

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
November 28, 2005

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, November 28, 2005 at 2:00 p.m., in the Conference Room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Mr. William Brent, 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, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Ms. Andrea Terry, Mr. Norman Wescoat, Ms. Randi Wescoat, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Dr. Robert Wichser, and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

Also Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Attorney, 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, November 28, 2005 at 2:00 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes Of Previous Board Meeting

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. Brent, that the Board of Directors vote to approve the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, October 24, 2005, and the minutes of the Community Water Supply Public Outreach Meeting on October 27, 2005. Prior to the vote, Mr. Krueger pointed out that when the October 24, 2005 Board packets were being copied, two pages of the Resolutions for the Series 2005A Bond agenda item might have been missing from some of the Board members’ Board packets. He then noted that the October 24, 2005 minutes that Mr. Tucker had moved to approve included the full text of those Resolutions. By a 4 – 0 vote, the Board of Directors approved the motion. Mr. O’Connell arrived at the meeting after the vote was taken.

3.0 Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Frederick commented that RWSA had experienced a significant amount of activity over the past month and drew attention to the following items that were more fully detailed in the Board packet.

Mr. Frederick first reported on the very successful revenue bond sale that took place this month. He attributed the refinancing success to the work provided by Mr. Lonnie Wood and the Authority’s financial consultants. He felt it was worthy to recognize that the

RWSA Board Minutes
3.0 Executive Director's Report (cont.)
November 28, 2005

bids received exceeded the refunding targets set for those bonds and would provide long-term benefits to RWSA. The closing for the bond sale was expected to occur within the next two weeks. A more comprehensive report on the bond issue was provided in the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Frederick further reported that a very significant event took place in Virginia last Monday. The State Water Control Board (SWCB) adopted nutrient wasteload allocations for significant point source discharges in the James and York River basins. The regulations would require in time that the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant go to a maximum discharge equivalent to 6 milligrams per liter nitrogen and 0.5 milligrams per liter phosphorus at 15 million gallons per day. Governor Mark Warner had also announced a call that funding for wastewater treatment plants be dramatically increased. The SWCB was expected to adopt a similar resolution next month. With the support of both City and County elected officials, he felt it was the opportune time for this community to initiate a call for legislative action on this item during the January 2006 session.

Mr. Frederick also stated that a very successful Public Outreach Meeting was held on October 27, 2005. The Community Water Supply Plan was moving forward toward completion of an application early next year. He was very pleased with some of the favorable comments received from the public at that meeting.

Mr. Frederick next commented on the Consent Agenda item which offered the cancellation of the December Board meeting if it were the Board's desire to take such action.

4.0 Items From The Public

Ms. Sally Thomas, Albemarle County Supervisor, stated that she had been appointed by Governor Mark Warner to the Local Government Advisory Committee to the Executive Council for the Chesapeake Bay. The purpose of that organization was to ensure that local governments had a full sense of participation in decisions being made concerning the Chesapeake Bay cleanup effort, such as the tributary strategies. It was the first time that anyone from this community had been appointed to serve on this committee, which included only six representatives from Virginia. The Committee will hold its first meeting on December 7, 2005. She hoped that the group's work would be of value and would welcome input from the community.

The Board members congratulated Ms. Thomas on her appointment to this Committee.

Mr. John Martin, a resident of Free Union, Virginia, commented that he attended the SWCB meeting on November 21, 2005. Mr. Frederick spoke at that meeting, and his comments were included in today's Board packet. There were a number of speakers who spoke before Mr. Frederick whom he recalled expressed that they were "happy, happy, happy" and thanked everyone because there was a compromise. Mr. Frederick

then presented his comments, which was followed by two additional speakers. At the end of the meeting, the members of the SWCB recognized Mr. Frederick and his

RWSA Board Minutes

4.0 Items From The Public (cont.)

November 28, 2005

comments. Mr. Martin then read a sentence from Mr. Frederick's Memorandum included in the Board packet as follows: "SWCB Member Bryson Powell made direct reference to Rivanna's comments on funding as well as non-point initiatives, and after brief discussion the Board directed DEQ Director Burnley to draft a resolution for adoption by the SWCB calling for more state money and support for non-point initiatives." Mr. Martin further commented that what Mr. Frederick did not mention in his Memorandum was that there was a large crowd at the meeting, which included DEQ representatives and utility representatives from the James and York basins. Though not certain, he also thought he saw Russell Baxter, Assistant Director of Natural Resources, in attendance. After the SWCB addressed Mr. Frederick and his comments, Mr. Martin reflected on what happened at the meeting and he thought it was a very nice reflection on Charlottesville and Albemarle County.

Mr. Martin next commented that he did not know if Mr. Frederick anticipated what else had occurred, but in his and possibly other people's minds, it created in a subtle way the expectation that Albemarle County and the City of Charlottesville were going to be leaders in the state process. He also thought it was clear from the setting that the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County were perfectly capable of being leaders as the process moved forward. As he recalled, Mr. Frederick's comments about getting practical and focusing on what would be needed in the future were in contrast to most of the other speakers who had expressed their happiness and thankfulness for the compromise. With that kind of expectation, he felt it clearly signaled that a lot of work needed to be done in coordination with the City Council and the Board of Supervisors to present a very unified approach to the State Legislature. He was glad to hear Ms. Sally Thomas's earlier comments.

Mr. Martin added that he felt the process had reached the point where leadership could be shifted away from the Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies (VAMWA) and put more into the hands of the governing bodies. VAMWA was a very useful organization, which was full of technical and scientific knowledge. However, it was the governing bodies and not VAMWA that represented the citizens of this community, and he hoped that the future process would move in that direction.

Mr. Martin concluded by stating that when he got home, he felt that it had been a very good day and he still felt that way.

Mr. Gaffney thanked Mr. Martin for his comments.

Mr. Phil Marx, resident of Ivy, Virginia, commented that he was not here today to talk about water but a sewer issue. He did not have any prepared remarks as he just found out about the date of the Board meeting this morning. He had spoken over the years to several in attendance today concerning the odor from the Crozet connector. He talked to Mr. Tucker and Dr. Wichser recently, but mostly with Mr. Norman Wescoat. His e-mail correspondence with Mr. Wescoat he thought went back about 10 years. Mr. Marx

attended the Board of Supervisors meeting when they approved the connector about 20 years ago, and he spoke in opposition to it at that point. He was tired of the smell from

RWSA Board Minutes

4.0 Items From The Public (cont.)

November 28, 2005

the storage tanks at the pumping stations. He got “footballed around” every time he tried to speak with anyone and found himself in the position where he had to do the maintenance and the oversight on Rivanna’s pumping stations because nobody else wanted to check it out. In the last two months when he took his daughter into Charlottesville for orchestra classes in the evenings, they both smelled the pumping station even through the closed car windows. His daughter would comment on the awful odor. He felt the odor was coming mostly from what he referred to as the Flordon Pumping Station.

Mr. Marx further stated that he called several people, including Mr. Tucker, in an attempt to find somebody who would listen to his complaints concerning the odor from the Flordon Pumping Station. He believed at that time he spoke with Dr. Wichser at RWSA and was told that during the wintertime the contractor shut off whatever chemicals were being injected into the system to handle the odor. The unseasonably warm weather was causing the odor. Mr. Marx did not feel that he should be one to tell the Authority that there were odor problems. He felt that if an odor was detected at 8:00 p.m. that was the time when someone should go to the pumping station to investigate the odor complaint. At one point, someone from RWSA informed him as to how much money the Authority had spent to address this issue over the years as if it were a solution to his problem. Mr. Marx did not care how much it had cost. He spoke up originally 20 years ago that it was a bad design to have open sewage sitting in storage facilities behind people’s houses until it could be pumped to the Moores Creek facility. He still thought that system was wrong. Citizens were told 20 years ago that the system would work. He had also called the Albemarle County Service Authority and spoke with Mr. Paul Shoop. When the pumping station was constructed, Mr. Shoop worked for RWSA and was the engineer on that project. At that time, Mr. Shoop indicated that there would not be any problems with the facility but any odors detected would be addressed.

Mr. Marx added for as long as the pumping station had been in existence – for at least nine or ten years – odors had been detected from that site. He had complained about the smell, and articles had appeared in the newspaper concerning the odor issue. Blame had even been placed on catalytic converters from cars, which he felt was not the case. RWSA had added something to kill the smell, but it was not working and nobody was monitoring the system. He believed that telemetry was installed at the facility two years ago. E-mails from Mr. Wescoat in 1999 indicated that an antenna was being installed for reporting odors.

Mr. Marx next commented that it was a simple matter in that the system smelled, there were open tanks, and something needed to be done. He was tired as a citizen of having to tell RWSA that the system smelled and wanted a solution. It was suggested to him by Mr. Shoop that since Board meetings were open public forums, it would be an appropriate venue to voice his concerns on this issue. He was told by Mr. Tucker that there was nothing that the County could do since they were not really the client.

Mr. Marx added that he was not a client since he was not connected to Rivanna's sewer system and did not use its water. He had a well and was on a septic system. He

RWSA Board Minutes

4.0 Items From The Public (cont.)

November 28, 2005

reiterated his earlier remarks concerning being "footballed" in his contacts with the various agencies. Mr. Shoop was the designer of that pumping station, and he felt that Mr. Shoop had been discredited as an engineer on that project by several experts who attended those meetings 20 years ago. Mr. Shoop was now telling him that nothing could be done, although 20 years ago he stated that any odor problems would be fixed. Right now, citizens still continue to smell the pumping station. The complaints pre-date the closing of Con Agra, which was blamed as the source of the odors for years. He wanted to know what action the Authority would take to solve the odor problems or at least monitor the pumping station when complaints were received so that he did not have to do that on a weekly basis. Mr. Marx had gotten tired and stopped after years of issuing his complaints, but now he was starting the process again. This was the first time that he had attended a Board meeting, and he really wanted a resolution to this problem and to hear their comments.

Mr. Tucker responded that he had discussed the odor issues with Mr. Frederick, who would be reporting on this matter today.

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) Staff Report on Community Water Supply Plan
- 5e) Bond Issue Update
- 5f) Report on Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Interceptor Study (RFP 06-02)
- 5g) Personnel Manual Amendments – Performance Appraisals
- 5h) Proposed Schedule for the 2006 Board of Directors Meetings
- 5i) Proposed Cancellation of December 19, 2005 Board of Directors Meeting
- 5j) Proposed Revisions to the Section 125 Cafeteria Plan

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mrs. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to approve Items 5a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h), i), and j) of the Consent Agenda. Prior to the vote, Mr. Frederick noted one correction to **Item 5g), Personnel Manual Amendments – Performance Appraisals**. On page D-7 of Section D – Compensation Plan and Administration, under 4.5. Unsatisfactory Performance, in line 3 a "greater than" symbol was inserted before the 1.75 figure and should be deleted. As there were no further questions or discussion, the Board of Directors voted to approve the motion as amended by Mr. Frederick by a 5 – 0 vote.

6.0 Other Business

In regards to **Item 6a), Update on Nutrient Wasteload Allocation for Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant**, Mr. Frederick stated that he would briefly summarize

the information in his Board report. He also acknowledged Dr. Wichser's involvement and follow-up efforts with this issue. He stated that this process had been closely

RWSA Board Minutes

6.0 Other Business (cont.)

November 28, 2005

monitored given its implications on the future of the Authority, the agenda for this community, and the relationship and ongoing issues with the Department of Environmental Quality. The purpose of his report was to provide a status update on where RWSA staff felt this organization needed to be at this point with respect to moving forward given the action taken by the SWCB. At the end of his report, the Board would be invited to provide comments on the proposed plan.

Mr. Frederick first reported on the DEQ General Permit. He stated that the framework for how this process would move forward once SWCB adopted the wasteload allocations was set by the Legislature during its last legislative session earlier this year.

A specific compliance schedule had not been set at this time. Over the next few months, DEQ will prepare a General Permit which will govern all point sources in the state related to discharges of nitrogen and phosphorus. The General Permit would have the same weight as a VPDES Permit, which was a permit that governed waste discharges from a specific point source. Based on discussions with DEQ officials, RWSA anticipated that the draft General Permit would be issued about April 2006 and would include a requirement that point sources affected by this permit would have about nine months from that date to prepare a compliance plan. In that plan, a description of how the plant upgrade would be accomplished and a compliance schedule listing completion dates for the engineering design, bid processes, construction, and plant start-up would be addressed.

Mr. Frederick next discussed the "Constructability Report" item in his report. Based on whether the information was obtained from DEQ or recent newspaper articles, there were either 125 or 128 point sources that were affected statewide by the wasteload allocations. Utilizing the enhanced nutrient-removal technology to achieve the proposed plant upgrades would not be a simple process and would require major plant renovations. He pointed out that the Virginia Nutrient Trading Association, which was created by the legislative act last year, was working on a report to be released in Spring 2006 that would include the Moores Creek facility as well as the other point source wastewater plants. The report would attempt to identify basin by basin a reasonable approach for plant upgrades based on market limitations and the need to remove nutrients in an expedient manner. The 2005 legislation allowed wastewater plants to develop compliance plans individually or combine with other facilities to submit a joint plan. In a joint plan, some facilities in the group could agree to move forward with construction projects and the others could defer their plant upgrades and buy nutrient credits until a later date. The idea was to sequence the plant upgrades in order to achieve "real and quick" goals for the environment without overwhelming the construction and engineering industry to the point that construction costs escalate due to demand far exceeding the supply.

Mr. Frederick then stated that RWSA had already selected Hazen & Sawyer through a consultant selection process to conduct a preliminary study of the Moores Creek facility. The study, funded through a WQIF grant, consisted of two parts. The first part entailed

looking at the existing facility to determine if there were ways to modify operating practices or make small capital improvements that could achieve some nutrient removal. He noted that the Moores Creek facility was not designed to remove nitrates or

RWSA Board Minutes

6.0 Other Business (cont.)

November 28, 2005

phosphorus and that significant nutrient removal would require a design and construction process. The second part of the study involved the evaluation of various scenarios for capital upgrades to achieve various options of wasteload allocations. RWSA felt at this point in the process that a better use of the grant funds would be to provide more detailed information to the Board and the public on the specific facilities at the Moores Creek plant needing upgrades and the costs for achieving the wasteload allocations enacted by the SWCB. In anticipation of modifying the scope of phase 2 of the study, Dr. Wichser has been in contact with DEQ officials responsible for administering the grant. RWSA has received favorable verbal comments from DEQ concerning amending the grant to allow RWSA to put more effort on the specific wasteload allocations instead of examining various scenarios. The negotiations were still considered ongoing since RWSA has not yet received written confirmation from DEQ. RWSA was working to have the negotiations finalized and the amendments executed in an expedient manner so that the process could continue to move forward. RWSA hoped to have the study completed by the spring of 2006.

Mr. Frederick then reported on “Funding Opportunities” and stated that there was a WQIF grant process that was available at this time. These grants were awarded on a non-competitive basis, which meant that anyone who was qualified would receive a grant. He noted that the terms of the contract included a provision that the ability to actually receive money from the state was based on the discretion of the legislature to appropriate future funding. For that reason, RWSA has stressed the need for a stronger program in Virginia that ensured funding rather than having to provide monies upfront to meet a regulatory deadline with the hopes of receiving grant funding later. He felt the state’s funding approach was also unfair to Rivanna’s ratepayers. He then pointed out that other states within the watershed have found funding programs. Although he was not advocating this as the exact approach for the Commonwealth, Maryland had implemented a “flush tax” that ensured funding for point sources which could be used to implement their projects.

Mr. Frederick further commented that RWSA contacted DEQ regarding the December 2005 deadline for submitting grant applications and was informed that agencies submitting an application during this grant period must be ready to commit to the design work immediately. Agencies that deferred during the first round could submit applications during the next grant cycle.

Mr. Frederick next reported that it was staff’s recommendation that RWSA not submit an application for grant funding next month or that a commitment be made as a body at this time to a firm schedule for designing these facilities. This recommendation would suggest that RWSA defer on this round of grant funding or at least monitor the fund and lobby for additional state funding for possibly an improved program with less stipulations. Mr. Frederick asked that as part of the discussion concerning this issue that the Board provide feedback as to whether they were in agreement with this strategy, had

recommendations for changes, or further discussion was needed at a future meeting.

RWSA Board Minutes

6.0 Other Business (cont.)

November 28, 2005

Mr. Gaffney questioned since there was the possibility that the construction and engineering industries could become overwhelmed in the Commonwealth, whether it made sense to move quicker than the other plants in order to get the design and construction in place and recognize the lower costs that could be achieved.

Mr. Frederick replied that it was worth noting that the action taken last Monday by the SWCB applied to the York and James tributaries to the Chesapeake Bay. Since the decisions affecting the Potomac, the Rappahannock, the Eastern Shore, as well as some others, took place last September, there might be some communities further along in the process. He added that it was a difficult issue. From his perspective, without a coordinated plan there was a very good chance that the few who participated in the process first might not provide the maximum benefit to the environment, yet could “crowd out” of the market projects offering stronger environmental benefits over the near term. Because of the increased opportunities in the market, the engineering and construction industries could dramatically escalate their prices causing some communities not to be able to go forward with the project due to the high costs. He felt it should be recognized that there would be some risks with RWSA moving independently through the process at this time.

Mr. O’Connell asked for further clarification as to the commitment that would be needed if RWSA decided to move forward in the process and submitted a grant application in December.

Dr. Wichser responded that the award of a WQIF grant required that the utility be ready to move forward with the upgrade process within three to four months. He also pointed out that the Moores Creek facility had also not received its legal permit and probably would not obtain it until next May or June 2006.

Mr. O’Connell further inquired if it were correct that without the permit, RWSA would not be able to determine what the design specifications should be for the plant upgrades.

Dr. Wichser replied that it was known what was allocated based on the action taken by the SWCB last Monday. However, the General Permit has not yet been written. There had been some discussion about possibly modifying the allocation figures as well as lengthening the construction time lines.

Mr. Gaffney added that he felt that was a reason to move forward now in the process and obtain an advantage over the other facilities. He also felt that the community would rather overbuild and create nutrient credits to offset the costs for those upgrades.

Dr. Wichser noted that once a facility reached its capacity hydraulically, it would need to reduce nutrients even further. It has been estimated that the Moores Creek facility would reach its capacity somewhere between 2015 and 2020.

Mr. Frederick noted that Hazen & Sawyer had been requested to incorporate into the study what the costs would be if RWSA decided to upgrade its facilities beyond what

RWSA Board Minutes

6.0 Other Business (cont.)

November 28, 2005

was required by the regulations and the opportunity for return on that cost through nutrient credits. Hazen & Sawyer were also asked to examine the future impacts to the facility with the expected growth of the community. It was felt that the Moores Creek plant's current 15 MGD capacity would not be sufficient for the growth that was anticipated to occur beyond the next 12 to 15 years, and the facility would need to be expanded hydraulically to handle the additional capacity. The wasteload allocations were based on a fixed constant into the future, which meant that with higher volumes of water the concentration levels of nutrients and phosphorus would need to be reduced further.

Mr. Gaffney and Mr. Tucker both commented on the need for further study of the Moores Creek facility's expansion needs in conjunction with upgrades to meet wasteload allocations, which was an important reason for not moving forward with an application for grant funding at this time in order to give further consideration to all options.

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller, the Board of Directors voted to accept the plan as outlined in the Board report and to adopt a Resolution asking the General Assembly to provide the funding necessary for the wastewater treatment plant upgrades as a high priority for the 2006 Legislative session, and that the Resolution be forwarded to the community's Legislators. The Board of Directors approved the motion by a 5 – 0 vote.

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda

Mr. Frederick stated that if it were agreeable to the Board, RWSA would like to introduce an item concerning the **Water Treatment Plant Filter Upgrade and Installation Project** at this time. Copies of the report were then distributed to the members of the Board and members of the public in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Frederick reported that RWSA was in the process of conducting the engineering work to rebuild water treatment plant filters at the Crozet, North Rivanna, and Scottsville Water Treatment Plant facilities. The work, particularly at the Crozet facility, needed to follow a tight construction schedule because the water demand in Crozet sometimes necessitated the use of both of the plant filters to meet peak summertime demands. RWSA wanted to be in the position to be able to complete the work by late spring. While it was still acceptable to award construction bids in January, there was enough lead time in the purchase of the media for the new filter rebuilds to enable those items to be removed from the construction contract and be awarded as a materials contract. This action would allow the materials to be pre-purchased by the end of December in order to meet the estimated construction start date.

Mr. Frederick further stated that RWSA was recommending that the Board authorize the Executive Director to award the materials contract in the amount of \$150,000 that was

set aside for the Water Treatment Plant Filter Upgrade and Installation Project in the current operating budget.

RWSA Board Minutes

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda (cont.)

November 28, 2005

Upon a motion by Mr. Brent, and seconded by Mr. Tucker, the Board of Directors voted to authorize the Executive Director to award the materials contract in the amount of \$150,000 in order to purchase the filter media for the Water Treatment Plant Filter Upgrade and Installation Project as recommended in the Board report. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

As mentioned previously in the Public Comment period of the meeting, Mr. Tucker stated that he had talked with Mr. Marx as well Mr. Frederick and RWSA staff members concerning the odor problem at the pump station near Flordon. He had requested that Mr. Frederick look into this matter further and provide an update at today's meeting.

Mr. Frederick reported that due to Crozet's topography, RWSA had a series of four pump stations that conveyed wastewater both uphill and downhill from Crozet. The enclosure of sewage in a pump under pressure could result in the breakdown of the wastewater by processes that created an odor. Several years ago, RWSA made a commitment and installed a chemical system that inhibited that process. Although it was not 100 percent foolproof, the system was very reliable. RWSA's operating staff monitor the system on a regular basis. The Authority was not certain at this time as to the source, occurrence and exact time frames for some of the odor complaints voiced at this meeting. He understood that Mr. Norman Wescoat has been contacted and has been in communication with citizens making these complaints. Although it was not a frequent occurrence, RWSA would immediately address any odor concerns and issues that were received. Mr. Frederick commented that the odor inhibitor that was installed was a chemical system. In order for the current system to go from a high degree of reliability to an even higher degree, additional chemical must be placed into the system. The concern was not only about the cost but also the consequences to the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent if the chemical were overfed by significant amounts. The amount of chemical added to the system was controlled to allow for a conservative margin so that the odors were being effectively treated.

Mr. Frederick further stated that he looked at one of the pump stations last week with Dr. Wichser and Mr. Wescoat. Through their observations and "brain-storming" discussions, some options were identified for further follow-up. One entailed assessing and obtaining a cost estimate from the vendor who owned and operated Turn-Key on a software system that could monitor the effectiveness of the chemical through connections to the SCADA system in order to receive alarms quicker if conditions were not perfect at certain times and certain intervals. Instrumentation would be used versus reliance on "noses" to respond to a rare failure of the system. This option was being investigated further as were other options.

Mr. Tucker inquired if the pump stations would still need to be vented if they were covered by RWSA staff.

Mr. Frederick replied that typically the facility would be vented by either an active or passive scrubber system. The active system used a blower to blow through a media. Activated carbon worked well until it needed to be regenerated and was often used for

RWSA Board Minutes

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda (cont.)

November 28, 2005

hydrogen sulfide and other types of sewer odors. As part of the evaluation process related to manning the pump stations, appropriate venting and meeting safety requirements would also be considered.

Mr. Tucker asked if odor concerns were primarily an issue with the pump station located near Flordon or if complaints had been received periodically at the other facilities as well.

Mr. Frederick responded that to his knowledge, since the system had been optimized there had been a minimal number of complaints from a minimal number of individuals. He added that he did not detect any odors during his visit to the facility last week, but it could have been at a time when the system was operating properly.

Mr. Gaffney inquired if it was correct that the odor control treatment stopped when the temperature dropped to a certain level.

Mr. Frederick stated that the chemical reactions and reactions within the pipe itself were the function of temperature, so it could be more difficult to chemically treat the odor and achieve the proper balance even with regular monitoring during wide temperature swings that sometimes occurred during mid to late fall or in the spring.

Mr. Gaffney further inquired that by converting to an electronic monitoring system would adjustments to the system be made automatically.

Dr. Wichser stated that RWSA would be investigating the capability of integrating system monitoring into the electronic SCADA system that could provide real-time data 24/7 at those facilities.

Mr. Brent stated that he felt that he needed to respond to one statement made by the gentleman who spoke earlier. The gentleman referred to Mr. Shoop who at the time of the design of the Crozet Interceptor's was Rivanna's engineer and was probably the principal designer of that project. Subsequently, Mr. Shoop moved to the Albemarle County Service Authority and was currently the Director of Engineering there. Unless he misunderstood the gentlemen, he said that he took exception to the gentleman's statement that "Mr. Shoop had been discredited as result of the design of that Crozet Interceptor."

Mr. Tucker next asked Mr. Frederick and Dr. Wichser when they anticipated that the evaluation process as discussed above would be completed and the information provided to the Board.

Dr. Wichser replied that RWSA was in active discussions with its vendor concerning a

scrubber. Also during their visit last week to the pump station, another vendor that supplied covers was discussed and that option would also be pursued during the next two weeks. He pointed out that a cover and the capacity to scrub the system would be costly.

RWSA Board Minutes

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda (cont.)

November 28, 2005

By example, the installation of the scrubber system for the Rivanna Pump Station recently cost about \$225,000.

Mr. Tucker stated that it would be helpful for the Board to be provided with a list of the number of complaints received at each of the pump stations.

Mr. Frederick added that a report on this issue would be provided to the Board at the January meeting.

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. O'Connell. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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