



695 MOORES CREEK LANE
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902-9016
TEL: 434.977.2970
FAX: 434.293.8858
WWW.RIVANNA.ORG

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
November 17, 2015

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 2:15 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Mr. Ken Boyd, Mr. Tom Foley, Mr. Mike Gaffney, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Maurice Jones, Ms. Judith Mueller and Mr. Gary O'Connell.

Board Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Ms. Victoria Fort, Mr. Tom Frederick, Ms. Teri Kent, Mr. Doug March, Ms. Michelle Simpson and Jennifer Whitaker.

Also Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger – RWSA Counsel, 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. Gaffney on Tuesday, November 17, 2015 at 2:25 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes of Previous Board Meeting

a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on October 27, 2015

Mr. Jones moved that the Board of Directors approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Board held on October 27, 2015. Mr. Foley seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 6-0-1. Mr. O'Connell abstained from the vote as he had been absent from the October 27, 2015 meeting.

3.0 Recognition

a. Water Environment Federation Technical Paper Selection

Mr. Frederick stated that this recognition spoke well to the state-of-the-art work that was done for developing the odor control project for the wastewater treatment facility, and reported that the RWSA and its engineer had been selected to deliver a technical paper in Milwaukee, Wisconsin in April 2016 at the Water Environment Federation (WEF) Odors and Air Pollution Specialty Conference. Mr. Frederick noted that RWSA Senior Civil Engineer Michelle Simpson would be a co-author of this technical paper.

Mr. Frederick and Board members congratulated Ms. Simpson.

4.0 Executive Director's Report

Imagine a Day Without Water

Mr. Frederick reported that staff had spoken on “Imagine a Day Without Water” at the October Board meeting, including publicity on the Downtown Mall. He then referred to his written report regarding a school poster contest, and clarified that elementary age homeschooled children in addition to those in City and County elementary schools were eligible. Mr. Frederick stated that there were 560 total entries, and the judges had met recently – with six award winners to be announced in early December. He stated that RWSA staff was working to get award winners to the RWSA Board meeting, and if that was not possible they would try to get video of the awards.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the artwork would be available for the Board meeting, or if it had been returned to the submitter.

Ms. Mueller responded that the artwork would be at the awards meeting, and stated that the artwork of the elementary students was quite impressive, with judges having narrowed down the 560 entries to about 200.

Ms. Kent stated that she was not certain yet where the artwork would be displayed, but it would “make the rounds”.

Ms. Galvin asked if the posters could be printed and displayed.

Mr. Gaffney suggested having them put on buses.

Ms. Galvin stated that the work could be displayed at the RWSA offices.

Mr. Frederick assured the Board that staff would bring something back to them in December.

Mr. Gaffney suggested that the artwork be put on the website.

Ms. Galvin agreed.

Mr. Frederick commented that this was a good idea.

Potential Nutrient Allocation Legislation

Mr. Frederick reported that the RWSA had become aware through its membership in the Virginia Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies (VAMWA) that a bill had been initiated, to be introduced in the General Assembly in 2016, that would be hostile toward all of the current wastewater facilities in Virginia that had invested millions – collectively billions – of dollars in upgrading treatment plants to provide additional capacity for future growth and provide nutrient treatment. He stated that the bill would give the State Water Control Board (SWCB) the authority to take away from the RWSA and other wastewater agencies in Virginia any nutrient allocation previously received that the SWCB deemed to be “unused,” and then create from such taken allocation a “pool” that could be allocated by the SWCB to new industry. Mr. Frederick stated that this was being “couched” as an economic development effort, but the problem was that citizens in communities around the Commonwealth had invested money in future capacity for wastewater plants, and this legislation would give incentive for new development to get “free” allocations from the SWCB at the expense of localities.

Mr. Frederick reported that there had been some progress in recent weeks toward some compromise, and VAMWA had made contact with appropriate people including the Virginia Manufacturers Association to try to work on an “offline” effort to postpone legislation and allow a plan to be developed over the next year, to address potentially valid grievances new development might have with the current nutrient trading program in Virginia. Because the current trading program had no mechanism for commitments beyond five years, one idea being incubated was to provide the means for long-term commitments to the program. Mr. Frederick emphasized that in addition to working on a compromise, it was very important for a broad advocacy to oppose adverse legislation in the 2016 session; therefore, he has asked the City and County to provide support through their approved list of legislative priorities.

Ms. Galvin stated that the City had approved the legislative packet the previous evening, and this matter was included in the packet.

Mr. Foley stated that the timing of the County’s packet had coincided with Mr. Frederick’s request, but the Board of Supervisors had discussed it and would be supportive, with a legislative meeting scheduled for December 1, 2015. Mr. Foley asked Mr. Frederick to provide any new information as it became available, and stated that he would get this information to the Supervisors for their December 1 meeting, as well as the December 2 legislative meeting.

Mr. Frederick responded that the timing of updates would be uncertain, but RWSA staff would keep him current as updates were available, and he offered to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting.

Mr. Foley stated that attendance would not be necessary at this point, but he would follow up with Mr. Frederick.

Mr. Frederick stated that it was appropriate to have the support of both the City and the County, and added that it was the citizens in the community who would suffer adverse financial consequences.

Sugar Hollow Reservoir Update

Mr. Frederick reported that the Board has asked for monthly updates on Sugar Hollow since June, and stated that conditions at the reservoir had been quite stable for the past month. He stated that there had been some periods between rain events where there was a minor drop in the reservoir levels, reflecting the release of 10 million gallons per day to the Moorman's River, but the reservoir refilled with rain events and was currently full. Mr. Frederick reported that over the last month the RWSA had been consistently transferring water to Ragged Mountain, and as of that morning Ragged Mountain was at -7 feet. He stated that the RWSA had established bi-weekly targets to get the reservoir full by the end of the March, with the target for November 15 at -7.6 feet. Mr. Frederick noted that RWSA was ahead of the target, which suggested that the reservoir would be full before the end of March, and RWSA staff had already begun having conversations about having some type of public activity around the filling of the new reservoir. He stated that given the fact that things were stable, staff had sufficiently updated the Board and would only update them as there was information to share, unless the Board wanted continued monthly updates.

Mr. Gaffney asked Mr. Frederick if he knew how much water was going into Ragged Mountain every day.

Mr. Frederick responded that it was estimated that the 18" pipeline capacity was approximately 4 million gallons per day, but the pipe did not have a meter. He stated that the RWSA staff had discussed whether the cost of the meter would be worth the benefit, and could continue that discussion with the Board if necessary.

CIP Update

Mr. Frederick reported that staff had originally planned to present the CIP for RWSA in December, but would instead present it on January 26, 2016 if that was acceptable to the Board. He stated that staff was advanced in their work but was not finished yet, and noted that because of the importance of the document they would meet with Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) and City staff before presenting it to the Board.

5.0 Items from the Public

Mr. Gaffney invited comments from the public.

There were none offered, and the Chair closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

6.0 Responses to Public Comments

There were no responses to public comments from the October meeting.

7.0 Consent Agenda

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items that Board members wanted to pull for comments or questions from the Consent Agenda.

- a) Staff Report on Finance*
- b) Staff Report on Operations*
- c) Staff Report on Ongoing Projects*
- d) Procurement Manual Amendment*
- e) Bid Award and Authorization of Additional Expenses – North Fork Rivanna River – Water Main Repair*

Mr. Foley moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed by a 7-0 vote.

8.0 Other Business

- a) Update and Potential Contract Award – Wholesale Metering Project*

Mr. Frederick reported that staff had received all but two of the required easements for this project, and that both meter locations where easements were incomplete was on property owned by the University of Virginia. With respect to the University, he described that RWSA had received some comments from the University, but were also being told that there were still some University departments that had not submitted comments, so RWSA did not have a complete list of comments to the drafts prepared by Mr. Krueger's office. Mr. Frederick stated that one important consideration when asking the Board to award a construction contract, which was also a best practice, was that the owner must commit the site for the work. He stated that obtaining easements was RWSA's responsibility, and he did not want to get into disputes with contractors because RWSA had not fulfilled this responsibility. Mr. Frederick noted that because the RWSA did not have power of eminent domain with respect to land owned by the Commonwealth, including the University, there was no assurance that the RWSA would get an easement from the University that was acceptable. He stated that the plan at this point was to remove these two sites from a scope of a construction contract award, but continue conversations with the University with the hope of reaching an agreement shortly that could allow these sites to reenter the contract. He offered to speak with Board members individually if they had any interest in pursuing contacts within the University that might help make that happen.

Mr. Frederick reported that the bid price was negotiated at \$2,228,254, and the low bidder – Linco – was deemed to be a responsive and responsible bidder. He stated that the RWSA had also negotiated a price of \$191,973 to remove the two meters located on University property, providing a balance of \$2,036,281. Mr. Frederick stated that the staff was suggesting that the Board award a contract to Linco at the reduced price, eliminating those two sites on the University Grounds. He noted that Linco had also allowed for the RWSA to include a provision in the notice of award

and contract that if RWSA acted on or before January 15, 2016 to put the two meters back in the project, the company would honor the same price as the deduct price. Mr. Frederick stated that he felt this was appropriate and fair, as there had to be a timeline on the decision because adding things back into a contract at a later time costs a contractor more money in terms of duplicative administrative processes.

Mr. Frederick added that one question he would ask if he were a Board member was if there were a backup plan if RWSA could not reach an agreement with the University. Mr. Frederick then stated that RWSA staff members Jennifer Whitaker and Victoria Fort had met and come up with a sound backup plan, and RWSA staff had also had discussions with City and ACSA staff.

Mr. O’Connell moved to award a contract for Wholesale Water Metering with Linco in the reduced amount of \$2,036,281, eliminating from the Work in the Bid the meters on University property, with a provision that two meter locations could be added back into the contract by change order in the amount of \$191,973 if executed by January 15, 2016. Mr. O’Connell then commented further that he felt the time was right to move it forward. Mr. Boyd seconded the motion.

Ms. Galvin asked Mr. Frederick if he could divulge the comments from the University.

Mr. Frederick responded that Mr. Krueger could outline some of the concerns regarding comments received thus far, with the caveat that there may still be more comments from the University.

Mr. Gaffney commented that this draft easement had to go through six or seven departments and offices at the University.

Mr. Krueger explained that the University had stated that if they wanted the pipe or meter box moved in the future for their convenience, the RWSA would have to move it at RWSA’s expense, except that the University would provide the new easement for the relocation. Mr. Krueger stated that this would require the Authority to assess what the likelihood of that request ever coming forth, the cost of moving a meter, and to establish or not establish a reserve by which to do that. He noted that one of the easements was very old and had that kind of provision in it for the pipe, while the other was newer and had a somewhat ambiguous provision for movement of the pipe, and the meter was to be attached to the pipe. Mr. Krueger stated that the RWSA had not yet received comments from two University departments, so they were not yet in a position to respond to comments as they did not want the response to be piecemeal.

Ms. Galvin stated that she agreed with Mr. O’Connell that RWSA could not wait, as it may be “endless”.

Mr. O’Connell asked Mr. Frederick if he was thinking there could be an alternative location where the meters designed to be placed on University property could be located.

Mr. Frederick responded that RWSA staff had identified a way, with some minor adjustments of the jurisdictional boundary, to maintain the integrity of the project should the meters have to be moved beyond University grounds. He stated that RWSA had until January 15 to obtain the

easements with no change in price from Linco to construct the meters, so he would like for the RWSA to continue with the discussions.

Ms. Galvin commented that it sounded like “bureaucratic issues” were delaying the easements.

Mr. Krueger stated that he had to get a waiver of the conflict of interest statement because his firm does the bond work for the University, and this situation had occurred before with the University agreeing to a waiver. He stated that the RWSA did not have the power of eminent domain over the University, so consent from the University was necessary.

Mr. Frederick commented that some of the issues the University raised had the potential to be significant.

Mr. O’Connell amended his motion to add in addition to the award to Linco, in the amount of \$2,036,281, to authorize the Executive Director to execute a work authorization with Michael Baker in the amount of \$223,127 for construction management services; to authorize the Executive Director to approve change orders necessary for the completion of this project, providing the total amount of all change orders does not exceed 10% of the initial contract price or initial total work authorization fee. Ms. Galvin seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Frederick requested that if RWSA reached agreement with the University that allowed the \$191,973 for two meters to be added by change order, that he be authorized to execute that change order in addition to the 10% contingency in the motion, otherwise that single change order would exhaust the authorized contingency and may require further Board action to complete the project.

Mr. O’Connell agreed to the change.

Mr. O’Connell further amended his motion to authorize the Executive Director, in addition to change orders within 10% of the initial contract price, to execute a specific change order for two meters on University property in the amount of \$191,973. Ms. Galvin seconded this further amended motion. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

b) Report - Update on Value Engineering

Ms. Whitaker reported that this item had been brought forth at Mr. Boyd’s request, and explained that value engineering involved having an outside third party with very specialized expertise look at various elements of a project design for cost reductions. She stated that the company would take a “clean slate” approach to brainstorm different ideas, some of which when further vetted were incorporated into the design and some of which were discarded. Ms. Whitaker said that RWSA’s development of this process initiated with the ITRT¹. She stated that from that process came several suggestions as to how RWSA might incorporate the approach in the future, adopting the policy that the worth of value engineering would be considered for any capital project over \$5 million. Ms. Whitaker said that the RWSA had pursued value engineering with three projects

¹ Editor’s Note: ITRT was an acronym used by the RWSA Engineering Department, which stands for “Independent Technical Review Team,” referring to a panel of three world renowned dam design experts who met multiple times in Charlottesville to review design progress by Gannett Fleming and Schnabel Engineering to optimize the Ragged Mountain Dam design balancing quality, performance, and price.

since the dam: the granular-activated carbon project, the wholesale metering project, and the odor control project. She stated that RWSA staff made the decision with the wholesale metering project not to pursue value engineering, in part because the project had a very specific location and scope, with staffs from the City, County and ACSA repeatedly looking at the project – and the conclusions was that value engineering for wholesale metering would not likely achieve cost savings sufficient to cover the cost of the process.

Ms. Whitaker noted that with both granular-activated carbon (GAC) and the odor control project, value engineering was held at a time during the design process when there were some fundamental questions about how to proceed. She stated that in both cases, staff found as they entered into value engineering that the project scopes were defined at a much higher cost than desired. Ms. Whitaker commented that the value engineering process really caused the entire team – including the designers and engineers in-house – to focus on how to bring the project into budget for the best value. She stated that what had come from the value engineering projects was that the projects have been kept within budget, while focusing on their value. Ms. Whitaker added that with the GAC and odor control projects, value engineering also allowed the projects to retain most of the original design intent, by identifying methods to reduce costs within the project goals. She commented that while it cannot be assumed that 30% of costs could be shaved off project costs each time they did value engineering, during the process of developing the project, value engineering did an excellent job of bringing costs in line and ensuring that available dollars were focused on the right things, as well as bringing a better design forward in the process.

Mr. O’Connell asked if she saw any upcoming projects that would use value engineering.

Ms. Fort responded that the Observatory Treatment Plant may be one example, with that project budget likely over \$5 million, and there was probably a point early in that design where value engineering could bring extra value.

c) Report – Sugar Hollow Reservoir Bathymetry

Mr. Frederick introduced RWSA Senior Civil Engineer Scott Schiller, stating that Mr. Schiller had managed the project to perform the Sugar Hollow bathymetric survey.

Mr. Schiller stated that the Sugar Hollow Reservoir had been at historic lows over the summer, which allowed RWSA to perform a bathymetric survey at lower cost and with better accuracy. He reported that typically a bathymetric survey was performed from a boat using sonar, but with so much of the reservoir being dry, RWSA was able to use two other more accurate techniques: a standard field survey and a long-range laser scanner. Mr. Schiller stated that all three techniques were used to develop the survey before the Board, and RWSA was were able to achieve great accuracy. He noted that also included in the Board packets was an updated stage-storage curve for the reservoir, which was used for regulatory purposes and by RWSA to identify how much water was in the reservoir at any given elevation. Mr. Schiller noted that staff had also included the 1947 design estimated stage-storage curve in the chart provided, which showed that the current curve was basically the same as the 1947 curve – albeit with a small reduction in volume. He explained that in 1947, it was estimated that the total usable storage was 376.5 million gallons, and in the 2015 survey useable storage was estimated to be 339.37 million gallons, a difference of

about 10%. Mr. Schiller reported that following the landslide of 1995, the RWSA had done some survey work that identified about 360 million gallons of total storage and 332 million gallons of usable storage. He noted that it did not appear that there was any significant deposition of sediment following the 1995 event, and there was an appearance there had been some storage capacity gained, although the greater accuracy of the 2015 method compared to the 1995 method may be affecting that appearance.

Mr. Schiller reported that because the reservoir was located near the entrance of the North Fork of the Moorman's River, there had been a question as to whether some of the sediment deposition was causing an obstruction of flow entering the reservoir itself. He stated that staff had pulled a quick profile off of the survey, which showed a slight increase in the elevation as the river entered the reservoir, but then the reservoir bottom sloped downward again. Mr. Schiller noted that there were also some field observations conducted when the reservoir was at a low level that indicated flow made its way through that material, with the material seeming to be rather porous, such as a gravely sand type of soil.

Mr. Frederick stated that this information was presented in response to Dr. Palmer's question, and he referenced a slide showing the bottom profile North Fork of the Moorman's River entering the reservoir – noting that when the reservoir water level dropped five feet or more below full, the river flow would filter through the small sediment deposit, appearing from the surface to disappear and then reappear below the sediment deposit. When the reservoir were full, the sediment deposit was completely under water. He stated that this explained why when Ms. Terry and a water plant operator were able to navigate by boat from the reservoir up the North Fork River without any problem. Mr. Frederick added that this was a relatively small pool of sediment that was likely comprised of porous material, because when the reservoir was dropped the water was running from the river through the sediment instead of water damming behind the sediment and then forming a small spillway.

Mr. O'Connell asked if there were any projections in 1947 about total storage, as 10% seemed to be a fairly small amount of loss, and whether there had just been one big storm causing the impact.

Mr. Schiller stated that it appeared that most of the storage loss may have been the single 1995 landslide event.

Mr. Frederick responded that staff making some inferences by conjecture as they did not have the depth of data over time to provide absolute answers, but staff was persuaded by the results of the recent survey that most of the loss of storage at Sugar Hollow had probably occurred at one time, likely the landslide occurred, and there was very little sedimentation on a regular basis – which was very good news and was very different from the South Fork reservoir.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the level were to drop again similar to where it was over the past summer whether there was any thought given to removing the sediment which had caused the storage loss with machinery rather than dredging.

Mr. Frederick responded that staff would guess that whatever was going to decay from what happened in 1995 by now had probably mostly decayed, and if the storage was accepted where it was, he did not see the need to spend any money on machinery or dredging.

Ms. Whitaker agreed with Mr. Frederick's assessment and stated that over the years staff had spoken with people about what it would take to remove the water-logged woody debris that had settled over time, adding that divers could actually stand on the brush piles in the water and bounce on it. She emphasized that it would be tremendously expensive to float that to the surface and mechanically convey it out, and if the volume and organics were acceptable as they were, the cost to remove the debris would be fairly prohibitive.

Mr. Frederick stated that the Board would be receiving a report from Kelly DiNatale next spring from their study of a reservoir management plan for all reservoirs, and Mr. DiNatale had looked extensively at Sugar Hollow and the data collected to date. Mr. Frederick stated that Mr. DiNatale had reported to him that Sugar Hollow behaved in some unusual ways for a reservoir located in a mountain forest with no development, with occasional algal blooms in the summer possibly due to the presence of organic matter in the bottom of the reservoir. Mr. Frederick noted that DiNatale would come up with some additional conclusions when they finished their report, as well as recommendations as to the right way to address that issue.

d) Preview of New Future Rivanna Authorities Website

Mr. Frederick reported that since beginning work with RWSA in June, Ms. Kent had spent a considerable amount of time on developing a new website, which would be launched within the next 30 days. He asked that Ms. Kent present a preview to the Board.

Ms. Kent stated that the first goal of the website was to bring it up to date, and the site should be accessible to the public, responsive, more reader-friendly, less technical and less text-heavy. She stated that RWSA staff also wanted it to be more personal, and the redesign offered a great opportunity to be clear, compelling and consistent with what RWSA was accomplishing. Ms. Kent noted that the benefits to the Board and the citizens included saving on some inbound calls and confusion as to what the agency was doing, which would increase efficiency. She added that the website was done on a WordPress platform, which meant that changes could be done in-house rather than being contracted. Ms. Kent stated that this was also a great opportunity to clarify how the three agencies dedicated to community water were similar and different, and provide opportunities to "cross-promote" what each agency was doing, helping the public understand on a deeper level their connection to water.

Ms. Kent presented the old site and the new site, projected onto a screen behind the Board table, and provided an overview of the website navigation. She stated that the site included sections entitled "Who We Are," including the Board of Directors and staff, "What We Do," "Where Does My Water Come From," "Recycling and Waste Disposal." Ms. Kent noted that the site afforded the use of one logo, so staff was working on some creative ideas to also highlight the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority logo. She stated that the site included "Community Projects," "Environmental Stewardship," information on operations, links to the City and the ACSA, a blog, a Board meeting portal, "In the News," and "Rivanna at a Glance." Ms. Kent noted that the Board

meeting information was included in a tab style with meeting agendas, minutes, etc. She referenced a page that focused on drinking water, featuring the Ragged Mountain Dam – including awards received and the project history. Ms. Kent noted that the website also featured the odor control project, sharing information about the project status and timeline, and how people can interact with RWSA during the project. She highlighted the website feature, “Meet Our Wastewater Operator,” which explained to citizens what operators do on a typical day. Ms. Kent also referenced a group picture of the Rivanna Authorities’ staff and a biography of Mr. Frederick, as well as the Board of Directors photo.

Board members complimented Ms. Kent on the new website.

9.0 Other Items from Board/Staff not on Agenda

Ms. Galvin stated that she wanted to bring up a request made at the previous night’s City Council meeting from one of the Councilors regarding wastewater metering data and how it compared to 2006 data, noting that she had sent Mr. Frederick an email about it.

Mr. Frederick responded that the RWSA had put meters in 40 sewer locations to capture wastewater flow over several weeks and months, and the cost allocation agreement negotiated required an update of wet weather and dry weather flows. He stated that the data had been collected and there had been enough rainstorms to allow engineers to interpret the data for wet weather flow, and they were currently working on the analysis to convert the raw data into meaningful 2015 present day wet and dry weather flows for all sewers across the system. Mr. Frederick stated that in order for the engineers to take the 2015 data and project it forward to future flows, they must have the population projections, which were still being coordinated with the City Neighborhood Development and County Community Development departments.

Mr. O’Connell asked if there was a projected completion date for the study.

Mr. Frederick responded that until there was a date when the City and County population projections were completed, it was hard to project a final date. He added that the goal should be to make the debt service charges for the next fiscal year based on the new data rather than the old, so that information would be needed by May.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the data would give the City and County an idea as to which pipes may have more infiltration than others.

Mr. Frederick responded that it would give an important clue because it would have both population data and flows, so if there was a pipe that had twice the flow per capita it was an indication that it was a leakier pipe.

Mr. Foley asked Mr. Frederick to send him an email requesting whatever information was needed from the County.

Mr. Frederick stated that Mr. Schiller would follow up on that, and noted that he did not mean to imply that the RWSA was not getting the cooperation needed, they just wanted to move it forward.

Ms. Whitaker stated that RWSA had received great cooperation to date, but it was an iterative process and they were in the “final throes” at this point.

Mr. Frederick commented that with 40 metering locations, they were asking City and County staffs to divide their populations into those locations. He emphasized that it was not as simple as using Weldon Cooper population data – there was much more work to it.

Mr. O’Connell asked if this could be included in the RWSA Board’s December or January packet, with a one-page explanation containing more detail about the process and when it might be finished.

Mr. Frederick stated that it had been included in the Ongoing Status report.

Mr. O’Connell responded that it was pretty general, and targeting it to the budget might be helpful.

Mr. Frederick agreed to have staff provide more detail on it for the Board.

Mr. Foley asked if it might be possible for the RWSA Board to get an update on the RWSA strategic planning process, with a lot of conversation regarding communications in their previous discussions of the strategic plan. Mr. Foley stated that he had a City Council member had asked him about the status of the strategic plan because it came up at a joint City/County meeting, and his response to him about efficiency studies at the Authority had been that the strategic planning process would be a good way to start looking at that. Mr. Foley reiterated that it might be helpful for the Board to get a sense of that process going forward.

Mr. Frederick stated that the RWSA had been trying to keep the cost of the North Fork waterline repair to a minimum, and it was an expensive repair project because a stream had eroded and exposed the pipe – and if the pipe broke the airport area would be without water. Mr. Frederick stated that one cost-savings measure had been to provide an inspector already on the RWSA staff to inspect the work as it was progressing, but the same inspector was watching the Rio Road transmission line relocation. He stated that Ms. Whitaker had recently learned that the VDOT Rio Road project was behind schedule, meaning the inspector would not be available to be assigned to North Fork for another six weeks, and he believed it was in his existing purchasing authority to spend an estimated \$25,000 on a contract inspector, and the North Fork project could not prudently be delayed until the water line portion of the Rio Road project was finished. Mr. Frederick stated that unless the Board had an objection, he would proceed.

Mr. O’Connell asked if the North Fork repair work had already begun.

Mr. March responded that it had been underway for about a week.

10.0 Closed Meeting

Mr. Foley moved, seconded by Mr. O’Connell, to adopt the following resolution:

RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority enter into a closed meeting to discuss potential litigation involving a construction projected as permitted by Section 2.2-3711.A7 of the Code of Virginia. The motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

The RWSA Board went into closed session at 3:18 p. m.

Resumption of Open Meeting

The Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Board of Directors meeting was resumed in open session at 3:37 p.m. Mr. Boyd entered the following resolution, seconded by Ms. Mueller:

WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water and 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 and Sewer Authority that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rivanna Water and 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 and, (ii) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting by the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority.

Mr. Krueger called for a roll call vote: Ms. Mueller – aye; Mr. Jones – aye; Ms. Galvin – aye; Mr. Gaffney – aye; Mr. Foley – aye; Mr. Boyd – aye; and Mr. O'Connell – aye. The motion passed by a 7-0 vote.

11.0 Adjournment

Mr. Jones moved to adjourn the RWSA Board meeting. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 7-0.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.