Special Meeting of the Board of Directors

September 24, 2019
2:00pm
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

DATE: September 24, 2019

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 Regular Meeting of the Board on August 27, 2019

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. General Administrative Procedures
   d. Award of Nonprofessional Services Contract
      On-Call Dam Maintenance Services: Bander Smith, Inc

8. OTHER BUSINESS
   a. Presentation: Charlottesville’s Landfill Diversion Program; Kristel Riddervold, Environmental Sustainability Manager, and Marty Silman, Public Service Manager
   b. Presentation: Composting Feasibility Study; Bill Mawyer, Executive Director and Craig Coker, Coker Composting and Consulting

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
August 27, 2019

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, August 27, 2019 at 2:03 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Liz Palmer, Paul Oberdorfer, Mike Gaffney, Kathy Galvin, Tarron Richardson (arrived at 2:17 pm).

Board Members Absent: Jeff Richardson, Lance Stewart.

Rivanna Staff Present: David Rhoades, Phil McKalips, Michelle Simpson, Austin Marrs, Andrea Terry, Victoria Fort, Jennifer Whitaker, Scott Schiller, Lonnie Wood, Liz Coleman, Dr. Bill Morris, Dyon Vega, Katie McIlwee, Bill Mawyer.

Attorney(s) Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger, members of the public and media representatives.

1. CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Gaffney convened the August 27, 2019 meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:03 p.m.

Mr. Gaffney stated he wanted to start by remembering someone who was a very active participant as a citizen living in the Ivy Landfill Area. He noted that Ed Strange passed away that week, and that he had attended almost every meeting for 6-8 years as well as was heavily involved in the mitigation plan and getting things right with the landfill.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING
Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on June 25, 2019
Mr. Gaffney asked board members if they had comments or changes. None were presented.

Dr. Palmer moved that the board approve the minutes of the previous board meeting. She was seconded by Mr. Oberdorfer and the motion passed unanimously (4-0). Mr. Richardson, Dr. Richardson, and Mr. Stewart were absent from the vote.

3. RECOGNITIONS
Mr. Gaffney stated that they did not have any recognitions.

1. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
Mr. Bill Mawyer stated the topic the previous week was the fire at the transfer station, which occurred in the trailer in what is called “The Tunnel.” He indicated to the Tunnel on a picture as well as a trash chute where trash falls into the trailer. He explained that the trailer was on fire, with the flames going up through the chute. He indicated to an area above the chute and the smoke discoloration on the wall and signs. He stated that the safety engineer did give approval to reenter the building on August 27th, and the transfer station would be open for the business the next day.
Mr. Mawyer noted there was still some repair work to be done there, indicating to a concrete wall where the concrete was scarred. He added that there was a bristle device that went around the opening, which all burned away, and that some of the lights were melted. He stated there were some repairs to do, and that they were working through the insurance company, who was providing their disaster response team as well as a structural engineer, adding that they have been very helpful.

Dr. Palmer asked if the Tunnel would be able to be used.

Mr. Mawyer replied they could use the Tunnel.

Dr. Palmer asked if there was an intention to put in a fire alarm to catch an occurrence like this one earlier.

Mr. Mawyer replied that this had not been discussed, but that there has been consideration to changing the practice of leaving the trash truck in the building at night, explaining that it would now be pulled out of the building, tarped, and covered. He stated that if whatever caused this fire – hot coals, batteries – happens again, it would not happen inside the building.

Dr. Palmer noted that some things are still stored inside the building, such as construction debris.

Ms. Galvin underscored Dr. Palmer’s point that an alarm system was critically important. She expressed surprise at the lack of one.

Dr. Palmer explained that this was a decision that was made early on because there was not a need for an alarm for this size transfer station.

Mr. Mawyer noted that it is an open facility on three sides (with the doorway), so it isn’t as if the doors are closed and the heat builds up to a point which it would trigger the alarm. He stated an alarm that would work in this situation would have to be investigated.

Mr. Gaffney suggested having a smoke detector inside the Tunnel.

Dr. Palmer stated she was thinking about all the construction debris, mattresses, etc. that sometimes pile up in order to try to obtain the tonnage in the trailers.

Mr. Mawyer agreed that this was a good thought. He indicated to a picture showing the outside of the building where a wall burned, which also showed light fixtures that melted in the Tunnel. He showed a picture of the trailer when it was pulled out of the chute and over near the convenience center area. He noted it was smoldering and continuing to burn in that picture. He explained that the trailer belonged to Thompson Trucking (RSWA’s subcontractor) and that RSWA is working through the insurance company to get it all resolved.

Mr. Mawyer recalled that in early August, a car ran into the back of our leachate transfer truck, and he showed a picture of the bent fender. He stated the SUV that hit the vehicle was totaled.

Dr. Palmer asked if anyone was hurt.

Mr. Mawyer replied that he didn’t think that anyone was hurt. He stated they have not yet received a report from the State Police. He stated the insurance company has been notified and as far as he knows, no one was seriously injured. He asked for confirmation of this from Mr. McKalips.
Mr. McKalips stated that all he knew was that they were taken to the hospital.

Ms. Galvin asked where this happened.

Mr. Mawyer replied this happened going up the incline at the Ivy exit to interstate 64 going eastbound. He explained that the truck had come up the merge lane and merged over at the crest of the hill before coming to the Route 29 exit. He stated the SUV ran into the back of the truck on the uphill side.

Ms. Galvin noted that I-64 is dangerous there because of the truck travel being slowed down by the inclines. She stated the cars aren’t gauging their speed and run into the trucks. She asked if it was a foggy day.

Mr. Mawyer replied no, that it was a clear day. He explained that the truck was loaded and was going slowly but did have its flashers activated. He expressed how unfortunate the incident was.

Dr. Palmer stated it was clearly not the truck driver’s fault.

Mr. Mawyer stated this was correct, that they didn’t believe so.

Mr. Mawyer stated he had wanted to provide an update on the strategic plan, which would have been the first quarterly update, but a written update was decided upon rather than a presentation. He mentioned that the Communication and Collaboration Team would be working on a project for the United Way’s Day of Caring at Camp Holiday Trails and that volunteers would be helping there. He stated under Operational Optimization and Protecting the Workforce, new locks have been installed at the Ivy Administration Building and the Scale House to better secure staff there.

Mr. Mawyer stated that for Workforce Development, two training classes have been conducted – one for CPR training, and one for OSHA-10 training. He described the OSHA training as 10 hours of training with an instructor on personal protective equipment, lockout/tagout, fall protection, and other safety issues in the workplace. He showed a picture of the CPR training, which included first aid and how to bandage cuts.

Mr. Mawyer stated RSWA held a Customer Appreciation and Safety Awareness event, showing a picture from the event. He stated there was a cookout, and that safety fliers were provided to customers on waste hauler safety and backing up to make sure no one is behind them. He stated the event was held at the Ivy MUC.

Mr. Mawyer stated there was also an operator training simulator coming from Carter Equipment to help train RSWA employees on how to operate some of the heavy equipment that is used at the landfill. He stated this was a unique opportunity that Mr. Rhoades and Mr. McKalips had come up with.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. McKalips held a tour at the landfill for 8- to 12-year olds on the recycling and refuse processes.

Mr. Mawyer stated there were 5,251 vehicles visited the Ivy facility in June, with an average tonnage of 94.5 tons per day. He stated there were 5,313 vehicles in July, with an average daily tonnage of 97.3 tons per day.
Mr. Mawyer noted that the safety manager, Liz Coleman, applied for and received a grant of $2,000 from RSWA’s insurance carrier, Virginia Risk Sharing Association. He stated the grant application was to purchase AEDs (Automated External Defibrillators) for RSWA.

Dr. Palmer stated that two Saturdays prior, she went out to the transfer station and that some of the employees working there spent time introducing her to everyone and discussing the operation. She stated it was very nice to have this kind of interaction, and that the gentleman managing at the time had told his employees that “you never can tell who will walk through the door.” She stated the employees were very friendly.

Mr. Mawyer thanked Dr. Palmer for her visit, noting that Mr. McKalips and Mr. Roades do a great job with the staff there. He stated that for the 50 years he has gone to the landfill, it is in the best condition he has ever seen it as far as its cleanliness and order. He stated it is much improved over how the old dump used to be.

Dr. Palmer agreed. She stated she was glad to hear it was reopening after the fire.

Ms. Galvin stated it was brought to her attention that there were applications being made to Dominion Energy for solar panels.

Mr. Mawyer stated he appreciated the letters of support provided from the City and the County, and that these were forwarded to Community Power Group to support their applications at Dominion Power to get a solar project approved at the landfill. He stated the lease was done with Community Power Group two years prior and it had been extended with their latest initiative to try to go back to Virginia Power. He stated this was still in play.

Dr. Palmer stated she hoped that Mr. Mawyer received the letter from the County Board.

Mr. McKalips stated he forwarded those letters to Community Power.

Ms. Galvin thanked Dr. Palmer for bringing the matter to her attention. She told Mr. McKalips that his explanatory email to Dr. Palmer was extremely helpful. She stated she was quickly able to get everyone up to speed on what was going on.

Dr. Palmer expressed hope that the project would be done.

Ms. Galvin stated there had been a question about what the monetary benefit would be if it was done.

Mr. Mawyer responded that the rental rate was $800 per acre that is used per year, and that looking at 5-10 acres, it would not be a huge amount of money but that it would go to support the environmental post-closures processes at the landfill, which the City and County share the cost (35.5% by the City, and 64.5% by the County).

Dr. Palmer noted that those exact numbers were listed in the email.

Mr. Mawyer stated he could forward an email to Ms. Galvin with more information. He stated they offered that they would support education in the community for renewable resource-type jobs.
Mr. McKalips added that there would also be support for power to those representing disadvantaged residents.

Mr. Mawyer stated this would possibly be the Charlottesville Housing Authority. He explained this was part of the proposal being made to Virginia Power, and whether Virginia Power would accept them to do this is up to them.

Dr. Palmer stated perhaps this email should be sent to the Board.

Mr. Mawyer replied that he would.

5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC
There were no items from the public, and thus no responses to comments.

Mr. Gaffney closed the Items from the Public portion of the meeting.

6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no responses.

7. CONSENT AGENDA
Mr. Gaffney asked members if there were any items they would like to pull. There were none.

Dr. Palmer mentioned the Thompson Trucking item and recalled that there had been discussions about possibly not being able to get the 20-22 tons in the loader from the beginning. She stated it seemed like a big jump and if there was anything else causing this jump besides the tonnage.

Mr. Mawyer replied no. He stated that as outlined in the memo, Thompson Trucking was previously charging $38.89 per ton, which was competitively bid last year immediately before opening the new transfer station. He explained they had a renewal and could have renewed this September, but they told RSWA that they will need to renegotiate that price as it wasn’t meeting their needs. He stated that RSWA responded that they would rather not do this, explaining that they would issue a new procurement. He stated they did advertise and received three competitive bids. He stated Thompson was still the low bidder, at $45.75 per ton, noting there was about a $7-per-ton increase, but that the second lowest bidder was about $46, and the next was $49.

Dr. Palmer asked if the reason the rate was not meeting Thompson’s needs was because there wasn’t enough tonnage per load.

Mr. Mawyer replied that this is what Thompson had told them, and that RSWA had never told them how much compaction they would have or how many tons they would get on a truck. He stated they had speculated that they would get more, and the per ton cost was more than they expected it to be, which is why they wanted the higher fee. He stated RSWA preferred to resolicit and re-procure, noting that Thompson was still low but that the cost went up nearly $7 per ton.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the budget needed to be reanalyzed for this year.

Mr. Mawyer replied this was not necessary, and that RSWA would monitor this, as it depends upon how many tons were transferred, but agreed that this was a good point that could be revisited if needed.
Dr. Palmer asked when the contract starts.

Mr. Mawyer replied it would start on September 23.

Dr. Palmer moved that the board adopt the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Galvin and passed unanimously (5-0). Mr. Richardson and Mr. Stewart were absent from the vote.

8. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Presentation and Approval: “Monday” Operations at the Ivy MUC

Mr. Mawyer stated that at Ivy, RSWA has been operating on Mondays at the request of the County and that the board discussed it to add Monday to the regular work session. He stated they had been open previously Tuesday through Saturday. He stated that initially Mr. Gaffney had received a call from a business saying that this was not a realistic business schedule to be closed on Mondays, and that the Board agreed. He stated officially, the Albemarle County Board has to approve any increase in rates, schedules, and costs at the transfer station, which was done in February.

Mr. Mawyer stated that since this time, the Ivy facility has been operating six days a week under a pilot program that would extend into September for six months. He stated the new schedule is Monday through Saturday, and that the goal was to increase tonnage at the transfer station to 87 tons per day. He stated that data over 23 Mondays says they are averaging over 100 tons a day on Monday, and that the daily goal is being met with a daily average of being 87 tons of day each day, noting that this did not rob from any other days of the week to do it on Monday. He stated that all the approaches the Board has attempted with lowering fees and increasing the work schedule in order to increase tonnage at the landfill are working.

Mr. Mawyer stated he would make a recommendation. He noted the Board is not scheduled to meet in September and suggested that Monday be made a permanent part of RSWA’s work schedule. He stated they would have to notify DEQ to obtain its approval. He stated that from the beginning, it was stated that two permanent staff would need to be added in order to add the additional day. He explained that two temporary staff have been added to help during the pilot period and that these positions would be converted to permanent ones upon the Board’s approval.

Ms. Galvin noted it was nice to have the data supporting the change.

Dr. Palmer moved that the current operating schedule be approved as a permanent schedule. The motion was seconded by Ms. Galvin and passed unanimously (5-0). Mr. Richardson and Mr. Stewart were absent from the vote.

Mr. Krueger asked Dr. Richardson if he was familiar with the closed meeting certification resolution for the June meeting. For the record he asked him if he would be willing to state that he agrees and consents to the resolution with respect to the portion of the closed meeting that he attended.

Dr. Richardson gave his agreement and consent.

9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA
Dr. Palmer stated that since there would not be another RSWA Board Meeting until November, it would be helpful to schedule one item in the September-October timeframe. She stated one of the things she loves to hear about is the City’s plans to look at their solid waste operations in general and would love to hear more about this and what the expectations are. She stated ideally, September would be a good time to look at this, but she wasn’t sure who would be available and that it would be nice to have more County staff, such as Mr. Stewart and Mr. Richardson, to discuss this if possible.

Dr. Palmer stated she would also like another update on how the repairs on the transfer station are going before November. She stated perhaps this could be considered and what date would work in September or October.

Mr. Mawyer supposed this would be in the discussion about the potential compost facilities, noting that he was on the agenda for the City/County Meeting on September 9 to discuss compost. He stated he had a meeting with Dr. Palmer, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Stewart on September 11 to discuss compost alternatives. He stated a consultant study has been done with Coker Consulting about a potential compost facility at Ivy and they have been given preliminary information. He stated RSWA wants to discuss it further and with Dr. Palmer to get it right-sized with alternatives of what could be available. He stated he did not plan to talk to City Council at the meeting about this until the RSWA Board had a chance to review the opportunities, such as building a facility at Ivy or other composting recommendations.

Dr. Palmer stated that whatever came out of this meeting would need to be discussed with everyone.

Mr. Mawyer stated this was the thought, to work with Dr. Palmer et al and then bring it back to the whole RSWA board for discussion.

Mr. Krueger asked if Mr. Mawyer may want to discuss with the other members of the Board who were not present to make sure they would be present for the special meeting.

Dr. Palmer stated they would need to look at the schedule and try to get as many members in as possible.

Mr. Krueger asked if she wanted this to be in September or October.

Dr. Palmer stated she preferred September, unless there are not enough members who can attend in September. She also stated that a big presentation was not needed.

Mr. Krueger stated assuming that the requisite board members are present, either in September or October, Mr. Gaffney as Chair has the power to call a special meeting and that the assumption is that the Board is directing him, subject to finding out what requisite members are available in those months to call such a meeting.

Mr. Mawyer stated on September 9, there is a joint Council/Board of Supervisors meeting.

Dr. Palmer asked if Mr. Mawyer would be talking about composting then.

Mr. Mawyer replied yes, that he was on the agenda.
Dr. Richardson asked Dr. Palmer what kinds of things she wanted to hear about relating to solid waste from the City. He offered to coordinate with Mr. Richardson so that they would be on the same page when they make the presentation.

Dr. Palmer replied that she would like to know what the expectations are as far as leaf collection, bulk, trash services that are done curbside, recycling, and other matters. She stated a newspaper article indicated that the City wanted to expand services but at the same time, they were looking to also decrease the budget. She stated this was confusing to her and that she wanted to find out more about what the City was trying to do.

Dr. Palmer recognized that no one has any intention of stopping curbside trash pickup in the City, but she wondered if this was a state requirement as a city to do this, or if it was something the City decided to do.

Dr. Richardson stated this is done as a courtesy.

Ms. Galvin stated at the same time, it would benefit the public to know that this is an extra service that the City provides. She stated there are private haulers that are picking up in the City.

Dr. Richardson stated the City would be looking at private haulers and in terms of how many there are in the City, and how many are traversing throughout the City messing up the streets. He stated the question is to if the City wants one company, or multiple companies, to do this. He stated where he has lived, traditionally there has been one hauler and from that one hauler, the locality was able to get different services, such as cleaning up storm debris or offering Porta Potties for special events. He stated that as part of this type of contract, extra trucks from other areas would be brought in for support in events such as storms. He stated there were different programs throughout the year done through the one hauler in the City.

Dr. Richardson stated there were different ways to look at this, noting that when he was in Richmond, the city did the collection throughout the city. He stated as far as Charlottesville goes, they will possibly want to look at having one hauler in the City, and that the capacity and size of the collection vehicles would be discussed in order to determine what would have the least impact on roads.

Dr. Palmer stated there were similar problems in neighborhoods in the County where there are five different garbage trucks going down the road because everyone has a different hauler.

Dr. Richardson stated they have no control over how long they stay in the City. He stated it is a matter of having haulers stay in the City until 7:00 or 8:00 pm, versus having a contract with someone to be out by 5:00 pm.

Dr. Palmer recognized that County staff has been speaking to City staff about the fact that the County has an urban area and they do not have much of a public works department.

Ms. Galvin stated this was something to discuss.

Dr. Palmer stated she wasn’t necessarily trying to bring up this subject in September but would like to hear about what the City would do, as they are having many issues in the urban areas.

10. CLOSED MEETING
There was no closed meeting.

8. Adjournment

At 2:34 p.m., Dr. Palmer moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. The motion was seconded by Mr. Oberdorfer and passed unanimously (5-0). Mr. Stewart and Mr. Richardson were absent from the vote.
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
    BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

We have coordinated with PVCC to provide a Project Management training program for our staff in October.

Safety and management training programs are being provided at no cost from our new property and liability insurance provider, the Virginia Risk Sharing Association. Group Long Term Care Insurance is being offered to staff by the Virginia Retirement System, with Genworth Life Insurance Company as the provider.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: COMMUNICATION & COLLABORATION

Community Outreach

Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste, gave a presentation on recycling and composting to the Monticello Garden Club.

UVA’s Theta chapter of the Alpha Phi Omega service group volunteered on Saturday, September 7, 2019 and on Saturday, September 14, 2019 at The Ivy MUC. The team collected trash from Dick Woods Rd to Interstate 64.

I met with the Blue Ridge Home Builders Association to inform the group about the new transfer facility, reduced fees and improved services to dispose of construction debris at the Ivy MUC.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP; SOLID WASTE SERVICES

Use of the Ivy Materials Utilization Center:

August 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>AVG MSW &amp; CDD Tons/Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4802</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Rights for Property Near the Ivy MUC

A professional appraisal of a “development right” was completed for RSWA property located adjacent to the IMUC, as was discussed with the Board during the June meeting. The appraiser estimated the development right to have a value of $20,000.
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
    BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: LONZY WOOD, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

REVIEWED: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AUGUST 2019 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating Results</th>
<th>Remediation Results</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$423,451</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$423,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>(528,306)</td>
<td>(87,265)</td>
<td>(615,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net operating results</td>
<td>(104,855)</td>
<td>(87,265)</td>
<td>(192,120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support - MOU &amp; Local</td>
<td>35,067</td>
<td>167,898</td>
<td>202,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)*</td>
<td>$ (69,788)</td>
<td>$ 80,633</td>
<td>$ 10,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total operating revenues for July and August were $98,500 over budget, and total operating expenses were $10,900 over budget. The Authority has processed 8,460 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>5,076</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net operating revenue (costs)</td>
<td>$3,054</td>
<td>$(18,934)</td>
<td>$(88,974)</td>
<td>$(104,854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net revenue (cost) per ton</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$(6.34)</td>
<td>$(222.99)</td>
<td>$(12.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments
# RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
## REVENUE AND EXPENSE SUMMARY REPORT
### FISCAL YEAR 2020
#### FOR THE MONTH ENDED 8/31/2019

**Target Rate:** 16.67%

### 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations Tipping Fees</td>
<td>$199,400</td>
<td>$199,400</td>
<td>$199,400</td>
<td>$199,400</td>
<td>$1,290,540</td>
<td>$1,290,540</td>
<td>$284,112</td>
<td>$284,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material &amp; Other Sales-Ivy</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
<td>$123,500</td>
<td>$200,900</td>
<td>$200,900</td>
<td>$24,787</td>
<td>$24,787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Revenues</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$11,612</td>
<td>$11,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,949,940</td>
<td>$1,949,940</td>
<td>$322,900</td>
<td>$322,900</td>
<td>$200,900</td>
<td>$200,900</td>
<td>$24,787</td>
<td>$24,787</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget vs. Actual</strong></td>
<td>21.72%</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
<td>12.34%</td>
<td>27.26%</td>
<td>27.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations</td>
<td>$337,846</td>
<td>$337,846</td>
<td>$337,846</td>
<td>$337,846</td>
<td>$1,768,602</td>
<td>$1,768,602</td>
<td>$273,819</td>
<td>$273,819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
<td>$531,656</td>
<td>$531,656</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
<td>$112,693</td>
<td>$112,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$3,364,733</td>
<td>$3,364,733</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$3,364,733</td>
<td>$3,364,733</td>
<td>$112,693</td>
<td>$112,693</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
<td>$726,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget vs. Actual</strong></td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Results Before Administrative Allocation

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$(1,209,584)</td>
<td>$(1,209,584)</td>
<td>$(185,953)</td>
<td>$(185,953)</td>
<td>$(556,069)</td>
<td>$(556,069)</td>
<td>$(3,054)</td>
<td>$(3,054)</td>
<td>$(467,562)</td>
<td>$(467,562)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Funding Sources

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution - Capital Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Fund - Transfer Station</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(49,030)</td>
<td>$(69,768)</td>
<td>$(69,768)</td>
<td>$342,969</td>
<td>$342,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Environmental Programs

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Support</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$167,896</td>
<td>$167,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$1,070,582</td>
<td>$167,896</td>
<td>$167,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget vs. Actual</strong></td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENSES

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Environmental</td>
<td>$863,374</td>
<td>$863,374</td>
<td>$56,940</td>
<td>$56,940</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Allocation</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$531,656</td>
<td>$531,656</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
<td>$205,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$373,925</td>
<td>$373,925</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$373,925</td>
<td>$373,925</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
<td>$1,068,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget vs. Actual</strong></td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td>8.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Reserves Used

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit) - Environmental</strong></td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(80,633)</td>
<td>$(80,633)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
<td>$(391,999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Administrative allocations:
- Administrative costs to Envir. MOU (below) | $205,209 | $205,209 | $531,656 | $531,656 | $726,629 | $726,629 | $112,693 | $112,693 | $726,629 | $726,629 |
- Administrative costs to Operations | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Year-to-Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations Tipping Fees</td>
<td>$32,267</td>
<td>$31,531</td>
<td>$63,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy MSW Transfer Tipping Fees</td>
<td>141,391</td>
<td>142,721</td>
<td>284,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Material Sales</td>
<td>9,769</td>
<td>11,342</td>
<td>21,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>14,209</td>
<td>10,578</td>
<td>24,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>8,407</td>
<td>18,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation Support</td>
<td>79,982</td>
<td>87,916</td>
<td>167,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest &amp; Late Fees</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>11,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$292,993</td>
<td>$298,356</td>
<td>$591,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Operations</td>
<td>$30,686</td>
<td>$47,887</td>
<td>$78,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Environmental</td>
<td>23,419</td>
<td>33,521</td>
<td>56,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy MSW Transfer</td>
<td>171,245</td>
<td>102,574</td>
<td>273,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Operation</td>
<td>43,486</td>
<td>50,059</td>
<td>93,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>58,374</td>
<td>54,319</td>
<td>112,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$327,210</td>
<td>$288,360</td>
<td>$615,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>$(34,218)</td>
<td>$9,996</td>
<td>$(24,222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$35,067</td>
<td>$35,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Cash Reserves</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td>$(34,218)</td>
<td>$45,063</td>
<td>$10,845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rivanna Solid Waste Authority
### Monthly Cash Flow Report
### FY 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Income</strong></td>
<td>$ (34,218)</td>
<td>$ 9,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for cash flow purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in accounts receivable</td>
<td>(14,973)</td>
<td>79,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in accounts payable</td>
<td>(100,691)</td>
<td>(159,467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserve fund interest not available in operating cash</td>
<td>(2,067)</td>
<td>(2,036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust fund interest not available in operating cash</td>
<td>(252)</td>
<td>(255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase (Decrease) in Operating Cash</strong></td>
<td>$ (152,201)</td>
<td>$ (36,714)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Operating Cash Balance - Beginning</strong> | 2,198,460 | 2,046,259 |
| <strong>Operating Cash Balance - Ending</strong>   | $ 2,046,259 | $ 2,009,545 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Line Item</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Budget FY 2020</th>
<th>Budget YTD</th>
<th>Actual YTD</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVY TIPPING FEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Fill Material</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>$ 65,000</td>
<td>$ 10,833</td>
<td>$ 21,846</td>
<td>$ 11,013</td>
<td>101.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grindable Vegetative Material</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>100,800</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>34,376</td>
<td>17,576</td>
<td>104.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires, Whole</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>(2,634)</td>
<td>-92.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tires/White Good (per item)</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>131.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,690</td>
<td>$ 2,916</td>
<td>$ 199,400</td>
<td>$ 30,565</td>
<td>91.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVY TRANSFER STATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compost Services</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$ 76,540</td>
<td>$ 12,757</td>
<td>$ 12,270</td>
<td>(487)</td>
<td>-3.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Transfer Station</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>5,076</td>
<td>1,214,000</td>
<td>202,333</td>
<td>271,842</td>
<td>69,509</td>
<td>34.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 23,000</td>
<td>$ 5,076</td>
<td>$ 1,290,540</td>
<td>$ 69,022</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATERIAL SALES - IVY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encore</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 3,333</td>
<td>$ 4,978</td>
<td>$ 1,645</td>
<td>49.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Mulch &amp; Chips</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>4,953</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>29.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling Fees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>(3,567)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(83)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 123,500</td>
<td>$ 20,583</td>
<td>$ 21,111</td>
<td>$ 529</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECYCLING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Sales</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>$ 162,000</td>
<td>$ 27,000</td>
<td>$ 24,787</td>
<td>(2,213)</td>
<td>-8.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials &amp; Services</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,050)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-Operating</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(4,833)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling Fees</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(600)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 200,900</td>
<td>$ 33,483</td>
<td>$ 24,787</td>
<td>(8,696)</td>
<td>-25.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Charge Fees</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>14,167</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
<td>$ 14,167</td>
<td>$ 16,651</td>
<td>$ 2,484</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 93,000</td>
<td>$ 15,500</td>
<td>$ 18,031</td>
<td>$ 2,531</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMETIATION SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA Contribution</td>
<td>79,982</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>$ 79,982</td>
<td>$ 13,330</td>
<td>$ 79,982</td>
<td>$ 66,652</td>
<td>500.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Contribution</td>
<td>638,937</td>
<td>106,490</td>
<td>106,490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(106,490)</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Contribution</td>
<td>351,663</td>
<td>58,611</td>
<td>87,916</td>
<td>29,306</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,070,582</td>
<td>$ 178,430</td>
<td>$ 167,898</td>
<td>(10,532)</td>
<td>-5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEREST, LATE FEES, OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Fund Interest</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 333</td>
<td>$ 507</td>
<td>$ 174</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Charges</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>426.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve Fund Interest</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,103</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>64.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Investment Interest</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>6,475</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>55.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 42,600</td>
<td>$ 7,100</td>
<td>$ 11,612</td>
<td>$ 4,512</td>
<td>63.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31,690</td>
<td>$ 7,992</td>
<td>$ 591,349</td>
<td>$ 87,929</td>
<td>17.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rivanna Solid Waste Authority
### Historical Material Tonnage Report - Recycling
### Fiscal Years 2016-2020

#### In U.S. Tons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiber Products</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper, magazines, catalogs</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard (corrugated)</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed paper and phone books</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File stock (office paper)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fiber Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,509</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Products</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2018</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2019</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Cans</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>305</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
<td><strong>396</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,881</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rivanna Solid Waste Authority
Ivy MSW Transfer Tonnages
FY 2017 - 2020
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: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

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

August 2019

- 4,802 vehicles crossed the scales

- The IMUC transfer station operated 26 days and received a total of 2,544.26 tons of municipal solid waste (MSW), an average of 115.12 tons per day of operation. The monthly transfer station tonnage figures are attached to this report.

- 1,204.54 tons of non-MSW materials were received

- 3,748.80 tons were received as a combined total tonnage (MSW + non-MSW)

Paint Collection:
On August 30, 2019, the Ivy MUC shipped out the twenty-fourth full 30-yard container of paint since the program began in August 2016. 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. This service is free to County 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 4.82 tons of compostable materials residents in August.
Transfer Station Update

As shown on the following figure, we continue to see growth in the tonnages being processed at the Transfer Station. Of note is that Monday operations began on March 18. The 5 days the facility was closed due to the fire at the transfer station are not included in the August averages.

With regard to the damages from the fire, the facility has been cleaned and is back in full operation. Repairs to damaged steel, concrete, and electrical service have been approved by the insurance company and are awaiting scheduling by its contractor, Belfor Property Restoration.
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY
    RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
    BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

As part of our Strategic Plan efforts to Optimize Operations, we have developed procedures to provide guidance to staff and to maintain consistent outcomes for several typical operational areas including:

- Control of Firearms and Ammunition
- Use of Rivanna Credit Cards
- Service Awards and Retirement Celebrations
- Business Meals and Refreshments
- Uniforms and Safety Shoes
- Emergency Food Supplies

These procedures will assist us in managing the appropriate use of our resources, maintain high standards of professional appearance, and support our security objectives. These procedures will supplement the Administrative Policies included in our Personnel Management Plan, as well as the procurement requirements of our Purchasing Manual. Additional procedures may be developed as our Strategic Planning process continues.

Board Action Requested:

These General Administrative Procedures are being provided as information to the Boards of Directors of the RSWA and the RWSA.

Attachments
Purpose

It is the intent of the Rivanna Authorities to maintain high standards of professional conduct, safety, security and customer service. Rivanna promotes the security of our employees, facilities and customers through the implementation of security policies, measures and enforcement required to maintain a safe environment. Our policies must be consistent with the laws established by the Commonwealth of Virginia. The laws of the Commonwealth allow public employers to adopt workplace rules for employees. The laws of the Commonwealth do not allow non-school public employers to adopt workplace rules applicable to the public who may lawfully come into the workplace.

Control of Firearms and Ammunition

Employees are not permitted to carry, or to possess in a Rivanna vehicle, firearms or ammunition while on duty. This includes firearms for which employees have a lawful permit. Exceptions to this policy require prior written permission from the Executive Director.

Employees may store lawfully possessed firearms and ammunition in a locked private motor vehicle on Authority property. Firearms and ammunition must remain in the private vehicle while on Authority property.
Purpose

Rivanna closely manages its financial resources to ensure they are utilized appropriately. All purchases must directly support Rivanna, and be completed in accordance with the Purchasing Manual. This procedure is to outline typical practices for minor operational expenditures.

Credit Cards

Rivanna credit cards will be available for use by the Executive Director and the Director of Finance. Typical instances of when these cards may be used include:

- Permit fees, license renewals or other administrative fees and charges, when available to be paid online
- Conferences or training and any associated registration fees, travel, and lodging
- Office and educational supplies
- Business meals, refreshments, and emergency food supplies
- Urgent or Emergency purchases – IT hardware, errors in billing disrupting services, etc.

The credit card(s) are used mainly as a means of payment and do not bypass purchasing/purchasing requirements. Procurement requirements still rest within the Purchasing Manual and VPPA as amended. Transactions will normally be less than $5000 for a single purchase. All charges to the credit card must be approved by the Executive Director or the Director of Finance via the Credit Card Charge Form (see attached). Vendor receipt for the purchase must be submitted to the Accounts Payable office promptly supporting the charge to the credit card account.
**Purpose**

Celebrations honoring employees for time in service and retirement are a valid means of employee recognition and support our Strategic Plan goal of Workforce Development. At the same time, Rivanna Authorities must be good stewards of Authority funds. The following procedures will apply to all service awards and retirement celebrations utilizing Authority funds.

**Service Awards**

As specified in our Personnel Management Plan, awards are presented for service in five-year increments. All awards are presented annually in a mass setting, typically on Employee Appreciation Day. Service awards will be based on $10/year of service with Rivanna.

**Retirements**

- Should typically be held on Authority property and combined within a Division whenever possible (monthly, quarterly, etc.).
- Gifts must be funded by contributions from employees or non-Rivanna sources.
- Celebration funding will be based on $10/year of service with Rivanna.

If you have questions about the appropriateness of planned costs for an event, including the reasonable cost per person, please discuss them with your Division Director.
Purpose

Rivanna closely manages its financial resources to ensure they are utilized appropriately. All purchases must directly support Rivanna, and be completed in accordance with the Purchasing Manual. This procedure is to outline typical practices for minor operational expenditures.

Business Meals and Refreshments

Business meals, typically a “boxed” lunch or food tray from a local vendor, are appropriate for certain instances to effectively conduct our business, and may be provided at Rivanna’s expense. The cost per person must be reasonable. Prior approval from a Division Director or the Executive Director is required. Typical instances of when business meals and refreshments may be appropriate include:

- For the interview/selection committee when presentations by vendors extend for most of the day as part of a procurement process.
- For the interview/selection committee to fill staff vacancies or promotions when the interviews extend for most of the day.
- For staff training which extends for most of the day.
- For special committee or informational meetings with multiple Divisions or outside partners, such as the ACSA or City.
- For Regional meetings we may host (i.e., NW Central Virginia Regional Utility Managers group).
- Internal and Regional Team Building events, including Employee Appreciation Day, the Holiday Luncheon, Administrative Professionals Day or special achievement events, along with staff departures, with approval by the Division Director.
- Meetings with Board Members, community businesses, or new employees, typically by the Executive Director or Division Directors.
- For service awards or retirement celebrations, in accordance with the Service Awards and Retirement Celebration Procedure.
Purpose

It is the intent of the Rivanna Authorities to maintain high standards of professional conduct, safety, security and customer service. The customer’s first impression of our organization is based on the appearance of our employees. It is very important for our employees to dress and conduct themselves professionally, and to be readily identifiable. Rivanna promotes this philosophy by providing employees with uniforms, shoes and safety equipment that are to be used in the performance of every employee’s job. Our policy in providing and requiring the use of these items is as follows:

Uniforms

Uniformed positions include all Maintenance, Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, Engineering Technicians/Inspectors, Lab employees, as well as the Water Quality Specialist, Water Resources Manager, and the Safety Manager. This uniform procedure does not apply to Directors.

Maintenance, Water, Wastewater, and Solid Waste employees are required to wear Rivanna issued uniform pants and shirts at all times during their work shifts, including during training events. If outer garments and hats are worn, these employees are required to wear Rivanna logo garments and hats. These employees are required to wear safety shoes at all times during their shifts.

Engineering Technicians/Inspectors are required to wear Rivanna shirts, but not pants, including during training events. If outer garments and hats are worn, these employees are required to wear Rivanna logo garments and hats. These employees are required to wear safety shoes at all times when working in the field.

Lab employees, the Water Quality Specialist, Water Resources Manager, and the Safety Manager are required to wear Rivanna shirts, but not pants, when working in the field for planned events. If outer garments and hats are worn when working in the field for planned events, these employees are required to wear Rivanna logo garments and hats. These employees are required to wear safety shoes at all times when working in the field.

Uniforms must be kept neat and clean. If an employee's uniform has missing patches, becomes permanently stained, torn, damaged, worn or no longer fits properly, replacement uniforms will be issued. The employee must turn in damaged, worn or ill-fitting uniforms to receive replacement uniforms using the proper process and approvals.
GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

Employees must wear uniform pants with a belt provided by the employee. Uniforms must be worn as designed, i.e. pants at waist level, and rental uniform shirts tucked in. No personal clothes may be altered by adding the Rivanna logo and worn as a substitute for Rivanna uniforms. In addition, the following examples are not acceptable while a uniformed employee is working, including attending training:

- Novelty shirts that can be seen through the uniform shirt,
- Shorts in lieu of uniform pants,
- Footwear other than approved safety shoes,
- Stained or badly soiled uniforms (upon arriving for the day),
- Uniforms with cut off sleeves or pant legs,
- Uniforms with frayed pants legs or shirt sleeves,
- Uniforms with missing Rivanna logo patches,

Employees must maintain professional conduct while wearing their uniform, even when off duty, and should not routinely wear their uniform when off duty. Any employee that reports to work and is not wearing the required uniform, including footwear, may be sent home to change. Time away from work for this purpose will be unpaid. Additional offenses will result in progressive disciplinary actions that may include suspension without pay and termination of the employee. No time will be allowed during the normal work hours to change into or out of uniforms. Additional shirts may be provided to establish an adequate initial supply.

Rental Uniforms

Upon initial employment, where applicable, the Department will provide 11-pair of pants and 11-shirts. It is the responsibility of each employee to ensure his or her dirty laundry is returned to the laundry bins each week. Dirty laundry pick-up, and the return of clean uniforms (dropped of the previous week for service), will be provided by the service supplier weekly.

Knit Shirts and T-Shirts

Knit shirts and T-shirts may be provided for uniformed staff, if approved by the Division Director. These shirts must have a readily visible Rivanna logo. Non-uniformed staff will be eligible for two knit shirts per year, which can be replaced if they become unsightly or no longer fit properly, and may be worn on a daily basis, as well as to conferences, seminars, functions with consultants, vendors, or the public (public meetings), when appropriate.

In accordance with the goals of our Uniform Procedure, these shirts must maintain the professional appearance of our employees, and clearly identify our employees for security reasons.

Safety Shoes

Upon being hired, uniformed and other authorized employees will be issued a voucher for the purchase of one pair of safety shoes. Safety shoes will be worn by most employees whose jobs
involve working in the field or in a plant. The need for safety shoes in other positions is determined by the Department Manager. Employees must select safety shoes appropriate for their job duties. Employees who work with instrumentation and electrical equipment will wear shoes that are also rated for electrical hazard (EH Rated). All Rivanna Solid Waste Authority employees will wear shoes that are puncture resistant.

RWSA employees will be issued a voucher for $125 each fiscal year (beginning July 1st). If an employee does not need to replace their safety shoes, they may forgo their annual voucher and accrue up to $250 over two years for safety shoes. This is the maximum amount they are allowed to accrue.

RSWA employees will be issued a voucher for $190 each fiscal year (beginning July 1st). If an employee does not need to replace their safety shoes, they may forgo their annual voucher and accrue up to $250 over two years for safety shoes. This is the maximum amount they are allowed to accrue.

All safety shoe vouchers are issued by Accounts Payable. Employees must return their receipts for the purchase of safety shoes to Accounts Payable.

Employees who feel their most recently issued safety shoes are in need of replacement should see their Department Manager to have their safety shoes inspected and a replacement approved. Employees will incur no costs for the safety shoes which are required to be worn while employed by Rivanna, except under the following conditions:

- The employee will be responsible for the replacement of the safety shoes if the safety shoes which are issued to the employee by Rivanna are lost, abused or there is evidence of deliberate mistreatment of the shoes by the employee.
- If the employee selects a pair of safety shoes that exceeds the cost allowance set by Rivanna, then the employee will be required to pay the difference in cost.
- If the employee cannot purchase proper fitting footwear from one of the two retailers that Rivanna uses for safety shoes (Super Shoes and Red Wing Shoes), consideration can be given to use an alternate vendor. This will be considered on an individual basis. Authorization must be provided by the Department Manager. The cost allowance will remain the same and the employee will have to pay any cost that is over the allowance amount.

All employees are required to wear their safety shoes when in any Rivanna Water and Sewer plant, while working at any Rivanna Solid Waste facilities, while doing any field work for the Rivanna Authorities, and in any other circumstance where foot protection is warranted.
Purpose

Rivanna closely manages its financial resources to ensure they are utilized appropriately. All purchases must directly support Rivanna, and be completed in accordance with the Purchasing Manual. This procedure is to outline typical practices for minor operational expenditures.

Emergency Food

Several Divisions, typically Operations and Engineering/Maintenance, are required to maintain a reasonable stock of food to support staff when required to work emergency situations, such as during a storm (hurricane, tropical storm, snow, ice, wind, natural disaster) or manmade disaster. Purchase and use of the emergency food shall be as follows:

- A stock of nonperishable food shall be maintained at all times throughout the year
- Food shall be consumed only during emergency periods as designated by the Division Director
- Food may be used, if possible, for a regularly scheduled staff function immediately before the food expires.
  - If there is no regularly scheduled staff function, the food shall be disposed of when expired.
MEMORANDUM

TO:
RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY
RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: JENNIFER A. WHITAKER, DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING AND MAINTENANCE

REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AWARD OF NONPROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT:
ON-CALL DAM MAINTENANCE SERVICES,
BANDER SMITH INC

DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

The Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) and Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) own and operate six regulated dams and four small unregulated dams. Neither the RWSA Maintenance and Water Departments nor RSWA staff have the resources or expertise necessary to perform tree removal, complex maintenance, or repair work that occurs periodically on RWSA’s and RSWA’s dams, or to address all possible emergency situations associated with these structures. In the past, these services have been procured via competitive sealed bid or request for quotes, but it was determined as part of a recent review of this process that having “on-call” contractors under contract for this purpose, with general provisions such as insurance, indemnification, and unit price compensation, could speed up response during routine and emergency situations. As a result, RWSA and RSWA issued a joint Request for Proposals (RFP) with the intent to augment the capabilities of our existing staff in order to respond to dam emergencies or complete complex small-scale repairs. Large scale repairs and modifications to dam structures will continue to be procured via competitive sealed bid.

The RFP was developed and advertised on August 1, 2019 and proposals were due on August 22, 2019. As part of the procurement process, competitive negotiation was utilized as the procurement method for this contract. Due to the nature of dealing with critical dam infrastructure in remote or difficult locations, it is critical to review a contractor’s qualifications and references to confirm capabilities and the satisfaction of other owners who have worked with the contractor in similar situations. This method would allow RWSA and RSWA to evaluate not only the firm’s experience, capabilities and availability, but also the management approaches and key personnel. In addition, this approach would still allow RWSA and RSWA to factor price into the decision-making process, but not use it as the sole determining factor.

On August 22, 2019 one proposal was received from Bander Smith, Inc. Based on the
qualifications of the firm and the proposed project team, responsiveness to the scope of services, professional competence, qualifications, competitive labor rates, depth of key personnel, and extensive experience with similar projects, including several successful projects completed for RWSA; it was determined that RWSA and RSWA would proceed with awarding a contract to Bander Smith.

**Board Action Requested:**

Staff requests that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute a contract with an initial term of two (2) years with options to annually renew the contract following the initial term for a total term not to exceed five (5) years with Bander Smith, Inc. for on-call dam maintenance services.

Staff also requests that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to execute work authorizations under these contracts as needed when the estimated price of a specific repair is less than $100,000, and to execute work authorizations in estimated amounts exceeding $100,000 with notification of the Board when an emergency purchase is declared by the Executive Director pursuant to Section XVI of the Procurement Manual.
MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA SOLID WASTE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: COMPOSTING FEASIBILITY STUDY
DATE: SEPTEMBER 24, 2019

Coker Composting and Consulting (CCC) was hired earlier this year to complete a feasibility study for diversion of organic wastes to a proposed composting facility at the Ivy MUC. CCC primarily examined three composting alternatives:

1. A windrow composting plant for source-separated food wastes, such as those brought to the McIntire Recycling Center by residents, as well as food wastes from UVA.
2. An aerated static pile composting process for biosolids produced by the RWSA at the Moores Creek, Scottsville and Glenmore wastewater treatment facilities.
3. An aerated static pile process for co-composting food wastes and biosolids.

CCC reviewed the tonnage of organic wastes currently processed in our systems, and developed forecasts of future compostable quantities to be produced in our community by the year 2030. Population projections were based on information from the Weldon Cooper Center at UVA. CCC also compared on-site to off-site alternatives using net present value economics and greenhouse gas emissions estimates. The report included background information on composting technology in use nationally. A summary of the CCC conclusions and recommendations include:

- Food wastes will increase from 550 tons/yr to 4000 tons/yr by 2030 in our community.
- Diversion of 4000 tons/yr of food waste from landfilling to composting will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 11.8%.
- The estimated cost of windrow composting of food wastes at IMUC ($56/ton) exceeds the cost of landfilling thru the IMUC transfer station ($46/ton).
- The estimated cost of aerated static pile composting biosolids at IMUC ($82/ton) exceeds the cost of composting at the McGill facility in Waverly ($47/ton).
- A small-scale food waste composting facility would be feasible at IMUC. The facility would cost about $950,000 to construct and equip, with annual operating expenses of $115,000.
- A biosolids composting facility is feasible at IMUC, but not recommended. The facility would cost $6 M to construct and equip, with annual operating expenses of $990,000.

Based on our knowledge of the operations at the IMUC, and biosolids composting by the RWSA, staff developed additional alternatives for compost facilities with less capacity and lower costs including:
- 2000 tons/yr, $725,000 construction and equipment, $75,000 annual operating expense (RSWA estimate).
- 1000 tons/yr, $650,000 construction and equipment, $75,000 annual operating expense (RSWA estimate).

Another alternative to be investigated is to combine food wastes with biosolids at the Moores Creek facility. Costs have not been developed. Completion of a preliminary engineering report would be the next step.

**Board Action Requested:**

These alternatives for composting facilities are being provided as information to the Board.
Composting Feasibility Study

Presented to the RSWA Board of Directors

BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SEPTEMBER 24, 2019
McIntire Recycling Center

• Compostable food waste collected

• Transported to McGill Environmental in Waverly, VA by Natural Organic Processes Enterprise (N.O.P.E.)

• 50 tons per year

• Cost: $12,000 per year
McGill Composting - Waverly, VA

Charlottesville to Waverly, VA: 120 miles
Ivy Material Utilization Center

• Compostable food waste collected
• Transported by Black Bear Composting to its facility in Crimora, VA
• Includes food waste from UVA
• 500 tons per year
• Cost: $65,000 per year
Black Bear Composting – Crimora, VA

Ivy to Crimora, VA: 28 miles
Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant

- Compostable biosolids
- Transported to McGill Environmental in Waverly, VA
- 14,000 tons per year
- Cost: $600,000 - $700,000 per year
Off-Loading Trucks at McGill
Hired Coker Composting and Consulting (CCC) to complete study

CCC evaluated 3 alternatives at IMUC for a planning period of 2020 – 2030:

ALT 1. Windrow composting of food waste
Composting Feasibility Study

ALT 2. Aerated static pile composting of wastewater biosolids

ALT 3. Aerated static pile composting of food waste and biosolids
Findings

• Thru a very pro-active food waste diversion program, our community could increase waste from 550 to 4,000 tons/year by 2030

• Reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions 11.8% by composting 4,000 tons/year of food waste, rather than landfilling
## Composting Alternatives at the Ivy MUC

### A. Windrow composting of food waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Facility Capacity</th>
<th>Construction &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Annual Operating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,000 tons/year</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Facility Capacity</th>
<th>Construction &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Annual Operating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 tons/year</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Facility Capacity</th>
<th>Construction &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Annual Operating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000 tons/year</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Aerated static pile composting of biosolids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Facility Capacity</th>
<th>Construction &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Annual Operating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

A. Continue to compost food waste at an off-site facility

B. If composting of food waste is desired at the IMUC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000 tons/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Continue to compost biosolids at an off-site facility

D. Combine food waste with biosolids at MC. Compost at McGill, or other compost facility

E. Explore privatized composting facility at the IMUC
Questions?