

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
June 19, 2006

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, June 19, 2006 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: Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Mr. Chuck Kent, Ms. Mary Knowles, Mr. Cary Lang, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Mr. Norman Wescoat, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Dr. Robert Wichser, and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

Also Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Attorney, Mr. Ron Taylor – RWSA Consultant with Hazen and Sawyer, 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, June 19, 2006 at 2:00 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

Mr. Gaffney welcomed his fellow Board members, RWSA staff, and the members of the public in attendance at the meeting.

2.0 Minutes Of Previous Board Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. Fern, the Board of Directors by a 5 – 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, May 22, 2006.

After the vote, Mr. Gaffney noted one change to today’s meeting agenda. Due to public interest concerning this issue, **Item 6c), Drought Conditions**, would be presented immediately following **Item 6a), Community Water Supply Plan – Joint Permit Support Documents**, which would allow the media to meet reporting deadlines.

3.0 Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Frederick commented that he felt it was noteworthy that the Board would be asked during this meeting to vote on the selection of the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion as the preferred Community Water Supply Plan alternative. He could not express enough about the cooperation and support that the Authority received from all segments of the community in order to reach this point in the process. The preferred alternative has been unanimously approved by the Charlottesville City Council, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, and the Albemarle

County Service Authority Board of Directors. With a positive decision today by the RWSA Board of Directors, the Authority planned to submit a Joint Permit Application prior to July 4, 2006.

Mr. Frederick next reported on the mitigation planning process with respect to the Community Water Supply Plan. He was in agreement with previous statements by Mr. Gaffney that at this time mitigation efforts should focus on attaining regulatory approval of the Joint Permit Application. RWSA would be working to complete and present a plan as soon as possible that met this directive.

4.0 Items From The Public

Mr. Jeff Werner with the Piedmont Environmental Council commented that he did not have a prepared statement today but distributed copies of correspondence that his organization received from a consulting firm concerning the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR). He then referred to the Community Water Supply Planning process where one of the options discussed related to dredging the SFRR. The Piedmont Environmental Council had asked CTI Consultants, Inc., to prepare a Proposed Scope of Work and a budget for developing a topographic model of the SFRR in order to study sediment issues related to location, depth, composition, potential use, and estimated costs for a dredging project. The results of the consultants' "Reservoir Capacity Analysis" were outlined in the distributed material. The proposal was completed last December, but Mr. Werner waited to share this information until after the selection of the preferred alternative as he did not want to complicate the process. The estimated cost for this work was roughly \$70,000 to \$90,000. He felt it would be prudent for the City, the County and RWSA to consider in some way undertaking this project as it would answer a lot of questions related to the feasibility of dredging the SFRR.

The second issue raised by Mr. Werner concerned the opportunities presented during the last drought for mechanically removing some of the sediment in the SFRR. If dry weather conditions persisted, he would urge that a plan and the necessary approvals be put in place so that the mechanical removal of the sediment exposed by the dropping water level could be undertaken.

Mr. Gaffney thanked Mr. Werner for his comments.

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) Job Descriptions for New Positions

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, 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), Community Water Supply Plan – Joint Permit Support Documents**, Mr. Frederick reported that as previously mentioned the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, the Albemarle County Service Authority Board of Directors, and the Charlottesville City Council unanimously voted to approve the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion as the preferred alternative. RWSA staff was recommending today that that Board endorse the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion Alternative with a pipeline from the SFRR and to also direct Authority staff to submit a Joint Permit Application to the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality prior to July 4, 2006.

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, that the Board of Directors vote to approve the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Expansion Alternative with a pipeline from the SFRR as the preferred alternative for the Community Water Supply Plan and to also authorize RWSA staff to submit a Joint Permit Application to the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality prior to July 4, 2006. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

In regards to **Item 6c), Drought Conditions**, Mr. Frederick commented that the Authority has been reporting for several months on the declining stream flows due to the abnormally low rainfall this region has experienced since January 2006. The decline has been steady as illustrated by the graph attached to the Board report. As indicated in his report, on June 9 the measured stream flow at the USGS gauging station on the Mechums River was down to only 19 cubic feet per second. As of yesterday, stream flow was further reduced to 15 cubic feet per second, which represented only 17 percent of the seasonal average stream flow at this location.

Mr. Frederick further reported that RWSA has been utilizing a Hydrologic Model to perform assessments on the potential future risk for a substantial reduction of the total storage in the reservoirs. More recent data indicated that as of June 9, 2006, there was a 20 percent risk that within 12 weeks the reservoir storage would fall below 80 percent. An e-mail received this morning from the Authority's consultant that runs the Hydrologic Model indicated that the risk has now gone beyond the "trigger" level that was recommended in the draft Drought Response and Contingency Plan that was presented at the April 2006 Board meeting for initiating a "Drought Watch" stage. A "Drought Watch" was one of three stages listed in the plan in order to keep the public informed and specified what actions would be warranted at that time. The first stage involved a call for voluntary water conservation measures for the public that were reasonable and achievable. The Authority's two customers, the City of Charlottesville and the Albemarle County Service Authority, provide a wide range of literature and information concerning ideas on how to conserve water and would also be initiating a media campaign in the near future to promote water conservation efforts in this community.

Mr. Frederick then stated that it was not known how long the drought conditions would persist, but after reviewing the data, he was convinced that the area was in a drought at this time. If

rainfall did not occur over the next few weeks, it was clear from the model that the SFRR would soon stop spilling. If this dry weather pattern continued, all the reservoirs would experience declining storage levels. For those reasons, he felt now was the time to take strong proactive measures. As stated in his report, if drought conditions persisted, the ACSA and the City of Charlottesville might find it necessary to impose mandatory restrictions.

Mr. Frederick added that RWSA staff was recommending that the Board of Directors approve the following three statements:

1. *The Board concurs with the staff's assessment that conditions are appropriate to declare a Drought Watch for this community and recommends the joint boards (Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, the ACSA Board of Directors, and Charlottesville City Council) confirm that assessment within each's jurisdiction at the earliest available meeting opportunity.*
2. *The Board calls upon all citizens using public water to voluntarily conserve water to the maximum extent possible, recognizing that water supplies may be limited in the weeks to come if current local weather trends continue; and*
3. *The Board request the Executive Director to continue to closely monitor reservoir and stream flow conditions, and authorizes its Chairman, in consultation with the Executive Director and individuals on the RWSA Board, to amend RWSA's position prior to the July 24 Board Meeting to lift the Drought Watch if rainfall should substantially improve current trends, or call for a Drought Warning (second stage) should modeled conditions reach the more severe second "trigger" level defined in the draft Drought Monitoring and Response Plan.*

Mr. Frederick also reported that when the draft Drought Response and Contingency Plan was presented in April, a commitment was made to hold a public meeting before requesting that the various boards actually adopt the plan. The meeting has now been scheduled for Thursday, July 13, 2006, at 6:00 p.m. and will be held in the Charlottesville City Council Chambers. During the meeting citizens will be given an overview of the plan and current conditions, hear what public officials are requesting of the citizens in this community, and have an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments.

Mr. Tucker commented that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors would be considering the matter of declaring a "Drought Watch" at its July 5, 2006 meeting. Under Albemarle County Code, the Board of Supervisors would need to declare an emergency in order to give ACSA the authority to restrict irrigation times during a drought.

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, that the Board of Directors approve the three items recommended by RWSA staff as outlined in the Board report and presented today by the Executive Director.

Prior to the vote, Mr. O'Connell stated that Charlottesville City Council would be meeting tonight, and this item would be added to the Agenda as "Other Business." It was his

understanding that action by City Council was not needed on this matter, but he wanted to include City residents in the discussions to start thinking about water conservation.

Mr. Tucker added that although the “Drought Watch” was aimed primarily toward citizens that used the public water system, Albemarle County would also be encouraging its rural residents who were on well systems to conserve water.

Mr. Gaffney felt it would be important to note that the reservoirs being at 97 percent capacity at this time did not reflect the challenges that this community could face in the event of a prolonged drought situation. As he recalled from 2002, when water stopped flowing in the streams, about a third of a percent of the water supply was consumed per day, 10 percent in one month, or about 30 to 40 percent expanded over a three-month period.

Mr. Frederick reiterated that the declaration of a “Drought Watch” was a proactive decision based on hydrologic modeling and the intermittent overflows that were being observed at the SFRR. At certain times of the day the SFRR was spilling, and during the hottest part of the day, the spilling would actually stop for brief periods of time. If the current trend continued, he felt it would not be long before the SFRR stopped spilling completely. He also reported that as of today, the Ragged Mountain and Sugar Hollow Reservoirs were not spilling. Sugar Hollow Reservoir was down 1.0 feet this morning and was dropping about a tenth of a foot per day. In July, the Authority would need to draw down the level of the Ragged Mountain Reservoir further in preparation for hurricane season. The Authority felt that the best way to meet Dam Safety needs and conserve as much of the water supply as possible was by using the water drawn from the Ragged Mountain Reservoir at the Observatory Water Treatment Plant and to drop back the transfer to the Sugar Hollow Reservoir.

As there was no further discussion, the Board of Directors voted to approve the motion by a 5 – 0 vote.

In regards to **Item 6c), Engineering Study of Moores Creek Compost Facility**, Mr. Frederick stated that included in today’s Board packet was a 16-page report prepared by Hazen and Sawyer engineers. In March, RWSA was directed to conduct a more detailed study of the compost facility at the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (Moores Creek WWTP) and make recommendations on what could be done to alleviate odor complaints in the neighboring community. Mr. Ronald Taylor with Hazen and Sawyer was in attendance today to summarize the report. Mr. Taylor co-authored the report and would be leading the project’s efforts from this point forward. RWSA would not be making a staff recommendation today. Due to the complexity of the issue, staff wanted the Board to first hear the report in order to facilitate discussion on the proposed options. RWSA staff would appreciate any directive or guidance from the Board on this matter either at this meeting or at a later point after the Board has had an opportunity to review the material.

Mr. Frederick then reported that it appeared from the study that in order to have confidence that there would be no odor complaints outside of the Moores Creek facility and still continue compost operations at the site, capital money would need to be spent to conduct either negative aeration or place a cover on top of the facility, which would require an active odor control

system. Other options considered included landfilling, which was the most economical alternative and entailed transporting the biosolids from the Moores Creek WWTP to a landfill. The landfill disposal option could be implemented with a one-time 5 percent increase in sewer rates. The abandonment of compost operations would also significantly reduce the community's and the region's recycling rates.

Mr. Ronald Taylor next provided a summary of findings from the Hazen and Sawyer study of the Moores Creek WWTP composting operations that was conducted over the past 90 days. He reaffirmed that the Moores Creek WWTP was a very well run facility and that the finished compost was very high quality product.

Mr. Taylor then discussed Hazen and Sawyer's investigation of odor complaints being reported off-site that were originating from the Moores Creek WWTP compost operations. The study included an examination of the types of odors that were being generated from the Moores Creek facility. Field and sensory perception odor sampling were conducted, as well off-site chemical composition examinations. Results of the odor sampling determined that the active compost piles, the recycled wood chip piles, and the finished compost were all significant sources of odor generation. Air dispersion modeling was also performed and concluded that the active composting operation and finished compost piles needed to be enclosed with some type of active odor control in place to prevent the detection of compost-related odors off-site. Mr. Taylor further stated that several different odor control technologies had been evaluated, and Hazen and Sawyer determined that biofiltration and wet scrubbing were viable odor control options.

Mr. Taylor next reported on the enclosure requirements for the compost facility. The existing structure has a footprint of approximately 46,000 square feet, which would be adequate for an enclosed operation based on the existing compost piles operation only. It was also determined that the anticipated production at 15 million gallons a day, based on enhanced nutrient removal, would require a larger footprint of approximately 82,000 square feet. Building codes would require that an enclosed facility be provided with a full sprinkler system for fire control. After looking at several different building types, Hazen and Sawyer determined that a pre-cast tip up panel construction, a pre-engineering metal building, and a soft enclosure would all be viable options. After further examination, it was found that a soft enclosure would provide long-term durability at the lowest cost.

With the intent of ensuring that the most economical solution was found, Mr. Taylor further stated that the possibility of retrofitting the existing canopy with walls for enclosure was explored. However, it was found that the structural design of that canopy did not provide sufficient lateral support for wind or seismic loads from the side, such that Hazen and Sawyer could not recommend adding walls without jeopardizing the structural integrity of the existing canopy.

Mr. Taylor then reported that Hazen and Sawyer also evaluated solids handling alternatives, which involved comparing composting to other means of handling and disposing of biosolids generated by the Moores Creek WWTP. Optimization of the current composting operations was evaluated during that process, which included positive and negative aeration. Positive aeration involved pushing air through the compost piles and out into the atmosphere, while negative

aeration entailed pulling air from the outside through the compost piles into a pipe collection system where the air would be treated by an odor scrubber system. Hazen and Sawyer found that negative aeration provided many benefits for the active compost piles, but the finished compost and recycled wood chips would still need to be in an enclosed building provided with an active odor scrubbing system. Thermal treatment technology, such as heat drying the biosolids and pelletizing the end product, would probably not be considered as a financially feasible alternative since it was more expensive than composting even with the odor control. Landfill disposal and land application of biosolids were found to be viable and the lower cost alternatives.

Mr. Taylor added that Hazen and Sawyer recognized that there were other factors that RWSA would want to consider when making a decision, but from a strictly economic basis, landfilling would be the lowest cost option.

Mr. Tucker asked if the Authority would receive credit for using the land application method. Mr. Taylor replied that he was not familiar with the criteria needed for recycling, but it was a beneficial use process. Mr. Frederick added that he has not seen any rule that allowed credit for land application in calculating the recycling rate, but staff would confirm the state's position on this issue.

Mr. Fern inquired when RWSA anticipated that the Moores Creek plant's capacity would be expanded beyond 15 million gallons per day (MGD). Mr. Frederick replied that it depended upon a number of circumstances and variables used, but staff felt that sometime between 2015 and 2020 would be an appropriate time frame for planning beyond 15 MGD.

Mr. Fern then referred to Mr. Taylor's previous comments that walls could not be added to the current compost structure and asked if this meant that walls could not be tied in to the columns of the current structure. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative and added that the existing structure could not withstand the lateral loads that would be induced by attaching walls for enclosure of the facility. Hazen and Sawyer had also examined the potential to provide self-supported walls just outside of the existing structure. Due to the large foundation requirements, this would be a more expensive option than the provision of a new structure.

Mr. Tucker then asked if the soft enclosure option would involve removing the existing structure. Mr. Taylor replied that his statement was correct and added that concrete push walls would be provided in order to accommodate composting operations. The soft enclosure alternative would also involve a space-frame type structure with a high density polyethylene (HPDE) material that would extend over the top of the space frame.

Mr. Gaffney next inquired if the soft enclosure would be placed in the existing structure's present location or if it would be placed at another site so that the existing structure could be used for another purpose. Mr. Taylor responded that estimated costs for this alternative anticipated its placement at the site of the existing structure. There was additional space adjacent to the existing structure, but there would be additional costs for a concrete slab foundation if the soft enclosure was placed in another location. Mr. Gaffney next questioned whether there was any salvage

value for the existing structure. Mr. Taylor stated that Hazen and Sawyer did not assume one, but scraps still had some value.

Mr. Fern asked if during the study, composting operations being performed by a contract operator in lieu of Rivanna staff performing this function was evaluated. Mr. Taylor responded that two options were evaluated, which included optimizing the existing operations at the Moores Creek WWTP or transporting the biosolids to a contract compost operations who would handle the process for RWSA completely off-site. A contract compost operation proved to be the most costly alternative under consideration.

Mr. Fern next inquired if transportation costs associated with landfill disposal of the biosolids related to commercial hauling or the use of Authority vehicles. Mr. Taylor stated that those were commercial costs for hauling the biosolids to the Amelia Landfill.

Mr. O'Connell referenced a statement in the Board report concerning the uncertainty of regulatory acceptance for landfilling biosolids and asked if other states had already prohibited this practice. Mr. Frederick noted that North Carolina did not permit landfilling of biosolids at MSW landfills. He was not aware of a movement in Virginia at the present time to make landfilling of biosolids illegal, but he had included the comment in his report as some states have seen reasons to prohibit the practice. Ms. Mueller inquired if landfilling could be used as a short-term alternative. Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative. Mr. Taylor further commented that there were a number of facilities in Virginia that were using the landfill disposal option at this time.

Ms. Mueller asked if there were any short-term measures that could be taken to help minimize the odor complaints while working toward a final solution. Mr. Taylor responded that the scope of their study was somewhat limited to finding a total solution to the odor issue that would serve the Authority in the long term. There were some lower cost alternatives that could be considered if partial reduction in the odors was acceptable, which included discharge of collected odors through a vertical stack into the atmosphere rather than treating the odors. The odor situation could be further improved by adding some type of treatment to that process. Ms. Mueller inquired about the costs associated with a carbon scrubber. Mr. Taylor responded that the evaluation of an active odor control system was beyond the scope of their study, but he estimated that the capital costs would be about \$1.4 million, which included the chemical scrubbing. He felt that short-term treatment option would amount to a fraction of that amount.

Mr. O'Connell next asked if there would need to be some structural improvements to the facility to implement this option. Mr. Taylor stated that containment of the structure would facilitate the process, but he reiterated that the existing facility could not withstand the addition of curtains or walls that would supply that containment. He added that those short-term solutions were also very costly.

Mr. Fern asked why carbon adsorption was not a viable option. Mr. Taylor replied that the primary reason was that the compost process generated heat, and warm air would then be sent through the air scrubbing device. Carbon adsorption filters have in some cases caused fires

due to the higher temperatures. Another reason concerned the high costs associated with the frequent replacement of the carbon in a carbon adsorption filter used for this purpose.

Mr. O'Connell next inquired if there were any data available related to the amount of odor that was reduced by utilizing such short-term measures. Mr. Taylor stated that the odor compounds found in the finished compost, the recycled wood chips, and the active compost piles were detectable in very small concentrations at great distances. He felt it would be somewhat difficult to predict as there was a human element involved in determining the amount of odor reduction that was achieved. The air dispersion modeling that Hazen and Sawyer conducted indicated that this option would reduce the odor threshold down to non-detectable levels at a distance very close to this facility's property line. Mr. O'Connell also asked if there were other communities that had a positive result from utilizing this option. Mr. Taylor responded that Hazen and Sawyer did not investigate that aspect during their study and would need to conduct further research before addressing that question.

Mr. O'Connell asked Mr. Frederick to discuss the staff's position on costs related to short-term measures versus a long-term solution. Mr. Frederick stated that the Authority was very sensitive to costs issues, which made this a complex issue to address. The driving need for this study and for a solution was the perception of odors in this community. There was some uncertainty by staff that even after spending money to implement an option to disperse or dilute the odor, the citizens of this community may not accept this as a sufficient solution. Another option that might merit further discussion entailed moving the compost operation to an off-site location with a wider buffer area that would be combined with a lower-cost odor control system. Mr. Frederick added that given the Moores Creek WWTP closeness to residential communities he could not definitely state that the lower-cost solutions just discussed would effectively eliminate complaints from the neighborhoods.

As Ms. Mueller previously mentioned, Mr. Frederick further commented that landfilling the compost could be considered as a short-term solution with the option of undertaking some method of composting at the Moores Creek WWTP at a future time.

Mr. Tucker questioned whether odor complaints could be evaluated as to their number and severity based on seasonal weather conditions in order to determine when the short-term option of landfilling the compost could be implemented. Mr. Frederick stated that several years of data suggested that most of the complaints were made in early spring and fall. Weather patterns were a factor in holding the air close to the surface and into the valley. RWSA staff as a team had discussed the possibility of scheduling compost operations during certain months of the year. Staff concluded that a seasonal approach might not be totally effective because weather patterns from year to year were unpredictable. Mr. Frederick felt that a reason more odor complaints were received during this past winter could be that the unusually warmer temperatures during that period promoted a longer period where air patterns were typical of "early spring." A seasonal approach might also have a detrimental effect on the Authority's ability to deliver the product to end consumers in sufficient quantities in order to maintain its customer base.

Mr. Fern inquired about revenue amounts that were generated from the Authority's compost operations. Mr. Wood replied that annual revenues were about \$100,000 to \$110,000.

Mr. Taylor next commented that the results from implementing partial odor control solutions in some communities has not resulted in fewer odor complaints, even though the measures were quite effective in odor reduction, due to the citizens having become more sensitized to the particular odors. This information led Hazen and Sawyer to believe that implementing a partial solution could involve significant capital expenditures for the Authority and might not result in the lessening of the odor complaints.

Mr. Fern also asked if Hazen and Sawyer was certain that some of the odors were not coming from the Moores Creek WWTP itself. Mr. Taylor stated that sampling conducted during the study indicated that there were definitely odors coming from the compost operations and those compounds were detectable in small quantities at a significant distance from the plant. If the compost operation was removed from the Moores Creek WWTP, there were other odor sources at the plant that could be detectable off-site, which was not addressed during this study.

Mr. O'Connell then commented on the other odors that he detected today coming from the Moores Creek WWTP. He felt the total odor issue should be addressed rather than concentrating on the compost operations. Mr. Taylor responded that the odor compounds that were found in the off gases from the compost facility were definitely ones that would be objectionable in small quantities, and he felt certain that this was the issue at hand. He suggested that a sampling evaluation could be conducted throughout the entire facility in order to identify all the odor sources.

Mr. O'Connell asked if RWSA had received sufficient feedback from today's discussion in order that staff could further evaluate this issue and bring recommendations back to the Board for consideration. Mr. Frederick replied that the discussion had been helpful but would need to continue, and added that staff would address the questions that were raised at today's meeting to the extent within budgeted resources. Mr. O'Connell also suggested briefing the neighbors on the options presented today and provide the Board with the input received from that meeting along with the Authority's recommended solution.

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda

Mr. Frederick requested that an item concerning the **Abington Place, Phase I – Pipeline Oversizing Project** be added for discussion at this time and asked Ms. Jennifer Whitaker to present this report.

Ms. Whitaker stated that this item was being presented today in order to make the Board aware of a cost savings opportunity that has recently come to RWSA's attention. RWSA staff have been working with ACSA staff during the review of a development project in the Hollymead Town Center, which was known as Abington Place, Phase I. This project included an alignment of over 1,000 feet of a 12-inch water pipeline that approximated where RWSA anticipated placing a Route 29 pipeline project, which was under evaluation and study. An oversizing agreement with the developer would allow the ACSA to install a larger diameter main by funding the increased cost of the materials estimated at \$55,000. The estimated cost for RWSA to independently install this length of main was approximately \$371,000. Ms. Whitaker felt that this presented an

opportunity from both a cost standpoint and an alignment standpoint to bring a pipeline through this area and serve the needs of that community.

Ms. Whitaker further reported that at its June 15, 2006 meeting, the ACSA Board of Directors authorized ACSA staff to negotiate an oversizing agreement with the developers contingent upon an agreement by RWSA to reimburse ACSA for the oversizing cost.

Upon a motion by Ms. Mueller, and seconded by Mr. Fern, the Board of Directors voted to authorize RWSA staff to negotiate through the ACSA a pipeline oversizing agreement with the developer of Abington Place, Phase I, and also authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with ACSA to fund the proposed pipeline oversizing. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

8.0 Meeting Recess

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O’Connell, that the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors Meeting be recessed at this time and be reconvened during the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board of Directors Meeting in order to enter into a joint closed meeting with the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board of Directors to discuss a confidential personnel matter. By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved and the meeting was recessed at 2:50 p.m.

9.0 Resumption of Open Meeting

The RWSA Board of Directors Meeting was reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

10.0 Joint Closed Meeting

Mr. Tucker made the following motion, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller:

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

By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved and the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority went into a joint closed meeting with the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 3:01 p.m.

ATTENDEES: Mr. Fern, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Graham (RWSA Board of Directors), Ms. Mueller, Mr. O’Connell, Mr. Tucker, Mr. Krueger, and Mr. Frederick (part of the closed meeting).

11.0 Resumption of Open Meeting

The RWSA Board of Directors meeting reconvened at 3:40 p.m.

Mr. Fern made the following motion, which was seconded by Mr. Tucker:

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

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

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

There being no further discussion Mr. Gaffney called for a roll call vote:
Ms. Mueller – Aye, Mr. O'Connell – Aye, Mr. Gaffney – Aye, Mr. Tucker – Aye, and Mr. Fern – Aye.

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Ms. Mueller, the Board of Directors voted to increase the annual salary of the Executive Director of both the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority and the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority to \$115,000.00 effective July 1, 2006. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

12.0 Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. O'Connell moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Mr. Fern. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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