



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

**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**February 27, 2018**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, February 27, 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:** Mr. Mike Gaffney – presiding, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Trevor Henry, Mr. Maurice Jones, Mr. Paul Oberdorfer, Dr. Liz Palmer and Mr. Jeff Richardson.

**Staff Present:** Mr. Tim Castillo, Ms. Victoria Fort, Mr. Rich Gullick, Mr. Bill Mawyer, Ms. Katie McIlwee, Mr. Philip McKalips, Ms. Betsy Nemeth, Mr. David Rhodes, Mr. Scott Schiller, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Ms. Andrea Terry, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, and Mr. Lonnie.

**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 2:00 p.m.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

*a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 14, 2017*

There were no changes to the minutes.

**Dr. Palmer moved to approve the minutes of the RSWA November 14, 2017 meeting as presented. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

**3. RECOGNITION**

There were no recognitions on the agenda.

**4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Mawyer wished members of the Board a Happy New Year.

41 Mr. Mawyer expressed upcoming exciting times for Solid Waste and stated that at the next  
42 meeting, he was hopeful to have a screen monitor in front of the Board at the podium so that  
43 members can avoid having to turn around or move to view presentations. He noted that the Ivy  
44 Transfer Station was under construction, and Michelle Simpson and the Rivanna inspector were  
45 doing a great job.

46  
47 Ms. Simpson confirmed that things were coming along well and directed the Board to look at  
48 pictures of the ladder and the walls going up. She also indicated the area that would get filled in  
49 with stone up to the top of where the walls would be and that the eight-inch thick concrete  
50 floor would be poured next, with the rest of the walls and building to be constructed on top of  
51 that.

52  
53 Mr. Mawyer stated that by fall or winter they expected to be “open for business.”

54  
55 Mr. Mawyer reported that the Compostable Food Waste Program has taken a step forward and  
56 recalled that when the program was started last year, there was a solid waste transporting firm –  
57 Thompson Trucking – that was hauling the compostable food waste from Ivy 130 miles to  
58 Waverly, VA, where they would then go to the McGill Compost facility, where Rivanna also  
59 sent its wastewater biosolids, with those products mixed together to make compost.

60  
61 Mr. Mawyer added that UVA was being charged about \$250 per ton in order to process that  
62 program, so RSWA put out a request for bids and Black Bear Composting (BBC) was the low  
63 bidder. He noted that BBC formerly had a compost facility in Crimora, VA, near Waynesboro,  
64 and was now opening that facility back up again. He stated BBC was the current provider for  
65 UVA, and would now be RSWA’s regional provider for compostable food materials  
66 transportation.

67  
68 Mr. Mawyer then directed the Board to view a picture that showed a 30-cubic-yard heavy green  
69 container that was formerly used, but stated that Black Bear now uses a yellow 55-gallon “toter”  
70 and stated that is what would be used to bring food waste from UVA to Ivy to be weighed at the  
71 scales. He noted that there would also be additional Black Bear composting containers at Ivy so  
72 residents could bring compost and dispose of it for free and businesses could bring it for a  
73 charge. Mr. Mawyer stated that the program would be piloted since they accept compostable  
74 food waste at the McIntire facility for free from residents but businesses were not allowed to go  
75 there, so the program would be similar to the McIntire model. Mr. Mawyer stated that Black  
76 Bear would then take the products to its site in Crimora and through the bidding process the costs  
77 has been reduced from about \$250 per ton to \$178 per ton. He stated that objectives were to get  
78 market-based pricing as low as possible, and Rivanna was working with city and county schools  
79 to see if they want to start bringing their product and grow the regional program. He commented  
80 that he has been pleased at the progress being made so far with the program.

81  
82 Dr. Palmer asked Mr. Mawyer how much UVA was paying when waste was transported across  
83 the scales.

84  
85 Mr. Mawyer responded that it was \$178 per ton. He explained that RSWA paid Black Bear the  
86 bid price, which was \$154 per ton so there was a \$24 per ton, or 15% mark up, for the overhead

87 and expenses for managing the equipment, the scale house, and doing the billing – which was an  
88 improvement from the original price to UVA with a 25% mark up. Mr. Mawyer stated that the  
89 smaller totes and smaller equipment would provide more efficient operations and could reduce  
90 the cost to RWSA, which would enable everyone to get that benefit.  
91

92 Mr. Mawyer confirmed for Dr. Palmer that Black Bear’s charge to RSWA was \$154 per ton and  
93 UVA’s cost was \$178 per ton, as well as anyone else that would use the program other than  
94 residents.  
95

96 Mr. Mawyer reported that Rivanna has had requests to start an Electronic Waste Program, also  
97 called “E-Waste,” and the Albemarle County Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) has  
98 talked about it, and he received a call as well from the Virginia Organizing Project’s  
99 Charlottesville chapter. He stated that this program was explored and it did not appear that the  
100 McIntire Recycling Center had adequate space to support an E-Waste program, which would  
101 involve people bringing computers, printers, televisions, and electronic equipment – and those  
102 items would take more space than is available at McIntire. Mr. Mawyer stated they looked at  
103 providing the program at Ivy and stated that it would be a feasible location, with two choices  
104 there. The first choice would be to buy trailers and use RSWA’s tractor and haul the products to  
105 a vendor in Richmond, and he estimated the costs to be \$100K for the first year to get the  
106 program started to purchase the trailer and pay for the products, as well as paying the vendor. He  
107 added that the costs would be \$100K for the first year, and \$60K per year thereafter as all the  
108 equipment would have already been purchased. Mr. Mawyer stated that a preferable option was  
109 to sponsor E-Waste Days at IMUC, similar to the current Household Hazardous Waste Days, and  
110 Care Environmental, which does the Hazardous Waste Days collection, could also do the E-  
111 Waste collection. Mr. Mawyer indicated that it would cost about \$12K per day for Care  
112 Environmental to bring the trailers and their equipment to take the electronics and dispose of  
113 them.  
114

115 Dr. Palmer asked for clarification that the electronics would go to a company that recycled those  
116 products.  
117

118 Mr. Mawyer stated that it was his understanding that was correct in that they would go to an  
119 electronics recycler.  
120

121 Mr. Gaffney asked if that also included businesses up to a certain size and not just individuals.  
122

123 Mr. Mawyer confirmed that this was correct.  
124

125 Mr. McKalips added that it could take from either individuals or businesses.  
126

127 Mr. Mawyer stated they were not looking for a large entity like Best Buy to bring a thousand  
128 used computers, as that would cost a fortune. Mr. Mawyer stated that the \$12K amount was for  
129 two trailers and when they were full that would be the limit.  
130

131 Ms. Galvin inquired as to how many days were being expected for the program.  
132

133 Mr. Mawyer answered approximately two to four days a year, which was similar to the  
134 Household Hazardous Waste program.

135  
136 Dr. Palmer asked how RSWA would handle that since companies like Best Buy were required by  
137 the state to take electronic equipment, and asked if there were other local companies that were  
138 required to follow the same procedures, and wondered if problems would be encountered by  
139 RSWA.

140  
141 Mr. McKalips responded that because of the volume, he would envision that the initial e-waste  
142 days would be open to residents and not businesses – just from the standpoint that the school  
143 district could possibly show up and have a warehouse full of products that would consume our  
144 capacity, which would then prevent residents from using the service. He added that an  
145 appointment system could be set up for businesses, as was done for the HHW program, and  
146 businesses could register ahead of time so that space could be earmarked.

147  
148 Mr. Mawyer added that RSWA would probably want to charge businesses, and there was general  
149 agreement among the Board to follow that recommendation.

150  
151 Mr. Mawyer reported that the HHW program was funded by the Board at approximately \$100K  
152 to \$110K per year, and stated that the county paid 64.5% of that cost and the city paid 35.5%. He  
153 added that UVA contributes \$80K toward the environmental program of the entire landfill –  
154 groundwater management and air management. Mr. Mawyer stated that this was where RSWA  
155 was funding the HHW management program, also through the environmental budget, and he  
156 clarified that UVA paid about \$80K per year, the county paid 64.5% and the city paid 35.5% of  
157 that program.

158  
159 Mr. Gaffney stated that UVA's contract was 7%, so the remainder of that was split 60/33. He  
160 asked for confirmation from Mr. Wood, who answered in the affirmative.

161  
162 Mr. Mawyer stated that was how the program would be funded and asked if the Board would like  
163 to take action now or if the Board would prefer further study. Mr. Mawyer stated he was  
164 providing it as feedback as heard from SWAC and the one business in Charlottesville if RSWA  
165 could become a regional electronic waste disposal location.

166  
167 Mr. Gaffney asked if RSWA did it in the current year, whether they would tie it to add another  
168 day on to the Spring HHW Program or whether it would be done at a totally different time  
169 period.

170  
171 Mr. Mawyer responded that they were thinking of a different day so that the traffic would not be  
172 involved with the other traffic, as the other HHW events were pretty well modulated to avoid a  
173 huge traffic jam. Mr. Mawyer stated that was done in part by making paint disposal available  
174 every day, and added that staff had done a good job on that item. Mr. Mawyer stated that  
175 program didn't have traffic problems, so there would be a concern if they added E-Waste at the  
176 same time as it could increase traffic. He suggested trying a different day or different weekend,  
177 and stated that it could be targeted primarily for residential use on a following Saturday.

178

179 Ms. Galvin noted that they could keep it within the timeframe for the spring cleaning period.  
180  
181 Dr. Palmer noted that the E-Waste days would be a good way to start and was hopeful that in the  
182 future it could be done in a similar fashion as the paint days, but it seemed reasonable to start  
183 with E-Waste days. She pointed out that SWAC was very interested in this issue, as was the  
184 Board, and it seemed like the \$12K split between the two was a small amount of money for a  
185 good benefit. Dr. Palmer stated she was very much interested in this item.  
186  
187 Ms. Galvin added that these items are exceptionally hazardous wastes.  
188  
189 **Dr. Palmer moved to accept the recommendation for sponsoring E-Waste Days at IMUC**  
190 **with a vendor and daily costs of approximately \$12K.**  
191  
192 Mr. Mawyer asked if that would be for one day at the Spring event and one day at the Fall event.  
193  
194 The Board answered in the affirmative.  
195  
196 **Ms. Galvin seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously (7-0).**  
197  
198 Mr. Mawyer thanked Mr. Phil McKalips for doing all the research on the item.  
199  
200 Mr. Mawyer discussed HHW Days and Amnesty Days to take place on April 26 for commercial  
201 hazardous waste, with the residential day being on April 27 and 28, and bulky waste Amnesty  
202 Day on May 5, 12, and 19. He stated those three days would be on Saturdays.  
203  
204 Mr. Mawyer indicated a very positive outpouring of community outreach, first from the UVA  
205 Theta Chapter of Alpha Phi Omega – the same group that in the Fall worked at McIntire, and  
206 then came again and cleaned up at McIntire and walked the Dick Woods Road area and cleaned  
207 up trash from the side of the road. Mr. Mawyer expressed thanks and appreciation for them being  
208 such a nice group to help Rivanna out.  
209  
210 Mr. Mawyer discussed contacts with the Community Power Group about leasing 10 acres to  
211 them to build solar cells, and stated they were going to use that project for a proposed project  
212 with Dominion Energy. Mr. Mawyer stated the project was not accepted in the RFP process  
213 Dominion used, and he stated he was not aware of the reasons why it was not accepted. Mr.  
214 Mawyer stated that Community Power Group was still going to try and find a way with  
215 Dominion or someone else to have a project, but for the time being it was not going to be  
216 pursued.  
217  
218 Mr. Mawyer stated that Rivanna would have the Solid Waste CIP and operating budgets for  
219 review in April. He stated they would also have the first year of the strategic work plan to tell the  
220 Board about projects that are being placed in the strategic plan and hopefully get the Board's  
221 concurrence with those projects on the assumption that the Board approved the strategic plan.  
222  
223 Mr. Mawyer stated they would advertise the operating budget for solid waste with the intention  
224 to adopt the solid waste budgets in May.

225 Mr. Gaffney asked for any additional comments or questions for Mr. Mawyer. There were none.

226

227 **5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

228

229 There were no items from the public.

230

231 **6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

232

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

234

235 **7. CONSENT AGENDA**

236 *a. Staff Report on Finance*

237

238 *b. Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update*

239

240 *c. Staff Report on Ivy Landfill Environmental Status*

241

242 *d. Staff Report on Ongoing Projects*

243

244 *e. Recommendation for Approval of the Strategic Plan 2018*

245

246 *f. Recommendation for Approval of Purchasing Manual Update*

247

248 *g. Recommendation for Engineering Services – Recycling Master Plan for the IMUC*  
249 *and County Convenience Facilities - Arcadis U.S., Inc.*

250

251 *h. Recommendation to Modify the IMUC Dam*

252

253 Mr. Gaffney state that there would be a replacement for Item 7g.

254

255 Mr. Mawyer stated that the replacement related to a scope of work with an engineering firm,  
256 Arcadis, to do a master plan for the Ivy MUC, as well as for some remote convenience centers in  
257 the county – and yesterday he had spoken with Mr. Henry and Dr. Palmer to talk about efforts  
258 the county had already gone through in looking at sites. He noted that there would still be a  
259 master plan developed for the MUC, but this reduced the scope and the fee.

260

261 Dr. Palmer expressed concern regarding looking at the scope more carefully and having an  
262 evaluation of what the county had already done, as well as getting the solid waste committee  
263 involved and making sure the Board of Supervisors know what they are paying for. Dr. Palmer  
264 stated the Board of Supervisors had already stated that they were very interested in going  
265 forward with the master planning process, but stated they did not want to delve too quickly into  
266 establishing and/or identifying different areas out in the county until they had a chance to do  
267 their own outreach to their constituents. Dr. Palmer asked for more information as to how master  
268 planning money was not placed in with the recommendation in the budget for the other  
269 additional work for building and operating the convenience center and recycling center at Ivy.  
270 She stated that Rivanna had not always taken these recommendations back to the Board of

271 Supervisors and City Council to make these adjustments, and asked staff to speak to how that  
272 could be done with respect to the amount not to exceed \$49,000.

273  
274 Mr. Mawyer responded that several parts of the solid waste budget – operations at the landfill  
275 and the transfer operation at the landfill – are budgeted solely for the County’s expense because  
276 the city didn’t send any refuse to Ivy. He also stated that Rivanna took in revenues because  
277 county haulers and others brought municipal solid waste refuse to the landfill, and they are  
278 charged \$66 per ton for that product. He noted that they take clean fill, brush, and other items, so  
279 these provide a revenue stream. Mr. Mawyer stated they also have a budget that includes expense  
280 projections, and Rivanna lets the county know the amount – but then does a true-up at the end of  
281 the year depending on the actual revenues and expenses, which had typically been a deficit that  
282 required further county contribution. He mentioned that last year, the environmental program –  
283 which is a shared expense with the City – had residual money left over, so both entities received  
284 a refund.

285  
286 Mr. Wood clarified that for environmental, there was no true-up. Only the operating accounts  
287 true-up – so the environmental funds would stay in reserves and carry over to Rivanna.

288  
289 Dr. Palmer pointed out that city residents and business did in fact send waste to Ivy.

290  
291 Mr. Mawyer agreed.

292  
293 Dr. Palmer explained that on the county side, they had a reserve for contingencies or similar fund  
294 to cover that, and the Board of Supervisors did not get all of the Ivy expenses into its budget for  
295 master planning.

296  
297 Mr. Henry noted that there was not a firm estimate for Ivy.

298  
299 Dr. Palmer responded that there was a general estimate for it quite a while back, but it was only  
300 verbal.

301  
302 Mr. Henry stated that the complicating factor is that this would typically come out the CIP, not  
303 operating, and he was very supportive of the work to do the master planning. He stated that  
304 process wise, it seemed better to go through the Board of Supervisors and have it authorized for  
305 an appropriation prior to proceeding, although Dr. Palmer had just discussed it with them the  
306 previous day.

307  
308 Ms. Palmer clarified that the Board’s expectation is for Rivanna to move forward, and this was a  
309 good example of how they needed to work out the coordination in dealing with the transfer  
310 station and its ultimate use. She stated that this was somewhat of a test case that revealed some  
311 holes in the process.

312  
313 Mr. Richardson asked what a placeholder amount would be to take it back to the Board.

314

315 Mr. Mawyer responded that they had an amount not to exceed \$49,000, and that was a unilateral  
316 number they came up with as they adjusted the scope, so they still need to discuss it with the  
317 consultant.

318  
319 Mr. Gaffney asked if the question was the cost of the recycling centers and convenience  
320 facilities.

321  
322 Dr. Palmer replied that the Board had that budgeted, and this pertained only to the master  
323 planning.

324  
325 Mr. Henry explained that this was not in the current budget and appropriation, authorizing the  
326 work now with the understanding they would have to true it up in July, and the preference would  
327 be for the Board to authorize it ahead of time.

328  
329 Dr. Palmer reiterated that they didn't do that, so she would leave it up to the Executive Director  
330 for that direction.

331  
332 Mr. Richardson stated they would be meeting with the Board in two days to review the CIP, so it  
333 could be discussed then with the specific amount of \$50,000.

334  
335 Mr. Krueger suggested that they could approve it now contingent upon the Board of Supervisors  
336 authorizing the funds as an appropriation from the CIP, then they could let Mr. Mawyer know.

337  
338 Board members agreed with that approach.

339  
340 Dr. Palmer suggested that they vote on these separately.

341  
342 Mr. Krueger agreed that they could have a separate motion for 7g.

343  
344 **Ms. Galvin moved to approve Consent Agenda items 7a-f and 7h as presented. Dr. Palmer**  
345 **seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

346  
347 **Ms. Palmer moved to approve Consent Agenda items 7g, with a recommendation for**  
348 **engineering services as amended in the memorandum, contingent upon approval of**  
349 **funding from the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Richardson seconded the**  
350 **motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

351  
352 **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

353 *a. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2017, Robert*  
354 *Huff*

355 Mr. Robert Huff of Robinson Farmer Cox Associates, RSWA's auditor, thanked the Board for  
356 the opportunity to present his report on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the year  
357 ending June 30, 2017. He stated that the CAFR contained unqualified opinions as in the past, and  
358 except for the statutory obligations to appear before the Board and report out the  
359 communications with those charged with governance, it would almost be unnecessary to report  
360 the findings. Mr. Huff stated that the qualitative aspects of the accounting practices are excellent,



361 and the difficulties encountered in performing the audit were none. He stated that there were no  
362 corrected or uncorrected misstatements within the document, and there were no disagreements  
363 with management – oral or otherwise – and the management representations were all signed,  
364 with no one shopping for a second opinion report and no other matters or issues to be disclosed.  
365 Mr. Huff stated that there were no restrictions on the use of the report whatsoever.  
366

367 Mr. Huff did point out that the report had gotten a certificate of achievement that Mr. Wood and  
368 his staff put in for annually. He noted that the opinions on page[A1] \_\_ of the report were  
369 “unmodified,” which was the equivalent of a positive report, and stated that operationally all  
370 aspects of annual fund balances were very close year to year except for a few small changes. Mr.  
371 Huff stated that regarding capital projects, this was a very routine report. Mr. Huff stated that this  
372 concluded his formal remarks, and stated there was no management letter as there was no reason  
373 for one.  
374

375 Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any questions for Mr. Huff. There were none.  
376

377 **At 2:36 p.m., Dr. Palmer moved to recess the RSWA Board meeting. Mr. Jones seconded**  
378 **the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**  
379

380 **The RSWA Board recessed their meeting at 2:36 p.m.**  
381

382 **At 2:52 p.m., Dr. Palmer moved to reconvene the RSWA Board meeting. Mr. Jones**  
383 **seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**  
384

385 **The RSWA Board reconvened their meeting at 2:52 p.m., as a joint meeting with the**  
386 **RWSA Board.**  
387

388 *b. Presentation[A2] to the RWSA / RSWA on the Compensation & Classification Study*  
389 *Recommendations: Director of Finance & Administration, Lonnie Wood and*  
390 *Consultant David Bollenback with Evergreen Solutions*  
391

392 Mr. Wood reported that the previous summer staff initiated a compensation study that included  
393 reviewing their job titles, classifications and job descriptions which had not been done for about  
394 ten years. He stated it was also initiated to conduct a market survey analysis which was in the  
395 process of going out to similar localities and getting information on compensation levels,  
396 compensation ranges, and pay grades. Mr. Wood stated that the last time an adjustment had been  
397 done to the pay raise system was in 2015, and the personnel policy required this to be reviewed  
398 every three years. He noted that it was also in line with the strategic plan, and even though the  
399 strategic plan was initiated at the same time, one of the conclusions in the plan that was adopted  
400 by the RSWA and RWSA in late 2017 was to conduct a comprehensive compensation and  
401 staffing study. He stated he expected the staffing study to come when the budget was introduced  
402 next month. Mr. Wood indicated that the consultant that was hired to help with the survey,  
403 Evergreen Solutions, would give a brief presentation on how the study would be conducted.  
404

405 Mr. David Bollenback of Evergreen Solutions stated that he would discuss some of the findings  
406 from the study process and some of the recommendations that were before the Boards. He

407 reported that one of the primary pieces of the process was data collection and stated they had to  
408 gather information from HR and Finance, as well as collect data from employees. He stated they  
409 used a job assessment tool (JAT) process that was sent out to all employees asking them to  
410 complete what was essentially a summary of their position, which allowed Evergreen to make  
411 sure they understood each position and the various functions that they were in charge of, as well  
412 as being able to determine the relative compensation levels of those positions.

413  
414 Mr. Bollenback stated that there were also some outreach and orientation sessions wherein they  
415 interviewed and discussed with employees what they liked or didn't like with issues that they  
416 were experiencing with the scope of the study, and introduced them in the orientation sessions to  
417 their study as well as to the JAT process.

418  
419 Mr. Bollenback reported that Evergreen had also done an analysis of the current conditions,  
420 which assessed the nature of the pay scales as to whether they were close enough to each other in  
421 terms of the various grades, as well as being far enough apart, and other various best practice  
422 pieces that were investigated as they related to those scales. He stated that they also conducted a  
423 market survey, which was a big piece everyone was interested in hearing about, and he would  
424 talk about those results, as well as recommendations.

425  
426 Mr. Bollenback explained that the study was launched in June 2017, followed by orientation  
427 focus groups onsite as well as with employees asked to attend focus groups, in July 2017. He  
428 stated there were 11 focus groups with 55 employees – so just over half of the employees  
429 participated in the focus groups. He also stated that the JAT ran from July 21 to August 15. He  
430 stated that the JAT participation rate was 83.5% out of a total 91+ employees who were asked to  
431 participate, which was considered a very strong completion rate as 70% was the desired rate.

432  
433 Mr. O'Connell asked if the JAT was like a job description.

434  
435 Mr. Bollenback confirmed that and stated that the JAT was introduced by having employees  
436 literally write their own job description, but it was asked to be done by the employee's individual  
437 perspective – so that employees share a job title, it would be Evergreen's expectation that those  
438 JATs would look slightly different. He added that in some cases if there was a classification  
439 issue, they would look very different. He noted that those differences and similarities were what  
440 Evergreen was trying to see in the JAT process, and then use that information to determine the  
441 compensation composition.

442  
443 Mr. Bollenback stated that he wanted to present several notes on what employees shared when  
444 they came onsite. He stated that many of them stated that they appreciated the stability that  
445 working for the authorities provided them. He also noted that there were some mid to upper-level  
446 compression issues (i.e., people's opinions that salaries were too close to one another based on  
447 certain variables such as experience, tenure, performance, etc.) He reported that whatever metric  
448 they were using, they stated they still felt that salaries were not differentiated from one another in  
449 a manner they felt was appropriate. He stated that Evergreen heard many different reasons for  
450 that compression, but stated those were fairly common complaints and that was one of the things  
451 Evergreen was looking to address. Mr. Bollenback stated that some employees felt their job  
452 descriptions were not accurate due to job duties having evolved over the years, and that

453 Evergreen was asked to review those job descriptions, which they were still in the process of  
454 finalizing.

455  
456 Mr. Bollenback indicated that there was a single salary schedule, which was sometimes  
457 presented separately, with solid waste in one and water and wastewater in another one, but  
458 overall, they were shared dollar figures and nomenclature. He reported that there were 56 unique  
459 classifications, so different job titles slot into that plan, with 99 budgeted positions – but he  
460 clarified that their numbers were not 99 because they were dealing with the actual employees  
461 present at the time of the study initiation, so those numbers did not match perfectly all the time  
462 with budgeted positions.

463  
464 Mr. Bollenback reported that the current range structure was very solid. He reported that  
465 generally you would expect to see a range spread of 50 to 70 %, and stated that the range spread  
466 was essentially the percentage increase from the minimum to the maximum of a pay range. He  
467 stated that it represented the lower to upper limit of compensation, and how much compensation  
468 could grow for an employee throughout the time of employment. He reported that Rivanna was  
469 sitting right at 66%, which was considered excellent. He also directed the Boards' attention to  
470 grade progression, which was the percentage increase from one grade to the next, and stated it  
471 was fairly consistent for Rivanna at about 5%, which was within best practice limits. Mr.  
472 Bollenback noted that this was relevant because there was a grade structure that they then had to  
473 slot classifications onto, so having those pay ranges relatively close to one another allowed them  
474 to slot them as close to market as possible. He added that being 5% apart from one another  
475 would allow them to slot them closer to their target value than if they were 10% apart from one  
476 another. He indicated that this was good news, and Evergreen had sought to build on the  
477 strengths that were identified during the Analysis of Current Conditions (AOCC) process, while  
478 also bringing up the ranges and some individual positions to market.

479  
480 Mr. Bollenback reported on the market survey and stated they had benchmarked 63  
481 classifications, with some speculative ones that were also included for data purposes. He  
482 reported that they went to 26 market peers, including cities, counties, school systems, and other  
483 utilities – casting a wide net to try to get a feel for the labor market that Rivanna competes in.  
484 Mr. Bollenback stated that overall 607 market matches were made, which was fairly strong for a  
485 study of this size and was just under 10 responses per position. He stated that the findings  
486 showed that overall, positions were on average 5% below market at minimum, 6.3% below at  
487 midpoint, and about 7.4% at maximum. He reported that this was an average of market responses  
488 using published pay ranges compared to Rivanna's published pay ranges, and these were not  
489 representative of employees' actual salaries but were structural comparisons. Mr. Bollenback  
490 also stated that when they referred to 5% below market on average they meant on average, and  
491 there were several positions that were compensated in terms of the pay range above the market  
492 average and several that were below that 5%.

493  
494 Mr. O'Connell asked if the survey included any local employers besides another utility, such as  
495 contractors or UVA.

496  
497 Mr. Bollenback responded that they had a private sector component but could not compel private  
498 organizations to provide them with that data, so they utilized a service from the Economic

499 Research Institute that provided localized private sector salaries and ranges based on experience  
500 and time with organization to really mirror that using private sector data. He stated they did not  
501 have a direct response from a specific entity but did have an aggregated response from the  
502 private sector.

503  
504 Mr. Henry asked if this was a consistent peer group as the last evaluation from three years ago.

505  
506 Mr. Bollenback presented the list of comparative entities and stated that there were 26  
507 organizations surveyed.

508  
509 Mr. Wood confirmed that this was very similar to the previous survey and stated that they took  
510 what they could find with the city and county adopted markets, so they were consistent with  
511 what the localities did.

512  
513 Mr. Bollenback addressed the cost of living index and stated that there was a service called  
514 coli.org, an entity that provides regional cost of living indexes, and their metric 100 is the  
515 national average cost of living – whereas anything over 100 is above average and below 100 is  
516 below average. He stated that there was a list of county-level cost of living index results and  
517 stated they used that information to essentially inflate or deflate peer responses. Mr. Bollenback  
518 used an example by comparing Rivanna at 106.4 and an organization that was below that, and  
519 stated that the actual dollar figure that came from them would have been inflated slightly by an  
520 equivalent percentage to make sure they were comparing apples to apples as closely as possible.  
521 He referred to the City of Lynchburg, which was just below 100, and stated that to try and  
522 compare that with Rivanna's salaries would lead to some inequities by the nature of the cost of  
523 living in that area. He noted that those were county-level cost of living indexes.

524  
525 Mr. O'Connell asked if Western Virginia was Roanoke, and whether its cost of living was higher  
526 than Albemarle's.

527  
528 Mr. Wood confirmed this.

529  
530 Mr. Bollenback asked if there were any further questions before moving on.

531  
532 Mr. Henry asked what the asterisk represented.

533  
534 Mr. Bollenback explained+ that the asterisk represented organizations – the South Central  
535 Wastewater Authority and Appomattox County Water – and the asterisks indicated that the  
536 administration of the water plants was shared.

537  
538 Mr. Bollenback then referred to Evergreen's recommendations. He stated that the first  
539 recommendation was to adopt their revised unified grade structure and the revised class list. He  
540 added that the revised class list included some job title changes, as well as a few grade placement  
541 changes.

542  
543 Mr. Bollenback stated that the grade structure being recommended started with Rivanna's  
544 current grade structure and represented a 4% increase from the current structure, but that was not

545 the sole summary to be taken from the survey. He reported that not only were the grades  
546 themselves adjusted by 4%, but there was a more detailed class list in the report that would detail  
547 where Evergreen recommends each position should be placed. He stated that some of those were  
548 in higher grade placements than they were currently, so even though there was only a 4%  
549 adjustment shown on the scales, for individual positions that adjustment may be greater.

550  
551 Mr. Bollenback stated that the second recommendation was to utilize the JAT and Point Factor  
552 System process to revise or establish pay grades going forward for positions. He stated that  
553 Evergreen has used that structure and methodology to compare each position to determine the  
554 appropriate pay level for the position, and it would be Evergreen's recommendation that Rivanna  
555 continue using that methodology going forward as needed. He added that he had been working  
556 with Ms. Nemeth as to how that would be done, and Evergreen would be available to ensure that  
557 the adoption of that practice was smooth and expressed hope that Rivanna would continue to use  
558 that.

559  
560 Mr. Bollenback stated that the final recommendation would be that Rivanna conduct a  
561 comprehensive compensation and classification study every three to five years – with three being  
562 the most ideal and five being the absolute limit. He noted that the reason for that was that market  
563 trends sometimes move very quickly, and it was important to stay aware of what was happening.  
564 He cited an example as being an increase for certain operators where their compensation went up  
565 regionally, but this didn't necessarily affect every other position and it might not be immediately  
566 seen but could have some long-term ramifications if not addressed. Mr. Bollenback stressed the  
567 importance of staying on top of the market every few years, and he asked for any comments or  
568 questions.

569  
570 Dr. Palmer asked that if everything was adjusted 4% up, how the three indicators that were given  
571 as 5% below the market average minimum would be changed.

572  
573 Mr. Bollenback replied that he did not have the exact figures but stated that the figure would be  
574 closer to zero. He stated that as mentioned earlier, he was hesitant to give updated figures  
575 because really they were looking at jobs. He clarified that when they actually slotted those  
576 positions in the pay structure, they looked at the individual job level to make sure that the actual  
577 job was closer to market, so he felt they were closer to the zero mark. He reiterated that he did  
578 not have the exact figure at present but could provide it to them.

579  
580 Mr. O'Connell stated that the ultimate goal was for the pay structure to reflect the market  
581 Evergreen surveyed for that particular job where it was slotted.

582  
583 Mr. Bollenback confirmed this and stated that when they looked at an individual job, they would  
584 hope that the job would be even closer to market, if not actually at market.

585  
586 Ms. Galvin inquired as to the impact to the operating budget and expenditures.

587  
588 Mr. Wood stated it would have no effect as it was for next year. He stated that it would not have  
589 any effect at all, as no one would receive a pay raise explicitly because of the study. He noted  
590 that what the study found was that Rivanna's pay for existing employees was actually a little bit

591 above market and a little bit above the current pay grade system, so shifting the grade was all  
592 that was happening. He stated that people stayed where they were but would be better positioned  
593 within the grade that they were currently in now, with more room to grow. He stated that the  
594 only budget impact would be when discussions were held for the budget and the recommended  
595 merit increases. Mr. Wood stated that there were a few positions that were significantly below  
596 the market, and stated those were usually the newer positions. He stated those would be  
597 addressed administratively internally, and he stated that if you pulled those data points out of the  
598 market analysis, those 5 to 6 to 7% above or below market that Mr. Bollenback mentioned would  
599 decrease a little bit. He stated that it was a combination of the 4% increase and then dealing with  
600 some of the larger outliers within the market survey itself.

601  
602 Mr. O'Connell added that from the employee perspective, it would create more growth and make  
603 them better able to compete in the market place.

604  
605 Mr. Wood agreed and stated that it would allow for keeping the market as a range in line with  
606 what the outside world was doing, so they could better compete within that market.

607  
608 Mr. Henry asked Mr. Wood to clarify the second recommendation in regard to utilizing  
609 Evergreen's JAT tool and point factor system to revise and establish pay grades. He also asked if  
610 that looked at the individual job assignment and whether it might involve a reclassification of  
611 that position.

612  
613 Mr. Wood confirmed that and stated that when there is turnover in a position it creates an  
614 opportunity to look at that position in terms of what it is doing, what you want it to do, and if it  
615 was fitting the skill set for the person in that position. He added that if during the budget process  
616 you are asking for a new position, it helped HR to determine where to slot that within the rest of  
617 the pay grade structure and classification. He noted that it was good for new positions, as well as  
618 to review any open ones they might have an opportunity to fill.

619  
620 Mr. Henry asked whether it could result in a reclassification.

621  
622 Mr. Wood confirmed that it could if there was a good enough reason for it. He stated that if all of  
623 their operators were terribly graded, for example, they would do a JAT on all four of the  
624 different positions, and it could be done administratively at any time.

625  
626 Mr. O'Connell stated that through the study, everybody participated as to where they were put in  
627 the appropriate position – so it should be corrected.

628  
629 Mr. Wood confirmed that and added that one of the things that would come out of this would  
630 that was that there would be brand new job descriptions, which was based on a lot of the JAT  
631 input that came during the employee meetings. He also wanted to note that the supervisors had a  
632 chance to review what the employees stated but did not approve, negate, or override it – but they  
633 did have a chance to comment on what the employee feedback was.

634

635 Mr. Richardson asked if he had addressed the fact that the grades were moving but people would  
636 stay where they currently were, and asked about an employee who had been with the  
637 organization less than two years who may be near the entry level.

638  
639 Mr. Wood stated that had been considered and no one was “hitting the floor.”

640  
641 Mr. Richardson asked what about the compression because there were some compression  
642 concerns. He asked about someone who might be close to the minimum who had been there a  
643 couple of years – because if they moved the grades and not the person, they might be hiring  
644 someone in the future at the same rate as someone who had been there just a year or two.

645  
646 Mr. Wood stated that those would be addressed administratively if they thought they were way  
647 off based on their tenure and skill set and where they fall in there.

648  
649 Mr. Richardson asked if that would be handled on a case by case basis and that would be looked  
650 at.

651  
652 Mr. Wood confirmed that a lot of times it would be handled that way.

653  
654 Mr. Mawyer stated that they would have a merit discussion next month that would be discussed  
655 within the operating budgets, so employees that might just be starting this week would not be  
656 eligible for a merit – but if they started a year ago, they would get a merit with the new scale to  
657 create some space. He added that if they hired someone in August, they would not be on step one  
658 with the existing employee.

659  
660 Mr. Richardson stated that he was not concerned about someone that had been there 10 to 20  
661 years, as there were lots of reasons over a period of decades where people separate out in terms  
662 of pay and such – but when there was an employee hired within the last 24 months, that learning  
663 curve is very steep. He stated that if that person was near or at the minimum and someone else  
664 was brought in, there was a lot of difference between a brand new employee and a two-year  
665 employee in terms of what they have learned. He asked if there would be a mechanism in place  
666 where that could be addressed and still keep what was an appropriate amount of spacing between  
667 someone brand new versus someone who had been there 18 to 24 months.

668  
669 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct.

670  
671 Mr. Wood stated that the authorities historically for the past 15 to 18 years had always done pay  
672 increases based upon a merit system, and had never been a 1% scale adjustment plus merit or a  
673 2% – so the system rewards the high performers. He commented that if they were at the bottom,  
674 there was usually a reason that they were at the bottom or have stayed down towards the bottom,  
675 instead of getting shifted up automatically.

676  
677 Mr. O’Connell stated that one of the positions that he had heard they were having trouble hiring  
678 water plant operators, and wondered if this approach would help with that and if that was still an  
679 issue.

680

681 Mr. Wood responded that he did not feel that they were having a hard time finding people that  
682 were interested in working for Rivanna in a water operator job, but stated they were having a  
683 hard time finding people that had an Operator 1 License. Internally, he stated they knew they  
684 needed to grow those employees and to hire employees that were capable of moving up that  
685 chain and taking tests, as this was a test-driven license. He stated that some people just didn't test  
686 well, so Rivanna had to help them with that. Mr. Wood stated that after recently talking to the  
687 water manager, he stated that he was now in a place where he could start moving people in that  
688 had been there one or two years into those 1 and 2 operator slots. He added that the way they  
689 have tried to address that is to grow them from inside.

690  
691 Ms. Galvin asked if they had vocation programs at the community college or some place where  
692 people can actually get those credentials.

693  
694 Ms. Nemeth stated that they used a Sacramento State program online.

695  
696 Mr. Wood added that there were also some state programs at Virginia Tech.

697  
698 Mr. Mawyer stated that Mountain Empire College also offers online classes.

699  
700 Mr. Castillo noted that there were some programs offered in person within the state, but they  
701 were very hard to keep going because there usually were not enough students for water/waste  
702 water to keep those kind of training programs.

703  
704 Mr. Wood stated that the recommendation for this meeting was to adopt the proposed pay grade  
705 structure that was noted in the presentation, with a copy with the comparison of the current pay  
706 grade structure in the cover memo. He stated it would be helpful to adopt the cover memo and  
707 second schedule, which was where people would be placed in the new pay grade structure based  
708 on the recommendations as a result of the market study.

709  
710 Dr. Palmer asked if they were going to deal with the other recommendation from Evergreen  
711 regarding the JAT.

712  
713 Mr. Wood responded that he felt that could be dealt with administratively and if they wanted to  
714 use it and found it beneficial they could keep using it – and if not, they would stop using it.

715  
716 Mr. Wood stated that this was helpful for the employees to step out of what they were doing and  
717 assess what they were doing. He noted that several other things in the study that were not  
718 addressed that could be done administratively were a couple of recommendations to shift some  
719 positions from non-exempt to exempt, as well as several title shifts. He stated that some of their  
720 assistant managers were not graded equally, so they have redone some of them to bring them  
721 closer in line with each other as they were all doing the same thing as far as management skills.

722  
723 Mr. Gaffney asked how all of this could be tied into the strategic plan and how what was just  
724 done has helped to get to this point.

725



726 Mr. Mawyer explained that workforce development was key to the strategic plan in making sure  
727 that they have a qualified professional, highly skilled, dedicated, and versatile team. He added  
728 that they needed to maintain competitive pay to do that, so they needed their scales to be  
729 competitive as well as their actual salaries. He reported that Mr. Wood and the study both  
730 indicated their scales were less than competitive so they were recommending increasing it. He  
731 stated that their actual salaries were very competitive with the market and were slightly above  
732 the market. Mr. Mawyer stated that they would still recommend a pay increase in March but  
733 were looking at both things, so this supported workforce development in the strategic plan.

734  
735 Mr. Richardson asked about an exemption status with hourly versus annual wage earners, and  
736 asked if they had made recommendations pointing in both direction and what they were able to  
737 find.

738  
739 Mr. Bollenback responded that they found there were several positions that were listed as non-  
740 exempt that could qualify as exempt status. He clarified that they were not labor attorneys and  
741 that this was just their understanding of what was presented to them by employees, and he stated  
742 it certainly needed to be reviewed. He stated that some positions that went from non-exempt to  
743 exempt and there were positions that went from hourly to annual, not from annual to hourly.

744  
745 Mr. Richardson responded that this was the side that opened up the liability, and asked whether  
746 Evergreen was comfortable in moving a position from hourly to annual wage status, and whether  
747 they were in good shape in that regard.

748  
749 Mr. Mawyer stated that they were and would double check based on those comments. He stated  
750 they had assistant managers, some of whom were non-exempt – meaning they got paid overtime  
751 – while other assistant managers were not. He stated that those particularly were the ones they  
752 looked at from a consistency standpoint. He added that those should be exempt – meaning there  
753 was no requirement to pay them overtime.

754  
755 Mr. O'Connell pointed out that the budget recommendation on pay would be around individual  
756 performance – also called merit – as an evaluation that determined whether there would be a pool  
757 of money.

758  
759 Mr. Mawyer explained that next month they would bring the operating budget to the Board with  
760 a recommendation for a 3% merit pool. He explained that they would take 3% of the salary  
761 dollars that they had and put them in a pool. Mr. Mawyer stated every employee would go  
762 through the merit evaluation program and would get a score between 0 and 3 – with 3 being high  
763 performers and 0 being the minimum performers – and those 3% dollars would get allocated to  
764 employees based on their score. Mr. Mawyer stated that 3% would be the average merit increase,  
765 higher performers would get more than 3%, and lower performers would get less than a 3%  
766 increase. He added that this was what the authorities had done for many years.

767  
768 Mr. O'Connell asked if they needed a motion for approval.

769  
770 Dr. Palmer asked if they needed two motions or one.

771

772 Mr. Krueger clarified that it would be better to have two motions, and stated the motions could  
773 be paired as one motion for each authority to recommend both the adoption of the pay salary  
774 grade scale for FY18-19, and the proposed job title placements.  
775

776 **Dr. Palmer moved for the RSWA to adopt the attached proposed pay grade scale for FY18-**  
777 **19 table one, and to approve the proposed job title placements as shown in the attached**  
778 **table two as recommended by the study. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which**  
779 **passed unanimously (7-0).**  
780

781 **9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA**  
782

783 There were none presented.  
784

785 **10. CLOSED MEETING**  
786

787 There was no closed meeting.  
788

789 **11. ADJOURNMENT**  
790

791 **At 3:27 p.m., Dr. Palmer moved to adjourn the RSWA Board meeting. Ms. Galvin**  
792 **seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**  
793

794  
795 Respectfully submitted,  
796

797  
798   
799 

---

Mr. Maurice Jones  
800 Secretary - Treasurer  
801