



RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY

695 MOORES CREEK LANE • CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22902-9016
(434) 977-2970 • FAX: (434) 293-8858 • WEBSITE: WWW.RIVANNA.ORG

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Minutes of Regular Meeting

April 23, 2007

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, April 23, 2007 at 2:00 p.m., in the Conference Room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Mr. Gary Fern, Mr. Michael Gaffney – Presiding, Ms. Judith Mueller, Mr. Gary O’Connell, and Mr. Robert Tucker.

Authority Staff Present: Ms. Anne Bedarf, Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Mr. Chuck Kent, Ms. Mary Knowles, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Ms. Andrea Terry, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Mr. Norman Wescoat, Dr. Robert Wichser, and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

Also Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Attorney, Mr. John Murphy – Director of StreamWatch, 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. Michael Gaffney on Monday, April 23, 2007 at 2:00 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes of Previous Board Meeting

Mr. Frederick stated that it was brought to his attention since the proposed minutes were made public that in Mr. Martin’s comments on page 2, the first word in line 3 should have been “sword boats” and not “sailboats.” Mr. Frederick suggested that the minutes be corrected to accurately reflect Mr. Martin’s comments.

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. O’Connell, the Board of Directors by a 5 – 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, March 26, 2007, as corrected by Mr. Frederick.

3.0 Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Frederick stated that this month’s report was an opportunity to update the Board and the public on the status of the Moores Creek WWTP Upgrade for nutrient reduction and the Community Water Supply planning process.

Mr. Frederick first reported on the Moores Creek WWTP Upgrade project. RWSA submitted a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER) to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VA DEQ) on February 12, 2007 outlining the Authority’s comprehensive plan for upgrading the Moores Creek WWTP to address the Chesapeake Bay Program issues. RWSA has also submitted an application for Water Quality Improvement grant funding (WQIF). The PER needed to be submitted before negotiations concerning grant amounts could be initiated. The Authority has been receiving regular correspondence from the WQIF office and has been

working through some of the issues related to the amount of grant money that RWSA was entitled to receive for this project. Mr. Frederick raised some concern that RWSA has not received any correspondence from the office of Wastewater Engineering (OWE), which is the VA DEQ agency responsible for reviewing the engineering content of the PER. Based on follow-up with VA DEQ, we understand OWE to be "backlogged." Since comments from OWE could be germane to the scope of the design work, RWSA implementation of design could be delayed by a late response from OWE.

Mr. Frederick further stated that RWSA was moving forward with this project where possible and has already conducted a solicitation for proposals under the Virginia Procurement Act. The firm of Hazen and Sawyer has been tentatively selected, and negotiations related to the design engineering fee have been initiated. He has asked staff to identify design tasks that posed no risk of redirection by DEQ and could be safely undertaken in the event of a delay in the PER review process in advance of a decision by DEQ. RWSA planned to bring recommendations on these matters to the Board in May 2007.

Mr. Frederick next reported that RWSA continued to be a very active participant in the Virginia Nutrient Credit Exchange Association (Association). The Association was formed to determine how wastewater agencies could exchange nitrogen and phosphorus credits among its members. The Authority has been informed that a commitment would need to be made to the Association by June 30, 2007 as to each member's role as a "seller," "buyer," or "neutral" party. He felt the negotiations underway on the WQIF grant amount and VA DEQ's performance requirements for the Moores Creek WWTP related to the grant were also relevant to this decision, and he will keep the Board informed on any additional information received on those issues.

Mr. Frederick then discussed the Community Water Supply Plan and finalization of the permit application for the new Ragged Mountain Dam and expanded reservoir. He felt that issues related to the stream release methodology were close to being resolved and could be submitted as part of this permit process. After having reached a conceptual agreement on the new methodology, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and RWSA held several months of healthy and constructive discussions and were very close to working out the details. He hoped that a public presentation could be made next month on this issue.

Mr. Frederick also commented on another water supply planning process that was proceeding under a grant RWSA obtained last year from VA DEQ related to updating information on the Crozet and Scottsville water systems and meeting other VA DEQ regulatory requirements associated with community well systems. Ms. Andrea Terry, RWSA Watershed Manager, has been working closely with the Albemarle County Community Development staff, who have provided support to the Authority, especially related to the community well data. Mr. Frederick expressed his appreciation for the very cooperative efforts by Albemarle County staff with this project.

Mr. Gaffney asked if it would be likely that RWSA would hear back from the OWE office by June 2007. Mr. Frederick stated that he had not been given any time table, and the only answer he has received has been that the office was "backlogged." The Authority will make every effort to obtain the information that will be needed in order to make a decision as to the Authority's

role in the Association. Mr. Gaffney further inquired if the state would hold off on the June requirement due to the "backlogged" status of PER reviews. Mr. Frederick responded that the state was being driven by many statutory deadlines, and his best answer at this time would be "probably not."

Mr. O'Connell next inquired if other localities were in a similar situation. Mr. Frederick replied that localities statewide were "all in the same boat." RWSA might actually be further along in its engineering work than many other communities. The Association's request for commitment information by June 30, 2007 is being driven by VA DEQ's deadline to submit compliance plans. The deadlines are statutory mandated and can only be changed through legislative action.

Ms. Mueller then asked about the number of wastewater plants that were participating in the Association. Mr. Frederick stated that 90 plus wastewater treatment plants were still considering upgrades, and he estimated that 70 to 80 plants were represented at the meetings. Mr. Frederick added that he hoped that this process would go smoothly, but since the state has never undertaken a project of this scope, it opened up the opportunity for the unexpected to occur.

Mr. O'Connell next questioned if a utility's decision to be either a "seller," "buyer," or "neutral" party could be reversed at a later date. Mr. Frederick stated that he would explore that issue further. He further commented that he has expressed at the Association meetings and to the Association's attorney that there needed to be language written that allows for contingencies that cannot be controlled by the agencies, which included the construction market, the availability of firms, and price. He will continue to advocate for those issues.

4.0 Items from the Public

There were no items from the public.

5.0 Consent Agenda

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items that the Board members would like to pull for questions or further discussion from the Consent Agenda.

- 5a) Staff Report on Finance
- 5b) Staff Report on Operations
- 5c) Staff Report on On-going Projects
- 5d) Design Services – Community Water Supply

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to approve **Items 5a), b), c), and d)** of the Consent Agenda. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

6.0 Other Business

In regards to **Item 6a), Presentation on Rivanna Stream Conditions**, Ms. Andrea Terry stated that Mr. John Murphy, President of StreamWatch, was in attendance to present his findings from the StreamWatch 2006 Report. A summary of that report is included in the Board packets, as well as a copy of Mr. Murphy's PowerPoint® presentation.

Mr. John Murphy first thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak about StreamWatch's recent report. As previously discussed by Ms. Terry, a summary of the report called "Living in our Watershed" was included in the Board packets. Additional copies were available on the table located outside the Conference Room. The complete 60-page report is available on the StreamWatch website. He noted that the slides he was about to present were a little different from what was shown in the Board packet.

Mr. Murphy next stated that StreamWatch serves seven partners, and RWSA was a leader among the group. Since the RWSA Board of Directors has little direct contact with the program, Mr. Murphy began his presentation with a brief program overview as follows:

- Many individuals and organizations are doing good work to bring this community closer to effective and sustainable management of the Rivanna basin. StreamWatch's role is to help these very diverse entities to pursue the goal that was summarized in StreamWatch's Mission Statement. Although the goal was simple, the pursuit could have a profound impact. By developing a consensus on stream conditions and factors driving conditions, StreamWatch may also help clear a path toward sound environmental management.
- StreamWatch also involves the grassroots in the form of about 70 trained and dedicated volunteers consisting of landowners who give the organization access to monitoring sites and the public who are reached through the media.
- StreamWatch serves governmental and quasi-governmental organizations, including RWSA. RWSA provides the water that was needed to survive and also the responsible disposal of waste. RWSA was recognized for the environmentally excellent manner in which it provides these essential services. Each of the other six StreamWatch partners also works in good faith to protect water resources, and a few of those efforts were included on his slide presentation "to illustrate the breadth of positive intention in our community." He prefaced those examples by stating that StreamWatch takes no credit for those projects. StreamWatch's activities consisted of monitoring and assessment through which they can inform the partners about the effectiveness of their work.
 - StreamWatch serves Albemarle and Fluvanna Counties. He then referred to the slide that illustrated a pervious pavement that was installed to reduce stormwater runoff from the parking lot at the Albemarle County Office Building.
 - StreamWatch also services the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Conservation District and noted the slide that pictured one of the District's tree planting projects.
 - StreamWatch also involves the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC). TJPDC archives Rivanna data from all sources, including StreamWatch, and in the future will host a website to provide public-friendly access to this data.
- StreamWatch serves key non-governmental organizations, such as The Nature Conservancy and Rivanna Conservation Society, whose missions focus on the recreational, scenic, and ecological assets for Rivanna's streams.
- StreamWatch involves an active science advisory committee that helped guide its field protocols and performs critical review of staff's data analysis and interpretation.

- StreamWatch involves periodic presentations to decision makers, such as the members of the RWSA Board of Directors. These presentations complete a wide spectrum of participation, ranging from concerned citizens at the grassroots to individuals who are elected and appointed to make environmental management decisions on behalf of the citizenry.
- StreamWatch views diversity as a resource to help build solutions, rather than a handicap that splits the community into factions.

Mr. Murphy next summarized the findings of the StreamWatch 2006 report.

- In order to save time, he discussed the methodology that was used in general terms. StreamWatch compared biological health at sites with many factors that could potentially explain or predict health. The approach was similar to what was used in several published studies, but its biological data set is “deeper” and more extensive than many other studies.
- Based on data collected from 2003 through 2005, StreamWatch estimated that about one-half of Rivanna’s streams meet Virginia biological standards. The standard that was developed by the Department of Environmental Quality indicates whether a stream is meeting the aquatic life use described by the Clean Water Act.
- Referring to the slide that pictured a map of the Rivanna watershed, the sites shown in yellow, red, or dark gray failed the standard. In the RWSA water supply area, the distribution of “supporting” versus “non-supporting” streams is about the same as in the rest of the watershed. He noted the lack of severely degraded streams in the water supply area.
- Human population density was the strongest predictor for biological health of the streams. On the slide depicting this finding, each square is a monitoring site. The squares position on the horizontal axis denotes the population density of the sites in the watershed, and the squares position on the vertical axis denotes the sites biological health. The curved line shows the central tendency of the data and “forms a graphic representation of a model that predicts the likely biological condition of the stream based on the population density of its watershed.” The bold horizontal lines that separate the color blocks on the graph denote two biological benchmarks, which StreamWatch called “Clean Water Act line” and “the persistent impairment line.” StreamWatch was developing some real numbers that described how much watershed disturbance the area streams could withstand before reaching particular levels of degradation.
 - The “Clean Water Act line” crossed at a density of about 55 people per square mile, which was about 25 to 30 acres per dwelling or “light exurban” density. His rough estimate of “30-80/sq mile (rural/exurban transition)” was illustrated in blue type.
 - The “persistent impairment line” is crossed at about 210 people per square mile or a “light suburban” density of 7 acres per dwelling. He again noted his rough estimate of “100 – 300 per sq/mile (heavy/exurban/light suburban)” in blue type.
- The model was developed from data gathered in medium-sized streams and was not applicable to the Rivanna River itself. The model also assumes current and historical behaviors. StreamWatch definitely did not want to imply that “we are absolutely stuck

with the estimates generated by this model.” The model suggests that we need to be better stewards in order to maintain or improve stream conditions while facing increasing population.

- StreamWatch’s focus is on general patterns of land use and stream health. If population control is not an option for local government, StreamWatch’s findings offer little toward management solutions and will need to determine what human actions are causing stream degradation. The leading theory among local experts is that sedimentation is the main stressor. It is less clear about the origin of the sedimentation.
- StreamWatch plans to conduct a two-year study that will involve more monitoring sites and the collection of more data types, in addition to the biological data that is typically collected. A key focus will be the relationship between impervious surfaces and stream conditions.
- StreamWatch felt it was essential to pursue this further study, but it could not be guaranteed that a way to entirely “escape” the density/stream health relationship will be found. “Mitigations are exercised at the local scale, but the strongest determinant of stream health may be land use at the scale of the stream’s entire watershed.” Localized stream protection efforts may become less effective with the intensification of landscape disturbances throughout the watershed.

Mr. Murphy concluded his presentation by stating that the Rivanna watershed contains many healthy streams as well as a number of interests that sincerely wished to protect them. On behalf of the StreamWatch volunteers, advisors, and partners, he expressed “our continuing enthusiasm for fulfilling our monitoring assessment mission.”

Mr. Tucker inquired how the two-year study would differ from StreamWatch’s current activities. Mr. Murphy stated that StreamWatch would be adding more streams and reflecting more data, in addition to the biological information currently being collected. He referred to the slide that listed the “Next Steps” to be undertaken in order to determine the causes for sedimentation, which included particle size distribution, assessment of stream channels, updating land cover and impervious surface mapping data.

Mr. Gaffney commented that according to the watershed map, it appeared that four streams are just below the “Good” designation. He asked if Mr. Murphy could identify those streams and what it would take to move those streams into the “Good” range. Mr. Murphy stated that he could not answer the second part of the question based on the data collected to date. Since it would take a few minutes to identify the four streams below the “Good” category from the table provided in the report, it was agreed that Mr. Murphy would send that information to the Board after he had obtained the average stream health data.

Mr. Fern referenced the same chart and questioned if it were correct that Ivy Creek’s biological health was improving. Mr. Murphy commented that the stream’s condition did show improvement since the last monitoring was conducted, but he could not state that it was an indication of a reliable long-term trend. The results could be due to natural variation.

Mr. Fern also inquired if StreamWatch's assessments took into account the effect of stormwater treatment. Mr. Murphy stated that StreamWatch's assessment was based solely on the biological condition of the stream.

Ms. Mueller next asked if she was reading the report correctly that the streams that were rated "very poor" were not "fixable." Mr. Murphy stated that the "persistent impairment" benchmark meant that the sites were unlikely to be restored up to the point of meeting the standard of "Good" or "Very Good."

Mr. Gaffney then questioned if the condition of the stream would change due to the "cleansing effect" further down the river. Mr. Murphy replied that the theory suggests that there is a "cleansing effect" as the water flows downstream due to the biological processes that occur. Mr. Murphy added that there were not any sites rated lower than "Fair" on the main stem. He noted that site No. 20 in red was Carroll Creek that drains to the Glenmore subdivision.

Mr. Tucker next inquired if the final study would be in such detail that it would identify the cause for the degraded conditions of the streams so that landowners within each basin or sub-basin could be notified through the Geographic Information System (GIS) on what improvements could be done to improve the health of that particular stream. Mr. Murphy responded that he did not believe that they would be able to "pinpoint" all factors, but he felt statements could be made that were a little less general than what had been presented to date. At this time, StreamWatch was essentially saying that land use intensity as measured in this case by population density is associated with stream condition/degradation. He did not believe that the results of StreamWatch's future work would be the source of all the information that would contribute to the understanding of this issue. The Rivanna River Basin Commission may direct much of the work that he felt would help answer those questions. StreamWatch would be examining such factors, such as agricultural impacts, soils, and morphology of the stream, in an attempt to either eliminate or refine some of those as contributing to stream health degradation.

Mr. Fern then requested Mr. Murphy to elaborate further on the assumptions made on current and historical human behaviors. Mr. Murphy stated that some of the stress that the streams were experiencing could be a legacy of what occurred 200 to 300 years ago in the watershed. Many people believe that the massive clearance undertaken by the first European settlers in Virginia is partly related to the sediment problem and the large alluvial deposits in many of the riparian areas in the basin today. The streams are cutting through these alluvial deposits, which could be a constant source of sediment. Current human behavior is recent historical development and design standards that provide opportunities for improvements by utilizing best management practices not considered 20 years ago.

Mr. O'Connell then asked if there were examples of urban streams surrounded by great density that were high quality water and what could we learn from those communities' practices. He used as an example trout streams that run through downtown areas, such as in Boulder and Durango, Colorado. Mr. Murphy reiterated the comments he made previously to Ms. Mueller that in his opinion there was only a certain level of biological integrity that could be achieved as measured by macroinvertebrate organisms in those urban streams. He added that he did not

have personal knowledge of the streams referenced by Mr. O'Connell and the condition of their watersheds. Mr. Murphy also stated that it was not appropriate for him to answer management questions as this was not in StreamWatch's purview. He felt that the StreamWatch partners individually would have a lot of input on management options.

Mr. Tucker further clarified that he and Mr. O'Connell's were inquiring about whether the level of data obtained by StreamWatch in the next two years would enable them to direct or determine what could be done to improve specific stream locations. He also commented on the need to educate the citizens on proper land use practices. Mr. Murphy agreed that education would be an important component to this process.

In regards to **Item 6b, Update on Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Study**, Mr. Frederick stated the intent of today's report was an attempt to provide an update on this study, and no Board action was being requested at this time. He cautioned that since the study was ongoing and there was still a lot of data that needed to be analyzed, he would not be making any conclusions that are dependent on future analysis.

Mr. Frederick first discussed the Authority's broad vision that was included in the first paragraph of the Board report, which encompassed how RWSA would maintain a wastewater interceptor system in harmony with other issues, such as stream water quality, environmental protection, and public health. RWSA also felt it was important that its assets be compatible with other public amenities, such as trails, parks, stream improvements, and greenway preservation, which would be facilitated by having an infrastructure that is up to date, adequate in size, and could handle the flows in an environmentally responsible manner.

Mr. Frederick next reviewed the background information on RWSA's interceptor system that was provided in the Board report. He stated that although RWSA operated the biggest sewer pipes in the collective system, the City and the ACSA operate more miles of sewer pipelines in order to serve their customers. The University of Virginia also owns sewer pipes, most of which flow into the City system and then into Rivanna's system. The University of Virginia Foundation, which owns real estate throughout the area, also has accounts with the ACSA. A project of this magnitude requires extensive cooperation of all those parties in order to accomplish the goals and the vision set forward by RWSA.

Mr. Frederick further reported that RWSA's consultant has compiled the extensive amount of flow data that has been collected into an average daily flow and the pattern of peak flows within a daily cycle. The consultant has not yet provided data on the effects of rainfall on sewer flows, which would be an important finding that would need to be fully understood before the study could be completed.

Mr. Frederick next stated that based on the modeling conducted to date, RWSA has identified one current limitation and some potential future limitations in its system, along with some suggestions for continued cooperation, which he reviewed as follows:

The Meadowcreek Interceptor, which parallels Meadow Creek from near the US 29/US 250 interchange to the Meadowcreek Golf Course, is reaching its capacity in many parts of the

system. In response and simultaneous with this study, RWSA began a preliminary design to determine an appropriate size pipeline and new infrastructure to carry the expected service requirements for the areas served by that particular pipeline.

Concerning the Moores Creek Interceptor, RWSA was aware that the City and ACSA each had a potentially large project being proposed that could affect the Moores Creek basin. It was recommended that their plans be closely coordinated with RWSA's engineering staff to ensure that when those systems were scheduled to be put into service that RWSA had the downstream infrastructure in place to handle those requirements once they reached Rivanna's system.

The Powell Creek Interceptor, which operates from the Forest Lakes Subdivision to the South Fork Rivanna River, only serves the ACSA. Some of the sections of the pipeline are not very large compared to some of RWSA's other interceptors. The pipeline was designed to serve all of the Forest Lakes area and some areas beyond that subdivision. The impacts associated with the proposed Places 29 and North Pointe development projects and the possible redirection of flow to the Camelot Wastewater Treatment Plant would suggest that this area would need to be upgraded at some future time. It was again suggested that plans be developed in coordination with RWSA so that its systems could be budgeted and put into operation at the appropriate time.

One section of the Crozet Interceptor has already been identified as an area that will need upsizing in the future. The ACSA has an agreement with the Olde Trail Subdivision that requires the developer to fund improvements when they are needed. Looking at the broader picture, this pipeline has adequate capacity to handle current flow needs. Issues have been raised concerning the appropriate growth of that system, and RWSA would be happy to work with agencies as those decisions were being contemplated.

Mr. Frederick next commented that the last paragraph of the report outlines what RWSA believes is the best way to accomplish the vision through a process that will lead to a master plan for the Authority's wastewater interceptor collection system. Wet weather data will be calibrated in the coming weeks. The consultant will then begin to develop some alternatives where there were some wet weather issues that needed to be addressed, based on the amount of water received during heavy rainfall events that can be removed from the system versus how much RWSA needed to increase the size of the system in order to handle the increased flow. The evaluation of those alternatives will not be done in a vacuum, but instead would be conducted with multiple agency discussions. Because of the complexity of the issues and the need for multi-agency cooperation, RWSA expected that it would take several months before this process is finalized and an end date is set. It is the Authority's end goal that when this process is completed, RWSA will have a specific plan that identifies where pipeline improvements on its system need to be upgraded, increased in size, or rehabilitated, to what level, and to what extent. From a wet weather flow perspective, goals will be developed as to the amount that can reasonably be removed from all the various systems that RWSA serves, a time table set to accomplish that process, and a permanent monitoring plan implemented by the use of flow metering to measure actual flows.

Mr. Frederick then added that he would encourage the Board to take advantage of this opportunity to provide feedback and ask questions concerning the information he presented today.

Mr. Gaffney commented that the Community Water Supply Plan had a 50-year planning horizon and inquired if this study provided a 50-year outlook on RWSA's sewer system. Mr. Frederick stated that RWSA had a long-term outlook and asked Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, RWSA Chief Engineer, to further explain the planning process. Ms. Whitaker commented that the Authority was evaluating future needs based on 5-, 10-, and 20-year time frames, as well as "build out." "Build out" serves as the long-term planning horizon, based on the projected maximum population density, where it was difficult for the entities served by RWSA to project service needs based on a 50-year planning horizon. RWSA has discovered through past discussions and reviewing population projections that the further out in the future that planning is done the higher the variability of the figures.

Mr. Tucker next asked when RWSA felt the rainfall calibration would be completed. Mr. Frederick stated that the Authority expected to receive the wet weather data from its consultants in September 2007. Multi-agency discussions will need to occur before recommendations could be presented to the Board, which he anticipated would take a number of additional months.

Mr. O'Connell then commented that given RWSA owned less than 10 percent of the sewer pipelines, there was a clear need for a multi-agency approach. He then asked Mr. Frederick to detail how this coordination process would be accomplished. Mr. Frederick explained the approach taken by RWSA when the study was first undertaken in order to collect data and keep the process moving forward. Twenty-five data points were selected on all of the Authority's pipelines or connectors to its system, and the City and ACSA were being encouraged to provide additional studies during this process. Mr. O'Connell added that he felt an interceptor study could not be conducted without knowing the details upstream of the pipelines. Mr. Frederick agreed with Mr. O'Connell's assessment that the more information that could be obtained the better the outcome of the study. RWSA's consultant has a lot of nationwide experience in addressing these types of systems at various levels. The consultant could take the 25 data points identified by RWSA, and given the duration and intensity of a particular storm and how fast the system responds to the event in deviation from the normal dry weather flow patterns, could draw order-of-magnitude projections through best professional judgment on the cost effectiveness of removing stormwater at various levels. He felt there was nationwide recognition on a cost effective point beyond which stormwater is transported and treated instead of trying to keep it out of the sewer system. The multi-agency negotiations were geared from RWSA's perspective to reach that optimum point. More detailed information that Rivanna's two customers were willing to share concerning studies they have conducted on their particular systems would improve the best professional judgments that RWSA's consultant could make from data obtained from the 25 data points. Budgetary impacts will also need to be addressed during these discussions.

Mr. O'Connell next stated that the City has engaged a staff person to be involved in this process. He then asked Mr. Fern if ACSA has designated someone from their staff to participate in those discussions. Mr. Fern stated that ACSA has already begun studying the issues. Mr. O'Connell

also inquired if the University of Virginia had become involved in this process. Mr. Frederick stated that he was informed that the University was initiating some discussion on this issue, and he understood that in May a meeting will be held with University staff for a dialog on its sewer needs. He felt that ACSA and the City should be a part of that discussion.

After further inquiries from Mr. O'Connell on how this process would be coordinated, Mr. Frederick stated that the objective of the master plan would be for each contributing agency to determine a reasonable approach and to agree on performance conditions for meeting the goals, which would be enforced through permanent metering at selected points in the system.

Mr. O'Connell next requested Mr. Frederick to elaborate further on the timeline for this process. Mr. Frederick replied that he did not expect to have the master plan developed until sometime in 2008. He felt that until the multi-agency discussions occurred, he did not want to set dates for the other agencies involved in this process. Once the discussion process began and data was reviewed, the group could begin to set target dates for when the master plan was expected to be completed.

Mr. Fern next stated that he did not believe that it was possible to get any more specific at this time. Questions related to infiltration issues would first need to be addressed by the group. Ms. Mueller added that for the past year a committee composed of staff from the City, ACSA, and RWSA has been working on integrating the mapping of the three agencies and sharing information in order to get a more accurate picture of the entire system. Mr. O'Connell inquired if the University of Virginia had been involved in this process. Ms. Whitaker responded that this committee has coordinated with University staff during the mapping portion of this project.

Mr. Tucker next commented that it would be helpful to the Board to have a copy of the written plan that outlined the coordination process and time frames for completing the master plan when that information became available. Mr. O'Connell added that as discussed at a previous meeting, most citizens were not aware of this huge community issue. He felt that the public education process should get underway as quickly as possible so that the citizens would have a better understanding of the huge dollars that were involved with this project.

7.0 Other Items from Board/Staff not on Agenda

Mr. Fern commented that it had been recently suggested that the "four parties" hold a joint meeting to discuss RWSA's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). At last Thursday's meeting, the ACSA Board of Directors strongly encouraged that this meeting take place in the near future so that everyone in the community could be informed about the projects, timelines, and funding issues associated with the CIP. Mr. O'Connell inquired about the format for such a meeting. Mr. Tucker stated that due to the size of the group, he would suggest a presentation by RWSA to all the various Boards, which would be followed by a question and answer period. Mr. O'Connell next commented that he would encourage that the University of Virginia also be included in this discussion. The Board requested that RWSA coordinate scheduling this joint meeting by mid-June if possible. Mr. Tucker also volunteered the use of Albemarle County's Auditorium for this meeting if that would facilitate the process. Mr. Frederick was in agreement that RWSA would coordinate scheduling a joint meeting of the various boards to discuss RWSA's CIP.

8.0 Closed Meeting

There was no need for a closed meeting.

9.0 Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Tucker moved that the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Mr. Fern. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Robert W. Tucker, Jr.
Secretary-Treasurer