

1 2 3 4 5	RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS Minutes of Regular Meeting November 15, 2022
6 7 8 9	A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, November 15, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. in the Administration Building at 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, VA.
10 11 12	<b>Board Members Present:</b> Mike Gaffney, Jeff Richardson, Jim Andrews, Brian Pinkston, Stacey Smalls, Lance Stewart, Michael Rogers.
13 14	Board Members Absent: None
15 16 17	<b>Rivanna Staff Present:</b> Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, Jennifer Whitaker, Lonnie Wood, Deborah Anama, Liz Coleman.
18 19	Attorney(s) Present: Carrie Stanton
20 21 22 23	1. CALL TO ORDER  Mr. Gaffney convened the November 15, 2022 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:00 p.m.
24 25 26	2. AGENDA APPROVAL Mr. Rogers moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which passed 5–0. (Mr. Richardson and Mr. Smalls were not present.)
27 28 29	3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING
30 31	a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on September 27, 2022
32 33	Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any changes to the Board minutes or comments.
34 35	Mr. Gaffney asked if Mr. Smalls and Mr. Richardson were satisfied with the minutes.
36 37	Mr. Mawyer stated that he had not received any comments from them on the matter.
38 39	Mr. Gaffney asked if there was a motion.
40 41 42	Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to approve the minutes of September 27, 2022. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which passed 5-0. (Mr. Richardson and Mr. Smalls were not present.)

43 4. RECOGNITION

There were no recognitions.

45 46

47

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mawyer stated that under the strategic plan goal of workforce development, their safety
manager, Liz Coleman, applied for and received a \$2,000 grant from the Virginia Risk Sharing
Association, the liability insurance carrier for the Authority. They used the grant funds to purchase
hearing protection with radio headsets. He stated that they were very appreciative of Ms. Coleman's
effort to receive the grant.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they also celebrated their annual Employee Appreciation Day on November 2, and historically, they had gone to Michie Tavern, but with an abundance of caution with respect to COVID-19, they decided to have the event in the parking lot with games, service awards, and other things of that nature. He showed a photograph of all staff members from both authorities who had attended the function. Mr. Mawyer stated that prior to the pandemic, he held a quarterly lunch with new employees to get to know them and he had recently begun to host this again now that the pandemic was substantially behind them.

He continued to say that the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center in Keene was expected to have construction completed in December or January. He showed some images of the progress that had been made at the site. He stated that in September and October, they completed the e-waste, household hazardous waste, and bulky waste collection events held at the Ivy facility, sponsored by the City and County. He stated that they collected over 36,000 pounds of products during the event.

Mr. Mawyer stated that to celebrate the United Way Day of Caring, they collaborated with Brown Advisory Company for an event at the Ivy MUC to assist staff in bagging oyster shells that had been dried for about a year, after which they were taken to the VCU Rice Center, where the oyster shells were reseeded with young oysters and put back into the Piankatank River. The oysters tremendously reduced pollution in the raw water. He stated that the program had been running for a number of years, and they had shipped about 120,000 oyster shells to the VCU site.

Mr. Mawyer stated that because this would be the last meeting of the RSWA for the year, he wished everyone a happy holiday season and that he looked forward to getting back together in January.

## 6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Gaffney opened Items from the Public. He asked if there were any speakers who wished to address the Board. Seeing none, he closed the Items from the Public.

## 7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT

As there were no items from the public, 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 Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2023

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items to be pulled or discussed from the Consent Agenda. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Rogers moved the Board to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pinkston and passed unanimously 6-0. (Mr. Richardson was not present.)

## 9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Presentation and Vote on Acceptance: FY22 Audit Report Matthew McLearen, Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates

Mr. Matthew McLearen greeted the Chair and members of the Board. He stated that he would be presenting the FY22 financial statement audit and would present the results of the audit as well as a few required communications from the auditor. He stated that in the Board packet, there were two documents, one being a letter titled "Communication with Those Charging Governments," which he would briefly review, as well as a few key pages in the annual financial comprehension report. He stated that the title change on that document for this year forward would be "Annual Comprehensive Financial Report."

Mr. McLearen stated that there were a few key points from the letter "Communication with Those in Charge of Governments." He stated that the first was responsibilities under the audit, which were that the management of the Authority was responsible for maintaining accounting records, and certainly maintaining internal controls over the financial reporting process throughout the fiscal year. He stated that management was also responsible for the preparation of the financial statement, whereas the auditor was required to audit those financial statements and communicate any audit findings they may have had during the process.

Mr. McLearen stated that financial statements included accounting estimates, which was common among many sets of financial statements, and the most common estimates were depreciable lives of fixed assets, which also applied to the Authority. He stated that they applied accounting estimates and determined the depreciable life of the long-term assets, as well as estimates related to the OPEP and pension liabilities, which were significant liabilities determined by an actuary third-party, and determined those liabilities to be reported in the financial statements, which had significant estimates in those reports.

Mr. McLearen stated that the third item communicated in the letter was difficulties encountered during the audit, which was where an auditor would describe any difficulty, which could be as simple as being unable to access records needed to apply on the financial statements, or incomplete records or incomplete accounting system. He stated that they were pleased to report there were no difficulties encountered in the FY22 audit.

Mr. McLearen stated that the next significant point in the letter was to describe any disagreements in applying accounting principles. He stated that there were many accounting principles that applied to a governmental entity, whether it was a normal, everyday accounting, or financial reporting standard as issued by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board. He stated that he was pleased to report that there were no disagreements in applying any accounting principles to the Authority for FY22.

Mr. McLearen stated that lastly, it was required through professional standards to disclose knowledge that Management sought a second opinion. He stated that this would only apply in a situation where they had issued a qualified for modified opinion to the financial statements, which was also known as a "opinion shopping," and they had no knowledge that Management sought a second opinion.

Mr. McLearen stated that the annual comprehensive financial report document had on its first page the independent auditor's report, which was the first of two reports in the document with the CPA firm's letterhead. He stated that he was pleased to report that they had issued an

unmodified or clean opinion for FY22's audit. He stated that there were three core financial statements in this document, the first being the statement of net position, in exhibit 1. He stated that it was similar to their balance sheet for a for-profit entity, which reported the assets, liabilities, and equity determined, and that position was the equity for a governmental entity. He stated that the net position or equity on June 30, 2022 was \$8,5M.

Mr. McLearen stated that the second of the three financial statements was a statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in that position. He stated that it was similar to an income statement or profit/loss statement for a for-profit entity, it reported the revenues and expenses as well as the increase or decrease of the equity in the net position. He stated that the increase in net position, the third number from the bottom of Exhibit 2, was an increase of \$1.1M for FY22 ending on June 30.

Mr. McLearen stated that the third and final financial statement in this document was the statement of cashflows, and was isolated just in the cash balance that the Authority had, and reported the increase and decrease, as well as the sources and uses of the cash flows. He stated that there was a lot of information on the one page, and it could be seen that the cashflow for the Authority increased by approximately \$187,000 in the year ending June 2022.

Mr. McLearen stated that there were two reports that had the CPA firm's letterhead, and the second of the two reports was the independent auditor's report on controls, which was where an auditor would describe any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses in the internal reporting structure. He stated that as he had mentioned, there was a responsibility from management to maintain internal controls throughout the fiscal year of the financial reporting process. He stated that they were required by professional standards to test those controls and report any significant deficiencies and material weaknesses, and they could read those two pages in this document that they had not issued any significant deficiencies or material weaknesses for the FY22 audit. He concluded his remarks by extending thanks to Lonnie Wood and Kathy Ware for their part in this audit, for without them it would have been much more difficult, and they had also prepared the annual financial comprehensive report.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were comments or questions.

Mr. Pinkston asked where copies of the document could be obtained digitally.

Ms. Anama stated that it could be accessed on the website.

Mr. Mawyer asked the Chairman for a vote on the acceptance of the annual comprehensive financial report.

Mr. Stewart moved the Board to accept the annual comprehensive financial report for FY22. Mr. Smalls seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

b. Presentation and Vote on Approval: Baling Facility Update – Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste

Mr. McKalips stated that he wanted to provide a presentation on the Paper Sort facility and how it fits into the recycling operations, followed by what they were looking forward to with the Baling Facility. He stated that the Paper Sort facility was where they processed all of their fiber and plastic products, including all cardboard, mixed paper, office paper, newsprint, number 1 and

2 plastics, and plastic films. At the Paper Sort, these materials are compacted and baled for shipment so that they were at a higher value to the vendors who bought them. He stated that they began using the Paper Sort facility in 1995, and it had grown in both the number of materials being handled as well as the volume of materials that they handled. He stated that they had a baler there, and in September, the Authority authorized the purchase of a new baler that was to be installed in January of this upcoming year. He stated the facility had no redundancy other than the single baler.

Mr. McKalips stated that the existing facility was open on one side, which allowed weather, dirt, and other materials to come inside. He stated that this had the ability to degrade the quality of the materials, and because it only had six bays and they collected seven different materials, it forced them to comingle materials, causing them to sell materials at a lower value. He stated that this meant that they could not take advantage of spot pricing in the marketplace. He stated that in the last five years they had received 15% more materials. Using cardboard or mixed paper as an example, they brought that material from Ivy and McIntire in roll-off containers to the Paper Sort, where they were compacted, baled, loaded into trailers, and hauled to a paper mill south of Richmond, in loads of 20 ton bales.

Mr. McKalips stated that if they did not have the Paper Sort facility, they would have to take those roll-offs and drive them to some other place, such as a paper mill, in a two-ton load because that was what a roll-off truck would hold in terms of loose material. He stated that by using the Paper Sort facility, they cut the hauling portion of expenses by a factor of 10. He stated that the vendors on the receiving end of the loose material were not that thrilled, especially in the case of paper, because it became an issue of storage for the receiver. He stated that in the case of plastics, they took them to Madison Heights, where they were charged \$40 per ton for the baling labor prior to shipment. He stated that these processes pointed to the value of the Paper Sort facility for the Rivanna recycling operations.

Mr. McKalips stated that they had looked into expanding the Paper Sort facility about three years ago, and it had significant costs of \$2M to expand it, but even that expansion would not be to the full extent needed for the existing use. He stated that there were also concerns about investing in that site because of the long-term lease problems and access to the site. He stated that the problem with expanding the site was that the only way for large trucks to access the site was for trucks to drive off of Meade Ave. through the middle of the Gerdau scrap metal yard. He stated that the Paper Sort site was owned by Woolen Mills Self Storage, and Gerdau property was owned by Harry Wright, who owned the junkyard.

Mr. McKalips stated that Gerdau required a 90-day kickout clause for access to this site. He stated that if they invested in the site, they would always be concerned that they had 90 days before they had to leave. He stated that there was no other access to this site now that Woolen Mills had developed the self-storage facility. He stated there was car access off of Franklin Street, but trucks could not be driven because of the residential neighborhood and tight turns.

Mr. McKalips showed on the slide different views of the access to the site. He stated that about half of the site shown in the first image was used by Gerdau for truck turnaround. He stated the lower image on the slide was of the old baler that was to be replaced in January and also gave an idea of the state of the building. He stated that it did not have lights and one side was open. He stated that the insulation was beginning to fall apart because it was exposed to weather, animals, and nesting birds. He stated that also importantly they could see the cardboard pile. He stated

that when they received loads of cardboard, it was dropped inside the entrance, which was identified as the best place to stage it in the building.

Mr. McKalips stated that if they got a lot of cardboard, the pile began to grow across the floor and could get to a point where the loading bays could not be reached along the back wall, which was where all other materials were stored and processed. He stated this was controlled by baling cardboard first because it could seal the building off. He stated that they had gotten to the point where if there was something that delayed the cardboard baling, such as a mechanical issue with the baler, it would seal off the site, which would result in needing to take loads elsewhere, which was expensive.

Mr. McKalips stated that the new baler hopefully meant that it would be less of a reliability problem, but they were still getting to the point where, due to the 15% growth, any additional growth meant that it would become more and more of a risk of processing delays and would likely happen due to the volume of material coming in. He stated that they could not keep materials at the collection sites either, because it would overflow.

Mr. McKalips showed another image of the bays in the back of the Paper Sort facility. He stated that because they only had six bays and they used the bays for storage for mixed paper, once the material was baled, they often had to store it outside. He stated that they tried not to do this for fiber products like paper, but even for things like plastics, it was desirable to minimize the amount of movement of the bales because it could break the tensile wires that held together the large bales. He stated that when kept outside, the material began spilling out and littering the site, which was time-consuming to regather, which was another reason why they would like to have a closed facility. He showed another image of the cardboard spilling out across the facility.

Mr. McKalips stated that the actions to date were that in September 2021, the Board authorized them to look for a new facility location in the County. He stated that they completed preliminary engineering to give an idea of what this project would look like. He stated that the Board had also allowed the purchase of a new baler to extend the life of the existing facility. He stated that they had come up with design criteria for the new Baling Facility. He stated that they wanted to have it on Rivanna-, City-, or County-controlled land, because leasing a site that they did not have long-term control or ownership of was a concern.

Mr. McKalips stated that they wanted a fully enclosed facility to keep materials out of the weather and prevent litter, and to be sized to accommodate all materials that were currently being collected. He stated that they were missing out on better pricing and having to make decisions based on space, not the best practices for materials management. He stated that ultimately, they would like a second baler for redundancy because it was an essential component of operations and the finances of those operations.

Mr. McKalips stated that they had identified a site on Berkmar Drive in the County and a few different locations on the Ivy MUC property. They had identified a suitable, cost-effective location at Ivy, to the northeast and north of the disposal cells. He stated that the advantages to having it at the Ivy location were that they already had scales and scales software at that location, and could take advantage of co-used equipment, such as the sweeper, and co-use of staff to respond when needed. He stated that it was already a brownfield site as an old landfill, so they were not taking up otherwise valuable green space in the County.

Mr. McKalips stated that on the bottom of the image on the screen was the entrance to the Ivy landfill, and the main haul road went up toward the back of the lot, near where the old clean fill area was on the site. He stated that the cell between the entrance and the preferred location was Cell 2, where the solar development would be if it went forward. He showed a more detailed layout of the same figure, followed by an inside view of what the facility would look like at that location. He stated that there would be 11 loading bays, allowing them to store materials separately. He stated that they currently use trailers to store materials that were loose as well as baled.

Mr. McKalips stated that they had gotten a preliminary engineer's report that estimated \$420,000 for design permitting and bidding services. He stated that they would like that cost to be in the 2024 budget. He continued that construction was estimated at \$6M for the 2025 budget. He stated that they must finalize a draft Baling Facility agreement with the City and the County, and at some point, they must revise and amend the local government support agreement for the recycling program so that they could all be satisfied with how cost-sharing would be with the new facilities.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any regular employee parking spaces at the new proposed Baling Facility.

Mr. McKalips stated that he did not know if they had called any specific ones out. He stated that there would only be one or two employees working at the facility.

Mr. McKalips stated that they often used golf carts for shuttling people in and out. He stated that this location would not have bathrooms or shower facilities, so there would likely be a port-o-john for staff.

Mr. Mawyer asked what the rent paid for the current sorting facility was.

Mr. McKalips stated that they paid \$2,700 per month for the current facility. He stated that when they were previously discussing renegotiating, they would be at \$3,300, which would be a \$600 increase per month, and now he assumed it would be closer to \$3,500 per month. He stated that at some point they needed to finalize the lease because they stopped negotiating the lease with the short kickout clause, because it was better to exist under the guise of the existing lease than to have the new one that documented how quickly they must be kicked out.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they kept the existing Paper Sort facility, what they would have to invest in the building to bring it up to where it needed to be.

Mr. McKalips stated that the new baler would bring it up to what it was currently as well as the additional rent.

Mr. Mawyer asked if they required an addition to the building.

Mr. McKalips stated that they figured three more bays could be added for a total of nine bays. He stated that there was a potential design where another baler could be inserted, but it would still not be fully what was necessary for the existing material volume, and they would still be storing some material outside. He stated that that cost was about \$1.6M.

Mr. Gaffney stated that still was with a 90-day notice at any point.

Mr. McKalips stated that was correct.

349 Mr. Gaffney stated they would then essentially throw that money away.

Mr. Stewart stated that Charlottesville's recently-adopted comprehensive plan took that whole block of industrial area on this side of Meade Avenue and south of Market Street and called for rezoning it to higher potential uses, so it was very developable brownfield land now, but the likelihood of something happening to the Gerdau parcel that was owned by the same person who owned the junkyard was much higher than it would have been a few years ago.

Mr. McKalips stated that it was in the future land use map as being primed for residential use.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the agreement between Rivanna, the City, and the County stated that the County paid 70% of recycling costs and the City paid 30% because they had the curb-recycling program. He stated that the \$6M was allocated the same in a 70/30 split, but if the County's proportion of tonnage increased after the Southern Convenience Center was built, they would have a chance to measure the tonnage and revisit the agreement to potentially change the proportioning. He stated that they wanted the design cost to be in the budgets for FY24 and the construction cost in FY25, both to be shared by the County and the City.

Mr. Pinkston asked if there should be a motion to approve the design amount.

Mr. Mawyer stated that he was asking to approve making an official request to the County and the City to include this in the budget for next year.

Mr. Pinkston stated that there was also a commitment to their budget here for design work.

Mr. Mawyer stated it was, but they would not go forward unless they had a commitment from the County and the City to fund it because the Authority could not front the cost of that service.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the motion was for the City and the County to include this amount in future budgets.

Mr. Mawyer stated yes.

Mr. Pinkston asked where it would appear in the budget.

Mr. Rogers stated that it would be in the FY24 budget.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the \$420,000 would be, and the \$6M would be in the following year, FY25.

Mr. Rogers stated the City Manager would have to decide if they were cooperating.

Mr. Pinkston stated that this was different than other times when the Authority was the one approving the funds. He stated that this was a request.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would approve that the Authority officially ask the City and County to put it in their budgets so that it could also be included in the Authority's budget.

Mr. Pinkston motioned to approve the request. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

(Recess RSWA in a JOINT SESSION with the RWSA)

At 2:40 p.m., Mr. Andrews moved to recess the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

At 3:39 p.m., Mr. Gaffney brought the RSWA back into session.

(Joint Session with the RSWA)

a. Presentation and Vote on Approval: Remote Participation Policy and Amended and Restated By-Laws; Bill Mawyer, Executive Director

Mr. Mawyer stated the General Assembly in September passed a change to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act to allow organizations, such as the Authorities, to have remote participation by Board members under certain conditions and to conduct a certain number of all-virtual meetings limited to 25% of the regular meetings.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the number of allowed virtual meetings would be two per calendar year for the RSWA and three per calendar year for the RWSA. He noted that the Boards had approved the calendars for calendar year 2023 on the consent agendas. He stated March and September had been designated as the months to hold virtual meetings for the RSWA and RWSA, and in December, there would be a virtual meeting for RWSA.

Mr. Mawyer explained that the Code of Virginia had several provisions and requirements. He stated that the Authority's by-laws already allowed remote participation for members, but the legal counsel informed him that the new Code of Virginia provisions superseded the Authority's by-laws.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had to pass a new remote participation policy to allow a Board member to participate remotely by virtual means or telephone. He stated that some of the rules required a member to have a temporary or permanent medical condition or disability, or a member of their family may have a similar situation, or the member's principal residence was more than 60 miles away from the meeting location.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the member would have to notify the chair in advance of the meeting that remote participation was requested. He stated that there would have to be a motion and approval by the Board to allow the member to participate remotely. He stated that the reason for remote participation and the location of the remote member would have to be recorded in the minutes.

Mr. Mawyer explained the virtual public meeting section had 10 conditions. He stated the meetings would have to provide public access to the all-virtual meetings, such as was done during the pandemic. He stated the public would have to be able to hear and see the members, and the public would have to be allowed to speak virtually at the public meeting.

Mr. Mawyer stated the ninth condition stated that virtual meetings could be held no more than two times per calendar year or 25% of the total meetings rounded to the higher whole number,

whichever is greater. He noted virtual meetings could not be held in consecutive months.

Mr. Mawyer explained they needed to amend and restate the by-laws because the new remote participation policy had to be incorporated into the by-laws. He explained that all members of each Authority had to be present to approve any change to the by-laws. He stated the amended and restated by-laws would incorporate the remote participation policy into the by-laws.

Mr. Mawyer stated the amended by-laws would clarify that being remote or virtual constituted being present for the meetings. He explained that the by-laws stated that to amend the by-laws, all members had to be present. He stated if they wanted to amend the by-laws in the future and a member was participating remotely, then the remote member would be considered present and able to vote to amend the by-laws.

 Mr. Mawyer stated that also in the amended by-laws, they clarified the authority of the Executive Director to execute contracts and other instruments. He explained that the by-laws currently stated that the Executive Director could execute contracts. In the amended by-laws "or other instruments" had been added. He stated that those could include deeds of sale or easement transactions.

 Mr. Mawyer explained the current by-laws limited the Executive Director's authority to process procurements up to \$200K and for no more than a year. He explained that typically when they came before the Boards to award a design or construction contract, the recommendation requested approval of the award and authorization for the Executive Director to execute the documents. He explained that otherwise, the chairman would have to sign the documents.

Mr. Mawyer stated at counsel's recommendation, they had added that the Board meetings would be conducted in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order and gave precedence to the Articles followed by these By-laws, then the Rules. He stated that the Articles governed if there was any conflict. He noted they had also included an administrative cleanup to the by-laws.

Mr. Mawyer explained that each Board had to separately approve the Remote Participation Policy and approve the Amended and Restated By-laws, and both would be effective immediately.

Mr. O'Connell asked which meetings would be held virtually.

Mr. Mawyer responded that it would be March and September for RSWA, and it would be March, September, and December for RWSA. He explained that in January, there could be new members. In May, we held public hearings to approve budgets. In July, the Boards completed an evaluation of the Executive Director's performance, so he did not recommend holding virtual meetings during these months. He noted that they held a joint meeting of the Boards every other month, so he did not want to have one Board meeting virtually and the other in-person. He noted that the meetings could not be held virtually in consecutive months.

Mr. O'Connell stated it would be confusing for the Boards and the public as to whether the meeting was virtual or not.

Ms. Mallek asked whether they were required to select dates now or if they were allowed to decide on meetings to be held virtually with proper notice due to extenuating circumstances.

496 Mr. Mawyer explained that they had approved the meeting schedule for calendar year 2023, but 497 they could amend the schedule whenever they wanted. He noted that if the Boards wanted to meet in person instead of meeting virtually, they could. 498

499 500

Mr. Pinkston stated he agreed with Mr. O'Connell. He asked if there was an advantage to scheduling for the virtual meetings.

501 502 503

Mr. Mawyer stated they scheduled them in advance so the Board, staff and the public would know when the meetings would be held going into the next year.

504 505

506 Mr. Pinkston asked why they needed to have the virtual option.

507

508 Mr. Mawyer stated it helped people to plan for the meetings.

509

510 Mr. Andrews asked if there had been any reasons for special meetings to be called within the 511 past 10 years.

512

513 Mr. Mawyer explained there was one held in 2017 when there was a drought and the RWSA had 514 to issue mandatory water conservation measures. He explained the meeting was held on four 515 hours' notice. He stated that was the only time in his six years with the Authority.

516 517

Mr. Andrews stated it may be a convenient tool if they needed to hold a special meeting.

518 519

520

Mr. Mawyer explained the chair could call a special meeting whenever desired. He stated they could hold an emergency meeting with four hours' notice to the public. He noted that what was proposed was a hybrid practice between all virtual and all in-person meetings.

521 522

523 Mr. Pinkston stated he understood the rationale to disperse the virtual meetings throughout the year.

524 525

526 Mr. Mawyer stated he could remind the Boards each month before the meetings whether the 527 meeting was virtual.

528

Mr. Stewart asked if there were cost impacts for the all-virtual meetings.

529 530 531

532 533 Mr. Mawyer explained there was a cost of about \$6K per year to hold virtual meetings and allow the public to speak at the meetings. He stated initially they were not going to have remote public input, but then the General Assembly granted the authority to have all-virtual meetings in which the Authorities would be required to have virtual public comment.

534 535 536

Mr. Stewart noted that citizens were able to participate remotely in the meetings. He stated it was important for the A/V technology to be maintained. He asked if they had considered whether they needed upgrades to the room to ensure members could be heard.

538 539

537

540 Mr. Mawyer stated he had not heard of any major issues. He noted that they hosted virtual 541 meetings with input to the public for two years. He stated they had to purchase some equipment 542 to accommodate the virtual format.

543

544 Mr. Rogers clarified that the Boards were requested to take two actions—to approve the Remote Participation Policy and approve Amended By-laws. 545

546 547 Mr. Mawyer explained that the Remote Participation Policy would allow remote participation and virtual meetings. He explained that the Boards would have to adopt the policy into the 548 549 amended by-laws. 550 551 MOTION: Mr. Andrews moved that the RSWA Board of Directors approve the Resolution 552 regarding the adoption of the Remote Participation Policy. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion which carried unanimously (7-0). 553 554 555 **RESOLUTION OF THE** 556 **BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE** 557 RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY 558 REGARDING 559 ADOPTION OF REMOTE PARTICIPATION POLICY 560 561 **NOVEMBER 15, 2022** 562 563 WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 2.2-3708.3 of the Code of Virginia (the "Code"), the 564 Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (the "Authority") has prepared a Remote Participation Policy (the 565 "Policy"), describing the circumstances under which an all-virtual public meeting and/or remote 566 participation will be allowed and the process the Authority will use for making requests to use remote 567 participation, approving or denying such requests, and creating a record of such requests, and fixing 568 the number of times remote participation for personal matters or all-virtual public meetings can be 569 used per calendar year, said Policy being attached hereto as Exhibit A; 570 571 WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3708.3(D) of the Code requires that the adoption of the Policy by 572 recorded vote at a public meeting; and 573 574 WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Authority (the "Board") deems it advisable and in 575 the best interest of the Authority to adopt the Policy; 576 577 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Board hereby authorizes, approves, 578 adopts and ratifies the Policy in all respects. 579 580 MOTION: Mr. Pinkston moved that the RSWA Board of Directors approve the adoption 581 of the Amended and Restated By-laws. Mr. Smalls seconded the motion which carried 582 unanimously (7-0). 583 **RESOLUTION OF THE** 584 585 **BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE** 586 RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY 587 **ADOPTING** 588 AMENDED AND RESTATED BY-LAWS 589 590 NOVEMBER 15, 2022 591 592 WHEREAS, the Board of Directors (the "Board") of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (the

"Authority") has determined that it is in the best interests of the Authority to amend and restate the

current By-Laws of the Authority, which were adopted and made effective as of August 25, 2020 (the

"Current By-Laws"); and

593

594

WHEREAS, pursuant to Article VI of the Current By-Laws, the Board may amend, add to, alter, or repeal the Current By-Laws at any meeting of all of the Board, provided that notice of the proposed amendment, additions, alteration or repeal is given in the notice of such meeting and that all members of the Board are present at such meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Board deems it advisable and in the best interest of the Authority to amend and restate the Current By-Laws in order to conform language regarding remote participation in Board meetings in accordance with the Code of Virginia and the Remote Participation Policy of the Authority to be adopted on even date herewith, to clarify signing authority for contracts and other instruments of the Authority, and to make certain other procedural updates; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the proposed Amended and Restated By-Laws in the form attached hereto as <u>Exhibit A</u> (the "<u>Amended and Restated By-Laws</u>") and has determined that it is advisable and in the best interests of the Authority to amend and restate the Current By-Laws by adoption of the Amended and Restated By-Laws and to ratify, confirm and approve all contracts and other instruments of the Authority signed by the Chair or the Executive Director of the Authority;

*NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED*, that the Current By-Laws are hereby amended and restated in their entirety, and the Amended and Restated By-Laws attached hereto as *Exhibit A* are hereby adopted and ratified in all respects, effective immediately; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Secretary of the Authority or any other proper officer of the Authority be, and each of them hereby is, authorized and directed to place the Amended and Restated By-Laws and this resolution in the minute books of the Authority; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that all contracts and other instruments of the Authority signed by the Chair or the Executive Director of the Authority prior to the date of these resolutions are hereby ratified, confirmed and approved in all respects as the act and deed of the Authority; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the proper officers of the Authority are, and each of them hereby is, authorized and directed to prepare, execute and deliver, or cause to be prepared, executed and delivered, any and all agreements, documents, certificates and instruments, and to take any and all such other actions as may be deemed necessary, desirable or appropriate, to carry out the purpose and intent of each of the foregoing resolutions; and be it

**FURTHER RESOLVED**, that any actions taken by such officers or directors prior to the date of these resolutions that are within the authority conferred by the foregoing resolutions are hereby ratified, confirmed and approved in all respects as the act and deed of the Authority.

Mr. Gaffney clarified that these Resolutions were not addressing scheduling of Board meetings.

Mr. Mawyer explained the schedules had been approved on the consent agendas. He stated the schedules could be amended in the future if desired.

b. Presentation and Vote on Approval: Strategic Plan 2023 Update; Bill Mawyer, Executive Director

Mr. Mawyer stated he was responding to the Boards' comments from September when they stated that more metrics were needed and the strategic plan needed a greater emphasis on local and regional communications.

Mr. Mawyer stated the vision, mission, and values were the same as for the last five years. He noted that they did some edits to the 2018 strategic plan to create the 2023 strategic plan. He stated the goals for the next five years were the same five—communication and collaboration, environmental stewardship, workforce development, optimization and resiliency of the systems, and planning and infrastructure. He noted there had been a sixth goal in 2018—solid waste services—which had been merged into each of the five goals for 2023.

Mr. Mawyer stated they added to the strategy of communication and collaboration that they would communicate with local and regional partners. He stated it was a benchmark for the prior five years and had been unintentionally left out. He stated they had included metrics to measure how they were meeting the strategies.

Mr. Mawyer noted there were 19 metrics on which they would be working. He noted that the aggregate was a resource issue for the staff.

Mr. Pinkston asked what the impacts on staff were in terms of tracking the metrics.

Mr. Mawyer explained the metrics each required a percentage of staff time, and the staff time was limited so the aggregate of all the requirements became a staffing challenge. He stated they would be requesting more staff over the next five years in part to address the strategies included in the plan.

Mr. Rogers asked what the baseline of 2% was.

Mr. Mawyer explained that to implement the strategies, they developed a goal team for each of the five goals with six to seven staff members on each team. He explained that one of the first duties of each term was to determine the baseline for the goal. He stated they had preliminary estimates on a number of metrics. He noted that they estimated that they spent 480 staff hours per year to meet the goal of providing resources to foster community collaborations.

 Mr. Mawyer stated in terms of enhancing the website and expanding community service initiatives by 1% per year, they estimated that they spent 240 staff hours per year on the item in the past. He stated there was some baseline information, but it was the goal teams' first task to assess the baseline and use the percentages to move forward.

 Mr. Richardson stated the planning assumed the Authorities continued the operations that were ongoing and did not stop any practices. He noted that there were opportunities to revisit stopping practices that were not effective or reducing hours in certain areas to create capacity for staff to focus on items that yielded more meaningful results.

Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct. He noted that it was part of the optimization goal to consider opportunities to create value including stopping practices that were not effective. He stated, for example, they advertised every month in the newspaper that they were holding Authority Board meetings. He stated that the by-laws already stated when the Board meetings would be held— RSWA was the fourth Tuesday every other month at 2pm and the RWSA was the fourth Tuesday of every month at 2:15 p.m., and our attorney indicated in the past that we did not have to advertise the meetings additionally in the newspaper each month.

Mr. Mawyer explained that they had to advertise a public hearing or a special meeting. He stated there was an estimate of about \$1,500 a year that would be saved by not advertising every

month. He stated they were looking to optimize every nickel that they could find. He stated that was part of the reason they brought next year's Board meeting schedule before the Boards this month so that they could advertise the 2023 Board regular meeting schedule and post it on the website.

Mr. Richardson said that was a perfect example of optimizing and stopping practices that we no longer needed.

MOTION: Mr. Smalls moved that the RSWA Board of Directors approve the 2023 Strategic Plan. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion which carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Brian Pinkston left the meeting.

- c. Presentation: Safety Program Update; Elizabeth Coleman, Safety Manager
- Ms. Elizabeth Coleman, Safety Manager, explained OSHA described safety as a continuous improvement process that protected staff and reduced the number of workplace deaths, injuries, and illnesses. She explained safety was part of the strategic plan and the goal for operational optimization.

 Ms. Coleman stated there were two strategies to meet the goals of our safety program—enhance the culture of safety and continually grow our culture of safety. She stated that the safety program included the written manual, safety training, equipment purchases, job procedures, new employee orientation, contractor safety, and emergency management.

Ms. Coleman stated there were 25 chapters in the safety manual, including topics such as fire prevention, outdoor safety, and chemical hygiene. She noted that they were updated annually.

Ms. Coleman stated there were seven departments performing a variety of tasks. She stated training requirements included annual training required by OSHA, periodic training every three years, and annual best practices training. She explained that each department had specific training needs, and not every department received the same training.

Ms. Coleman stated safety training took time, and the average hours spent in all types of training for companies of comparable size to the Authority was 63.9 hours per employee in 2021. She stated RSWA spent about 23 hours on safety training, and maintenance spent the most at 27.7 hours.

Ms. Coleman noted that COVID-19 caused difficulty in scheduling and hosting in-person training. She stated they had been able to provide virtual and in-person required training as necessary.

Ms. Coleman noted that important safety items had been purchased—spill containment for chemical storage jobs, new 55-gallon drum dollies, man-hole guardrails, and headsets.

Ms. Coleman noted that safety had been enhanced in several areas. She stated a convex mirror was installed at Ivy to help with traffic. She stated deteriorated steps were replaced at South Rivanna WTP, and smoke detectors were installed in the breakroom and sludge pump building at Moores Creek.

739 Ms. Coleman stated the safety suggestions were provided by staff to the Safety Committee.

- 740 She stated that monitoring of Contractor Safe Work Practices was also part of the Safety
- 741 Program. As an example, a contractor had inspected the interior of the methane sphere using a
- drone. She stated they ventilated the sphere for approximately 18 hours and measured levels of 742
- methane continuously while entry of drone occurred. Another example of Contractor Safe Work 743
- proactive monitoring included lead paint abatement occurring at the South Rivanna facility. She 744
- explained that they were measuring air levels of lead as well as dust levels, and so far, it had 745
- been safely below 2 micrograms. She stated that, through this monitoring, they had been able to 746
- sandblast the lead paint and ensure safety for the staff. 747

748

749 Ms. Coleman stated they maintained the safety resources via one full-time Safety Manager and a staff Safety Committee. She stated there was a budget of approximately \$103K from RWSA and 750 \$26K from RSWA, and they had received \$6K in grants this year. 751

752

753 Ms. Coleman noted there were declining annual incident rates for RWSA. She stated in 2018, there was 1.98. She stated that the industry average for water and sewer was 2.8 total recordable 754 injury reports. She noted that they had reduced to 0.93 in 2019 and maintained about 0.9 through 755

756 2021.

757 758

Mr. Rogers asked if they would receive a rebate on the insurance.

759

Ms. Coleman noted that they had saved the insurer over \$200K, but they had not received a 760 761 rebate.

762

763 Mr. Mawyer noted that there had been discussions with the insurance carrier about a reduction in 764 costs. However, no cost reduction had been received to date.

765

766 Ms. Coleman explained that the industry average for solid waste in 2019 was 3.6 total recordable injuries reported. She stated in 2018, there were 13, and in 2019, there were 22 injuries reported. 767 768 She stated in 2020, there were 8.7, and now they were at about the injury average of about 4 for 769 2021.

770 771

772

Ms. Coleman noted that many safety program improvements had been completed. She stated that they needed continual updates to protect human resources, enhance safety culture through safe work practices, maintain VOSH requirements, and provide a safe workplace.

773 774 775

- 10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA
- 776 There were no items.

777 778

- 11. CLOSED MEETING
- 779 There was no closed meeting.

780

- 781 12. ADJOURNMENT
- 782 At 3:59 p.m., Mr. Andrews moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Smalls seconded the motion, which passed 6-0. (Mr. Pinkston was not present) 783

785 Respectfully submitted,

786

784

Secretary - Treasurer

787 788