

RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Special Meeting
January 28, 2020

A special meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, January 28, 2020 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Dr. Liz Palmer, Jeff Richardson, Mike Gaffney, Lloyd Snook, Lance Stewart, Paul Oberdorfer.

Board Members Absent: Dr. Tarron Richardson.

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

Attorney(s) Present: Mr. Kurt Krueger.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney convened the January 28, 2020 special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:02 p.m.

.3

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 19, 2019

26 Mr. Gaffney asked board members if they had comments or changes.
27

Dr. Palmer moved that the board approve the minutes of the previous board meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Oberdorfer and passed unanimously (6-0). Dr. Richardson was absent from the meeting and the vote.

3. RECOGNITIONS

There were no recognitions.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mawyer stated that with regards to the workforce development initiative, he wanted to celebrate that Russ Blankenstein (Assistant Solid Waste Manager) successfully passed his Class I and Class II Waste Operator License exams, which qualifies and licenses him to operate a transfer station, as well as a landfill. He stated that the Ivy MUC is a closed landfill that is still under a landfill permit, and Mr. Blankenstein is one of several people licensed to operate the facility.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Phil McKalips (Solid Waste Manager) led a tour at Ivy for some homeschooled students.

Mr. Mawyer stated that there continues to be good traffic at the IMUC, with over 4,400 vehicles in November, averaging about 119 tons per day. He stated that the December numbers dropped off

slightly, with 3,900 vehicles and 86 tons per day of refuse disposal.

 Mr. Mawyer stated that RSWA continues to diversify its services. He stated that Gary O'Connell made a request and suggestion about coming up with a way to collect used cooking oil. He stated that RSWA had also been contacted by a vendor and in February, the vendor will be bringing a container to McIntire Recycling Center that will collect used cooking oil. He stated that this would be run as a pilot program at no cost to RSWA, as the vendor will be picking up the container when it is full. He stated that this will allow people who deep fry foods to deposit the waste oil in that container rather than dumping it down the drain and into the sewer system.

Ms. Palmer asked if the vendor contacting RSWA was a coincidence.

Mr. Mawyer stated that it was, noting that Five-Star Septic from Sterling, VA called shortly after Mr. O'Connell made his suggestion, asking if it would be okay to put a container at the recycling facility. He stated that staff agreed to give it a try.

Mr. Snook asked what the company does with the oil when they receive it.

Mr. Mawyer replied that they reuse it to produce animal feeds or biofuels. He stated Valley Proteins has a similar program where they collect cooking oil from restaurants and repurpose the product.

Mr. Mawyer stated that this was another addition to the McIntire services, along with the oyster shell collection program.

Mr. Mawyer stated that he, Mr. McKalips, David Rhoades, and Mr. Blankenstein visited the Sonoco Recycling facility near Lynchburg to see where RSWA's newsprint and office paper, as well as #1 and #2 plastics, go and how they are processed. He stated that it was very informative and interesting to see how Sonoco takes all the products, sorts, bales, and send them away, and helped us understand what contamination looks like and, if we are going to decrease contamination, how we have to improve their source separating.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would also be visiting Sonoco Richmond on Thursday that week, where there is a papermill that reprocesses mixed paper and cardboard into paper products.

Mr. Mawyer stated that under the current bylaws, the RSWA Board was scheduled to hold another meeting in February, unless they chose not to. He noted that the current meeting was a special one that they had decided to have back in November. He stated that the next regularly-scheduled meeting was in February, and if they could get all the members there, they could approve a bylaw change that had been discussed of making the meetings every other month. He stated that they have not yet been able to do that, and until they do, they are following the original schedule and would have a meeting in February.

Mr. Stewart stated that the idea was to align the meetings in a frequency that is more reasonable for getting business done every other month instead of having seasonal meetings.

 Mr. Mawyer stated that the bylaws say they will meet in February, April, May, June, August, and November. He reminded that in order to change the bylaws, they must have all the board members present to vote. He stated that they had drafted an amendment to the by-laws that says they will have the same six meetings, but that they will be every other month starting in January in order to have a more consistent flow to the meetings instead of leaving a gap where in the last six months of the year, there are currently only two meetings. He stated that in the past, they have had to schedule

special meetings to do business, such as construction awards. He stated that as programs are continuing and expanding, they were trying not to add more meetings, but space them out in a better way.

)1

Mr. Krueger stated that they need all the members present to amend the bylaws to change the regular meetings, but they also need all the members present to amend the bylaws to no longer require all the members present to amend the bylaws.

Mr. Snook stated that he noticed that the last draft of the bylaws was written in 2014. He asked if the requirement that all members be present to amend them was based on some particular, historical problem.

Mr. Krueger replied that it has always been in the bylaws.

Mr. Mawyer noted that the bylaws do not state there has to be a unanimous vote, but that everyone must be present (compared to needing four for a quorum). He stated that they could have 4 members present including, three County reps, a Chairman, and no one from the City for a quorum, and that perhaps this is why the bylaws were written to require all members to be present.

Mr. Snook stated that the Regional Transit Partnership's bylaws provide that there has to be at least one City person and at least one County person in order to have a quorum.

Mr. Mawyer stated this was similar, but that RSWA was different.

Ms. Palmer stated that given they were discussing collecting oil at McIntire, and pizza boxes, she wanted to mention that May 3-9 is the International Composting Awareness Week. She stated that many are hoping that the City, the County, and Rivanna will collaborate and do something related to this. She stated that Mr. McKalips was aware and was included on emails pertaining to it, and that Susan Elliott was involved. She stated that she wanted to mention it because as she was rereading the minutes from the last meeting and what Ms. McIlwee had discussed in terms of school videos, and she thought this might be something the schools would want to consider.

5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

 Hearing no items from the public, Mr. Gaffney closed the Items from the Public portion of the meeting.

6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT

135 There were none.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

138 There were no consent agenda items.

- 8. OTHER BUSINESS
- a. Presentation: Staff Report on Finance

Mr. Lonnie Wood, Director of Finance, presented. He stated that he would briefly go through the financial statements that are prepared each month and give some context on the budget.

`5

- Mr. Wood stated that the Authority's budget, since 2002, has always run in a deficit. He stated that in 2002, they closed the final landfill C&D cell (construction and demolition debris), noting
- 147 they had stopped accepting MSW many years before that. He stated that ever since then, the

budget has operated at a deficit and because of that, they have evolved over the years with
 several cost reimbursement agreements between local partners and Rivanna.

Mr. Wood stated that there are several multi-party cost agreements, with the first being in 2005. He stated that this one addressed most of their remediation costs, and was also part of the HHW program, and so all those costs are bundled together in the MOU Environmental account. He stated that this agreement was created in 2005 and ends in 2034. He stated that in that agreement, the first five years, UVA paid a larger amount annually than was shown on the report. That was based on some of the massive closure costs that were happening at the time.

Mr. Wood stated that now that closure is finished, they are in post-closure care. He stated that UVA, in the agreement, chose to have a fixed annual amount of roughly \$80,000 per year.

Mr. Wood stated that the City and the County's agreement says they will pay all remaining unbudgeted costs at the percentages shown in the report. He stated that the remediation and environmental program agreement covers 30% of all the administrative costs. He stated that there are no true-ups related to that agreement.

Mr. Wood stated that the other multi-party agreement is the local agreement on recycling. He stated that in this agreement, the City agrees to pay 30% and the County agrees to pay 70% of the net budget deficit. He stated that this is paid in quarterly installments at the beginning of each quarter. He stated that there is a true-up involved at the end of the year. If there is a deficit that wasn't funded by the local support payments, a true up is performed and the County and City will own the Authority for the deficit. If there is a surplus, the true up would refund the excess back to the County and City. He stated that this agreement covers 20% of the administrative costs.

Mr. Wood stated that the last two agreements are between Rivanna and the County alone, with one being related to all Ivy operations at the Ivy Transfer Station. He stated that 100% of the net budget deficit is paid for by the County, with the remaining 50% of the administrative costs being covered by this agreement, with a true-up as well.

Mr. Wood stated that the newest agreement for the Ivy Convenience Center will go into effect in FY 2021. He stated that they are creating a new cost center for that agreement, but that it is similar to the transfer station where the County agrees to pay for 100%, and there is a true up related to this as well.

Mr. Wood stated that the summary of the budget document shows the main operating accounts, and the four related cost centers showing revenues and expenses. He indicated to the line showing that everything was basically running at a deficit. He reviewed the administrative costs on the report, explaining that they are absorbed into the other cost centers. He stated that this is why they see the administrative costs going to zero, as they are reallocated out each month. He stated that the net annual contribution by the two local governments is \$1.2 million.

Mr. Wood presented the Environmental MOU cost center summary, which showed the MOU support and the costs related to that.

Mr. Wood stated that each cost center will have a detailed line item, and in the budget done every year, those details are included. He stated that the report boils the information down to the summary of what the local support payments are for 2020 and 2019. He stated that the first two

197 groups under the County will get trued up, so they are always forcing themselves to get back to
198 that number in the adopted budget.
199

∠45

Mr. Wood stated that the financial statements included in the board packet each month provide a basic summary of the state of finances. He indicated on the statement to total revenues, total expenses, net operating (noting this was at a deficit), and the local support. He indicated to a section on the statement that takes the cost for each cost center and divides the net ending deficit by the total tonnage processed up to year-to-date, with a cost per unit ton included.

Mr. Wood presented a page showing budget versus actuals. He indicated to a percentage that shows where they are at compared to the target and explained that since the report was for December, the target was 50% of the budget. He stated that all revenue (except for recycling) was running over budget.

Mr. Wood stated that with revenue for recycling, pricing was down about 40-50% that year so far, for the first six months, and paper, aluminum cans, and plastic were suffering.

Mr. Wood presented a page showing the same information organized into monthly results, as well as the local contributions as they come in.

Mr. Wood presented a legacy cash flow report, noting that many years ago, they used to run out of cash, and that the report was used as a predictor of when the two local governments would have to expect to fund on an as-needed basis. He stated that this was how funding was done before all the agreements came into place, and so this report may not be as useful as it used to be.

Mr. Wood presented a summary of the revenues that shows the annual budget, the budget year-to-date (annual budget divided by the percentage of the year) versus actual, and giving a result of where the variances are.

Mr. Wood presented a report showing the tonnage information. He stated that even though the report stated "December," it is usually lagging because the information doesn't always get to Finance until mid- to late-January for what was collected in the previous month, and so there is not always a hard cutoff there on actual tonnages. He stated that the tonnages were down for half a year, and that they were not halfway there for most of the materials, except for mixed paper.

Mr. Wood presented a graphic of transfer station tonnages only, and does not include the tonnages for vegetative or clean fill. He stated that this only represented what is received at the transfer station, which is MSW and construction debris. He stated that there was a slight downtick on the report in December that Mr. Mawyer had just mentioned.

b. Presentation: Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update Mr. Phil McKalips (Director of Solid Waste) presented. He stated that he would walk through the Operations Report, which is included in the board packet every month. He stated that the report serves two purposes, with one being to provide the hard numbers that are generated each month from the transfer station operations. He stated that the report has morphed over the past year or so into including other activities going on to provide a bigger picture.

Mr. McKalips stated that the board's last meeting was in November, and so the Operations Report would include the November and December transfer station data. He stated that there were almost 4,500 vehicles in November, and almost 4,000 in December. He stated that

typically, there is a decline in business in December and January, and so the number was notsurprising.

Mr. McKalips presented a picture of the transfer station, indicating to the entrance from Dick Woods Road, the scale house, and the new transfer station where MSW (municipal solid waste) and construction and demolition debris (C&D) is taken. He presented a picture of the interim Ivy Convenience Center, as well as the location in June of the new Ivy Convenience Center.

Mr. McKalips indicated to the old, closed landfill cells, and to an area where vegetative waste is collected and ground into mulch. He stated that in the back corner is where they take clean fill, which includes rock and stone debris, brick, and asphalt, and that they are refilling a borrow area.

Mr. Mawyer asked if this included glass.

Mr. McKalips replied that there is a glass stockpiling area there as well that is used until the glass can be transported to Strategic Materials, adding that Rivanna had just entered into a new agreement with them.

Mr. McKalips presented another picture of the new transfer station. He also presented a closer picture of the vegetation area, noting where the vegetation comes in, which includes everything from grass clippings and leaves to big stumps, trees, vines, and shrubs. He stated that the vegetation is ground into mulch, which is sold out every year to the public or commercial businesses. He noted that the clean fill was located nearby.

Mr. McKalips presented the location of the new convenience center. He indicated to what was the location of the old transfer station, explaining there was an upper deck where mulch piles were being stored. He stated that the parking lot was where waste trailers are stored and where HHW and amnesty days such as furniture, appliances, tires, and e-waste collections occur.

Mr. McKalips noted that this information was all included in the first half of the report, and that the second half included pertinent information that might be of interest to the board.

Mr. McKalips stated that the report still included information on paint collection, which was part of the HHW program. He stated that because of the demand, it was driving the customer traffic at HHW and about one or two years ago, the board decided to allow for providing paint collection on a daily basis, whenever the transfer station is open. He stated that the report tracks the amount of material they collect there, and that it has been increasing ever since the program started and has been very popular. He stated that with the new HHW contract, most of that material is also being recycled, which is an added benefit.

Mr. McKalips stated that they do compostable food waste collection, with some of this being done at the Ivy MUC. He stated that most of the actual food collection is done at McIntire, where there is residential food collection and now, pizza boxes.

Mr. Snook asked if pizza boxes were now part of the composting program.

Mr. McKalips replied that they were, at McIntire. He stated that they have collected cardboard there for years, and that people have always come with pizza boxes to recycle into the cardboard. He stated that because pizza boxes are typically greasy, the recyclers do not want that material,

and so people would have to be asked daily not to throw them in, and would have to take them home.

 Mr. McKalips stated that they just recently got a new contract with the compost service provider there and because of the way the contract is structured, they can now take those pizza boxes, as they are very compostable. He stated that the boxes are now taken with the rest of the compostable food waste, which is a nice offering for the public.

Mr. McKalips stated that they hoped that towards the end of February, they will be able to offer the used cooking oil collection pilot at McIntire. He stated that it would be run as a pilot to see if it is well suited to that public site, as there are concerns about whether or not this will become objectionable.

Mr. McKalips presented a slide showing the average daily tonnages by month for the new transfer station since its opening. He stated that the station opened in September of 2018 and that starting in January of 2019, they changed the tipping fee from \$66 per ton to \$52 per ton. He stated that almost immediately, there was a doubling of the amount of material collected from 28.5 to 64 tons per day. He stated that in mid-March, they started opening the facility on Mondays, which then saw another 20-ton-per-day jump in the average daily tonnages.

Mr. McKalips stated that the figures on the slide tracks whether or not those two decisions are still paying for themselves. He stated that the breakeven tonnage per day is about 89 tons. He stated that this has averaged out to about 91 tons per day over the course of the year and thus, the changes continue to pay for themselves.

Dr. Palmer stated that when City residents go to the transfer station, they are asked at the scale house whether they live in the City or County. She stated that if they are from the City, they are charged an additional \$9. She asked about how they will manage the recycling, as she has heard that many people are happy that they will be able to drop both their trash and their recycling off at the same place, rather than going two places. She asked how they would manage City versus County for the tag-a-bag and recycling area.

Mr. McKalips stated that they would not have to manage this for tag-a-bag, as the person pays for the tag with an all-inclusive fee. He stated that currently, there was no way to monitor this because it is an unmanned area.

Mr. McKalips stated that their expectation was if someone was from the City and wanted to recycle, they would go to McIntire, but if they went to Ivy, it was still a free service that wouldn't be tracked. He stated that the service fees are applied as they cross the scale, and that the whole convenience center access would be before they get to the scales, so they wouldn't be confronted with that issue when they recycle.

Mr. Mawyer stated that all the recycling expenses are combined between McIntire and Ivy, so in that vein, the City still pays 30% of the recycling costs for Ivy recycling. The County will fund 100% of the new Convenience Center costs.

Mr. McKalips stated that starting in July, the Ivy Convenience Center would become its own cost center.

Mr. Mawyer asked if with the new agreement, cost allocations would change.

Mr. McKalips stated that the cost allocations for recycling would remain unchanged. He stated that they were still working out how to track costs. He explained that at McIntire, if they get a ton of cardboard, it goes to the Paper Sort, gets baled, and sold. He stated that there is an agreement that says it is a 30/70 split between the City and County for the cost of recycling. He stated that revenue is split on those same terms.

 Mr. McKalips stated that because the new Convenience Center will be a separate cost center where the County will be bearing all of the cost, they will try to figure a way where they can associate those revenues separately and that currently, it was very difficult to do so, as the materials are taken to the Paper Sort without a good system in place to scale them. He stated that once the materials are comingled, there is no way to ever differentiate them, and so this problem is being worked on.

Dr. Palmer stated there have been discussions on ways to make this work.

Mr. Stewart stated that there was the question about the Paper Sort operating costs, which may increase marginally with the extra volume from the County.

Mr. McKalips stated that currently, there are no means to parse Paper Sort costs other than by the original recycling agreement. He stated that because there is the interim facility at Ivy, they can say that they are pulling one partial load (because they are non-compacted loads) from Ivy, and they are going to the Paper Sort, versus the two compacted loads of material that are coming from McIntire without much in the difference. He stated that he didn't know what this would turn into. He stated that if they ended up with one facility driving 20-30% of the business, this could result in important questions.

Mr. Stewart stated that he realized that the County is reviewing the Paper Sort study. He asked if the intention was to bring the subject back to the next board meeting for discussion, contingent upon the County's review.

Mr. McKalips replied that he had discussed this and wasn't sure exactly what the perfect time would be in front of the board.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would bring to the Board any items related to scope of work or funding for the Paper Sort, but that if that discussion didn't happen until the second convenience center comes into the program, they would combine the two cost issues at that time.

c. Presentation: Award of Construction Contract for the IMUC Recycling Convenience Center

386 Mr. McKalips stated that this was a presentation that related to the Ivy Convenience Center,
387 which he would ask the board to act on at the end of the presentation. He presented the full-scale
388 recycling facility, noting that the funds were already set aside by the County and that they have
389 been moving forward with Arcadis. He stated that they did a Master Plan several years ago that
390 the board reviewed and selected from two alternatives one that was at the location of the old
391 transfer station.

Mr. McKalips presented an image of the entrance from Dick Woods Road, the scale house, and the new transfer station. He indicated to the old transfer station and the proposed location the

board selected of the Ivy Convenience Center. He indicated to the interim facility, set up in a parking area.

Mr. McKalips stated that Arcadis' original cost estimate was \$443,000 for the alternative. He stated that they did some value engineering and brought it down to \$350,000, which the County had already allocated in their budget. He stated that they signed an agreement with the County for the construction in August.

Mr. McKalips stated that the new facility would be set up to take all the same materials except for oyster shells, which are taken at McIntire. He stated that the difference will be that the only compactor (at least at first, until they start to see a demand for it) will be for cardboard, and all the rest will be static containers. He stated that they would still be collecting all the same materials.

Dr. Palmer asked if there would be a baler there for cardboard.

Mr. McKalips replied no. He stated that there will be a compacted container like the one at
McIntire. He stated that they are currently putting cardboard into a static roll-off box, which is
pushed in with a piece of equipment and doesn't last very long (as it needs to be emptied twice a
week).

Mr. Mawyer asked where this is taken.

-43

Mr. McKalips replied that it is taken to the Paper Sort.

Dr. Palmer stated that there is a baler for it there.

Mr. McKalips stated that the Paper Sort facility (off of Meade Avenue) is where all the processing of the recycled material is done. He stated that instead of hauling a roll-off down to Sonoco and Madison Heights for newsprint, for example, it is taken to the Paper Sort facility and loaded into trailers until it is a trailer load, and then it is taken down. He stated that this creates an economy of scale in hauling costs. He stated that they actually bale some of their own materials as well, which allows them to get much more material onto those tractor trailers and make the loads worth hauling. He stated that this processing step earns recycling money.

Dr. Palmer asked if the cardboard needs to be sorted much.

Mr. McKalips replied no, adding that they do not process it beyond baling it. He stated that as far as he has heard, it has always been highly sought after by a variety of paper companies.

Mr. McKalips stated that one of the value engineering steps made was to take the material from the old transfer station, which had upper and lower decks, and move the whole thing down to the lower deck since they don't need that elevation change because of compactors. He stated that the project then became putting a bypass road on it so that the road could be a dead-end road without operational traffic running through it. He stated that the road would only be for people using the recycling center and convenience center.

Mr. Mawyer asked Mr. McKalips to explain what the rectangles on the map represented.

Mr. McKalips replied that the black parts of the rectangles represent the compactors, noting that this was the engineer's layout. He stated that the dotted area was the truck access needed. He stated that the small rectangles were relics from previous activities in the areas and that he believed they were the location of some metal items.

Mr. Oberdorfer asked if it was metal and tractor trailers.

Mr. McKalips stated yes, adding that cardboard and newsprint trailers sat there and that people could load them. He indicated to an area where the oil and antifreeze collection will be located.

Dr. Palmer asked where HHW traffic would go.

Mr. McKalips replied that it would come down the new road, around the barn, in much the same place as it is located currently (in the long, paved area). He indicated on the map where it would come back out.

Mr. McKalips stated that they were familiar with the type of traffic they get at the recycling centers and that at McIntire, there are lots of people and small children going from bin to bin. He stated that this was not the place where they want thru traffic of heavy equipment or tractor trailers. He stated that the idea of putting them in that diversion road is to make that a dead-end area.

Mr. McKalips indicated on the map where patrons would come in (off of Dick Woods Road) and that the entrance was before they would arrive at the scales.

Mr. McKalips presented a picture, explaining where the new road would come in. He indicated to where the original transfer station was located (on the mulch piles and concrete below). He stated that they would not be using this area, but that the Convenience Center would be located in the large paved area. He indicated on the picture to where the traffic would be closed.

Mr. McKalips stated that there was a Request for Bid for the construction of the project, and that two bids were received on January 16. He stated that Faulkner Construction was determined to be the lowest responsible bidder, and that their bid was \$150,270.

Mr. McKalips stated that there were still some things that needed to be purchased, but that they received good estimates for them, which include the metal containers and the compactor. He stated that those have a four- to six-week lead time, and so they would go into that procurement March 1 so that those are ready well before the project is supposed to be complete.

Mr. McKalips stated that the staff would like to request the board to authorize the Executive Director to award a construction contract to Faulkner Construction in the amount of \$150,270 for the Convenience Center Improvements Project, and to execute change orders up to 20% of the original construction amount.

Mr. Mawyer noted that 20% is not what is normally recommended, but because it is a small project, he asked for a greater change order flexibility.

Mr. Stewart stated that in the County's agreement for the construction of the facility, there is some very specific language capping the amount of the County's contribution for

reimbursement. He stated that he wanted to be careful that if any action would override the agreement between Rivanna and the County, he would want to know about this before voting.

Mr. McKalips stated that there is contingency that would account for some of that 20%.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the 20% authorization would be used within the project budget. He stated that if it exceeds the project budget, they will then need to come back to the County to ask for any additional funds. He stated that the request will authorize Rivanna to authorize change orders instead of having to wait and, theoretically, delay construction to come back to the board to authorize the change order. He stated that it allows him to do this up to 20%. He stated that typically, it is 10%, but because the project is small, he was asking for 20%.

Mr. Gaffney asked if any resulting motion could be modified to reflect "not to exceed total project budget of \$350,000."

Mr. Mawyer replied yes. He stated that it was implied but that they could be specific about it, too. He stated that they were going to stay within the total budget, but be able to authorize construction change orders, if they would happen.

Dr. Palmer stated the \$150,000 was slightly more than the original estimate for construction. She asked what the original estimate was.

Mr. McKalips replied it was about \$130,000, and so this is over budget, but within about 10% of what the original engineer's estimate would have been.

Mr. Snook asked if the \$150,270 includes the 20%, it suggests they were starting from a bid of \$125,000.

Mr. Mawyer clarified that it does not include the 20%, so this would authorize Rivanna to do change orders for up to \$30,000 (20%), for a new total contract amount of \$180,000, if needed.

Dr. Palmer stated that this would still keep them within the \$350,000, and so there must be leeway to accommodate the \$30,000.

Mr. McKalips confirmed.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the budget was tight on the project, but that they would stay within \$350,000, unless they receive approval from the County to go above that.

Mr. Gaffney asked Mr. Stewart if this was what he was asking -- if they would stay within the \$350,000.

Mr. Stewart replied yes. He stated that Mr. Gaffney's suggestion was a good one for the motion - that the project stay in the \$350,000 unless authorized otherwise by Albemarle County.

Mr. Snook asked if there was any provision for City money going into the project.

Mr. Mawyer replied no.

Mr. Stewart moved that the Board award the construction of the contract to Faulkner Construction in the amount of \$150,270, and authorize the Executive Director to execute change orders up to 20% of that original construction amount; provided that the amount of the total construction costs and all costs for the project do not exceed the budget within the agreement without the expressed written consent of the County of Albemarle. The motion was seconded by Dr. Palmer and passed unanimously (6-0). Dr. Richardson was absent from the meeting and the vote. 9. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA 10. CLOSED MEETING

There was no closed meeting.

8. Adjournment

At 2:48 p.m., Dr. Palmer moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. The motion was seconded by Mr. Richardson and passed unanimously (6-0). Dr. Richardson was absent from the meeting and the vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Tarron Richardson Secretary - Treasurer