



**RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY**  
695 Moores Creek Lane • Charlottesville, Virginia 22902 • (434) 977-2970

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**September 25, 2018**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, September 25, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

**Board Members Present:** Mike Gaffney – presiding, Paul Oberdorfer, Liz Palmer, and Kathy Galvin.

**Board Members Absent:** Trevor Henry, Mike Murphy, and Jeff Richardson.

**Staff Present:** Bill Mawyer, Katie McIlwee, Mark Brownlee, David Rhoades, Phil McKalips, Lonnie Wood, Andrea Terry, Scott Schiller, Tim Castillo, Bill Morris, and Michelle Simpson.

**Also Present:** Mr. Kurt Krueger – RSWA Counsel, members of the public, and media representatives.

***1. CALL TO ORDER***

Mr. Gaffney called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

***2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING***

***a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of August 28, 2018***

There were no changes to the minutes.

**Dr. Palmer moved to approve the minutes of the RSWA September 28, 2018 meeting as presented. Mr. Henry seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-3. Mr. Henry, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Richardson were absent from the meeting and the vote.**

***3. RECOGNITION***

There were no recognitions presented.

42 **4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

43

44 Mr. Mawyer reported that this was Mark Brownlee's last week at Rivanna, and the Board had  
45 celebrated his retirement the previous month.

46

47 Mr. Mawyer stated that Rivanna had recently started its information technology master plan,  
48 which is a spinoff from their strategic planning efforts. He stated they had hired a consultant to  
49 help provide a vision for technology and how various systems would be integrated, in an effort to  
50 leverage technology as much as possible.

51

52 He reported that the Household Hazardous Waste and Bulky Waste Amnesty Days would  
53 commence on September 27.

54

55 Mr. Mawyer stated that Rivanna had begun receiving refuse at the new Ivy Transfer Station  
56 earlier that day, and he presented several photos of the operation.

57

58 Dr. Palmer stated that she noticed a lot of water on the floor and realized it had been wet, but she  
59 wondered about the drainage situation.

60

61 Mr. McKalips responded that they found there was one roof drain that needed to be turned 90  
62 degrees, as it currently spilled out onto concrete and redirected back into the building.

63

64 Mr. Mawyer noted that they have internal drains that collect any water on the floor.

65

66 Mr. McKalips pointed out that the water inside the building was properly managed.

67

68 Dr. Palmer stated that she understood that but was looking at the floor and the wet trash.

69

70 Mr. McKalips stated that the necessary repairs would only cost about \$10.

71

72 **5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

73

74 Mr. Gaffney invited items from the public.

75

76 There being none offered, the agenda item was closed.

77

78 **6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

79

80 There were no responses to public comments for this month.

81

82 **7. CONSENT AGENDA**

83

*a. Staff Report on Finance*

84

*b. Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization*

85

*c. Staff Report on Ivy Landfill Environmental*

86  
87

88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133

*d. Staff Report on Ongoing Projects*

**Dr. Palmer moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Oberdorfer seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-3. Mr. Henry, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Richardson were absent from the meeting and the vote.**

**8. OTHER BUSINESS**

*a. Solid Waste Fees Alternatives Presentation*

Mr. McKalips reported that staff had undertaken an analysis of the current fee structure and rates charged at the Ivy MUC, with the opening of the new transfer station being the catalyst for the process. He added that one of the strategic plan goals was to improve solid waste services, which was planned to be achieved through increased participation, tonnages, and customer satisfaction.

Mr. McKalips stated that opening the station may in itself cause positive changes, and the facility would allow large commercial haulers, which could dump right on the tipping floor – allowing Rivanna to process that waste more conveniently. He noted that hopefully that would increase tonnage. He noted that because of the layout of the building, the side entrance, and the way it was set up for traffic to flow, it was hoped that it would ultimately decrease wait times.

Mr. McKalips stated that they would also consider simplifying the fee schedule, and currently at Ivy they charged a tipping fee based on weights. He stated that mostly through this discussion, they would be talking about the municipal solid waste rates because they address the largest amount of material hauled and had the greatest impact on finances, amount of tonnages, and the overall operations.

Mr. McKalips reported that Rivanna had a service fee charged for inbound customers, so every county resident paid a \$1 transaction fee when coming onto the site. He stated that non-county residents, which were mostly city residents, paid a \$10 service fee – generating approximately \$82,000 per year – this difference created some negative impressions among the public. Mr. McKalips explained that customers questioned why it was different depending on where they were from, and even led people to try to get around paying different fees by misrepresenting the wastes' origin.

Ms. Galvin asked what the competitive rates were.

Mr. McKalips responded that there really was not a competitive rate for service fees, adding that they were started in 2011.

Dr. Palmer pointed out that Van der Linde charged \$8 if a customer went in and did just a minimum amount.

Mr. McKalips explained that county residents were charged \$1 for all transactions, with \$10 charged for all non-county inbound transactions. He stated that this caused consternation among

134 customers because Ivy dealt with a lot of very small loads – people with a few hundred pounds  
135 of trash or vegetative waste in the back of their pickup truck. He noted that the minimum charge  
136 was \$6, so anything 200 pounds or less received a \$6 weight ticket; when adding the service fee,  
137 that amount was \$7 for county residents. Mr. McKalips stated that city residents paid an addition  
138 \$10, which showed up on their ticket, and this caused some conflict with those paying more.

139  
140 Mr. Gaffney asked if there was an explanation given as to why that fee was different.

141  
142 Mr. McKalips responded that it mostly consisted of a statement as to the fact the RSWA Board  
143 had established the structure in 2011, but staff did not really go into that explanation. He  
144 emphasized that the differential was largely to the city pulling out of the transfer station activity.

145  
146 Mr. Gaffney noted that this was because the county accepted all the additional expenses and the  
147 city did not pay any, and he felt that \$9 was pretty reasonable in light of that.

148  
149 Mr. McKalips stated that the other aspect staff wanted to consider was the municipal solid waste  
150 tipping fees, with an evaluation of what a change to market-based fees would cause. He  
151 explained that Rivanna was currently charging \$66 a ton, and the average for surrounding  
152 counties was \$55 a ton. Mr. McKalips stated that in inquiring among some private transfer  
153 stations, they were in the low \$50 range but they made deals with different haulers, so that  
154 number was harder to establish.

155  
156 Dr. Palmer stated she called Greene County to find out the smaller haulers that drove there to  
157 unload, and their cost was \$50.

158  
159 Mr. McKalips reported that Rivanna received 8,200 tons of MSW the previous year, and  
160 decreasing from \$66 to \$55 would result in a \$90K decrease in revenue – so he evaluated how  
161 much tonnage they would have to stimulate to offset that deficit.

162  
163 Ms. Galvin asked if there were bonds floated to build this facility and if the budget was  
164 illustrating there was no profit – so the \$90K was cutting into the ability to pay the operations.

165  
166 Dr. Palmer responded that the county was subsidizing the operation and never expected it to pay  
167 for itself, adding that this was for the community and was an expense.

168  
169 Mr. McKalips stated that they were trying to be conscious of not increasing the deficit. He stated  
170 that the question was whether decreasing to a market-based rate would stimulate enough  
171 additional tonnage to offset the deficit. He stated they reached out to some of the large haulers in  
172 the area, who had originally shown interest in April but were reluctant in their responses when he  
173 contacted them again in August. Mr. McKalips stated that they would not commit to bring in  
174 significant additional tonnage.

175  
176 Mr. Gaffney asked if Rivanna was aware whether their contracts called for them to haul all of  
177 their waste to the facility they were contracting with.

178

179 Mr. McKalips replied that most of them do not have contracts, just agreements on a specific rate.  
180 He stated the only one he knew of that had a contract was Waste Management, which was  
181 hauling its material to Republic in Zions Crossroads in a unique deal wherein they brought it to  
182 Republic, which loaded it into Waste Management trucks and those drivers taking it to a Waste  
183 Management landfill. He presented a table with average area costs, stating that \$66 was the  
184 current tipping fee and he provided some other potential tipping fees and what it would take in  
185 tonnage to offset that. Mr. McKalips stated that the threshold was 5,500 tons and stated that four  
186 tons a day was about 1,000 tons per year. He stated that 2,100 tons would be another eight tons a  
187 day, which would be about one reasonably large commercial hauler – with the current average  
188 being about 40 tons per day.

189  
190 Mr. Gaffney noted that this would require about a 20% increase.

191  
192 Mr. McKalips responded that this was why they were targeting large haulers, and a few  
193 commercial haulers would drive those numbers up.

194  
195 Ms. Galvin commented that the commercial haulers were the ones drawn to the municipalities  
196 with the lower tipping fees.

197  
198 Mr. McKalips stated they were largely going to the larger ones at Zions Crossroads.

199  
200 Ms. Palmer explained that they could have a special deal and a lot of the smaller and mid-sized  
201 haulers had been put out of business due to competition from the big ones.

202  
203 Mr. McKalips added that because they were hauling bigger trucks, the distance from here to  
204 Zions was not as big a penalty.

205  
206 Ms. Galvin mentioned that gasoline had not gone up yet.

207  
208 Dr. Palmer stated that labor costs were also a factor, adding that Rivanna did not necessarily  
209 have to match the lowest tipping fees, as some of the smaller haulers would stimulate some  
210 people to go into the business. She stated they would just need to find that reasonable nexus of  
211 where they were saving more on labor, time, gas, and wear and tear on their trucks. Dr. Palmer  
212 added that she had spoken to a hauler in Greene County that did everything north of I-64 and  
213 west of Route 29, and he told her the main reason he did not go to Ivy was the fact it took too  
214 long – and the tipping fee was a secondary factor.

215  
216 Ms. Galvin asked who would be in a city business or organization that would be the equivalent to  
217 a commercial hauler that could use Ivy and was currently using another vendor.

218  
219 Mr. McKalips stated that he had spoken with Boyd McCauley at Time Disposal, and his  
220 complexity was how to get single-stream recycling done, which was currently not offered  
221 through the transfer station – but could be if they could find someplace to take it. He stated that  
222 Rivanna's hauler was having difficulty finding anyone to take that recycling at a reasonable  
223 price, which was related to the recycling market.

225 Ms. Palmer asked if they were checking to see if there were places that would take it without the  
226 glass, if they took some of the things that normally got crushed.

227  
228 Mr. McKalips responded that they had not gotten down to that level of discussion, but he felt it  
229 was something they could consider doing as it would add value to the stream so they would not  
230 have as much to sort through.

231  
232 Ms. Galvin asked about facilities like Habitat for Humanity and where they went.

233  
234 Mr. Oberdorfer responded that it was typically Van der Linde.

235  
236 Dr. Palmer stated that her understanding was that the housing authority went to Ivy after they  
237 cleaned up.

238  
239 Mr. Oberdorfer replied that he did not know.

240  
241 Mr. Gaffney stated that if they were looking at lowering fees and taking risks, whether they  
242 would get enough trash to at least break even on those, who would be at risk.

243  
244 Dr. Palmer explained that it was the county because it was their money, and the question for her  
245 was the service fee and the tipping fee – the latter of which was just a county issue. She stated  
246 that if in the future they got the city to direct its trash to Ivy, the tipping fee became important to  
247 them also. Dr. Palmer stated that her concern was also what length of time it would take if they  
248 were going to do a trial in which they lowered the tipping fee down to \$55.

249  
250 Mr. McKalips responded that it would require at least a few years, as it would require people to  
251 buy a truck and go into the trash business.

252  
253 Mr. Oberdorfer explained that the city had advertised an RFP for transfer station services  
254 because of the issue with Van der Linde, and that RFP was open until October 11 – with five  
255 years and an additional 15 one-year term extensions. He stated they have a hauling contract and  
256 transfer station contract, with Van der Linde covering the latter and defaulting on that because of  
257 the change of ownership. He noted that County Waste picked up the hauling.

258  
259 Dr. Palmer stated that County Waste and Waste Management were about the only two industries,  
260 adding that they also had recycling at the same time – and there were only so many who could  
261 compete.

262  
263 Mr. Oberdorfer pointed out that typically they strike agreements behind closed doors with  
264 transfer station owners to get the rate where they needed to be for their cashflow model.

265  
266 Dr. Palmer stated that there were likely only two haulers bidding on these contracts.

267  
268 Mr. Oberdorfer clarified that County Waste would still be the hauler for the next year until they  
269 had a new hauling contract, but the transfer station services were out to bid.

270

271 Ms. Galvin asked why the RSWA with the Ivy MUC couldn't just go into bid.  
272  
273 Mr. Gaffney responded that they would have to find out how much waste it was, because they  
274 had a limit as to how much they could take at Ivy.  
275  
276 Mr. McKalips stated that it was within their limits at 6,500.  
277  
278 Mr. Gaffney asked if the old rate could be shared.  
279  
280 Mr. Oberdorfer responded that they were paying \$39 at Van der Linde with the recycling, and  
281 once that was taken off the table, the rate went to \$49.  
282  
283 Mr. Krueger asked if that was just for transfer station services and not disposal, as their rate  
284 reflected both.  
285  
286 Mr. Oberdorfer stated that he would have to go back and see exactly what the parameters were,  
287 stating that they did not own the transfer station at the time the contract with Van der Linde was  
288 executed.  
289  
290 Dr. Palmer stated that they could underbid it at \$49, but they would have to publicly come out  
291 with a tipping and rate schedule – and they would just have to go \$1 below. She emphasized that  
292 this was problematic, although she liked the idea.  
293  
294 Ms. Galvin stated that local government received competitive bids on that.  
295  
296 Dr. Palmer clarified that they could also stipulate in their contract that the trash had to go  
297 somewhere.  
298  
299 Mr. Oberdorfer stated that was the case if it was both hauling and transfer services, and they  
300 were looking at that as a feature of a new hauling contract. He stated that he would prefer to not  
301 to manage two contracts, adding that the process would entail public input and a consultant to  
302 engage with residents as to what they wanted to see – calling it a “waste diversion contract”  
303 instead of a “refuse contract.” Mr. Oberdorfer stated the RFP would be out for transfer for five  
304 years, with a year or two into the hauling portion.  
305  
306 Dr. Palmer stated that if the city decided they wanted to participate in a community transfer  
307 station, they could put out another RFP in a year, combining the two and specifying a location.  
308  
309 Mr. Oberdorfer stated he was not completely clear on the procurement side of it, but he felt it  
310 could be navigated.  
311  
312 Ms. Galvin suggested that they could talk about it with Mike Murphy, and she wasn't sure what  
313 City Council action would be required, if any.  
314  
315 Mr. Oberdorfer responded that if they could get a single hauling/transfer program for the County,  
316 City, and UVA, it would provide a strong public benefit.

317  
318 Dr. Palmer stated that it was very helpful to get everyone on board for the public education  
319 aspects.  
320  
321 Ms. Galvin stated that she would like to reduce the service charge for city residents but wasn't  
322 sure if that was premature in light of the contract issues.  
323  
324 Mr. Oberdorfer responded that he thought it was independent and they would need to specify  
325 logistics.  
326  
327 Mr. McKalips stated that there was a "wait and see" option wherein they could evaluate how the  
328 new transfer station facility did and where contracting went in the next year, as well as the public  
329 sense of how it was going.  
330  
331 Mr. Gaffney stated that if the City were to approve \$48K per year and everyone paid \$1, it would  
332 break even.  
333  
334 Ms. Galvin stated that instead of the user bearing the brunt of that fee, the City would absorb the  
335 cost and essentially subsidize the use. She stated it was appealing to her but she would need to  
336 have that discussion with the City Manager and City Council, noting the favorable outcome of  
337 reducing dumping.  
338  
339 Dr. Palmer stated that she was in favor of getting rid of the service fee, but she also had to get it  
340 through the Board of Supervisors. She added that she did not like the fact that it put them in the  
341 situation of doing surveys every year to see who was doing what and the level of use, and it  
342 would be nice to find some other way to contribute that did not lock them into that argument.  
343  
344 Ms. Galvin noted that this was the advantage of having all three entities working together in one  
345 system of solid waste management.  
346  
347 Mr. Oberdorfer asked when they were meeting on that.  
348  
349 Ms. Galvin confirmed that it was in early October, adding that it could be raised then.  
350  
351 Dr. Palmer stated that the agenda may be too full to add anything else, but they could certainly  
352 bring it up as a quick discussion.  
353  
354 Mr. McKalips stated that the program agreement stated that a rate change would have to come at  
355 the request of the Board of Supervisors, so the RSWA could ask for that.  
356  
357 Dr. Palmer stated that for the present time, she would ask the Board if they would consider a  
358 tipping fee reduction if Rivanna could figure out some short-term plan as they were working to  
359 get everyone together – and it was hard to bring that forward without some kind of contribution  
360 from the City.  
361  
362 Ms. Galvin noted that this would be a budget transfer to go directly to the RSWA.



363  
364 Mr. Mawyer stated that was the same process for the County.  
365  
366 Ms. Galvin emphasized that she would prefer to talk about it in the context of a larger strategic  
367 discussion regarding how they manage solid waste.  
368  
369 Mr. Oberdorfer stated it may be possible to cover it in the short term.  
370  
371 Dr. Palmer stated that they may end up having less waste like mattresses.  
372  
373 Ms. Galvin stated it may shift the cost burden away from City Public Works.  
374  
375 Mr. Oberdorfer added that they could look at their bulk item pickup program for fees, to move  
376 some of the business over and create a better partnership, even though the numbers were small.  
377  
378 Dr. Palmer stated that there was information about things needing to be corrected with the new  
379 transfer station – one being the drain – and she wasn't sure about other issues.  
380  
381 Mr. McKalips responding that the water collection system was leaching from inside the building,  
382 the plumbing needed to get rerouted, and they were working on getting that done. He stated that  
383 the original alignment for routing it turned out to not be working the way they wanted, so they  
384 were rerouting it along a different alignment.  
385  
386 Mr. Mawyer clarified that it was the pipe going from the building to the leachate pond that  
387 needed to be replaced. He also mentioned that DEQ had noted some cracks but Rivanna had  
388 sealed them.  
389  
390 Dr. Palmer commented that she would like to do the contest she had mentioned about naming the  
391 transfer station. She also stated they had discussed at the county's Solid Waste Alternatives  
392 Advisory Committee what the cost would be to do the composting and Ivy, and she would like to  
393 get a price on that so they could get it into the budget.  
394  
395 Mr. McKalips responded that the master plan consultant, Arcadis, had to have all the design and  
396 cost to Rivanna by the next meeting.  
397  
398 Mr. Galvin asked if UVA was involved.  
399  
400 Dr. Palmer responded that UVA Sustainability Director Jesse Warren was active in SWAAC and  
401 was involved in all these conversations.  
402  
403 Mr. Mawyer noted that the compostable food waste program started with UVA, and it was taken  
404 in at Ivy currently – then went to Black Bear's composting facility.  
405  
406 Dr. Palmer stated that from 2014 on, UVA had been present at all SWAAC discussions.  
407

408 Mr. Mawyer stated that if they can get it done through the master plan, the consultant could  
409 estimate the compost cost.

410

411 Dr. Palmer stated she would also like to see a cost comparison between hiring Rivanna  
412 employees and contracting it out.

413

414 Mr. McKalips stated that they would just have to see what the need was.

415

416 **9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA**

417

418 There were none presented.

419

420 **10. CLOSED MEETING**

421

422 There was no closed meeting held.

423

424 **11. ADJOURNMENT**

425

426 **At 2:45 p.m., Ms. Palmer moved to adjourn the RSWA Board meeting. Mr. Oberdorfer**  
427 **seconded the motion, which passed 4-0-3. Mr. Henry, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Richardson**  
428 **were absent from the meeting and the vote.**

429

430 **The RSWA Board adjourned its meeting at 2:45 p.m.**

431

432

433 Respectfully submitted,

434

435

436

437

438

439

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Mike Murphy  
Secretary - Treasurer