increased, likely a result of increased irrigation; and wastewater charges decreased because there was less stormwater infiltrating into the sewer system. He stated that the reverse patterns occurred during wet weather periods.

Mr. Frederick explained that the RWSA had money set aside in reserves, and Amendment # 1 would allow debt service charges to be established on the basis of a fixed, monthly sum. He stated that this would be beneficial to all parties, providing greater certainty of the ACSA’s and City’s costs as well as greater certainty of RWSA’s revenue. He stated that Charlottesville City Council, the ACSA Board of Directors and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors had all approved the Amendment, and upon the RWSA Board’s approval, the Amendment would be executed and placed into effect.

Mr. Krueger reminded the Board that they would also need approval from the bond trustee to place the Amendment in effect, and bond counsel had already let the trustee know it was forthcoming – and it was actually beneficial to the bond holders because it RWSA greater certainty of revenues it would receive to make bond payments.

Mr. Frederick noted that when the Service Agreement was adopted in 1973, the signatories were the chairs of the four boards and to be consistent, the attorneys have agreed that the motion by the Board should be to authorize the Chair to execute the amendment on behalf of the RWSA.

**Mr. O’Connell moved to approve Amendment No. 1 to the 1973 service “Four Party” Agreement regarding wholesale rates and debt service charges, and authorizing the RWSA Board Chair to execute the Amendment on behalf of RWSA. Ms. Galvin seconded the motion, which passed by a 7-0 vote.**

*c) Preliminary Rate Resolution and Call for Public Hearing to Amend Wholesale Rates and Debt Service Charges for FY 2015-16*

Mr. Frederick reminded the Board that every April, the Board adopted a preliminary rate resolution and called for a public hearing to adopt wholesale rates for the next fiscal year. He stated that they had held the public hearing in May and adopted wholesale rates based on Article 7 of the Service Agreement, but since they had just amended the agreement, they needed to amend the rates to conform to the amendment. He explained that any change in the wholesale rates invoked the Commonwealth of Virginia statute requirements that a preliminary rate resolution be adopted and advertised after which a public hearing was held before new rates could be adopted. He recommended that the hearing be held on September 22, 2015 at 2:15 p.m., which was the time of the Board's regular September Board meeting, and after public comment the Board could take action regarding rates. Mr. Frederick stated that staff was proposing October 1, 2015 as the date for which the new rates would take effect, which would mean that for the current fiscal year, three billing cycles would reflect the old "thousand-gallon rate" adopted in May 2015 and nine billing cycles would be under the new rates. He noted that the Board was simply modifying the per-thousand gallon rate to remove the debt service revenue requirements and adding a fixed charge to cover that same revenue, so the estimated amount of revenue collected would be the same.

Mr. Gaffney asked if actual revenues for the three months would be lower than estimated in May because of the low amount of rain.

Mr. Frederick responded that for July and August the wastewater revenues were about on target with the estimate, with water revenues slightly above the estimate.

**Mr. Foley moved to adopt the preliminary rate resolution and call for a public hearing to amend wholesale rates and debt service charges for FY 2015-16. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion, which passed by a 7-0 vote.**

#### **8.0 Other Items from Board/Staff not on Agenda**

Mr. Frederick stated that the Department of Environmental Quality permit required that the RWSA was required periodically to perform bathymetric surveys of all urban reservoirs, to update total usable storage, a factor in the formula that determined how much water must be released from dam structures. He stated that since the Sugar Hollow Reservoir was currently so low, RWSA could get a "bargain rate" – \$19,250 – to conduct a bathymetric survey since much of the area to be surveyed was dry land, and the survey would also be more accurate. He stated that the survey was not in the current budget, but performing it now would save a considerable amount of money compared to the cost with normal water levels, and performing the survey with low water levels would further provide more accurate results.

Mr. Boyd asked what the cost would be if the reservoir was full.

Mr. Frederick responded that based on what had been paid at South Fork, he would estimate a cost of about \$50,000 to do this survey when the reservoir was full.

Mr. Gaffney asked if performing the survey now would include what was left under water.

Mr. Frederick responded that it would.

Mr. O'Connell asked if it would help determine how much sediment had occurred in the reservoir.

Mr. Frederick responded that it would. When asked if the Board would be required to amend the budget to authorize performing the survey now, Mr. Frederick responded that the Board could choose to amend the budget for this survey but it could also be authorized without amending the budget.

Mr. Boyd asked where the money would come from if the Board chose not to amend the budget.

Mr. Frederick responded that the RWSA had adequate reserves, and the future balance sheet would simply report the expense as beyond what was budgeted. He explained that while budgets are an important management tool in which exceedance should be limited to good cause, the law does not prohibit the RWSA budget being exceeded in the manner that "appropriations" did represent a fixed ceiling for budgeting by localities.

Mr. Boyd asked if "money" was set aside for this type of expenditure.

Mr. Frederick responded that RWSA had ample undesignated reserves that could be used for any type of unexpected expense.

Mr. Gaffney added that the current situation was more emergency-related than opportunity-related, and if the Board did not amend the budget, monthly financial statements would be footnoted the remainder of the year.

Mr. Frederick agreed that it would be noted as a line item over budget, but mentioned that there would also be line items that were under budget.

Mr. Boyd asked if RWSA had "overcharged" in the past in order to build the reserves.

Mr. Frederick responded that both he and Lonnie Wood were inclined to be appropriately conservative in estimating future revenues, and more often than not, actual revenues would be higher than what was budgeted. He also stated that RWSA had a good track record of keeping expenses under budget, so it was often true that funds could be added to reserves at the end of a fiscal year. He stated further that higher reserves could then increase "pay-as-you-go" funding for capital projects, reducing the requirement for borrowing and the associated costs of borrowing money.

Mr. Boyd then asked if RWSA would be "shorting" itself in reserve funds by changing to a fixed monthly charge for debt service.

Mr. Frederick explained that fixed debt service charges would be more predictable, which also protects RWSA in a year when actual water or wastewater use might be less than estimated, then

noted that because historically actual revenues have more often than not been greater than estimated, the effect of the wholesale rate change could be less excess funds, but that should not be a significant issue and we would borrow what we need for capital projects beyond the limitation of use of appropriate reserves.

Mr. Boyd asked if perhaps it should be part of their normal budget process to set aside reserves for these types of situations.

Mr. Foley stated that the County had a reserve for contingencies that was appropriated, which allowed use of funds without going through a formal appropriations process.

Mr. Frederick stated that in addition to reserves that may result from a difference between estimated and actual revenue, the RWSA and RSWA budgets have included line-items that served a similar purpose to what Mr. Foley described the County places in its budget. Mr. Frederick identified depreciation charges and a reserve for future rolling stock replacement as examples. Then noting the number of questions being asked by Board members with regard to how budgeting and reserves are established and used, he suggested that Mr. Wood make a presentation to the Board next month. Mr. Frederick concluded that RWSA was not at any financial risk by proceeding with the bathymetric survey, noting that total reserves were being maintained within a range of 100-150% of annual debt service payments.

Mr. Boyd stated that he hated to see exceptions to budget reports each month, and would like to see if there was a different way to account for proposed expenses that were not budgeted.

Ms. Galvin agreed, but stated that she would like to move ahead with the bathymetric survey to save the \$30,000.

Board members agreed.

**Mr. O'Connell moved to approve an expense for the bathymetric survey of the Sugar Hollow Reservoir, with the budgetary accounting to be discussed at the RWSA Board meeting of September 2015. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7-0.**

## **9.0 Closed Meeting**

**Mr. Foley moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, to adopt the following resolution:**

**RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority enter into a closed meeting to discuss a potential property acquisition matter as permitted by Section 2.2-3711.A3 of the Code of Virginia. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0.**

**The RWSA Board went into closed session at 3:10 p. m.**

### *Resumption of Open Meeting*

**The Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Board of Directors meeting was resumed in open session at 3:16 p.m. Mr. Boyd entered the following resolution, seconded by Mr. O'Connell:**

**WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and**

**WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712.D of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law and, (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority.**

**Mr. Krueger called for a roll call vote: Ms. Mueller – aye; Mr. Jones – aye; Ms. Galvin – aye; Mr. Gaffney – aye; Mr. Foley – aye; Mr. Boyd – aye; and Mr. O'Connell – aye. The motion passed by a 7-0 vote.**

*RWSA Meeting in Recess*

**Mr. O'Connell moved to recess the RWSA Board meeting. Mr. Foley seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7-0. The RWSA Board meeting was in recess at 3:18 p. m.**

*RWSA Meeting Reconvene*

**Mr. Gaffney announced the RWSA Board meeting was reconvened from recess at 3:18 p. m.**

*Joint Closed Session with Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board of Directors*

**Mr. Jones moved to adopt the following resolution, seconded by Mr. O'Connell:**

**RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority enter into a joint closed meeting with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board to discuss confidential personnel matters as permitted by Section 2.2-3711.A.1 of the Code of Virginia.**

**The motion was approved by a 7-0 vote. The RWSA Board went into joint session with the RWSA Board at 3:19 p.m.**

*Resumption of Open Meeting*

**The Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Board of Directors meeting was resumed in open session at 4:25 p.m. Mr. Foley moved that the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Board of Directors vote to approve the following resolution, seconded by Ms. Mueller:**

**WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority has convened a joint closed meeting with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and**

**WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712.D of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law and, (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority.**

**Mr. Krueger called for a roll call vote: Ms. Mueller – aye; Mr. Jones – aye; Ms. Galvin – aye; Mr. Gaffney – aye; Mr. Foley – aye; Mr. Boyd – aye; and Mr. O'Connell – aye. The motion passed by a 7-0 vote.**

**Mr. Foley moved, seconded by Ms. Galvin, to approve an annual pay increase for the Executive Director of 3.34%, effective August 1, 2015. The motion passed by a 7-0 vote.**

#### **10.0 Adjournment**

**Ms. Mueller moved to adjourn the RWSA Board meeting. Ms. Galvin seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 7-0.**

**There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.**