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Special Meeting of the Board of Directors of Rivanna Solid Waste Authority

DATE: October 23, 2018

LOCATION: Conference Room, Administration Building
695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, VA

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING
   a. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board on September 25, 2018

3. RECOGNITION

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

7. CONSENT AGENDA
   a. Staff Report on Finance
   b. Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update
   c. Staff Report on Ivy Landfill Environmental Status
   d. Staff Report on Ongoing Projects

8. OTHER BUSINESS
   a. Presentation: Ivy MUC Master Plan – Convenience Center Layout Alternatives; Director Of Solid Waste, Phil McKalips

9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA

10. CLOSED MEETING

11. ADJOURNMENT
GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AT RIVANNA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

If you wish to address the Rivanna Board of Directors during the time allocated for public comment, please raise your hand or stand when the Chair asks for public comments.

Members of the public requesting to speak will be recognized during the specific time designated on the meeting agenda for “Items From The Public.” Each person will be allowed to speak for up to three minutes. When two or more individuals are present from the same group, it is recommended that the group designate a spokesperson to present its comments to the Board and the designated speaker can ask other members of the group to be recognized by raising their hand or standing. Each spokesperson for a group will be allowed to speak for up to five minutes.

During public hearings, the Board will attempt to hear all members of the public who wish to speak on a subject, but it must be recognized that on rare occasion presentations may have to be limited because of time constraints. If a previous speaker has articulated your position, it is recommended that you not fully repeat the comments and instead advise the Board of your agreement. The time allocated for speakers at public hearings are the same as for regular Board meetings, although the Board can allow exceptions at its discretion.

Speakers should keep in mind that Board of Directors meetings are formal proceedings and all comments are recorded on tape. For that reason, speakers are requested to speak from the podium and wait to be recognized by the Chair. In order to give all speakers proper respect and courtesy, the Board requests that speakers follow the following guidelines:

- Wait at your seat until recognized by the Chair.
- Come forward and state your full name and address and your organizational affiliation if speaking for a group;
- Address your comments to the Board as a whole;
- State your position clearly and succinctly and give facts and data to support your position;
- Summarize your key points and provide the Board with a written statement, or supporting rationale, when possible;
- If you represent a group, you may ask others at the meeting to be recognized by raising their hand or standing;
- Be respectful and civil in all interactions at Board meetings;
- The Board may ask speakers questions or seek clarification, but recognize that Board meetings are not a forum for public debate; Board Members will not recognize comments made from the audience and ask that members of the audience not interrupt the comments of speakers and remain silent while others are speaking so that other members in the audience can hear the speaker;
- The Board will have the opportunity to address public comments after the public comment session has been closed;
- At the request of the Chair, the Executive Director may address public comments after the session has been closed as well; and
- As appropriate, staff will research questions by the public and respond through a report back to the Board at the next regular meeting of the full Board. It is suggested that citizens who have questions for the Board or staff submit those questions in advance of the meeting to permit the opportunity for some research before the meeting.

The agendas of Board meetings, and supporting materials, are available from the RWSA Administration Office upon request or can be viewed on the Rivanna website(s)

Rev. September 22, 2009
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 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.


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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Gaffney invited items from the public.

There being none offered, the agenda item was closed.

There were no responses to public comments for this month.

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

Mr. Gaffney asked if there was an explanation given as to why that fee was different. Mr. McKalips responded that it mostly consisted of a statement as to the fact the RSWA Board had established the structure in 2011, but staff did not really go into that explanation. He emphasized that the differential was largely to the city pulling out of the transfer station activity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Gaffney asked if Rivanna was aware whether their contracts called for them to haul all of their waste to the facility they were contracting with.
Mr. McKalips replied that most of them do not have contracts, just agreements on a specific rate. He stated the only one he knew of that had a contract was Waste Management, which was hauling its material to Republic in Zions Crossroads in a unique deal wherein they brought it to Republic, which loaded it into Waste Management trucks and those drivers taking it to a Waste Management landfill. He presented a table with average area costs, stating that $66 was the current tipping fee and he provided some other potential tipping fees and what it would take in tonnage to offset that. Mr. McKalips stated that the threshold was 5,500 tons and stated that four tons a day was about 1,000 tons per year. He stated that 2,100 tons would be another eight tons a day, which would be about one reasonably large commercial hauler – with the current average being about 40 tons per day.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. McKalips stated that he had spoken with Boyd McCauley at Time Disposal, and his complexity was how to get single-stream recycling done, which was currently not offered through the transfer station – but could be if they could find someplace to take it. He stated that Rivanna’s hauler was having difficulty finding anyone to take that recycling at a reasonable price, which was related to the recycling market.
Ms. Palmer asked if they were checking to see if there were places that would take it without the glass, if they took some of the things that normally got crushed.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Oberdorfer replied that he did not know.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Oberdorfer clarified that County Waste would still be the hauler for the next year until they had a new hauling contract, but the transfer station services were out to bid.
Ms. Galvin asked why the RSWA with the Ivy MUC couldn’t just go into bid.

Mr. Gaffney responded that they would have to find out how much waste it was, because they had a limit as to how much they could take at Ivy.

Mr. McKalips stated that it was within their limits at 6,500.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the old rate could be shared.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that they were paying $39 at Van der Linde with the recycling, and once that was taken off the table, the rate went to $49.

Mr. Krueger asked if that was just for transfer station services and not disposal, as their rate reflected both.

Mr. Oberdorfer stated that he would have to go back and see exactly what the parameters were, stating that they did not own the transfer station at the time the contract with Van der Linde was executed.

Dr. Palmer stated that they could underbid it at $49, but they would have to publicly come out with a tipping and rate schedule – and they would just have to go $1 below. She emphasized that this was problematic, although she liked the idea.

Ms. Galvin stated that local government received competitive bids on that.

Dr. Palmer clarified that they could also stipulate in their contract that the trash had to go somewhere.

Mr. Oberdorfer stated that was the case if it was both hauling and transfer services, and they were looking at that as a feature of a new hauling contract. He stated that he would prefer to not manage two contracts, adding that the process would entail public input and a consultant to engage with residents as to what they wanted to see – calling it a “waste diversion contract” instead of a “refuse contract.” Mr. Oberdorfer stated the RFP would be out for transfer for five years, with a year or two into the hauling portion.

Dr. Palmer stated that if the city decided they wanted to participate in a community transfer station, they could put out another RFP in a year, combining the two and specifying a location.

Mr. Oberdorfer stated he was not completely clear on the procurement side of it, but he felt it could be navigated.

Ms. Galvin suggested that they could talk about it with Mike Murphy, and she wasn’t sure what City Council action would be required, if any.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that if they could get a single hauling/transfer program for the County, City, and UVA, it would provide a strong public benefit.
Dr. Palmer stated that it was very helpful to get everyone on board for the public education aspects.

Ms. Galvin stated that she would like to reduce the service charge for city residents but wasn’t sure if that was premature in light of the contract issues.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that he thought it was independent and they would need to specify logistics.

Mr. McKalips stated that there was a “wait and see” option wherein they could evaluate how the new transfer station facility did and where contracting went in the next year, as well as the public sense of how it was going.

Mr. Gaffney stated that if the City were to approve $48K per year and everyone paid $1, it would break even.

Ms. Galvin stated that instead of the user bearing the brunt of that fee, the City would absorb the cost and essentially subsidize the use. She stated it was appealing to her but she would need to have that discussion with the City Manager and City Council, noting the favorable outcome of reducing dumping.

Dr. Palmer stated that she was in favor of getting rid of the service fee, but she also had to get it through the Board of Supervisors. She added that she did not like the fact that it put them in the situation of doing surveys every year to see who was doing what and the level of use, and it would be nice to find some other way to contribute that did not lock them into that argument.

Ms. Galvin noted that this was the advantage of having all three entities working together in one system of solid waste management.

Mr. Oberdorfer asked when they were meeting on that.

Ms. Galvin confirmed that it was in early October, adding that it could be raised then.

Dr. Palmer stated that the agenda may be too full to add anything else, but they could certainly bring it up as a quick discussion.

Mr. McKalips stated that the program agreement stated that a rate change would have to come at the request of the Board of Supervisors, so the RSWA could ask for that.

Dr. Palmer stated that for the present time, she would ask the Board if they would consider a tipping fee reduction if Rivanna could figure out some short-term plan as they were working to get everyone together – and it was hard to bring that forward without some kind of contribution from the City.

Ms. Galvin noted that this would be a budget transfer to go directly to the RSWA.
Mr. Mawyer stated that was the same process for the County.

Ms. Galvin emphasized that she would prefer to talk about it in the context of a larger strategic discussion regarding how they manage solid waste.

Mr. Oberdorfer stated it may be possible to cover it in the short term.

Dr. Palmer stated that they may end up having less waste like mattresses.

Ms. Galvin stated it may shift the cost burden away from City Public Works.

Mr. Oberdorfer added that they could look at their bulk item pickup program for fees, to move some of the business over and create a better partnership, even though the numbers were small.

Dr. Palmer stated that there was information about things needing to be corrected with the new transfer station – one being the drain – and she wasn’t sure about other issues.

Mr. McKalips responding that the water collection system was leaching from inside the building, the plumbing needed to get rerouted, and they were working on getting that done. He stated that the original alignment for routing it turned out to not be working the way they wanted, so they were rerouting it along a different alignment.

Mr. Mawyer clarified that it was the pipe going from the building to the leach pond that needed to be replaced. He also mentioned that DEQ had noted some cracks but Rivanna had sealed them.

Dr. Palmer commented that she would like to do the contest she had mentioned about naming the transfer station. She also stated they had discussed at the county’s Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee what the cost would be to do the composting and Ivy, and she would like to get a price on that so they could get it into the budget.

Mr. McKalips responded that the master plan consultant, Arcadis, had to have all the design and cost to Rivanna by the next meeting.

Mr. Galvin asked if UVA was involved.

Dr. Palmer responded that UVA Sustainability Director Jesse Warren was active in SWAAC and was involved in all these conversations.

Mr. Mawyer noted that the compostable food waste program started with UVA, and it was taken in at Ivy currently – then went to Black Bear’s composting facility.

Dr. Palmer stated that from 2014 on, UVA had been present at all SWAAC discussions.
Mr. Mawyer stated that if they can get it done through the master plan, the consultant could estimate the compost cost.

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

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

9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA

There were none presented.

10. CLOSED MEETING

There was no closed meeting held.

11. ADJOURNMENT

At 2:45 p.m., Ms. Palmer moved to adjourn the RSWA Board meeting. 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.

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

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2018

Household Hazardous Waste and Bulky Waste Amnesty Days
SP GOAL: Environmental Stewardship; Solid Waste Services

The fall Amnesty days were very well attended. 706 vehicles brought HHW products, 179 vehicles brought furniture and mattresses, and 289 vehicles brought appliances.

Pumpkin Recycling
SP GOAL: Environmental Stewardship; Solid Waste Services; Communication and Collaboration

We will host a “Pumpkin Smash” at the McIntire Recycling Center on Saturday, November 10, to collect pumpkins for composting.
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: LONZY WOOD, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER 2018 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2018

The results of operations and remediation activities for the first quarter of this fiscal year are summarized below and in the attached statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Results</th>
<th>Remediation Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$390,333</td>
<td>$390,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>(561,142)</td>
<td>(223,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net operating results</td>
<td>(170,809)</td>
<td>(223,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - MOU &amp; Local</td>
<td>290,138</td>
<td>155,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surplus/(Deficit)* $119,329 $ (67,187) $ 52,142

* Cash reserves are used when deficits occur. (Use of up to $390,000 in reserves for an expected shortfall for remediation was included in FY 2019 budget.)

Total operating revenues through September were $65,000 over budget and total operating expenses were $40,000 under budget. The Authority processed 6,139 tons of waste this fiscal year. A breakdown of net revenue or cost per ton, including overhead and administrative support costs, is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>Ivy MSW</th>
<th>Ivy - All Other</th>
<th>Recycling</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>6,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net operating revenue (costs) $ (70,464) $ 5,691 $ (106,036) $ (170,809)

Net revenue (cost) per ton $ (28.88) $ 1.79 $ (203.92) $ (27.82)

Attachments
## Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations Tipping Fees</td>
<td>$158,960</td>
<td>70,703</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158,960</td>
<td>70,703</td>
<td></td>
<td>648,200</td>
<td>185,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy MSW Transfer Tipping Fees</td>
<td>648,200</td>
<td>185,816</td>
<td></td>
<td>121,500</td>
<td>41,728</td>
<td></td>
<td>251,900</td>
<td>32,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material &amp; Other Sales-Ivy</td>
<td>121,500</td>
<td>41,728</td>
<td></td>
<td>251,900</td>
<td>32,564</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Revenues</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td>41,402</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td>41,402</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>18,120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$1,302,260</td>
<td>$390,333</td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,460</td>
<td>$112,431</td>
<td></td>
<td>$725,400</td>
<td>$227,218</td>
<td></td>
<td>$251,900</td>
<td>$32,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget vs. Actual*</td>
<td>29.97%</td>
<td>40.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.32%</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.72%</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.72%</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

| Ivy Operations | 324,245 | 70,901 | | 324,245 | 70,901 | | | | |
| Ivy MSW Transfer | 1,186,282 | 261,842 | | 1,186,282 | 261,842 | | | | |
| Recycling Operations | 452,490 | 109,928 | | 452,490 | 109,928 | | | | |
| Administration | 694,924 | 161,478 | | 694,924 | 161,478 | | | | |
| Total Expenses | $2,657,941 | $604,150 | | $324,245 | $70,901 | | $1,186,282 | $261,842 | | $452,490 | $109,928 | | $694,924 | $161,478 |
| Budget vs. Actual* | 22.73% | 21.87% | | 22.07% | 24.29% | | 23.24% | 24.29% | | 23.24% |

## Net Results Before Administrative Allocation

| Administrative allocations: | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative costs to Envir. MOU (below) | 195,127 | 43,008 | | 195,127 | 43,008 | | | | |
| Administrative costs to Operations | - | - | | (162,606) | (35,840) | | (162,606) | (35,840) | | (130,085) | (28,672) | |
| Total | $1,160,554 | $170,809 | | $206,391 | $5,691 | | $623,488 | $70,464 | | $330,675 | $106,036 | | | |

## Other Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>1,160,554</td>
<td>290,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution - Capital Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>616,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Fund - Transfer Station</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(616,837)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Surplus (Deficit) - Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>1,160,554</td>
<td>290,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution - Capital Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>616,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Fund - Transfer Station</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(616,837)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Environmental Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Y-T-D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Support</td>
<td>383,741</td>
<td>155,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>383,741</td>
<td>155,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget vs. Actual*</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

| Ivy Environmental | 578,614 | 180,101 | | 455,297 | 100,351 |
| Administrative Allocation | 195,127 | 43,008 | | 195,127 | 43,008 |
| Cash Reserves Used | 390,000 | 67,187 | | | | |
| Surplus (Deficit) - Environmental | - | - | | - | - |

## Total Surplus (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Support</td>
<td>383,741</td>
<td>155,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>383,741</td>
<td>155,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget vs. Actual*</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Environmental</td>
<td>578,614</td>
<td>180,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Allocation</td>
<td>195,127</td>
<td>43,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserves Used</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>67,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit) - Environmental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$ (0)</td>
<td>$ 119,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations</td>
<td>$26,096</td>
<td>$28,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Transfer</td>
<td>58,095</td>
<td>75,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Sales</td>
<td>15,367</td>
<td>15,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>13,491</td>
<td>11,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>10,346</td>
<td>22,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Support</td>
<td>79,982</td>
<td>48,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Late Fees</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>4,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$210,212</td>
<td>$206,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations</td>
<td>$24,197</td>
<td>$23,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>32,707</td>
<td>52,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Transfer</td>
<td>42,723</td>
<td>107,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Operation</td>
<td>41,155</td>
<td>33,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>56,173</td>
<td>51,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$196,955</td>
<td>$268,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$13,257</td>
<td>$(61,926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$265,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution - Capital Grant</td>
<td>260,104</td>
<td>207,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Fund - Transfer Station</td>
<td>(260,104)</td>
<td>(207,201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Cash Reserves</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$13,257</td>
<td>$203,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>$ 13,257</td>
<td>$(61,926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for cash flow purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to show funds available for operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>265,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accounts receivable</td>
<td>(97,902)</td>
<td>85,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in accounts payable</td>
<td>(408,602)</td>
<td>(9,818)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserve fund interest not available in operating cash</td>
<td>(3,463)</td>
<td>(1,588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund interest not available in operating cash</td>
<td>(294)</td>
<td>(271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund release for Transfer Station permit</td>
<td>55,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (Decrease) in Operating Cash</td>
<td>$(441,037)</td>
<td>$ 277,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Cash Balance - Beginning</strong></td>
<td>2,650,834</td>
<td>2,209,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Cash Balance - Ending</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,209,797</td>
<td>$ 2,487,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Line Item</td>
<td>Tonnage</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong> FY 2019</td>
<td><strong>Actual</strong> YTD</td>
<td><strong>Budget</strong> FY 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVY TIPPING FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Fill Material</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindable Vegetative Material</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallets</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires, Whole</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires/White Good (per item)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>3,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVY TRANSFER STATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost Services</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Transfer Station</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIAL SALES - IVY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encore</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Mulch &amp; Chips</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling Fees</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>121,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECYCLING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Sales</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-Operating</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling Fees</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>251,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charge Fees</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>77,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMEDIATION SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA Contribution</td>
<td>79,982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution</td>
<td>195,925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Contribution</td>
<td>107,834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>383,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST, LATE FEES, OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Fund Interest</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve Fund Interest</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Investment Interest</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,860</td>
<td>5,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rivanna Solid Waste Authority
### Historical Material Tonnage Report - Recycling
### Fiscal Years 2015-2019

### In U.S. Tons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiber Products</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019 (Jul-Sept)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper, magazines, catalogs</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard (corrugated)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed paper and phone books</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File stock (office paper)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fiber Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,139</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,509</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>395</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Products</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019 (Jul-Sept)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Cans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>344</strong></td>
<td><strong>305</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                   | **1,483**        | **1,615**        | **1,878**        | **1,881**        | **520**                     |
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
    BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: DAVID RHOADES, SOLID WASTE MANAGER;
    PHILLIP MCKALIPS, DIRECTOR OF SOLID WASTE

REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: IVY MATERIAL UTILIZATION CENTER REPORT/
    RECYCLING OPERATIONS UPDATE

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2018

Ivy Material Utilization Center (IMUC) : DEQ Permit 132: 300 tons/day MSW limit

September 2018

- 3,159 vehicles crossed the scales
- The IMUC transfer station operated 21 days and received a total of 653.97 tons of municipal solid waste (MSW), an average of 31.14 tons per day of operation. The monthly transfer station tonnage figures are attached to this report.
- 641.56 tons of non-MSW materials were received
- 1,295.53 tons were received as a combined total tonnage (MSW + non-MSW)

Paint Collection:

On October 5, 2018, the Ivy MUC shipped out the sixteenth full 30-yard container of paint since the program began in August 2016. RSWA currently has loaded 10 cubic yards of paint which will be included in a future shipment. Each 30-yard container holds about 4,200 one-gallon paint cans. This program continues to make paint disposal more convenient for residents and alleviates some of the congestion during our fall and spring Household Hazardous Waste Days.

Compostable Food Waste Collection:

This program continues to operate smoothly at the IMUC, and is free to residents. A similar bin has been placed at the Transfer Station for the receipt of compostable food wastes from commercial customers. Commercial customers are charged the established disposal fee of $178 per ton.

The McIntire Recycle Center received 4.17 tons of compostable materials in September.
Fall HHW and Bulky Waste Totals:

Thursday, September 27, Friday, September 28, and Saturday, September 29, 2018:  Special Collections

The Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (CESQG) Special Collection for business hazardous waste was held on Thursday, September 27, 2018. CESQG collection program is a pre-registration, fee-based program with sign-up information and instructions on the Rivanna.org website.

Household Hazardous Waste Day was a two-day event this Fall. Hours were from 9am-2pm on both Friday, September 28 and Saturday, September 29, 2018. Wait times on both days this spring was less than 10 minutes. The total customer count for the two-day event was 706 City/County residents. Friday: the split was 232 County, and 58 City. Saturday: the split was 336 County and 77 City. 3 Nelson county residents participated.

Saturday, October 6, 2018:  Furniture / Mattresses

A total of 179 vehicles participated, including 151 from the County and 28 from the City. 23,480 lbs. of furniture and mattresses were collected from the County, and 4480 lbs. of furniture and mattresses were collected from the City.

Saturday, October 13, 2018:  Appliances

A total of 289 vehicles participated, including 262 from the County and 27 from the City. 4.75 tons of appliances and 152 freon units were collected from the County, and 0.47 tons of appliances and 21 freon units were collected from the City.
## Ivy Material Utilization Center
### Daily Scale Crossing Data

**September 1-30, 2018**

Days of Operation: 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Citizen-Can</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>MSW Total</th>
<th>Total Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/01/18</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/18</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/05/18</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>38.31</td>
<td>39.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>23.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/07/18</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/18</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/11/18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/18</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/13/18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>31.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/14/18</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>38.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/18</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>60.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/16/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/18/18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>29.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>80.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/20/18</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>34.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/21/18</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>46.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/18</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/23/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/25/18</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>118.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/26/18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>25.79</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/28/18</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/29/18</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>36.26</td>
<td>11.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>244.04</td>
<td>397.80</td>
<td>653.97</td>
<td>641.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average** 150 180 0.58 11.62 18.94 31.14 30.55  
**Median** 134 157 0.60 10.78 19.30 32.06 20.78  
**Maximum** 250 325 1.71 16.48 24.81 41.51 118.49  
**Minimum** 90 95 0.13 6.43 11.28 21.99 2.83

**Material Type & Description**

**Citizen-Can:** Roll-off container at the Ivy MUC Convenience Center-citizens dispose of prepaid trashbags  
**Construction:** Construction/demolition debris (shingles, sheetrock, treated lumber, etc.)  
**Count:** Transactions per item (appliances, hauling fees, service fees, tag-bag stickers, tires)  
**Domestic:** Business/residential general or household waste  
**MSW:** Materials processed/handled at the Transfer Station  
**Non-MSW:** Materials processed/handled on-site  
**Vehicle:** Transactions or vehicles processed in a day
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TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
    BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: PHIL MCKALIPS, DIRECTOR OF SOLID WASTE

REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: IVY LANDFILL ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS UPDATE

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2018

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

The Ivy MUC continues to maintain compliance with VA DEQ regulations and our approved Corrective Action Plan.

On March 14, 2017, VA DEQ provided their Second Technical Review of the revised Corrective Action Plan. In summary, the Department’s comments were generally minor administrative corrections or requests for further detail on specific portions of the Corrective Action Plan. Our response to these comments was provided to the Department by the June 12, 2017 deadline. VA DEQ has not provided further comments on the revised Corrective Action Plan or a schedule as to when further comments or an approved Corrective Action Plan may be expected.

This revised Corrective Action Plan was originally submitted in July 2013 and incorporates revised groundwater sampling and reporting requirements. While awaiting finalization, the Department has authorized the Authority to utilize the revised sampling and reporting requirements.

Paint Pit Interim Measure (Soil-Vapor Extraction System)

The Soil-Vapor Extraction (SVE) System has been having control panel electrical issues and is undergoing renovation and repairs. The SVE System is 10 years old and is located outside and exposed to relatively harsh environmental conditions. Electrical issues have begun to increase and in response, staff has determined that a major renovation of the control panel and electrical system is needed to return it to reliable duty.

Surface Water

The Fall 2018 Surface Water Assessment and Sampling Program will begin in October/November. Data from the visual survey and analysis of samples will be included in a tri-annual Corrective Action Site Evaluation (CASE) report to be submitted to VA DEQ in November 2018.

Non-CAP Groundwater Monitoring

The Spring 2018 sampling event has been completed, with no anomalies identified. The results of the analysis of groundwater samples were documented in a report to VA DEQ in August 2018. Efforts are underway to prepare for the Fall 2018 Groundwater Sampling Program to be conducted
in October and November. These groundwater monitoring activities are being completed in accordance with the requirements of our DEQ Permit and the 2000 settlement agreement with the landfill neighbors.

**Cell 3 and Leachate Collection and Treatment System**

The horizontal drain system to the landfill gas collection system continues to be throttled to maintain proper balance of the system’s pressures and flows. Documentation summarizing the activities related to Cell 3 will be submitted to VA DEQ in the 2018 tri-annual Site-wide CASE report.
This memorandum reports on the status of the following project at the IMUC:

1. **Ivy Master Plan**

   - **Consultant:** Arcadis U.S., Inc.
   - **Project Start:** May 2018
   - **Project Status:** 75% Complete
   - **Completion:** November 2018
   - **Total Contract Cost:** $42,560

   **Current Status:**

   The consultant is continuing to work towards completing the Master Plan for the Ivy site. The plan will be presented to the Board at the November Board Meeting. As an interim deliverable, Arcadis prepared two alternative preliminary designs of a convenience center at the Ivy MUC. These alternative designs were presented to the Board of Directors for comments at the August Board meeting.

   **History:**

   Over the past few years, multiple changes have been considered and/or implemented at the Ivy Material Utilization Center (IMUC). The New Ivy Transfer Station is currently under construction and will be opened this fall. Food waste composting has been implemented and a major solar energy project was considered, although not moving forward at this time. The County has inquired about enhancing the recycling services at Ivy MUC to include a convenience center, similar to McIntire Recycling Center. With all of these various developments, staff and the Board decided it would be beneficial to embark on a master planning process.

   This project will include development of a Master Plan for a recycling convenience center at the IMUC. The project will begin with the collection of existing Authority data on current recycling activities and materials, and then compare our services to other similar
size communities. The consultant will evaluate proposed services, and provide alternative site layouts and preliminary construction costs for improvements.
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At the February 2018 Board Meeting, the development of a Master Plan for the Ivy MUC site by Arcadis was approved. This Master Plan project has been undertaken to develop a defined plan for the use of the Ivy MUC property and the nature of waste management, recycling, and other activities that the site could support. The first phase of this project was to develop two alternative preliminary designs for a recycling convenience center at the Ivy MUC. With Board input and approval, the selected convenience center design will be incorporated into the Ivy MUC Master Plan. The Board was first presented two alternative designs for the Ivy convenience center at its August 28, 2018 meeting, and requested further information the cost estimate for the two alternatives.

The Master Plan will also propose an area for potential construction of a composting area. The area currently being considered is located to the north of the new transfer station facility on top of Cell 1 Unlined is shown on Figure 3. The facility is designed to process compostable food waste but could easily include grass clippings and leaves from lawn cleanup. The facility is sized to be capable of receiving several times the quantity of material that is currently received through the existing composting program (500 tons in the last fiscal year). The initial cost to construct and permit this facility is estimated to be approximately $70,000. Annual operating costs, based on the assumption that no additional equipment or manpower become necessary, is estimated to be approximately $20,000.

Proposed Convenience Center Alternatives

As shown on the attached figures (and provided in the Board Meeting Presentation), two alternative convenience center locations and layouts are currently being considered (see Figure 1 and Figure 2).

Alternative 1 – Existing Transfer Station Location

The first of these alternatives is based on a development that occupies the soon to be closed
transfer station location (see Figure 1). Based on input from Arcadis and staff, the cost estimate for constructing and permitting the Alternative 1 facility is estimated to be in the range of $700,000 to $1,000,000. This alternative establishes a facility that utilizes the existing loading dock of the existing transfer station to create a customer walkway with recyclable material collection container located to the left and right as the customer walks down the central walkway. In this design, materials that will utilize top-loading compactor containers will be located to the right (south-side) of the walkway, so that patrons do not have to move around the compactor motor, compressor, power pack assemblies as they do at the existing McIntire facility.

PROS of this alternative are:
- By placing containers on each side of the walkway, patrons and operating staff will have shorter distance and sight-lines between containers.
- This location maintains certain ease of vehicle considerations by keeping traffic separate from that requiring use of the site scales.
- The majority of site vehicle traffic is kept separate from convenience center patron traffic.
- Does not significantly interfere with currently established traffic patterns for Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other Amnesty Days.
- Makes good use of this already-developed part of the Site.

CONS of this alternative consist of:
- Limited potential for future expansion.
- Contains two-way customer traffic patterns.
- Will require interaction between periodic movement of waste hauling trailers coming from the new transfer station and convenience center patrons.

Alternative 2 – Transfer Trailer Parking Area Location

The second alternative will establish a separate facility to be located at the east end of the existing paved area, currently where waste transfer trailers are stored (in the area of the closed Asbestos Disposal Area). Based on input from Arcadis and staff, the cost estimate for constructing and permitting, the Alternative 2 facility is estimated to be in the range of $700,000 to $1,000,000, the same range as the Alternative 1 facility. In this alternative, the recyclables collection containers will all be at grade, and access to the containers will be like that at McIntire (i.e., a linear parking area with an adjacent line of collection containers and compactors).

PROS for this alternative:
- Significant room for future expansion to the west.
- Provides longer access road, inbound queuing of traffic on access road.
- All traffic is one-way.
- Eliminates areas of two-way traffic.

CONS of this alternative:
- Creates more interaction between site vehicles and patrons.
- Interferes with established traffic and queuing patterns for HHW and other Amnesty Days.
• Effectively isolates parts of the existing Site from convenient use for ongoing programs.

Staff’s preferred design is Alternative 1, as it creates minimal interruption with other site programs (e.g., HHW and Amnesty Day collections). This location also contains a great deal of existing infrastructure (e.g., electricity) that will be needed to install the needed compactors. This location also allows the greatest amount of separation from other existing Site services which will help resolve customer confusion.

**Board Action Requested**

In order to complete the development of a complete Master Plan for the Ivy MUC, RSWA staff is requesting the Board to select one of the two alternative convenience center designs so that it may be incorporated into the final Master Plan for the Ivy MUC Site.

Figure 1. – Alternative 1 Convenience Center
Figure 2. – Alternative 2 Convenience Center

Figure 3. – Composting Facility
Ivy MUC Convenience Center Alternatives

Presented by Phil McKalips
October 23, 2018
Alternative 1 – Old TS Location

Pros:
• More compact, utilizes Old Transfer Station space.
• Does not interfere with Amnesty Day traffic.

Cons:
• Less space for expansion
• Design creates two-way traffic for customers

Cost: $700k - $1 M
Alternative 2 – Transfer Trailer Parking

Pros:
• Room for expansion
• One-way traffic flow
• Provides more in-bound queuing if needed.

Cons:
• Creates more interaction between site vehicles and patrons
• Interferes with existing HHW and Amnesty traffic patterns

Cost: $700k - $1 M
Proposed Composting Area