A special meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, October 23, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

**Board Members Present:** Mike Gaffney, Trevor Henry, Jeff Richardson, Liz Palmer, Paul Oberdorfer, Kathy Galvin and Mike Murphy.

**Board Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Bill Mawyer, Katie McIlwee, Phil McKalips, Liz Coleman, Alisa Cooper, David Rhoades, Michelle Simpson, Scott Schiller, Lonnie Wood, Russ Blankenstein, Jennifer Whitaker, Andrea Terry, Tom Freeman and Dave Tungate.

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Gaffney called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

   a. *Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of September 25, 2018*

   Dr. Palmer stated that she had sent Ms. McIlwee corrections to the minutes, including proper spelling of the word “leachate.”

   Dr. Palmer moved to approve the minutes of the RSWA September 25, 2018 meeting as amended. Mr. Oberdorfer seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

3. **RECOGNITION**

   There were no recognitions presented.
4. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Mr. Mawyer introduced new employees: Russ Blankenstein, Assistant Manager, Solid Waste Divison; Alisa Cooper, Payroll and Benefits Coordinator; and Robert Wood, Operator/Attendant, Ivy Transfer Station (not present).

Mr. Mawyer reported that the Household Hazardous Waste and Bulky Waste Amnesty Days had gone well in the fall, with more than 700 vehicles bringing household hazardous waste products, 179 bringing furniture and mattresses, and 289 vehicles bringing appliances – with the bulky waste totaling more than 17 tons of material.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. McKalips had developed a pumpkin recycling program – a “pumpkin smash” to be held at the McIntire Recycling Center on November 10, 2018. He stated that the post-Halloween pumpkins would be collected there and then shipped to Black Bear Composting in Crimora.

Mr. Mawyer noted that the RSWA Board would meet earlier the following month – on November 13, 2018 – to accommodate the Thanksgiving holiday.

Dr. Palmer commented that she appreciated the MUC report format, particularly how many customers crossed the scales as it spoke to customer service.

Mr. Mawyer noted that in Attachment 7B, the Operations Center Report, Mr. McKalips had provided more information regarding City and County participation in the HHW Event.

Dr. Palmer asked if the Ivy Materials Utilization Center Report and Recycling Operations Update would be provided with every Board meeting packet.

Mr. Mawyer confirmed that they would.

He also stated that staff was pondering new names for the Ivy MUC.

Dr. Palmer suggested that they have a contest.

5. **ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Mr. Gaffney invited items from the public.

Mr. John Martin of Free Union addressed the Board and stated he had lived in the County for 21 years and paid for trash to be picked up at his house, and several times a year he had a need for extra things to be taken to the landfill for disposal – and it cost him $7, but could not afford $16, if he were from outside the County. Mr. Martin stated that it was convenient and was a pleasant trip to the landfill, but emphasized that City residents did not have an affordable option and they were punished because their elected officials could not agree. He urged the Board to end the problem now, adding that there was no reason why City residents could not enjoy using the Ivy MUC.
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6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Galvin thanked Mr. Martin for advocating for City residents and stated she had been pondering the issue a lot and would be asking Mr. Murphy and Mr. Oberdorfer about diverting the City’s solid waste needs to Rivanna for management.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that it would be a business decision.

Ms. Galvin stated that all business decisions needed data, information and rationale.

Mr. Oberdorfer commented that part of that was the differential rate, and the City had put together a matrix of this for both the City and County sides, with an eye toward parity and understanding that there may need to be subsidization.

Ms. Galvin suggested that there may be other aspects besides solid waste management, as they seemed to be considering this in a piecemeal fashion.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that the City has a large item pick up and could generate numbers for that tonnage that could be applied to the model.

Ms. Galvin stated that this would help make them identical to the County.

Mr. Gaffney mentioned that Mr. Martin was pointing out just one tiny aspect of this, and Rivanna could look at this further once data was collected as to County versus City usage.

Dr. Palmer stated that the issue with this suggestion was that they would never know how many City people would have come or would not have come if there were a different program in place. She emphasized that the County had not asked the City to do anything and had not asked for any up-front funding, noting that the County assumed the liability of running the transfer station. She added that she hoped the two localities could be partners on some level and not just try to make up the difference based on the arbitrary $9 charge. Dr. Palmer stated that she hoped the City would look at the benefits of a regional solid waste partnership on some level, and if they were to come to a situation wherein they could send their trash to the County, that would be beneficial. She added that she hoped they would be able to reduce the amount of trash, compost, and get recycling done as a community – and doing it together made much more sense for both, even if it involved subsidies.

Ms. Galvin asked if it would be possible to get this onto a City Council agenda to discuss solid waste management and the costs/benefits of a regional approach, with an increasing proportion diverted to the Rivanna authority.

Mr. Oberdorfer responded that composting factors in heavily, because without recycling they were packing the landfill.
Dr. Palmer stated that was a lower-cost item, but the County did have the facility and was investing in it, so that was worth something. She added that they had also been actively working with UVA, the County and Rivanna.

Ms. Galvin stated that before Mr. Oberdofer proceeded, he would need clearance from City Council and a directive from the City Manager. She reiterated that she would like to get this on a Council agenda, with Mr. Oberdofer directed through Mr. Murphy to do a more in-depth study regarding consolidation of a solid waste management system.

Mr. Oberdofer provided an example of a rate differential: non-freon appliance disposal was $9 for the County versus $49 for the City. He added that much of this was transportation costs, and if they recovered freon there was additional expense. Mr. Oberdofer noted that these rates had not been adjusted in several years, so this would provide an opportunity to revisit those.

Mr. Murphy commented that it would not be any trouble to do this, as Mr. Oberdofer had already been doing work on this and could prepare a report to be added to a City Council agenda. He pointed out that solid waste was not a revenue generator for the City and overall operated at a loss, so they would have to take that into account.

Dr. Palmer added that it was also a part of sustainability and thus was a priority on some level.

Ms. Galvin commented that as they were losing less by doing this, it was also a gain.

Mr. Murphy stated that large item pickup was something that previous Councils had considered, and if they were to operate at a break-even, the rates would be very different than what they were today.

Ms. Galvin stated that she would get another Councilor’s support and would get it on an agenda, as it was obvious to her that this was an opportunity that shouldn’t be missed.

Mr. Mawyer added that staff would work with Mr. Oberdofer to get data on capital and operating costs, as well as the service fee and volume fee.

Dr. Palmer emphasized that she was not suggesting that the City start paying for capital costs of the transfer station, but was interested in partnering with them on waste disposal – including bulky waste and other municipal waste – as it made the system more viable.

Dr. Palmer noted her appreciation of Mr. Martin’s interest.

Mr. Mawyer presented photos of the existing transfer station near the tent, pointing out the conveyor area and showing it being demolished. He stated that the new station had been operating for about one month.

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

Dr. Palmer commented that she would like to hear more about the transfer station operating efficiently, and whether that involved truck traffic or the actual handling of material from the time it entered the station to the time it got in the top loader.

Mr. McKalips explained that David Rhoades had been making adjustments and had ideas about having a quick-drop area, with other traffic sweeping around the outside. He stated that staff had changed that around so that everyone was coming through the building, which created a single stream of traffic flow and avoided having cars run across a floor that may contain nails. Mr. McKalips emphasized that this allowed all traffic to move the same way and made it easier for operators to keep an eye on who was where. He stated that they were trying to maximize the amount of material put in every trailer and optimizing how much went out in each trailer.

Dr. Palmer asked how many lines of traffic could get in at one time.

Mr. McKalips responded that they all came around into a single line, with four active aisles plus the lane for the “citizen can,” which was at the front of the facility. He stated that when you came through the side opening, you turned immediately to the left and adjacent to the wall were small roll-offs for quick disposal. He added that there were also four lanes or dumping areas in the major part of the floor where people could pull in and make disposals. Mr. McKalips stated that once that was accumulated, the traffic moved out and the equipment moved in to process it and get it in the hole, which was currently done as a batch operation. He stated that while they had to stop the flow to move material, he had not seen any wait lines accumulate.

Mr. Rhoades clarified that the worst was perhaps a five-minute wait, or perhaps seven to eight minutes if they had to do a trailer switch-out and pack down. He emphasized that this was only done about three times over an entire day period, adding that the traffic flowed very well.

Mr. McKalips stated that the wait at the old facility could be much longer, and for staff and customer use, the new transfer station was much more efficient.

Mr. Mawyer commented that they had integrated a safety aspect of this program, with Safety Manager Liz Coleman, Mr. Rhoades, and other staff sitting down together and coming up with strategies to paint lines and block off the pit. He stated that they did not want Rivanna’s equipment operating with other cars in the facility, so they open the entrance to the transfer station, let people dump their loads on the floor, then close the entrance when it is time to fill the trailer, getting the trash into the container and immediately reopening.

Mr. McKalips stated that when four lanes were open, several vehicles at a time were depositing waste – accommodating as many as 50 cars – with the pile creeping out toward the front of the building.
Mr. Henry noted that this was a change from the original design concept and it was good to be responsive, and he asked if the process could be maintained if the volume increased or whether it would revert to the original design.

Mr. McKalips responded that he liked the way this was open, and instead of having the front neck down to a smaller opening in the building, this worked a lot better. He stated that the staff person can now be at the gate or side door and could be part of directing traffic and allowed others to be more functional and useful.

Mr. Gaffney asked if staff had designed the metrics so they could measure the efficiency over time as they got busier.

Mr. McKalips responded that they had not done a cycle time yet but were hoping to see increases in tonnage as the new facility was open, adding that they could analyze the ticket data.

Dr. Palmer stated she would be very interested in measuring this for commercial vehicles.

Mr. McKalips clarified that he had reached out to the larger haulers, such as Time Disposal, Updike, and Waste Management, to let them know the facility was open. He added that if they did show up, staff would make every effort to accelerate the trip and make it efficient.

Dr. Palmer moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. Galvin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

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

Mr. McKalips reported that in August, staff had presented two alternatives for a convenience center at Ivy, which was part of the development of the master plan for Ivy. He stated that the questions associated with that had related primarily to the cost of construction, and the desired outcome of the presentation was for the Board to select one of the two alternatives.

Mr. McKalips stated that the first alternative would be located at the old transfer station facility, with only the loading dock left there currently. He explained that half of the green cans would go below on the low side of the loading dock, and the others would be on the high side – with all the compactor units on the low side so that customers did not have to be around any of the mechanical infrastructure.

Dr. Palmer asked why the slide showed $400K-$700K when the Board packets stated $700K-$1M.
Mr. McKalips responded that there had been a discussion about that, and the cost estimate had been updated.

He explained that a user would come into the site and would go down to the existing convenience center, which is the cardboard container, then turn on a new road back to a parking area – with the new convenience center located on the right. He stated that this would allow existing truck traffic that came back into the paved area for amnesty days to stay undisturbed, and would allow the back lot to be used for amnesty days, as well as trailer parking and other existing uses.

Mr. McKalips emphasized that the site was somewhat fixed and would be constrained in the event of future expansion if that were necessary, and one negative aspect was that the roadway had two-lane traffic in this section of the roadway. He pointed out the traffic route to access the new transfer station, noting that a user came in the site entrance, up the hill to the scale house, up a curved road into the transfer station into the side entrance – with the traffic coming into the site and always staying to the left, with the convenience center traffic coming before the scales and going to the right so they did not cross.

Mr. McKalips explained that the second alternative would come into the site from the same location, come down the road currently used for truck traffic past the truck parking area, and to a convenience center located at the far end of the asbestos disposal area. He stated that traffic leaving would circle around, come up behind the barn across a new road, and exit to the site – with the new transfer station to the left. He emphasized that this would keep convenience center traffic separate, but where it would cause potential conflicts would be amnesty days, as all that traffic would be comingled with convenience center traffic. Mr. McKalips noted that there could be some potential time delays with people arriving to use the center.

Mr. McKalips stated that in December 2017, he had prepared a cost for a convenience center located at the Ivy MUC of $312K for the facility at the alternative #1 location. He explained that he presented the information in August and the Board had asked for better cost estimates, so staff went to the consultant, Arcadis – which provided costs that were all above $1 million. He stated that in looking at this, he felt that it was hard to justify spending 1/3 of the transfer station costs on just the convenience center, so they arrived at $700K-$1M and ended up revising them again to get to the lower levels presented. Mr. McKalips added that his original estimate from a year ago may be missing something, but he did not think it would be at that level.

Dr. Palmer commented that the Board had asked for staff to develop a convenience center that would be the ideal center so it could be used as a model for other areas, but at the same time, it would be pretty difficult to sell a $700K center. She asked how they would get to the point where they narrowed down the actual cost and how they could make it more saleable.

Mr. McKalips responded that the step would be to proceed down the path as they got someone on board to actually do a design that was a nuts and bolts approach – not just speculation. He stated that those would generate a much more refined number for the Board to consider and compare, and ultimately would have something to go to bid.
Dr. Palmer asked why they would need a road when they already had all the asphalt.

Mr. McKalips responded that the road would be all new — two lanes totaling 24 feet — and it was currently just a grass hill. He stated that there was plenty of power service in the existing barn that used to run all the compactor equipment, so the new electric would be a short run, and it is largely already underlain with concrete. He mentioned that sometimes roll-offs had issues with asphalt because the asphalt gave way, and these things may not have been reflected in the consultant’s estimate.

Mr. Mawyer pointed out that they were in the conceptual stage, and if there was a preference between the two sites, they could then get a professional to focus on the details and budget, which was an iterative process.

Mr. Henry asked if alternative #1 took better advantage of existing site conditions, because it seemed to be the preferred solution.

Mr. McKalips responded that it was staff’s preferred choice because it already had the concrete and the loading dock, and it saved valuable real estate to be used for other things, making use of space that did not have much other potential use. He stated that it kept activities on the site compact from the standpoint of utilizing equipment, and it would be a manned facility so it was easy for someone to come down instead of being at the far end.

Dr. Palmer stated that it seemed that alternative #1 was the best option, but there would be a goal of cutting costs.

Mr. McKalips stated that this would be the next step.

Ms. Galvin asked about the composting possibilities.

Mr. McKalips explained that staff had the consultant put together a concept for where the compost yard would go, and his preference was to have it on the other side of the fence in front of the existing transfer station because the old cell one unlined was generally flat and would allow them to utilize labor and equipment for managing the compost. He stated that when compost was received, it would need to be mixed with mulch, and there was a loader inside the barn so it would be easy to do small amounts of work — which meant a separate person and a separate piece of equipment would not be needed.

Mr. Gaffney asked how much of this was on Cell 1.

Mr. McKalips responded that the entire footprint would be on Cell 1, with the parking area being a permeable gravel surface — but they would need to build a concrete processing floor that people would dump the compost on to then be mixed with mulch, because an earthen cover would constantly require digging. He pointed out that it would be put in the center in the green oval shown on the figure presented, and as they did not damage the cap, DEQ was amenable to it being on the cell.
Dr. Palmer stated they were currently doing the transfer for UVA and whatever small amount of compost Rivanna got, and she asked how it would work out financially if they were doing it onsite and not trucking it off, as they would not be paying any portion of it to truck it away.

Mr. McKalips stated that they created mulch so they were self-supporting in terms of the other ancillary raw material needs for it, and if they could get by using staff with a few spare hours — along with the existing onsite equipment — his estimate was approximately $20K a year in costs. He stated that this would involve hiring a company called Royal Oak to come up with their screening machine to screen all the wood back out of the mulch so it left only the compost material.

Mr. Mawyer mentioned that there would be a cost reduction on the compostable food waste, as it would not be shipped to Crimora.

Dr. Palmer asked if that was reflected in the $20K estimate.

Mr. McKalips responded that they did not make any adjustments to the expense, so it was not a net calculation, and they could set a tipping fee to offset it.

Mr. Mawyer commented that there was also a revenue component for the compost if they were going to sell that, and that must be factored in. He stated that the capital costs reflected in the packet were estimated at $70K, which was considerably lower than what the consultant developed at $100K.

Dr. Palmer asked what Rivanna was currently getting from UVA for the transfer.

Mr. McKalips responded that it was 500 tons per year as of last year, and they paid $178 per ton, with RSWA paying $152 per ton for Black Bear to take it away. He stated that 500 tons cost the RSWA about $20K per year.

Mr. Oberdorfer asked what storm water controls were required.

Mr. McKalips responded that he had been told they did not need any additional controls, as they already tested storm water because of the transfer station and the fact it was a landfill — and when it came to permitting, they may up some of the analytes Rivanna was testing for, but that would only be $100-200 per year. He stated that his intention was to not do as much earth work as the consultant had suggested, because it would be a fairly small composting operation at 500 tons per year.

Dr. Palmer commented that this was the beauty of doing it on a landfill, and she would be interested in taking this further to see what Rivanna staff could work out and what UVA would be willing to do — including possibly paying some of the up-front capital costs.
Mr. Mawyer stated that part of UVA’s incentive was to try to become a regional system so Rivanna could get the unit price down and make it more affordable for UVA and any other partners.

Dr. Palmer recalled that they had needed 35,000 tons to make money from it, and at the point that was evaluated, they only had 360 tons. She stated that UVA’s sustainability efforts were concentrated on the food-water-energy interface, so this seemed to fit into their priorities.

Dr. Palmer moved to direct Rivanna staff to proceed with alternative #1. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA

Dr. Palmer stated that she had recently found a paper at home that was a memorandum dated 2004, from Cole Hendrix as a consultant to the RSWA, with alternatives proposed at Ivy – including building a new transfer station at a cost of $3.4 million, which was remarkably close to the actual cost.

Mr. Henry reported that the Board of Supervisors would be evaluating an executive summary for a reduction in tipping fees from $66 to $55 per ton, and if approved, a letter and action would come from the Board.

Dr. Palmer noted that it was for a two-year trial and she would have preferred a three-year trial, but it did coincide with her term on the Board. She stated that it would likely take them longer than two years because haulers would need to buy equipment, etc.

Mr. Henry stated the length of the trial period was within the Board of Supervisor’s ability to discuss.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the RSWA would have a regular meeting in November and anticipated a fee reduction to be on the agenda, including the conclusion from the Board of Supervisors. He stated that if the Albemarle Board of Supervisors were to approve it and the RSWA approved a new fee schedule on November 13, RSWA could authorize advertisement of the public hearing in December, with an effective date to follow anytime thereafter.

Dr. Palmer stated that she hoped it could be January 1 for a new transfer station and new tipping fee in the New Year.

10. CLOSED MEETING

There was no closed meeting held.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Palmer moved to adjourn the RSWA Board meeting. Ms. Galvin seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.
The RSWA Board adjourned its meeting at 2:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Mr. Mike Murphy
Secretary - Treasurer