

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
September 25, 2006

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, September 25, 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: Ms. Anne Bedarf, Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Mr. Chuck Kent, Ms. Mary Knowles, Mr. Cary Lang, Ms. Andrea Terry, Mr. Norman Wescoat, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, and Dr. Robert Wichser.

Also Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Attorney, Mr. Ronald Taylor – Hazen & 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, September 25, 2006 at 2:02 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 Ms. Mueller, and seconded by Mr. Tucker, the Board of Directors by a 5 – 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, July 24, 2006.

3.0 Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Frederick first reported that the Authority had an opportunity during the extremely dry weather in August to test the Beaver Creek Reservoir release to the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir (SFRR). He was pleased to report that RWSA could not quantify any “bed loss,” even though there had been speculation that a significant amount of “bed loss” might occur. Based on the test reflecting what the Authority felt was a “true [drought] condition,” the results would support the contingent use of the Beaver Creek Reservoir during a future drought.

Mr. Frederick further stated that RWSA had also observed during the dry conditions that the South Fork Dam had stopped spilling over the dam for about three weeks in August, which was a rare occurrence. Additionally, the Authority found that within two weeks after South Fork stopped spilling over the dam, the North Fork River flow at our North Fork intake had dropped

well below 2 mgd in total stream flow, which suggested that without augmentation there would not be much benefit in trying to increase the production of the North Fork WTP to offset the losses experienced at the other reservoirs during a drought. Based on those observations, Mr. Frederick reported to the Board that he had asked RWSA's Watershed Manager to initiate discussions with Albemarle County staff concerning issues that would need to be worked out before the next significant drought to allow for a responsible water release from Chris Greene Lake.

4.0 Items From The Public

Ms. Laura Covert stated that she was speaking on behalf of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood Association concerning the proposal to end composting operations at the Moores Creek facility. She thanked the Board for hearing the comments today from the residents most affected by the Compost Facility and the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Ms. Covert next commented as follows:

“ I think I speak for a number of people in the neighborhood when I say that my feelings about being here today are mixed – excitement that there may finally be movement toward a real solution to the compost odors in our neighborhood, frustration that it has taken so many years to get here, and trepidation that we may once again be set aside until more research, more data, more discussion and more time were requested, delaying further the decision that is undoubtedly difficult to make – spending money to fix this problem. You have collected data, hired consultants, and arrived at the conclusion that Woolen Mills and Belmont have known for years that the compost stinks and makes our neighborhoods stink, and I hope that we can agree that there is enough data to support the research that there is indeed an offensive and invasive odor in the operations. The problem has been particularly bad this summer. There were times when the smell was apparent three and five times per week. How many people have to be affected how many times before action is taken – 10 people; 100 times; 100 people, 10 times; 1,000 people, 1 time – and over how many years? How often do our backyards, our bedrooms, and our kitchens smell like human waste before we get relief? These are not questions that a consultant can answer; they are yours to make. I am asking today for your decision to close down the compost plant, to do so as soon as is humanly possible, and to address finally the heinous issue which affects an ever-expanding community of RWSA customers. I am asking that you begin to shift the compost off-site within 90 days – not by July 2007 – until such a time as the funds and technology are available to do it without impacting the residents adjacent to the facility. In short, I ask that you accept the recommendations of RWSA staff and move forward with due haste. Should you decide not to fund the project, I would respectfully ask that you give us some data – how many people must be affected how many times over how many years before this problem becomes actionable. Thank you.”

Mr. John Semmelhack, 1403 Chesapeake Street, Charlottesville, VA, next stated that he was Co-President of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood Association. He then asked the neighbors who

were present today for the compost facility report to indicate by raising their hands, which comprised a number of people in the audience. He then commented as follows:

“I very much appreciate all the work that RWSA staff has done, especially Mr. Frederick and Mr. Wichser. I generally support the report and its recommendations. Just want to point out one specific point in the report. On page 2 – ‘open air’ compost facility – they have been told by various experts that *an ‘open air’ facility ... within the fringe of an urban environment is highly unusual.* I’m in support of landfilling as an interim solution. I’m also in support on the capital costs for an enclosed compost facility in the future, as well as the higher rates that it might bring. I do ask that if you are considering the landfill option that it be done as quickly as possible, hopefully before the July 2007 date that is given in the report. Thank you.”

Mr. Chris Hayes, 1900 Chesapeake Street, Charlottesville, VA, next commented as follows:

“I come to you as a resident of the [Woolen Mills] neighborhood and also someone who has invested in the neighborhood. I belong to a group, the Rivanna Collaborative that is building 10 houses along Riverview Park, and as such, acting in a couple different ways. We have worked with RWSA before, and we have been very pleased with the results of the pumping station down in our area; but this issue with the composting station, I don’t hesitate to say, has been one of the most important issues that the neighborhood has addressed as long as I have been living within this neighborhood in the last 10 years. In particular, I think what I would like to address is not only the smell factor that a lot of people comment on, but if we have an ‘open air’ event ... the night that we decide to show a movie outside and maybe 50 people to the area and there was a really strong stench coming down from the compost actually Saturday night about 10:00. As we have done more research, it is not only being unable to occupy our environment but it is also a health factor impact. There is some research done by one of our neighbors that uncovered an article – I’ll leave with you – ‘Potential Health Effects of Odor From Animal Operations, Wastewater Treatment, and Recycling of Byproducts’ – they talk about very serious health impacts of being exposed to noxious odors of the sort that we are experiencing on what it feels like almost on a daily basis. I believe the report is strong that we have seen from RWSA. Probably the biggest issue I would suggest is that we would like to see the closing of the Compost Facility sooner not later. We have talked in the past unofficially amongst us about a three-month time frame or something like that, but waiting until July is problematic. For instance, just as a business person ... we are starting to build the first of the ‘spec’ houses in this development. We hope to have that ready in the spring, and we won’t be able to sell something when the smells are still wafting down and people are getting a sense of the strong odors that we have been experiencing more and more in the last year and a half or so. Thank you.”

Mr. Karl Ackerman, 1611 East Market Street, Charlottesville, VA, next made the following comments:

“I’ve lived at that house for the past 15 years, and I have to report that I’m beginning to feel like a frog in water where the temperature is going up and up as the smell gets worse and worse. You accustom yourself to it. I think part of the reason why I’ve never turned left to come down here

just in my wanderings in the neighborhoods is because I don't want to know what is here because I know how it's impacting on my life. I love my neighborhood. I don't want to stand up publicly and disparage something about my neighborhood. I would hate to do that if somebody next door to me was trying to sell a house at that point, but I feel like we have come to the point – and I'm somebody that has probably called dozens of times to report the odor, and I compliment the RWSA and their staff – but at the same time it has become this thing where we are reporting a smell and the person on the other end is happy to take the news. It's not the RWSA coming into our neighborhood to smell and report back to themselves that we have gotten to a place where we need to do something. If the Board can't follow the recommendations of the staff and actually move expeditiously as my neighbors have asked, I really feel like it's our obligation for our kids to start creating smell maps of the area so that it is not one house but at 9:00 p.m. on Thursday this is the extent of the smell. This is something that we have never seen, but I know it is not just the Woolen Mills. We had a meeting in our neighborhood, and there were neighbors from up by Kathy's Produce who were affected by this smell. I'll leave it with you today to say – please act on this, please take the recommendation, please move quickly to landfill this material, and don't put us in a position of having to sort of be activists and confrontational about getting relief. Thank you.”

Ms. Victoria Dunham, 2000 Marchant Street, Charlottesville, VA, next commented as follows:

“I would like to thank the Board for being open to our comments today. For many of us in the Woolen Mills neighborhood, the odors from the composting operation have been a problem for well over a decade. The odors have had a significant negative impact on our living conditions. The smell of sludge has had a negative financial impact on us as well. I'm a property manager, and last year I crunched some numbers to estimate how much more we would have received in rental income over the past 14 years had we not needed to keep our rents so far below fair market value because of the chronic odor. The percentage is considerable and in retrospect quite discouraging. That lost income has translated into the owner having to fork considerable amounts of her own money back into the property to keep it running. How many other people in the Woolen Mills and Carlton neighborhoods have seen their property values affected adversely by the sewer plant's practices? Another thing to consider in making your decision today is the health risks associated with 'open air' composting in close proximity to inhabited areas. When we have complained about offensive odors – burning eyes and throats, headaches and nausea caused by the stronger odors – things like ammonia and hydrogen sulfide – the response has frequently been that smell is a subjective thing, thus inferring that perhaps the onus is somehow on us to prove that what the majority of the people in the neighborhood have been experiencing is in fact real. Fortunately the data exists, including several well publicized studies from Duke University, that backs up our experience. It is not a recently discovered problem. Please take into account the considerable length of time that we have been pleading with RWSA for relief. We request that you begin landfilling sludge off-site as soon as possible until such time that an adequate solution can be found. A two- to three-month time frame was mentioned in our last meeting with Mr. Wichser and Mr. Wescoat, and we asked that this be observed rather than the ten-month wait mentioned in today's report. Thank you very much.”

Ms. Phoebe Haupt, 2000 Marchant Street, Charlottesville, VA, next provided the following comments:

“I have been living there for one week. I was prepared for the smell from the Property Manager when she showing me the apartment. I just wanted to add my voice to the crowd and say that I really could not have been prepared for the strength of the odor. As a newcomer to the neighborhood, it’s just totally overwhelming. To be honest, it’s embarrassing to bring people over to show them my new apartment that I’m so excited about ... when they step out of the car and there is a terrible smell, that’s pretty embarrassing. I just moved from Belmont Avenue, where the smell is also very strong, but it is nothing like being in the Woolen Mills neighborhood. Just wanted to add my voice to the response coming from those in this community. Thank you.”

Mr. Steve Riggs, 1610 East Market Street, Charlottesville, VA, next commented as follows:

“They have already said pretty much and covered what I would want to say. It is so bad we are thinking about moving if it is not solved. It’s just really, really bad. I’ve never experienced anything like it in my life ... the chemicals. Please just try to do something about it as soon as possible. Thank you.”

Mr. Bill Emory, 1604 East Market Street, Charlottesville, VA, next provided the following comments:

“Mr. Chairman and Board Members: I don’t have anything really prepared, but I did want to mention that as a state we really value the composting efforts that RWSA has made as a community. Interesting to note that if I was a business and I wanted to begin a composting operation where I only accepted yard waste and not sewage sludge that I would have to be according to Virginia State Code at least 1,000 feet away from the nearest inhabited residence. There are actually inhabited residences in the Woolen Mills that are closer than 1,000 feet ... I would just like to reiterate ... I realize that the end of the fiscal year is June 30, so it’s kind of neat to stop the compost operation at the same time. As the engineers pointed out, the alternative to landfill compost could be implemented rapidly and we would really like to see that. With respect, I thank you very much.”

Ms. Georgeann Wilcoxson, 407 Key West Drive, Charlottesville, VA, next commented as follows:

“I didn’t intend to speak today, but I need to tell you that I bought the 2000 Marchant house in 1979. When I bought it, it was like a shell; it was collapsing. I personally did a lot of the work up on the roof, insulating, and making it into a home for a number of people over the years. When I left Charlottesville – unfortunately I had to leave to go earn a living up in Washington, D.C. – but I’m back now, having retired here. My daughter has just moved back into the home of her childhood on Marchant, and I just have to tell you all how long it has been. In mid-1980’s I had to call night after night when my folks could not sleep. So, when I came back, I thought by

now this would be dealt with. I understand budgets; I understand priorities, but it is so important for the people in the neighborhood. Some of us can move out, but not everybody can. It is so important that we do this quickly. It has been over 20 years for me. Thank you very much.”

Mr. John Martin, Free Union, VA, next provided the following comments:

“I just want to preface my remarks by saying that first of all I’m still a big supporter of the Future Water Supply Plan, which is in place, and secondly, I want to say Rivanna has a great website. The City and County on their websites have a button or whatever you call it that a business could push to access information that might be particularly relevant to a business. I’m suggesting that Rivanna add that kind of a tab to its website. Under the business button or whatever you call it, put information about population projections, which underlie actually the Future Water Supply Plan, which is designed to meet the Demand Analysis. I am asking this for two reasons. Number One – the Demand Analysis and the subsequent Gannett Fleming Demand Analysis was done in 2004. It is very difficult to go through there and really pull out and sort out and add up the total population projections, which are made for the City and the County for 2050 or 2055. I have done it the best that I can. The total figure that VHB came up with for 2050, as I add it up, is 225,000 total population for the City and the County. Gannett Fleming in 2004 came up with a total population of 206,000. In addition to that, there are the University population increases. Those seem to be the population limits on which the Future Water Supply Plan is based with variables – all sorts of uncertainties and all things are variables. I think it is important to have that figure out there so businesses and citizens can see it for several reasons. First of all, there is something serious going on about growth in this community just in the last couple of years, and I think everybody recognizes it. To appreciate it, just back to the 1997 Demand Analysis and read a statement that they have there which states: ‘Albemarle County has experienced significant population growth, dating back to 1930. Growth from 1930 to 1970 was relatively modest, with an average annual change of 1 percent per year. From 1970 to 1994, growth continued to be positive but at a much higher rate. During this period growth occurred at an average annual rate of just under 4 percent. A closer examination of the last five years, preceding 1997, shows continued growth but at an average annual rate of approximately 1.7 percent.’ The Weldon Cooper Analysis for 2000 to 2005 is out now, and Weldon Cooper for just those five years has calculated a growth rate of 7.4 percent ... astounding ... and other things are going on. I won’t go into the politics of it, but there are changes on the Board of Supervisors regarding growth. The Board of Supervisors decided to joint the TJPED and pay money to TJPED to promote growth in the region. Growth is really happening, and I’m making the suggestion to add this information to the website so that prospective businesses in particular can come to the County website and find out what’s going on. They should know now what the plan is based on. If this kind of thing is not done and this information is not out there for people to understand, what’s going to happen is that we are going to be rolling along growing and growing until 2030 and then somebody is going to come forward and say ‘Oh, we need more water supply. Nobody told us that. Rivanna, why didn’t you tell us that?’ It should have been obvious. Of course, those population figures are not population limits by any stretch of the imagination, but there are limits in terms of our present capacity and our planning, perhaps. There are only two alternatives if we grow beyond the 200,000 citizen level, and those two options are to build the Buck Mountain

Reservoir or dredge the Rivanna Reservoir. The James River is not a solution; we need storage capacity - another hugely expensive project. All I'm suggesting - I'm not making growth arguments right now - I'm just saying let's let everybody know what the facts are and what the basis for the water supply planning is in a very clear and direct way. Thank you."

Mr. Gaffney thanked all the members of the public who provided comments at today's meeting. Their input was greatly valued and would be taken into consideration.

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) Public Forum Notes
- 5e) Administrative Part-Time Positions Consolidation

In regards to **Item 5e), Administrative Part-Time Positions Consolidation**, Ms. Mueller requested that this item be deferred until next month to allow her the opportunity to further review this matter. She felt her questions could be addressed through discussions with Mr. Frederick prior to the October Board meeting. The Board members and Mr. Frederick were in agreement that this item would be tabled until the October meeting.

As there were no further questions or discussion, Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, that the Board of Directors vote to approve **Items 5a), b), c), and d)**. The motion was approved by a 5 - 0 vote.

6.0 Other Business

In regards to **Item 6a), Drought Response and Contingency Plan**, Mr. Frederick stated that when the initial draft was introduced in April, the Board requested that a meeting be held in order to invite public comment on the draft plan. A Public Forum was held on July 13, 2006 at City Hall, which was hosted jointly with the staffs of RWSA, County, City, and ACSA. Throughout the entire process, staffs from those organizations contributed greatly to this thorough and coordinated effort by demonstrating a willingness to work together toward a common goal. The significant public comments that were incorporated into the revised plan were summarized in the Board report. It was at the Board's discretion whether he briefly went over each comment or addressed questions related to specific items. Mr. Gaffney suggested that he discuss the top two or three comments and then entertain questions from the Board.

Mr. Frederick then addressed the last bulleted item concerning the Committee seeking some process to evaluate actions taken following a declared drought as a means for continuous

improvement. He felt this was a positive comment, and the suggestion had been added to the plan.

Mr. Frederick next discussed the request that a detailed public relations plan be prepared for water conservation education during the voluntary phase of the plan. He was pleased to report that ACSA has taken the lead on the preparation of a flexible plan that could be tailored to the specific circumstances of a specific drought rather than a precise plan for all conditions. ACSA and the City have jointly agreed that consulting services should be used in an actual drought.

Mr. Frederick then commented on a concern that had been expressed related to the terminology used in the past for the different stages of the drought. The draft plan presented in April used the State's current terminology, which consisted of a "Watch," "Warning," and "Emergency." He understood that ACSA and the City were taking measures to establish consistency in terminology, and the County was reviewing this issue subject to the findings of their attorney as to whether state law mandates that an "Emergency" has to be declared in order to authorize ACSA to implement restrictions.

Mr. Gaffney then asked Mr. Frederick to discuss the public suggestion concerning setting a water conservation goal for the community during Drought Watches. Mr. Frederick stated that as noted during the presentation at the July meeting, assumptions incorporated into the model needed to be on the conservative side. Over-projection of the amount of water conservation savings would mean that the model output would indicate that the "trigger" to implement further measures would not need to occur until later in the drought. Separate from the conservative goals in the model, RWSA attempted setting a reasonable water conservation goal of 12.5 mgd during the dry period in August. He felt the rainfall that occurred shortly after a press release had been issued calling for this goal played a role in meeting that water conservation goal. He would recommend that public water conservation goals be considered in a future Drought Watch situation and positive action taken.

Mr. Gaffney then commented that during his previous discussions concerning the Demand Analysis he had inquired if the figure used as the basis for demand should start below 12 mgd. He felt that the infrequent rainfall experienced during the summer and demand climbing above the 12 mgd figure justified using the 12 mgd figure as the demand basis. He added that when the area entered a Drought Watch, water usage actually increased. Mr. Fern also commented that ACSA observed during that time that the exclusion meters went up, which indicated an increase in irrigation. He felt this was an indication that the message concerning conserving water during the Drought Watch did not reach all of the citizens and that increased efforts were needed in the future.

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. Fern, that the Board of Directors approve the Drought Response and Contingency Plan attached to the Board report. By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved.

In regards to **Item 6b), Recommendation on Compost Facility**, Mr. Frederick first highlighted sections of the Board report he felt were germane to the significant topic being discussed today

and was also of great interest to the citizens in attendance at the meeting. He stated that the report consisted of three parts, beginning with RWSA's responses to outstanding questions raised at the June Board meeting, followed by general staff findings based on extensive contacts throughout the industry, and concluding with a recommended strategy toward resolution of this issue.

Mr. Frederick then addressed the outstanding questions listed in his report as follows:

- **“Has composting at an alternative site from the Moores Creek WWTP been addressed?”** During its study, Hazen & Sawyer did investigate other sites that currently compost wastewater plant biosolids. The nearest facility that would accept biosolids from other facilities was located in Richmond, and the contract cost would be significantly higher than landfilling. Since the June meeting, RWSA has initiated contacts with some rural farm sites in Albemarle County that could potentially accommodate a composting operation. At this time RWSA has not received a specific proposal, but discussions were continuing regarding this option. This effort was also addressed in the recommendations presented in this report.
- **“Would landfill disposal of Moores Creek WWTP biosolids be acceptable to Virginia regulatory agencies?”** In his June Board report Mr. Frederick mentioned that one state near Virginia had banned biosolids in landfills, which he felt prompted this question. RWSA learned from discussions with DEQ that there were no plans on the “horizon” to consider eliminating that practice, which was currently being widely used in Virginia. It was clear from discussions with experts throughout the country that there were more states that permitted landfilling of biosolids than prohibited the practice. On at least an interim basis, he felt that landfilling of biosolids would meet with regulatory acceptance.
- **“Can some additional odor control be obtained in the interim while pursuing a more permanent solution?”** RWSA staff spent a considerable amount of time searching for interim odor control measures that could be implemented quickly, inexpensively, and improve the odor situation while pursuing a more permanent solution. Several experts over recent years have visited the Moores Creek WWTP and have consistently commended the practices of RWSA's operations staff to produce a quality product while at the same time trying to minimize odors with available capital resources. There were some other solutions that could be partially effective, but implementation of these interim measures would still involve time and capital costs. Regulatory issues would also need to be considered, as new capital projects would require state approval. The additional time consumed during the permitting process could result in the time frame for implementing interim measures to be as great as that for undertaking a permanent solution. Although the Authority would remain open to other ideas, research to this point indicated that the best interim solution might be to temporarily cease compost operations and to landfill the biosolids while undertaking improvements to the existing Compost Facility.

- **“Have other communities successfully used a soft enclosure over compost facilities?”** RWSA found that the limited number of facilities who used a soft enclosure were successful in controlling odors. There were a great number of facilities across the country that conducted successful aerated static pile composting operations in hard building enclosures, which he felt was a result of recent advances in technologies using flexible plastics and fabrics. Hazen & Sawyer had been requested to study the costs associated with both soft and hard building enclosures and had determined that lower costs could be accomplished with the installation of a soft enclosure.
- **“What would it cost to perform a similar odor evaluation for the remainder of the entire Moores Creek WWTP?”** After discussions with Hazen & Sawyer concerning the scope of the study, RWSA would recommend that \$100,000 be budgeted to study the entire site, identify if there were other issues that might extend beyond the facility’s property lines, and then develop estimated costs and options for a solution.

Mr. Frederick next discussed the list of findings summarized in the Board report. He first prefaced his comments by stating that while RWSA had a significant amount of trust in the findings provided by Hazen & Sawyer related to this study as well as from their previous work for the Authority, other consulting firms were contacted in order to verify to the extent possible the full range of proven available technology to address this issue. Confirmed across all contacts was a realization that “open air composting in an urban fringe area was becoming “a thing of the past” in most locations. Most “open air” composting that remains in operation today occurs in rural areas away from population centers. Whenever there was industrial-scale composting with biosolids in urban areas, as is conducted at the Moores Creek facility, staff found consistent across the country that issues related to odor had to be addressed and controlled.

Mr. Frederick further stated that during discussions with the biosolids practice managers of several large consulting firms, suggestions were made on other proven technologies that had not been mentioned in Hazen & Sawyer’s study. Some of the suggestions included technologies that may be competitive with Hazen & Sawyer’s recommendations, but none of them were likely to be significantly lower in cost. The Authority had not completed its research efforts and would continue to explore other options. An example of these efforts included RWSA staff meeting with a company that had developed odor control technology in Germany but had only been working in this field for a short time in the United States. It was not known at this time whether their technology was suitable for the Moores Creek facility. RWSA’s intent was to use a technology that had been proven at other locations, so that RWSA does not become someone’s experimental test site.

Mr. Frederick then reviewed the initial recommendations that were listed in the report for the Board’s consideration as follows:

- RWSA has concluded that continuing to operate the Compost Facility in its present mode without implementing any improvements was not recommended and was not acceptable.

- The Authority at this point was not recommending that a budget be established in order to enclose the facility. Included in the report was a \$10 million figure that would be needed to provide adequate odor control technology for the volume of biosolids that would be generated after the next Moores Creek WWTP upgrade to 15 million gallons per day.
- RWSA was recommending that its efforts to identify any private farms in this area that would entertain establishing compost facilities for the Moores Creek WWTP be continued on a vigorous basis.
- If the decision were made to pursue an interim solution, RWSA would recommend at this point to temporarily cease composting and to landfill the biosolids while efforts continue to find a permanent solution. If the intent were for RWSA to get back into the compost business again sometime in the future, consideration should be given to implementing the interim measure in a way that is understandable and acceptable to RWSA's commercial customers that have in the past and were currently purchasing compost in order to retain their business.
- "Hybrid" solutions, which were some combination of composting and landfilling, might be available if the decision were made to enclose the Compost Facility but there was not enough public support to finance a structure to house the entire amount of biosolids generated by the Moores Creek plant.

At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Frederick stated that he would entertain any question that the Board might have concerning the information provided in the report.

Mr. O'Connell inquired what the consequences would be for moving quicker with temporarily ceasing compost operations related to the market and also the environmental impacts from a recycling standpoint. Mr. Frederick replied that if consideration was given to getting back into the composting business at a later time, the Authority should be sensitive to the notice that customers who have been loyal and bought significant volumes of compost from RWSA would request. Also, any decisions concerning changes to the compost operation would be contingent upon regulatory approval, as the permit for the Moores Creek WWTP was tied to a specific method for handling biosolids. It may be possible that the regulatory approval process could be completed in as little as three to four months, but the time frame would need to be verified with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Concerning the impacts to the recycling rate, it was felt that the Authority would probably be in compliance for calendar year 2007 if composting operations continued for several months into 2007. The cessation of composting operations for most of 2007 would most likely result in the Thomas Jefferson region being out of compliance with the recycling rate as early as next year.

Mr. O'Connell next questioned what would be at stake if the region was not in compliance with the recycling rate. Mr. Frederick stated that state law allowed the regulators to propose sanctions. DEQ's Waste Division officials have expressed in discussions with stakeholders that

DEQ's goal at this time was not to punish with fines but to assist those facilities with the development of plans for how they would attain the targeted recycling rate.

Mr. Tucker then asked if RWSA contracted with the Richmond firm, would the compost generated by that facility count toward the Authority's recycling rate. Mr. Frederick responded in the affirmative. Mr. Tucker next inquired if RWSA had any numbers it could share with the Board if the option to contract with an alternate site was pursued rather than landfilling the biosolids. Mr. Frederick stated that the net present cost estimate for 20 years prepared by Hazen & Sawyer was over \$14 million. He noted that Mr. Ron Taylor with Hazen & Sawyer was also in attendance at the meeting and asked Mr. Taylor to confirm his estimate. Mr. Taylor informed the Board that the cost for contracting the compost operations would likely be at least twice what it would cost to landfill the material. Mr. Tucker also asked if that number included transportation costs. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative. Mr. Frederick added that the cost per ton for landfilling would in the mid \$40's range so the contract cost could be above \$90 per ton.

Mr. Gaffney next commented that contracting the compost operations was one of the options where the recycling rate could still be met and contracting could be done on an as-needed basis. He then questioned if only the amount needed to meet the 25 percent recycling rate for the Thomas Jefferson region could be sent to the Richmond firm and the remainder of the material landfilled.

Mr. Frederick replied that the Authority would be able to estimate ahead of time the amount of compost that would need to be contracted based on historical records to target the 25 percent recycling rate, but there is no guarantee that future recycling in other categories would remain the same. Mr. Gaffney further suggested that a more reasonable assessment might be to determine the costs based on a limited contract versus sending the entire amount to the Richmond facility.

Concerning the "hybrid" solution, Mr. Gaffney asked what the minimum amount of waste from the total being generated at the Moores Creek facility would be used in a "hybrid" operation where the facility would operate at full capacity year round. Mr. Frederick stated that the size of the "hybrid" operation and the amount of biosolids that would need to be landfilled would depend upon the amount of capital funding that was approved for this solution. If the Board chose to pursue this option further, RWSA could provide sizing data for a "hybrid" operation based on different levels of funding. Mr. Gaffney next questioned whether it was a linear regression. Mr. Frederick replied, "Not completely," and added that you would generally see economies of scale in a larger facility. Mr. Gaffney further inquired if the Moores Creek plant generated more waste during certain periods of the year. Dr. Wichser replied that the amount generated was usually about 190 to 200 wet tons per week. Mr. Gaffney commented that when determining what amount of biosolids to landfill, this data could be used to base the size of the "hybrid" plant. Dr. Wichser stated that he would caution the Board not to "put all their eggs in one basket." The compost process conducted in Richmond was being done by Environmental Solutions, whose office is located on Route 95 across from Sunoco Products, and is situated on a very small land area. The facility was currently composting 10 percent of Hampton Roads Sanitation District's biosolids. It has not yet been determined whether the facility has the

necessary permitting and adequate land space to accept additional biosolids. Mr. O'Connell questioned whether it had been established at this time that contracting with the Richmond facility was really a viable solution. Dr. Wichser responded that RWSA had explored this option related to estimated costs for contracting biosolids at an alternative site. Mr. Frederick added that the Board could direct RWSA to pursue this option and report back on whether it was possible to contract with the Richmond facility.

Mr. O'Connell next inquired if there were other contractors undertaking the composting of biosolids, Dr. Wichser stated that he was not aware of any other contractors in the Central Virginia area. Mr. O'Connell then asked if all the other facilities were landfilling their biosolids. Dr. Wichser replied that other facilities were primarily either landfilling or using land application. Mr. Frederick added that from summary reports RWSA reviewed, land application was the number one option for disposal of biosolids in Virginia, followed closely by landfilling. RWSA considered the land application option when exploring possible solutions. Based in part on discussions with Albemarle County staff, the decision was made not to pursue this option as land application would likely not be acceptable in Albemarle County. Bills have also been introduced in recent legislative sessions that would ban land applying biosolids across county lines in Virginia. Although it has not yet garnered enough support to reach the floor of either house of the General Assembly, the potential for future adoption would make land application to adjoining counties a risky venture. Another factor that would make land application less attractive is the additional capital within the Moores Creek facility that would be necessary. The Moores Creek facility meets EPA biosolids regulations with a Class A product by composting. This facility would not reliably meet EPA's minimum standards by eliminating the composting operations and directly applying the biosolids to land without further complex capital improvements for biosolids digestion. Further, there were many restrictions on land application during inclement weather, and the only way to overcome them would be to build tanks to store the biosolids coming out of the digestion when the land was too wet for land application. When consideration was given to all these additional capital costs, and considering there might not be enough public acceptance to support this option, it was decided not to include land application in the list of recommendations.

Mr. Fern asked if the Authority had looked at the life cycle costs related to composting biosolids to the amount that could be handled by the existing facility, making the needed improvements, and landfilling the remainder of the material versus transporting the biosolids to the Richmond facility. Mr. Frederick stated that there is some information on this in the Hazen & Sawyer report, but a direct side-by-side comparison has not yet been done. This could be done at the Board's direction. Mr. Fern added that there might be savings in actually upgrading the Moores Creek facility at some future time as opposed to incurring a cost for contracting with the Richmond site. Mr. O'Connell inquired if Mr. Fern's statement meant that the reduction in the compost volume and operational costs at the Moores Creek facility would compare more favorably than shipping the material to Richmond. Mr. Fern replied in the affirmative and added that hauling costs and contract fees would increase over time, whereas the investment to upgrade and make the existing Moores Creek facility environmentally sound might actually be achieved at a lower cost in the long term.

Mr. Frederick then commented that he thought it was important to note at this point in the discussion concerning contracted composting that during Hazen & Sawyer's evaluation, they used several ways to estimate what it might cost to deliver biosolids to a private composting facility. The Richmond facility was directly contacted, but did not provide a proposal to RWSA. The Authority could pursue a specific proposal, but the outcome as to its feasibility is uncertain at this time.

Mr. O'Connell commented that he personally would like to see the Authority reduce the odor generated from the compost operations. As a representative of the City and the Woolen Mills neighborhood, the easiest solution would be to recommend quickly disposing of the biosolids into a landfill. His concern with pursuing that option related to this community's interest in sustainability. He felt that the right thing to do would be for the Authority to find the means to recycle as much of the product as possible, as it had value and use regardless of the state's mandated recycling rate number. He was troubled with the lack of a longer-term strategy to address those issues. Mr. O'Connell then suggested that the landfill option be pursued subject to the time frame for the permit approval process. Mr. Frederick stated that he could not provide a firm date on the regulatory process, but if directed by the Board, RWSA would move as quickly as possible to implement that interim solution.

Mr. Frederick next clarified that if the community wants to continue composting while resolving the odors, recommendations on how this could be accomplished, based on extensive staff research efforts, were identified in the report. The Authority was flexible in its continuing efforts to explore other options due to the significant costs associated with the recommended solutions included in the Board report.

Mr. Fern asked if Mr. Frederick's reference to composting options entailed taking the biosolids to another site rather than continue the operations at the existing Compost Facility at the Moores Creek site. Mr. Frederick replied that several inquiries have been made, but aside from what has been already discussed at this meeting, we have not received any proposals at other sites.

Mr. O'Connell questioned whether the enclosure technology would be effective at the Moores Creek plant. Mr. Frederick stated that it was proven technology, and Mr. Gaffney pointed out that it had been successfully accomplished at several locations throughout the country.

Mr. Frederick also commented that the same technology is currently used for the Rivanna Pump Station, which entailed enclosing the facility and installing a scrubber system.

Mr. Gaffney inquired if the \$75,000 for professional services related to alternate rural sites was the only funding being requested at this time. Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Gaffney further questioned whether additional funding would be needed for the other three solutions. Mr. Frederick stated that RWSA was first requesting the Board's agreement that continuing the current operations at the Compost Facility was not acceptable and that other means of handling the plant's biosolids needed to be found. The recommendations stopped short of requesting a budget to enclose the existing Compost Facility, but this option was still on the table. RWSA was also requesting the Board's direction to continue its solicitation efforts with existing farm sites more vigorously. If during this effort questions arose that required consulting

services, the Authority was requesting that the Board authorize \$75,000 in new professional services to address those issues and keep the process moving forward.

At this point, Mr. Gaffney asked if the assumption was correct that “existing farms” referred to sites in Albemarle County and surrounding counties and not sites in the City of Charlottesville. If so, he inquired if locating a composting operation on an existing farm would be an acceptable alternative with respect to Albemarle County. Mr. Tucker replied that the answer might not be known until the discovery process has been completed. It would also depend upon the location of the farm. Mr. Frederick added that first step in this process would be to identify a person interested in undertaking this project, followed by an inspection of the farm site, and then contacts made to Albemarle County staff and DEQ concerning local and state requirements. Once it was known that a composting operation could be conducted on the site, the next issue to address would be if it could be operated as an “open air” facility or would some type of odor control technology need to be installed. Mr. O’Connell asked if anyone was conducting composting operations in the region, and Mr. Frederick responded that he was not aware of anyone in our area composting with biosolids at this time. The nearest “open air” biosolids compost facility that RWSA was able to locate was situated in a very rural area in the Valley. Mr. Tucker then inquired if it was a public facility similar to the Moores Creek plant or a private facility. Mr. Frederick stated that although it was a public treatment facility, it was less than one-tenth of the size of the Moores Creek WWTP. Mr. O’Connell asked Mr. Frederick if he felt that it would be unlikely that RWSA would need to spend the \$75,000 for this option. Mr. Frederick stated that the funding would only be used if serious interest was expressed. Mr. Tucker commented, which was echoed by the other Board members, that the money would be better served by using it for improvements to the existing compost facility.

Mr. Gaffney next inquired if the third listed recommendation dealt with the “interim” solution of temporarily ceasing the compost operations, and Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative. Mr. Gaffney further questioned if there was a way to determine the recycling rate for the remainder of 2006 and 2007. Mr. Frederick responded that the rates could be forecasted based on current trends and could be provided to the Board next month. Mr. Gaffney commented that those numbers would assist in calculating the amount of biosolids that would need to be shipped to the Richmond facility in order to meet the recycling rate during those time frames. If it were decided to pursue a “hybrid” solution, then the projections for 2008 could be used in determining the size of the compost operations at the Moores Creek site and the amount of biosolids that would need to be sent to an outside facility. Mr. Frederick suggested that in order to save some time, RWSA could quickly calculate the amount of compost that would need to be generated in order to meet the recycling rate. RWSA would then contact the Richmond facility to solicit whether they would be willing to provide the Authority a specific proposal in terms of volume based on those calculations. The Board members were in agreement with Mr. Frederick’s suggestion.

Mr. O’Connell inquired as to the steps in the regulatory process for implementing an “interim” solution. Mr. Frederick stated that at the end of the process, DEQ would require a specific written plan on the solution that would be implemented. During the next 30 days, DEQ would be

informed as to the status of our discussions, which we could explore as a possible way to streamline the process.

Mr. Fern asked if the DEQ permitting process would require both a primary and secondary means for biosolids disposal at the facility. Dr. Wichser stated that to amend the facility's biosolids management plan for RWSA's VPDES permit for the Moores Creek WWTP would require the completion of official federal forms that would be sent to DEQ for their review and comments. Mr. Frederick added that it would be advisable to incorporate as much flexibility into the official plan as DEQ will allow. Mr. O'Connell inquired if the Authority could begin that regulatory process so that the implementation of an "interim" solution could proceed as quickly as possible. Mr. Frederick replied that staff would inquire with DEQ if this is possible.

Ms. Mueller asked if it had been determined which landfill the biosolids would be taken. Mr. Frederick stated that although for procurement purposes there would be a more open process, a specific landfill has been identified that would accept the material. The biosolids would need to pass a standard EPA test for determining non-hazardous versus hazardous waste, which he was confident would not be a problem.

Ms. Mueller further inquired if RWSA has been able to determine from the preliminary numbers the financial impact on the current budget. Mr. Frederick stated that as mentioned in June, there would need to be a one-time increase in wholesale rates at the time the landfiling option was implemented. The rate would not increase further in subsequent years for this purpose unless or until landfiling costs increase or a new permanent solution with new costs was directed. Ms. Mueller then stated that most contracts would include a fuel factor in the transportation costs. Mr. Frederick commented that this would be a factor and a part of the landfiling option. Ms. Mueller further inquired if wastewater rate increases would require a 60-day notification period for advertisement purposes. Mr. Krueger confirmed that there was a 60-day notification requirement for adopting new wastewater rates.

Mr. O'Connell next asked what would be the annual cost for 100 percent landfiling of biosolids. Dr. Wichser replied that it was estimated at about \$425,000 annually. There was also a fuel factor in the transportation costs, which depended upon the federal published rate for diesel. Mr. O'Connell further questioned that if you were able to contract the composting operations would the cost for landfiling the material be reduced. Mr. Frederick stated that you would reduce the cost for landfill disposal, but you would increase by more the cost for composting the material. Mr. Tucker asked if there would be a difference in transportation costs. Mr. Frederick replied that the distance to transport the material is similar for both options. The additional costs would result primarily from the composting process rather than from transportation.

Mr. Fern voiced a concern that once the Authority got out of the composting market, it would be difficult to get back into that business. He wanted to make the community aware that RWSA could potentially lose a lot of their current customers, who would find another source for compost. Mr. O'Connell added that absent constructing a major facility a loss of customers would be the consequence. Mr. Tucker reiterated Mr. Frederick's earlier comments about

advising RWSA's compost customers as to the "interim" measures being undertaken in order to reduce the amount of loss experienced during this transitional period. Mr. Frederick added that it was an open competitive market, so RWSA would do everything possible to assure its customers of its future plans for composting if that option were selected.

Mr. Gaffney asked Mr. Frederick to restate the recommendations based on the previous discussions. Mr. Frederick commented that a statement would be made that the existing facility

as currently operated was not going to be continued over the long term. The Authority would continue to pursue existing farms in the area. At this point, Mr. Gaffney and the other Board members pointed out that this option and the proposed \$75,000 funding for professional services had been dropped from consideration at this time. Mr. Frederick continued by stating that RWSA would pursue the option of landfilling as an "interim" solution. The Board has additionally requested that over the next 30 days the Authority obtain some financial information, particularly looking at how much composting might still need to be done to meet the 25 percent recycling rate, and pursue a specific proposal from a contract firm that provided that service. Ms. Mueller also stated that the Authority would proceed with contacting DEQ in an attempt to initiate the process for amending the Moores Creek WWTP permit. Mr. O'Connell proposed that an odor study of the entire Moores Creek WWTP facility be added to the list of recommendations in order to provide a "whole picture" of the odor issue. He added that a budget in the amount of \$100,000 also be approved, if that was the least amount for which a study could be done. Mr. Frederick stated that the Authority would negotiate the best price possible, but \$100,000 would be the budget figure that RWSA would request for conducting the odor study.

Mr. Fern then inquired why the study would need to be done since the Authority planned to landfill the biosolids as quickly as possible. Mr. Fern further stated that Mr. Taylor's answer to a question posed by him two months ago was that composting was the source of the odor issue for the neighbors. Mr. Taylor clarified that the predominant odor detected off-site and an issue with the community was coming from the compost operations. As discussed at the June Board meeting and mentioned in Hazen & Sawyer's report, Mr. Taylor added that there were other odors at the Moores Creek WWTP that might be detectable by the community if you took away the majority of the odors coming from the composting operations. Mr. O'Connell questioned whether Mr. Taylor's statements meant that both studies would need to be done in order to reach the point where the neighbors did not smell any odors. Mr. Taylor replied in the affirmative with respect to odors originating from the treatment plant.

Ms. Mueller asked, which was echoed by Mr. Fern, what the funding source would be for the \$100,000. Mr. Fern added that based on discussions during the Consent Agenda, expenses were running over budget in the Urban Wastewater cost center. Mr. Frederick replied that as part of the Authority's overall financial planning, many needs were identified and listed in the Board report. Money spent for odor matters did not preclude RWSA from other regulatory issues, such as nutrient treatment and major transmission system improvements, which were mandatory in order to maintain regulatory compliance. Ms. Mueller commented that those items were future Capital Improvement projects. Mr. Frederick then stated that the Authority was attempting to

generate some reserves through its rates in anticipation of those needs. Increasing the budget to cover expenses related to odor issues would mean spending down the reserves and would increase the impact on next year's rate forecasting decisions. Ms. Mueller added that she, and she felt Mr. Fern as well, wanted to be sure that the Authority was not anticipating a mid-year rate change. During the ensuing discussion concerning RWSA's finances, Mr. Frederick pointed out that the current fund balance was above the amount being requested so the reserves could be used to cover the funding being requested in this report. Mr. O'Connell suggested that when the Authority presented its findings to the Board in 30 days that it also provide a clear financial picture concerning financial support. Mr. Gaffney asked if Mr. O'Connell was requesting that the odor study for the entire Moores Creek WWTP be delayed until the funding issues have been resolved. Mr. O'Connell stated that he felt that the Moores Creek facility was part of the overall odor issue and wanted to add the \$100,000 budgeted for the odor study to the list of recommendations being addressed today. He felt that when the compost situation had been resolved, there would still be an odor issue. Mr. Gaffney then confirmed that this study and accompanying \$100,000 budget would be added to the list of recommendations, and Mr. Frederick would be directed to prepare a Request for Proposal and review the status with the Board next month.

Mr. O'Connell moved, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to approve the four recommendations as summarized by Mr. Frederick and amended by the Board at today's meeting as follows:

- Agreement on the statement that the existing facility as currently operated was not going to be continued over the long term.
- RWSA would pursue the option of landfilling as an "interim" solution. Over the next 30 days, RWSA would obtain financial information related to how much composting would need to be done to meet the 25 percent recycling rate and pursue a specific proposal from a firm that provided that service.
- RWSA would proceed with its contacts to DEQ in an attempt to initiate the process for amending the Moores Creek WWTP permit.
- RWSA would prepare a Request for Proposal for an odor study of the entire Moores Creek WWTP with a budget of \$100,000.

The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

Mr. Gaffney then thanked again all the members of the public who provided comments not only at today's meeting but also over the past 10 plus years. He apologized that it taken so long to reach this point toward resolving the odor issues.

Mr. Fern next mentioned the 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. time frame mentioned in e-mails and comments concerning when odors were more regularly detected. He inquired why the odors

were detected during that time period, if this was a daily occurrence, and if it was contributed by the treatment plant or the compost facility. Mr. Frederick stated that there was some dialogue among staff this morning about conducting surveillance in that area during the 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. time frame. Since RWSA had just received the information this morning, he was not able to provide an answer at this time without further investigation of this matter. Mr. O'Connell requested that if anyone else in the audience had detected the same smell during that time period to please leave their name. An unidentified citizen in the audience then thanked the Board members for reading their letters. She also stated that she did not work and was home during most of the day. She noted that temperature inversion was occurring during the 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. time frame that could account for the detection of the more noxious odors. Another unidentified member of the audience added that odors were detected at other times during the day but almost always during the 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. time period.

Mr. Gaffney thanked the members of the public for their comments on this matter.

In regards to **Item 6c, Meadowcreek Sanitary Sewer Repair near Banbury Road**, Ms. Whitaker stated that RWSA was requesting funding for a sanitary sewer repair. The Authority's Line Maintenance Technician recently found an area of the Meadowcreek Interceptor where the 24-inch diameter main shows significant deterioration. While not currently causing any releases to the environment, there was enough concern about the pipeline itself that staff believed it needed to be repaired. Some internal CCTV evaluations have been done, and there were staff concerns concerning tree growth and the actual condition of the pipe. Staff was requesting that funding be approved in the amount of \$70,000 with a 10 percent contingency in order to move forward with the repair work during the fall or early winter. The estimated cost includes some additional by-pass pumping, which will be a critical component of this project as the main carried a 4- to 5-million gallon per day range of wastewater. The Authority's goal would be to time the by-pass pumping in order to reduce the cost of the project, but it was felt that the \$70,000 would allow for the work to be completed in the event of a wet weather episode or other conditions out of RWSA's control.

Ms. Mueller moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, that the Board of Directors vote to authorize the construction of repairs to the damaged Meadowcreek Interceptor at the site near Banbury Road and also authorize the Executive Director to transfer up to \$70,000 from the wastewater reserve account to address this issue. By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved.

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda

There were no other items from Board or staff not on the agenda.

8.0 Meeting Recess

Mr. Tucker moved, and was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of Directors Meeting be recessed at this time and be reconvened at the conclusion of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board of Directors Meeting in order to enter

into a closed meeting to discuss the potential acquisition of real property. By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved and the meeting was recessed at 3:23 p.m.

9.0 Resumption of Open Meeting

The RWSA board of Directors Meeting was reconvened at 3:39 p.m.

10.0 Closed Meeting

Mr. O’Connell made the following motion, which was seconded by Mr. Tucker:

RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority enter into a closed meeting to discuss the potential acquisition of real property as permitted by Section 2.2-3711.A.3 of the Code of Virginia.

By a 5 – 0 vote, the motion was approved and the Board entered into a closed session at 3:40 p.m.

ATTENDEES: Mr. Fern, Mr. Frederick, Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Krueger, Ms. Mueller, Mr. O’Connell, Mr. Tucker, and Ms. Whitaker.

11.0 Resumption of Open Meeting

The RWSA Board of Directors Meeting was reconvened at 4:12 p.m.

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

WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority has convened a closed meeting 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 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.

RWSA Board Minutes
11.0 Resumption of Open Meeting (cont.)
September 25, 2006

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.

12.0 Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Tucker moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by
Mr. Fern. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

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