

1	
2	
3	

RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS **Minutes of Regular Meeting** January 24, 2023

4 5 6

7

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, January 24, 2023, at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

8 9 10

Board Members Present: Mike Gaffney, Michael Rogers, Jeff Richardson, Brian Pinkston, Jim Andrews, Stacey Smalls, Lance Stewart.

11 12 13

Board Members Absent: None.

14 15

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, Lonnie Wood, Jennifer Whitaker, Deborah Anama.

16 17

Attorney(s) Present: Carrie Stanton.

18 19

20

21

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney convened the January 24, 2023 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:00 p.m.

22 23 24

2. AGENDA APPROVAL – (Item 11 AMENDED)

25 26

Mr. Mawyer explained that Ms. Stanton had submitted substitute wording for the motion for the closed meeting, and it had been added to the amended agenda.

27 28 29

Mr. Pinkston motioned to approve the Agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rogers and passed unanimously (7-0).

30 31 32

33

34

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING

a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 15, 2022

35 36

Mr. Rogers motioned to approve the minutes from the November 15, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Richardson and passed unanimously (7-0).

37 38

Mr. Mawyer explained that members did not have to be present at the meeting to vote to approve the minutes for the meeting.

39 40 41

4. RECOGNITION

There were no recognitions.

42 43 44

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

45 Mr. Mawyer reported that Mr. Gaffney had been reappointed by the Board and City Council for his 11th term. He stated that Mr. Gaffney had served 21 years on the Board. 46

47

- 48 Mr. Mawyer stated that he provided a quarterly report to the Albemarle County Board of
- 49 Supervisors and Charlottesville City Council, and he provided a brief presentation to City Council.
- He stated that Mr. Cole Hendrix had served on the RSWA Board for many years. He stated that Mr.
- Hendrix died in November. He explained that Mr. Hendrix had been instrumental in forming the

52 RSWA and the RWSA.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had received the new baling machine for the paper sort facility, and the machine had been installed. He stated that staff would be trained on how to operate the baling machine. He reported that the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center was under construction. He stated that concrete slabs had been poured, and site work had been completed. He anticipated that the project would be completed in May, weather dependent.

 Mr. Mawyer reported that they had received two grants from the DEQ. He stated that one grant of \$45,707 was for the litter prevention and recycling program, and the other grant of \$17K was for a new container for the oyster shell reuse program. He stated that they applied for a specially lined container for the oyster shells. He stated that the pumpkin smash event went well.

Mr. Mawyer announced that the next meeting of the Board would be in March, and it would be held virtually. He stated that the next in-person meeting of the Board would be in May.

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Gaffney opened Items from the Public. He asked any speakers to identify themselves for the public record. He noted that there were no speakers and closed the items from the public.

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Since there were no public comments, there were no responses.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

 a. Staff Report on Finance

 b. Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update

c. Approval of Updated Flexible Benefits Plan

No items were pulled from the Consent Agenda for comments or questions.

 Mr. Pinkston moved for the Board to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stewart and carried unanimously (7-0).

9. OTHER BUSINESS

 a. Presentation: History and Organizational Agreements of the RSWA

 Mr. Mawyer stated that he had provided the presentation in May, but he wanted to start the new year with a reminder of the history and agreements of the RSWA. He stated that several budget calculations were based on the agreements.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the City and the County purchased 300 acres in the County in 1968 which would become the Ivy Landfill. He stated that the landfill was operated by the City until the creation of the RSWA in 1990. He stated that the County and the City approached the State Corporation Commission with drafted articles of incorporation and bylaws to request approval of the RSWA. He

stated that the City and the County sold the Ivy Landfill to the Authority for \$1, and from that point on, the Authority has managed the Ivy Material Utilization Center as it is now known.

Mr. Mawyer explained that in 2000, neighbors expressed concerns about the landfill activity. He explained that there were six cells at the landfill—three lined and three unlined. He stated that lined cells included a synthetic liner under the landfill and a synthetic cap. He stated that there was a settlement agreement to stop the landfill activity at Ivy. He stated that they continued to transfer refuse at the site.

Mr. Mawyer stated that there was an asbestos disposal area capped at the landfill, and it was used from 1982 to 1999. He stated that they estimated about 1300 tons of asbestos-containing materials were disposed at the Ivy facility. He stated that the paint pit was one of the larger issues, and the contractors have dumped paint in an unlined area.

Mr. Mawyer stated that in 2005, an environmental memorandum of understanding (MOU) was issued between the City, the County, and UVA to determine how the remaining landfill at Ivy would be handled and paid for. He stated that Mr. Gaffney participated in the negotiations to determine the cost allocation.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the agreement stipulated UVA would pay 7%, the City would pay 33%, and the County would pay 60%. He stated that UVA had requested the 7% be a fixed cost, so it was fixed at \$79,982 per year through the year 2035. He stated that the County paid 64.5% of the remaining balance, and the City paid 35.5% of the remaining balance.

Mr. Gaffney explained that UVA had agreed to pay 7% of the total cost, about \$30M over the lifespan. He stated that the 30-year budget had a fixed figure for UVA, but they paid more initially.

Mr. Mawyer stated that in 2007, the City decided to create a curbside refuse collection program, but they did not want to dispose of refuse and pay the tip fee at the Ivy Landfill. He stated that in 2010, there was a three-year decline for the RSWA, and its future became uncertain. He explained that the City had substantially withdrawn from the partnership. He stated that in 2010, there was an agreement in which the City and County agreed to finance RSWA through the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Mawyer stated that in 2011, the County and the City developed the Local Government Support Agreement for the recycling program. He stated that in 2016, the County indicated it would continue to fund the programs at Ivy. He stated that the DEQ informed them that the transfer station facility was insufficient, so it had to be replaced. He stated that the County funded the new transfer station, which was built in 2018.

Mr. Mawyer stated that in 2019, the Authority and the County came to an agreement on the Ivy Convenience Center. He stated that there were articles of incorporation and bylaws that governed the Authority. He explained that the bylaws were last changed by the Board in 2020 when they changed the meeting schedule to every other month. He stated that all members had to be present to vote for a change in the bylaws. He stated that staff monitored the agreements as they distributed costs between the City, the County, and UVA.

Mr. Pinkston clarified whether the County and the City would cease to make payments for the Ivy Landfill in 2035 or if they would pay in perpetuity.

Mr. Mawyer stated that was dependent upon when DEQ would allow them to end the landfill postclosure program. He stated that as long as there were contaminants in the ground or air, DEQ would not end the post-closure program.

Mr. Gaffney asked where they tracked the annual post-closure costs versus what was estimated.

Mr. Wood responded that the corrective action plan had been updated several times, but he did not have exact figures.

Mr. Mawyer stated he believed that they were close. He stated that the original plan mentioned \$1M per year or more, and that was about the Authority's expenses for the environmental MOU. He stated more detail would be provided in March.

Mr. Gaffney clarified that the payments could continue past the 30-year period.

(recess RSWA in a JOINT SESSION with the RWSA)

At 2:20 p.m., Mr. Rogers moved to recess the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Andrews and carried unanimously (7-0).

(reconvene RSWA for a JOINT SESSION with the RWSA)

Mr. Gaffney called to order the joint session of the RWSA and RSWA.

a. Presentation: Sustainability and Climate Action Overview

Ms. Jennifer Whitaker stated that she was presenting the collective work of numerous staff in both authorities in an effort to provide insight into how the Authorities fit into the regional fabric of the community's climate action plans. She stated that at their core, both authorities were environmental protection organizations, citing that both their vision and mission talked about sustainability, environmental protection, and public health.

Ms. Whitaker stated that the 1972 Clean Water Act established wastewater treatment targets and clean water goals. She stated that the 1974 Safe Drinking Water Act established public health and public protection through drinking water treatment, and that the 1976 RCRA Act set the groundwork for modern-day solid waste and recycling services. Ms. Whitaker stated that given this core mission, staff were working to understand what it meant to be sustainable and responsible for climate action, when their day to day work already addressed so many different aspects. She stated that the organization has taken some time to find out the next steps.

Ms. Whitaker stated that similar to many organizations, the Authorities were adjusting to a dynamic and unpredictable environment in several areas: (a) climate change, (b) regulatory requirements, and (c) scientific discovery and best practices, noting the industry was changing rapidly. Ms. Whitaker stated that in the past, they would have conceived a project, constructed it, and complete it. The process would have taken nearly 10 years. Now, however, work must be completed in much shorter periods of time with frequent mid-stream changes. She noted that it is difficult to measure progress and success in this environment. She stated that they have adjusted how they provide service, while still striving to meet the core mission, by internally changing work processes. Ms. Whitaker stated that they were attempting to better understand where their impacts and footprint. Going forward the organization is focusing on practical climate- based outcomes with measurable results and not just policy and conversation.

Ms. Whitaker stated that the 2023 strategic plan had five key priorities, including one for environmental stewardship. She stated that it weaved its way through everything they were doing, but also was worthy as a priority to stand on its own. She focused on and emphasized the first four words of the goal statement, "To demonstrate and promote." Ms. Whitaker explained that as an organization of people who "did things" by trade, they wanted to ensure that they were able to champion real change and make a difference. Ms. Whitaker stated that they also discussed sustainability, research, conservation, and environmental education, with strategies identified. She stated that they focused on outreach and how to work with other agencies to bring technical expertise forward, how to educate others, and how to help make collaborative decisions. Ms. Whitaker stated that they also are asking what their inward sustainability initiatives were, and what they could do to enhance the environmental protection work they wanted to achieve. She stated that the third item was about business practices and equity, specifically referencing solid waste in the strategic plan.

Ms. Whitaker stated that staff have developed an approach to working on this program that allows for input, problem solving and results at various points within the organization. She stated that on one side of the equation is a strategic plan goal team, composed of representatives of different departments in the Authority who have some interest or job authority for sustainability. Ms. Whitaker stated that those members had begun meeting and had set goals and objectives about educational outreach and finding opportunities to engage internally in the departments. She stated that she was impressed with the work accomplished by the team recently. The team feeds into the planning, strategy, coordination, policy and management aspect of the program. She stated that on the other side of the equation, sustainability focused capital and operating projects were utilizing traditional project management staff. She stated that by doing so, they were able to develop policies and be reactive to the impacts of climate change.

Ms. Whitaker stated that there were three key areas of focus for the Authorities at this time: (1) climate action and GHG emissions; (2) natural resources protection, and (3) climate change resiliency.

Ms. Whitaker notes that the climate action-related projects, included a greenhouse gas baseline assessment for the Moores Creek facility, which was the largest electricity user. She stated that a pilot project would be conducted before expanding it to the other facilities so that they had a clear picture of the actual carbon footprint.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were working their way through how to calculate this footprint, and one way was by putting in submetering and linking it to the SCADA system, so they would be able to see in real time the power consumption throughout all different parts of the plant. This will allow staff to have a better understanding of what was driving power consumption and how they might reduce it.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were intending to establish targets and goals, which would take a while to do, because the baseline work must be completed first. Ms. Whitaker acknowledged the County and City had greenhouse gas reduction goals through their climate action plans: to reduce 45% by 2030 and going to net zero by 2060. She stated that they understood that they were a part of the community and a part of achieving that goal.

Ms. Whitaker stated that the next project was focused on methane gas utilization. She stated that they had a cogeneration facility that was not very functional at the moment, and a study was

being conducted to determine how the wastewater biogas industry had evolved. She stated that staff were reviewing cogeneration, microturbines, and/or potentially cleaning the gas for pipeline use. She stated that the investigative phase was currently underway, with the hope of using that energy source at the facility in a better way.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were looking at renewable energy projects such as solar installation on the new Administration Building and the Ivy MUC brownfields installation. Ms. Whitaker noted that Dominion power had recently taken a greater interest in the Ivy MUC project, indicating it is becoming a likely candidate for their solar development program. She stated that things like operational optimization such as chemical, electrical use reduction, and vehicle driving reduction required finer process control at the plants. She stated that this would entail more SCADA control and more process programming, among other things.

Ms. Whitaker stated that granular activated carbon (GAC) was harvested out of the earth and was thus a carbon-intensive process. She stated that review of carbon regeneration and its footprint was being reviewed.

Mr. Richardson asked if Ms. Whitaker would be discussing anything regarding fleet.

Ms. Whitaker stated that it is intended to be part of the program. She stated that they had done research on fleet, but a very large portion of their fleet were heavy-duty trucks, and the industry currently was not quite fully developed for fleet vehicles. She stated that they were looking at adding eV-charging infrastructure at this building for guests, employees, as well as fleet. Additionally, she indicated that they were investigating installing eV-charging infrastructure at key fleet maintenance and storage areas. She stated that they were looking at replacing some lighter vehicles with eVs, and indicated that eventually the truck market would evolve.

Ms. Mallek stated that the EPA was working on a program for heavy vehicles, and some communities were getting fire engines and trash trucks, so it may be quicker than previously thought for this to come forward. She stated that the policy was there, but the substructure was missing.

Ms. Whitaker stated that a large issue was that many vehicles were demonstration vehicles or were very expensive.

Ms. Mallek stated that it was important to think about the entire cost of the vehicle, not only the diesel and the electricity. She asked if the methane from the wastewater treatment process was currently being released.

Ms. Whitaker stated no, and that by law, they were not allowed to release methane, nor did they want to. She stated that they were doing a combination of use in their boiler system and flaring, and they wanted to get away from doing that.

Ms. Mallek asked if flaring was the same as releasing.

Ms. Whitaker responded that it wasn't and stated that flaring was burning, and it converted it to a much less impactful emission.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they used electric golf carts on-site to reduce gas consumption.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were also using more electrical tools in place of gas-powered tools as the market evolved. She stated that they were taking little steps in an effort to understand where the markets were going.

She continued that for natural resource protection, the Moores Creek plant was an enhanced nutrient reduction plant, and most of the wastewater in the region came to the facility. She stated that the community did a great job, with their nutrient reduction targets exceeded across the board, and they continued to work to lower those. She stated that eventually, the regulations would become state-of-the-industry targets, so they would continue to work on that as well.

Ms. Whitaker stated that water quality had been an emphasis for a long time, and in Virginia, they were an early adopter in looking at raw water nutrients, algae monitoring, and reservoir treatment. She stated that they had an in-stream flow program and had recently worked with DEQ to update this plan to better mimic the data they had. She indicated that DEQ had been a good partner in that as staff have enhanced the understanding of river flows through data analysis, they have allowed the in-stream flow requirement to be altered to better mimic actual river conditions. She stated that they would be removing the dam at the North Fork Rivanna River when they decommissioned the North Fork water treatment plant, returning the river to a natural flow.

Ms. Whitaker stated that for land use management practices, there were forestry management practices being implemented at various sites. She stated that the expansion of the recycling and composting centers was done in concert with the County, and that staff continued to grow and regionalize cardboard baling and glass recycling. She stated that they were continuing with the residential compost facility drop-off program and with UVA dining composting. She stated that they were continuing the e-waste and hazardous waste disposal programs to keep those items out of landfills.

Ms. Whitaker stated that a key factor for the program area of climate change resiliency was that they were anticipating much larger precipitation flood events and much drier and longer droughts. She stated that it was what California was seeing right now, and their infrastructure was not set up to fully catch and utilize the heavy rainfall to refill the reservoirs. She stated that on the east coast, they had been buffered from that for a little bit, but it was coming, and we must be prepared for it.

Ms. Whitaker stated that to this point, they had done some building flood resiliency evaluations, working under the EPA and FEMA guidelines, and the evaluations were done based on the 100-year flood, the 100-plus-two feet, and the 500-year flood. She stated that they were going to start doing some mitigation activities with a target of all of the facilities being 500-year-flood-proof.

Ms. Whitaker stated that there were capital improvement projects to construct redundant water supply pipelines at critical river crossings for both the North Fork Rivanna and South Fork Rivanna Rivers. She stated that they were also designing and constructing the South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir (SFR to RMR) and the Ragged Mountain Reservoir to Observatory Water Treatment plant pipeline system, which would dramatically help with system operation as well as drought resilience by fully interconnecting the raw water resources and treatment capacity.

Ms. Whitaker stated that this also would allow them to refill the Ragged Mountain Reservoir at the rate of 25 million gallons per day as opposed to the current 3.3 MGD. She stated that when

there was a large rain event, they could take in more water, allowing them to quickly collect water and take advantage of those events. She stated again that they were decommissioning the North Fork Water Treatment Plant, which in turn allowed for dam removal and better flood resiliency.

Ms. Whitaker stated that staff were implementing "design policies" as part of their infrastructure resiliency standards. She stated that they have implemented a policy of installing exterior bypass pumping connections on every pump station. She stated that this is in addition to emergency power generation. She indicated that if there was something that destroyed the interior of the pump station such as a flood or fire, they could quickly tie in on the suction and discharge side with temporary pumping and keep the system operational. She stated that it was expected to be a policy moving forward.

Ms. Whitaker discussed dam safety and showed images on the landslide of the 2018 flood. She stated that they had adopted a "design standard" to size dams for 100% of the probable maximum precipitation/flood, although Virginia only required 90%. She stated that they were also working with the dam safety community to understand the recent research on anticipated future flood event and the impact of climate change on those events.

 Ms. Whitaker stated that for regional coordination, all the agencies, committees, and groups that they were either a part of or advisors to or stakeholders in were displayed on the current slide. She stated that their goal was to use their technical expertise to be helpful to others and to make sure that they were tied in regionally and understood the community goals, so that their work was in concert with what was being asked of them.

Ms. Mallek asked what the 2018 flood was in comparison to a 100-year flood.

Ms. Whitaker stated that published literature stated that it was close to a 1000-year storm event. She stated that however, it was not the storm of record, and was not a probable maximum flood. She stated that for this area, PMF precipitation was somewhere in the 30 inches in a 24-hour rain event. She stated that the 30+-inch storm was based on the existing calculations, so the future may be more than that.

Mr. Rogers asked if there was a forum that they were sharing with the City Climate Action Team.

Ms. Whitaker stated that they were part of that group and had sessions within that group in which the members shared what they were currently working on, but she had not shared this presentation. She stated that they had shared some of the information but could certainly share this with the City staff as well.

10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA

There were none.

11. CLOSED MEETING

At 3:43 p.m., Mr. Pinkston moved that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority enter into a joint closed session with the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority to discuss the evaluation of performance of departments where such evaluation will necessarily involve discussion of the performance of specific individuals as permitted by the personnel exemption at Section 2.2-

At 4:45 p.m., Mr. Smalls moved to certify the closed session whereas, the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority has convened a joint closed meeting with the Rivanna Water and Sewer 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 Solid Waste Authority that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law; now, therefore, be it resolved that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority hereby certifies by recorded vote that, to the best of each member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0), by roll-call vote.

3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which passed

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 4:48 p.m., Mr. Andrews moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

Respectfully submitted,

unanimously (7-0), by roll-call vote.

Mr. Michael Rogers
Secretary - Treasurer

