# RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS **Minutes of Regular Meeting** March 22, 2022

4 5 6

1

2

3

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, March 22, 2022 at 3:06 p.m. via Zoom.

7 8 9

**Board Members Present:** Mike Gaffney, Jeff Richardson, Brian Pinkston, Michael Rogers, Ann Mallek, Lauren Hildebrand, Gary O'Connell.

10 11 12

**Board Members Absent:** None.

13 14

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Lonnie Wood, John Hull, Jennifer Whitaker, Jeff Southworth, Andrea Bowles, Deborah Anama.

15 16 17

**Attorney(s) Present:** Carrie Stanton and Valerie Long.

18 19

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney called the March 22, 2022, regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority to order at 3:06 p.m.

21 22 23

20

#### 2. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR

Mr. Gaffney read the following statement aloud:

24 25 26

"This is Mike Gaffney, Chair of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. I would like to call the March 22, 2022 meeting of the Board of Directors to order.

27 28 29

30

31

32 33 "Notwithstanding any provision in our Bylaws to the contrary, as permitted under the City of Charlottesville's Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted on March 25, 2020, Albemarle County's Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted on April 15th, 2020, and revised effective October 1, 2020 and Chapter 1283 of the 2020 Acts of the Virginia Assembly effective April 24, 2020, we are holding this meeting by real time electronic means with no board member physically present at a single, central location.

34 35 36

37

38 39

40

41

42

"All board members are participating electronically. This meeting is being held pursuant to the second resolution of the City's Continuity of Government Ordinance and Section 6 of the County's revised Continuity of Government Ordinance. All board members will identify themselves and state their physical location by electronic means during the roll call which we will hold next. I note for the record that the public has real time audio-visual access to this meeting over Zoom as provided in the lawfully posted meeting notice and real time audio access over telephone, which is also contained in the notice. The public is always invited to send questions, comments, and suggestions to the Board through Bill Mawyer, the Authority's Executive Director, at any time."

43 44 45

Mr. Gaffney called the roll.

Ms. Lauren Hildebrand stated she was located at 305 4th Street Northwest in Charlottesville, VA.

48

Ms. Ann Mallek stated she was at 4829 Advance Mills Road in Earlysville, Albemarle County.

50

Mr. Gary O'Connell stated he was located at 1720 Yorktown Drive in Charlottesville, VA.

52

- Mr. Brian Pinkston stated he was located at his office at 1450 Leake Drive, University of Virginia in
- 54 Charlottesville, VA.

55

- Mr. Jeff Richardson stated he was located at the County Office Building at 401 McIntire Road in
- 57 Charlottesville, VA.

58

Mr. Michael Rogers stated he was located at Charlottesville City Hall.

60

Mr. Mike Gaffney stated he was located at 3180 Dundee Road in Earlysville, VA.

62

- Mr. Gaffney stated the following Authority staff members and consultants were joining the meeting
- electronically: Bill Mawyer, Lonnie Wood, David Tungate, Jennifer Whitaker, John Hull, Jeff
- Southworth, Deborah Anama, and Attorney Valerie Long (Williams Mullen).

66

Mr. Gaffney stated they were also joined electronically by Carrie Stanton, (Williams Mullen) counsel to the Authority.

69 70

# 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING

a. Minutes of Regular Board Meeting on February 22, 2022

71 72

Ms. Mallek noted line 403 of the February 22 minutes regarded Buck Mountain Creek and the history of the Buck Mountain Reservoir. She asked someone to explain the reference to a street survey.

76

Mr. Mawyer stated the line was supposed to reference a stream survey not a street survey.

77 78

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were further comments or changes to the minutes.

80 81

Mr. O'Connell moved that the Board approve the minutes of the February 22, 2022 meeting with the amendment of line 403 from "street" to "stream." Ms. Mallek seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

83 84 85

82

#### 4. RECOGNITIONS

There were no recognitions.

87 88

## 5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- 90 Mr. Mawyer recognized Ms. Mary Morris who passed the Class 1 Water Operator's exam. He
- stated Ms. Morris started working with the Authority one year ago with no operator's license,
- and now she had the highest level of license. He stated a Class 1 Water Operator's license was

required on site at the South Fork Rivanna Water Treatment Plant (WTP) and Observatory WTP 24/7.

94 95

93

He stated Ms. Liz Coleman, Safety Manager, received a Certified Safety Professional certification. He stated through her education and experience, Ms. Coleman obtained the certification. He congratulated Ms. Katie McIlwee, Asset Management Coordinator, who completed her Master of Informatics degree. He stated the Authority assisted these individuals through education reimbursement programs.

101

Mr. Mawyer stated in accordance with the Virginia Water and Wastewater Authorities Act, authorities are authorized for 50 years, then they have to be re-authorized. He stated the RWSA was authorized in June 1972, and the authority was celebrating its 50-year anniversary. He stated resolutions would be submitted to the Board of Supervisors and the City Council to re-authorize the RWSA.

107

Mr. Richardson asked when those re-authorization resolutions would be submitted.

109

Mr. Mawyer responded that the resolutions would be submitted in May or in early June because the authorization expired in June.

112

He stated easements for the South Rivanna Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir pipe project were being negotiated. He stated discussions were ongoing with the UVA Foundation regarding an easement on property owned by the Foundation. He stated the project would construct a waterline from the north end of the Birdwood golf course to the Westover Farm, located north of Old Garth Road.

118 119

120

121

122

123

124125

Mr. Mawyer noted that sampling of Beaver Creek Reservoir indicated high algae levels. He stated the reservoir required a treatment to lower the algae levels which would affect the odor and taste of the drinking water. He stated it was the earliest algae bloom in recent memory. He stated a hypolimnetic oxygenation system was planned to be installed. He explained the system was a pipe system laid at the bottom of the reservoir that would bubble oxygen through the water to minimize the conditions conducive to algae blooms. He stated construction of the system was included in the Beaver Creek Dam improvement project slated for 2024 to 2026. He stated the algaecide treatments were required when the algae became excessive.

126 127

Mr. Mawyer stated the exterior lighting project at Moores Creek had garnered some concern. He 128 stated new light fixtures would be placed around the aeration basins. He stated about half of the 129 new lights had been installed, and the light levels emitted from the plant should be reduced. He 130 stated the remaining large lights surrounding the aeration basin would be installed by the end of 131 the week, weather permitting. He stated there were other lights to replace. He stated a strategic 132 lighting program would be evaluated to determine what lights needed to be on and when the 133 lights needed to be on. He stated there were safety reasons for the lights to be on all night, such 134 as staff safety around the wastewater storage basins. 135

136

Mr. Mawyer stated there were neighborhood meetings with the Fry's Spring and the Fifeville neighborhoods. He stated a meeting with the Little High Street neighborhood and the

Charlottesville Day School was scheduled for March 30. He stated the meetings were to inform 139 the community of the plans for the Central Waterline and to receive comments from the public. 140

141 142

Mr. O'Connell asked what the next step in the process was after neighborhood meetings.

143

Mr. Mawyer stated there would be a presentation to City Council in June. He explained feedback 144 from the community meetings would be collected and assessed, and feedback from City Council 145 and the Board of Supervisors would be assembled. He stated at the June RWSA Board meeting, 146 a recommendation would be presented as to the final location of the waterline. He stated unless 147 there was another suggestion, or more information came up requiring further study, then the item

148

would be back before the Board no later than June. 149

150

- Mr. Rogers asked if the City Council would make an action on the report to provide guidance. 151
- He asked what action the Council would take. 152

153

- Mr. Mawyer stated during the presentation to City Council in June, he would summarize the 154
- feedback received from the community about the project. He stated he planned to provide 155
- Council a project update on the issues and responses to those issues. He stated feedback from the 156
- Council would be requested. 157

158

Mr. Rogers asked if the RWSA would determine whether the project would move forward. 159

160

- Mr. Mawyer stated in January 2020, an agreement was signed between the City, the Albemarle 161
- County Service Authority, and RWSA. He stated the agreement addressed the funding for the 162
- Observatory WTP improvements, along with the other pipeline improvements, to transport raw 163
- water from the Ragged Mountain Reservoir to the Observatory WTP. He stated the agreement 164
- addressed the commitment to complete the Central Water Line and to capitalize on the value 165
- added from the raw water pipe and water treatment plant improvements. 166

167

- Mr. Mawyer stated in order to capitalize on the improvements and improve the water distribution 168 system, the Central Water Line had to be completed. He stated once the water master plan was 169
- completed, it would serve as the basis for consideration of the final route of the Central Water 170

171 Line.

172

Mr. Rogers asked if the City Council reviewed the report and concluded it was not comfortable 173 with the facts of the report, and the item was brought back before the Board, would the Board 174 vote to move forward with the plan or to modify the plan. 175

176

- Mr. Mawyer stated the City Council comments would be brought back before the Board, and the 177
- City's position could be further expressed to the Board. He stated he hoped there would be a 178
- consensus that the route of the waterline was appropriate, and that most people would be in 179 agreement with the information presented.

180

- Mr. Mawyer indicated traffic counts, street widths, water modeling (the ways different routes 182
- provided varied benefits to the water system), and impacts to the neighborhoods were factors to 183
- be considered in the evaluation. He stated all the neighborhoods would be impacted relatively the 184

same with a trench in the street to install the pipe. He stated emergency vehicle routes were

- examined along 5th Street. He stated it was suggested that the Route 29 / Route 250 bypass was
- a better route for the waterline, but he noted the far greater impact to traffic than the Cherry
- Avenue route. He stated all suggestions would be considered and objective data would be
- gathered to come up with a suggested route.

190

Mr. Rogers noted the issue was complex. He asked staff to work on a simplified explanation of the process and project.

193

- Mr. Mawyer stated the information would be made understandable to a non-technical audience.
- He stated a one-page project information sheet had been completed, and presentations to the
- community were made to be understandable. He stated if information was not clear, there could
- be modifications.

198

- Mr. Mawyer stated the last item was related to safety and confined spaces. He stated confined
- spaces were usually manholes, communication manholes, or vaults with equipment. He stated
- confined spaces had a regulatory meaning. He stated people had to be prepared with harnesses
- and devices to extract workers from the spaces if they were to become ill. He stated if there was
- a complicated space, a rescue team had to be available. He stated there was an MOU with the
- 204 City and County fire departments that if a rescue team was needed proactively, then the
- departments would support the authority. He stated our Safety Manager, Ms. Liz Coleman was
- effective in establishing the agreements.

207

- Ms. Mallek asked if the water quality association provided research as to the causes of the algae
- blooms. She stated the use of certain chemicals that came from runoff changed the way aquatic
- plants absorbed phosphates which exacerbated growth. She stated changes in the uses of the
- chemicals around the reservoir could aid in mitigating the blooms. She asked if the possibility of
- motion sensors for the Moores Creek lighting had been considered.

213

- Mr. Mawyer stated studies had been done. He stated they were aware of phosphates from
- fertilizers and how they created algae blooms because they promoted plant growth. He stated a
- 216 phosphate study for the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir was underway. He stated the study was on
- the impact of piping water from the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain
- Reservoir versus constructing a treatment plant to remove the phosphates and sediment. He
- stated the Water Manager worked with watershed protection projects and phosphate
- management. He stated motion sensors could be a suggestion to work into the strategic lighting
- operations at Moores Creek. He stated motion sensors could be a good way to turn the lights on
- and off as needed.

223224

#### 6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

- Mr. Gaffney opened the meeting to the public. He asked speakers to identify their name and
- where they live, and to keep in mind the three-minute time limit.

227

Mr. Hull stated there were four people with comments.

- Mr. Justin Thomas Beights stated he lived at 1 Canterbury Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. He
- stated he was speaking on behalf of his wife's family, Colleen Kovac Beights and Michael and
- Kathleen Kovac—the former owners of the parent parcel of the 2.2 acres in the Buck Mountain
- Reservoir Property. He stated the RWSA indicated it was interested in selling the parcel. He
- stated he and his father-in-law had been in contact with the Board. He stated he and his wife's
- family were interested in buying the 2.2-acre land back. He explained the land was sold by his
- in-laws in 1983 to the RWSA. He stated the property was sold at a fair market value, and the
- family was interested in buying the property at fair market value.

- Mr. Beights stated adjacent landowners were interested in the future of the property. He stated a
- group of Free Union residents expressed interest in preserving the house on the land, the former
- Elliot House. He stated Mr. Bruce Bateman, a friend of the family, had been consulted and had
- sent correspondence to the Board regarding his opinions on the future use of the land. He stated
- 243 Mr. Bateman was responsible for two of his children.

244

- Mr. Beights stated a negotiated sale to a former landowner was the best way for the RWSA to
- ensure the architectural integrity of the final protect and the water quality of the adjacent
- property and the County. He stated the vision for the property was a small-footprint, barn-style
- architecture similar to the existing house. He stated he could provide more detail regarding the
- design. He stated the family was ready and willing to pay fair market value. He stated a sealed-
- bid process could lead to an architectural eye-sore.

251252

Mr. Gaffney told Mr. Beights he was over his time limit.

253

- Mr. Matthew Lucas stated he lived at 1966 Buck Mountain Road, two doors down from the
- Elliot House. He stated he had discussed at a prior meeting about adjusting his property line
- between his house and TMP 29-36A, a 66-acre lot owned by the RWSA for the reservoir. He
- explained at the last meeting, it was indicated that after the boundary adjustment, the plan was to
- lease the balance of the lot, TMP 29-36A, and combine it with three other lots and offer it as one
- aggregate parcel for lease. He requested that the parcels be leased individually.

260

260

- Mr. Lucas stated he was interested only in leasing TMP 29-36A because it was originally part of
- his farm, and he wanted to lease the parcel for his farm. He stated some of the parcels up for
- lease were behind his neighbor's property. He stated those neighbors might be interested in the
- other lots of the bundle because they were closely connected to their property. He stated TMP
- 29-36A was closely connected to his property.

266

- Mr. Lucas stated he would take care of land and clean up debris. He stated he had a long-term
- view for the property. He stated his neighbor was interested in the two lots behind his own house
- 269 that were part of the aggregate bundle. He stated if the bundle were broken up, the same result
- would be achieved as bundling. He stated if the Board looked for a Buck Mountain community
- liaison, he was willing to fill the role.

- Ms. Dede Smith stated she lived at 2652 Jefferson Park Circle, Charlottesville, Virginia. She
- stated she was concerned about the Central Waterline project because it would cut through the
- 275 City on the route to Pantops in the northern urban area. She stated the pipeline was a new

construction project, not a reimagining. She stated Mr. Mawyer emailed a City Councilor, stating, "the Central Waterline project was not included in the original community water supply plan, but was added in recent years by RWSA as a necessary project to, among other things, increase the drinking water supply of the community."

Ms. Smith stated the goal of the Central Waterline project was different then the southern loop agreement. She stated there was another reference in the materials to the Central Waterline, "it was decided in the August 2018 Board meetings that we should complete the finished water master plan prior to moving forward with final design and construction of the central waterline." She asked why the Board was moving forward with the project before the urban water master plan was released.

Ms. Smith stated she had read the draft master plan. She stated in the master plan, besides the Central Waterline project, a 30-inch pipeline running water from Observatory to Pantops, there was another 30-inch pipeline in the master plan to run water from Observatory north along Emmet Street. She stated the Emmet Street pipeline would connect the two water treatment plants, a different pipeline than the pipeline to connect the two reservoirs.

Ms. Smith stated there were three new pipelines and associated infrastructure planned within the next decade. She asked how the projects would be funded. She noted that in 2022, less water was used per day than in the 1990s. She asked how the million dollars in pipelines would be funded if there was no demand.

Mr. Michael Kovac stated he and his wife Kathleen Kovac were the former private owners of the Elliot house. He echoed Mr. Beights' comments and asked for the consideration of the Board to negotiate the sale of the property to the original owners, including the Kovac-Beights family. He stated the family respected the land and the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Steven Blaine stated he was speaking on behalf of the Hefner property owners who owned property south of TMP 29-33F, one of the parcels the RWSA considered leasing. He stated his clients supported the sale of the 14-acre parcel to Mr. Matthew Lucas and supported Mr. Lucas leasing the balance of TMP 29-36A. He stated the interests of his clients were in alignment with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Blaine stated the Kovac family was interested in preserving the surrounding property. He stated his clients were interested in leasing TMP 29-33F and 33C. He stated his clients were not interested in bidding against Mr. Lucas over the leasing of the balance of the remaining parcels, including TM 29-35D.

Mr. Blaine stated the clients' interests were in preserving the land and in security. He stated there had been activity that concerned the landowners, such as nighttime firearm discharges. He stated if the adjoining property owners controlled the parcels, they could better protect and monitor the area. He stated there was a consistency among the other speakers in having a past connection to the parcels and preserving them.

Ms. Anama read the following letter from Dr. Bruce Bateman into the record:

"Justin and Colleen Beights have been in touch with me regarding their interest in purchasing the Elliot house. I have known them for many years and I know Colleen's parents. They are fine people. I fear that they may overestimate my influence with regard to the fate of Elliot

325 property.

326327

328

329

330

331

On their behalf I will make 2 points. First- Having taken the position that restoration of the house would be desirable, to maintain the rural character of Free Union, the reality that we all learned from Matt Lucas is that the house has negative value. Therefore, restoration is quite unlikely. Second- The best I can hope, as a neighbor, is a new house with a small footprint and casual country style that is in keeping with the area. Justin and Colleen describe a home a keeping with those qualities. Thank you for your time. Bruce Bateman"

332333334

335

Ms. Anama read the following letter from Ms. Nancy Chamberlin and Mr. Allan Mayer into the record:

336

"Comments and Questions about Allen Farm Lane Bridge and Land, submitted by Nancy
Chamberlin and Allan Mayer, owners/residents of 1358 Allen Farm Lane for the March 22,
2022, RWSA Board of Directors Meeting.

340 341

342

343

344

345

Based on the minutes of the last meeting, it is clear that RWSA wants to rid itself of responsibility for the Allen Farm Lane bridge, even if that means going against its stated values and causing a deleterious impact on the environment. RWSA doesn't want responsibility for the bridge, so what makes Mr. Mawyer think someone else will want it? Will it be by allowing the buyer to build a number of houses so they can make more profit? What kind of division rights are you proposing for the land that would be sold with the bridge?

346347348

349

350

Building one house would be bad enough but building multiple houses would increase traffic and create an even bigger risk for the creek and the spinymussel. It seems your priority here is how much money you can make rather than what is best for the environment. This does not support RWSA's goal of environmental stewardship and its standing as a non-profit agency.

351352353

354

355

In the minutes, Ms. Bowles states that "after the mitigation plan has been deemed compliant by DEQ (which should happen in 2024), RWSA would plan to offer land and the bridge for sale to the public." What mitigation plan is being referenced and is a copy of that plan available for sharing with the public?

356357

Note that the land RWSA owns near the bridge is technically unsuitable for building. First, the bridge lies right in the middle of a 100 year flood plain. Approximately half a dozen times a year, we see water levels well over the top of the bridge. So where would you carve out a parcel that included the bridge and included an appropriate building site? Second, there is a hazard zone from the underground tank on parcel 18-19A that directly impacts your parcel 18-19A3.

Attached is an Albemarle GIS map that shows these issues.

364

RWSA is misinformed about many aspects of the bridge and land. The number of trucks going through the ford is not even remotely close to the number Ms. Mallek suggested when she said "dozens of big trucks go through this stream every day." The only trucks that use the ford are those that are too wide or too heavy for the bridge. At a maximum, only a handful of vehicles use the ford per month, All USPS, UPS, and FedEx vehicles can and do use the bridge to cross the creek.

371372

373

374

375

Ms. Mallek also stated "the biggest environmental crisis is the fact that there is a sign there that tells drivers of vehicles over the size of a Prius to drive through the stream." Attached is a photo of the sign near the bridge. Also, is Ms. Mallek aware that on Buck Mountain Ford Lane, less than a mile upstream, there are two places where all vehicles must go through the creek because there is no bridge?

376377378

379

380 381 We would also like to understand how LPDA came up with the new lease rates. In the minutes, Ms. Bowles states that "the new lease rates come from what was recommended by LPDA." Hopefully, LPDA used a more accurate methodology than the one they used to come up with the ridiculous valuation of \$325,000 for the Elliot house with only two acres of land.

382

"Ms. Bowles stated LPDA gave them a range, and the rates shown in the right-hand column on the screen are those that Rivanna wants to use now." Based on the range shown in the February minutes, the rates chosen are on the high end of that range. The range for the total market lease value shown is \$6,300 to \$8,800 and the new lease rates are \$8540. As a non-profit agency that pays no taxes on the land, shouldn't you be on the low end of that range?

388 389

Ms. Mallek stated "regarding the leases, she is all in favor of updating the cost of leases, as farmers who use it to bale and for graze land pay almost nothing for it, which carries through with a lot of other mismanagement." What mismanagement are you referencing?

391392393

394

395

396

390

You promised us you would hold a neighborhood meeting last summer and that never happened. You contracted for a structural engineering review of the bridge that identified maintenance needed in a report dated 11/8/2019 and those repairs never happened. You have numerous plastic tubes attached to wooden stakes for the 75 percent of trees you planted that were unsuccessful. Those need to be removed and that never happened.

397398

Now, you are proposing to sell the bridge and some of the surrounding land so you can rid yourselves of responsibility for the bridge without any concern for how it impacts the environment. It appears that you are uninterested in our views and our environment. Perhaps our local government representatives, the local news teams, and the environmental bodies overseeing you will be interested.

404 Fix 405 the

Fix the bridge, remove the tree tubes, and don't pursue massaging the zoning on a parcel near the bridge to try and make it "attractive" enough so that a developer buys it and destroys the environment. As residents of Allen Farm Lane, we ask that you allow us to continue our peaceful enjoyment of our property."

407 408

406

Mr. Gaffney closed the meeting to the public.

409 410 411

## 7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Gaffney asked Mr. Mawyer if he had a response to the public comment.

Mr. Mawyer stated there would be a presentation on Buck Mountain. He stated there was a

meeting with the Beights family and the Kovac family the week prior regarding their concerns.

He stated staff had kept in contact with Mr. Matthew Lucas and Mr. Steven Blaine.

417

- Mr. Mawyer stated criteria were being crafted to determine the appropriate process to lease and
- sell property. He stated a reasonable plan would be crafted so parties were treated fairly through the leasing and sale process. He stated the RWSA attorneys were being consulted. He suggested
- the leasing and sale process. He stated the RWSA attorneys were being consulted. He suggest a presentation would be made to the Board in May regarding the criteria for feedback on the
- a presentation would be made to the Board in May regarding the criteria for feedback on the
- process. He stated feedback regarding preference for former owners would be appreciated.

423

- Mr. Mawyer stated in response to the letter from Ms. Nancy Chamberlin and Mr. Allan Mayer,
- the mitigation plans to Buck Mountain were approved in 2012 to mitigate the environmental
- impacts of the Ragged Mountain Reservoir dam. In response to Ms. Smith's question, the Urban
- Finish Water Master Plan would be finished in April and there would be a presentation before
- 428 the Board in May.

429

- Mr. Mawyer stated there was a copy of the 2006 conceptual mitigation plan on our website that
- described how Buck Mountain stream preservation would be used to mitigate the impacts of the
- Rivanna Reservoir Dam. He stated there had not been a neighborhood meeting, but there would
- be one planned for the next month regarding Allan Farm Lane, the bridge, the Elliot house, and
- 434 the lease rates.

435

Mr. Gaffney asked if other members would like to respond.

437

- Ms. Mallek stated in regard to the letter from Ms. Nancy Chamberlin and Mr. Alan Mayer, the
- information regarding the trucks crossing the bridge was given to her by a UPS driver and
- several other different drivers. She stated the drivers stated the companies would not allow
- drivers to use a bridge that was marked as unsafe. She stated she would send staff a link to
- Winchester Precast who constructed several bridges in the area. She suggested traffic counts at
- the location be done to provide data beyond anecdotal information.

444

Mr. Rogers stated regarding the request to transfer property ownership to a previous owner, he wanted to know the process for disposition of authority property.

447

- Mr. Mawyer stated they were currently working out the process. He stated the Virginia Water
- and Wastewater Authorities Act, Virginia Public Procurement Act, and other state codes were
- reviewed. He stated the RWSA had authority to adopt its own process as long as it was in
- compliance with Virginia code. He stated if the authority wanted to give priority to existing
- owners, it could. He stated details could be discussed, such as a more formal definition of
- 453 "former owners."

454

- Mr. Rogers stated he was concerned because the property was acquired with public resources,
- and the RWSA was a public authority, so it should follow a published public procurement
- ordinance, law, or policy. He stated he inferred the RWSA did not have a set of procurement
- rules it followed, and state law had to be consulted to determine the authority.

Mr. Mawyer explained there was a detailed purchasing manual that directed the authority with 460 procedures to buy and sell most items, but it specifically did not apply to real estate which was 461 why the state code had to be consulted. He stated direction was required from the Board to create 462 criteria to give prior property owners priority. 463 464 Mr. Gaffney asked if there were further comments. 465 466 Ms. Mallek asked if there were different rules if the property was purchased through the eminent 467 domain process. She noted the Elliot house was not purchased through eminent domain. She 468 asked if there was a VDOT process. 469 470 Mr. Mawyer stated the obligation to sell property to prior owners was primarily a VDOT 471 process. He explained in the Virginia Water and Wastewater Authority Act, there was authority 472 to condemn property, but it did not state an obligation to resell property to owners that were 473 previously condemned. He stated most of the properties at Buck Mountain were not condemned. 474 475 8. CONSENT AGENDA 476 477 a. Staff Report on Finance 478 479 b. Staff Report on Operations 480 481 c. Staff Report on Ongoing Projects 482 483 d. Staff Report on Wholesale Metering 484 485 Staff Drought Monitoring Report. 486 487 Mr. Gaffney asked if there items from the consent agenda that Board members would like to pull 488 489 for comment or questions. 490 Mr. O'Connell moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Mallek seconded 491 the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0). 492 493 9. OTHER BUSINESS 494 a. Presentation: Northern Urban Area Utilities Update; Jennifer Whitaker, Director of 495 Engineering and Maintenance 496 Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Director of Engineering and Maintenance, stated a version of the 497 presentation had been presented at the December Board meeting. She stated after receiving 498 questions concerning the potential rezoning of the North Fork research park, and because several 499 members of the Board had turned changed, this presentation would be an update on the process. 500

Ms. Whitaker stated the County had been approached along the Route 29 North corridor about

the Discovery Park, the National Ground Intelligence Center, and the Airport. She stated those

potential projects and future needs for utilities. She listed the UVA research park, also known as

March 22, 2022

501

502

503

areas made up a part of the County Comprehensive Plan called the Places29 master plan. She stated growth was envisioned in the areas. She stated the envisioning was done prior to the 2008 Great Recession. She stated the County had been approached by the research park regarding future development and rezoning in the area.

Ms. Whitaker stated RWSA, ACSA, and the City had plans and routinely updated those plans to systematically improve the drinking water and sewer infrastructure. She stated improvements were balanced so water and wastewater needs were met. She stated there was a 10-to-15-year plan to serve the northern area of the County. She stated the significant utility demands proposed could necessitate one of two choices: accelerate the utility plan or incorporate project phasing so there was no unmet need in the future.

Ms. Whitaker highlighted the service area within the urban water system. She stated the area included the City, the County's urban ring, along Route 29, east to Glenmore and west towards Ivy. She highlighted the urban wastewater system. She stated the system included the Crozet sewer system. She stated the Crozet system was connected via four pump stations to the urban area and connected to the Moores Creek AWRRF. She stated two-thirds of the system was directed to the Rivanna pump station, and the other third was directed to the Moores Creek pump station. She stated both stations connected to the Moores Creek wastewater treatment plant.

Ms. Whitaker stated one of the six goals from the strategic plan was infrastructure and master planning, due to the large capital infrastructure investment and the time spent planning projects. She stated the RWSA was charged to plan, deliver, and maintain dependable infrastructure in a financially responsible way. She stated projects were spaced out to meet community needs while not being a financial burden.

Ms. Whitaker noted that from September 2016 to April 2022, there were a series of master planning documents compiled. She noted the documents included sanitary sewer modeling reports, demand forecasts, safe yield reports, wastewater cost analysis, master plans for the Moores Creek facility, and the Urban Finish Water master plan. She stated there was flow metering in the water and wastewater systems which are monitored on a month over month basis.

Ms. Whitaker stated the slide displayed (1.) how demands would grow and (2.) how the raw water safe yield could meet the demands. She stated there was a crossing of the lines in 2060 based on the previous set of demand data from ACSA, the County, the City, UVAF, UVA, VDOT, and the Weldon Cooper Center. She stated community developments and the state of the reservoirs were considered. She stated an increase of 86,000 gallons per year was projected with a steady incremental increase over time.

Ms. Whitaker stated the safe yield report examined demand growth versus what was available in the reservoirs. She stated good planning from an infrastructure standpoint meant not building at the last minute, because the exact future conditions could not be predicted. She stated the best available information was used. She stated the goal was to proceed with construction of new infrastructure when the demand reached 80% to 85% of capacity. She stated it was geared to the raw water supply and community water supply plan. She stated by 2035, the South Fork to Ragged Mountain pipeline system should be built to provide an adequate supply of raw water.

Ms. Whitaker stated the existing drinking water infrastructure in the northern Albemarle area was important to understand. She stated the North Fork Rivanna WTP currently served the area. She stated the plant was augmented with an above-ground diesel pump connected with above-ground hoses. She stated the pump was the backup system to the North Fork WTP.

Ms. Whitaker stated the North Fork WTP could produce one million gallons per day. She stated the demand was about 500,000 gallons per day. She stated that more recent analysis as to what water was available in the river was completed. She stated during a drought, there was an available supply of about 750,000 gallons per day. She stated as the area grew, there had to be another way to supply water because the North Fork Rivanna River could not supply the entire demand.

Ms. Whitaker stated there was a North Fork WTP alternative analysis that identified upgrades to the plant would cost \$13 million to \$15 million. She stated the approved plan was to decommission the North Fork WTP and tie the Northern system into the South Fork WTP and the remainder of the urban system. She stated in order to meet the future capacity, the North Fork WTP would be decommissioned, and pipelines and tanks would be constructed to meet the need. She stated now that the need had increased at the North Fork research park and other northern Albemarle areas, the speed of the plan implementation was being reevaluated.

Ms. Whitaker stated there were several projects planned to be built in the urban system to supply the northern area. She noted the Airport Road pump station, the second crossing of the South Fork Rivanna River, and the second crossing at the North Fork Rivanna River for redundancy. She stated the Observatory and the South Fork WTPs were being updated. She stated the Central Water line project was needed. She stated new raw water pipelines were required from Ragged Mountain Reservoir to Observatory WTP and from South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir.

When referencing the wastewater system, Ms. Whitaker stated there were ACSA pipelines and pump stations and RWSA pipelines and pump stations. She stated the sewer system would have to be upgraded between 2045 and 2065. She stated as future growth was evaluated, the upgrades could be accelerated. She stated the data came out of the sewer master plan and regarded the upgrade of ACSA pipes and the remainder of the RWSA collection/interceptor system. She stated the pipes were the limiting factor in the sewer system, and the plan showed how and when to upgrade the pipes. She stated if more demand were placed on the pipes than anticipated, they would have to be upgraded sooner.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the Rivanna river was between the blue and yellow marked pipes.

Ms. Whitaker stated that was correct.

Mr. Mawyer asked if the pipes marked green were existing.

Ms. Whitaker stated all the pipes were existing. She stated the green pipes were the RWSA interceptor collector sewer system that brought the flow to the Moores Creek facility.

Mr. Gaffney clarified that the pipes did not need to be updated except for the last section of the Schenks Branch.

600

Ms. Whitaker stated there were small projects, but out of the master plan as it related to the northern area, the last parts to be completed were the Powell Creek areas. She stated there was a plan, and the RWSA was considering the past flows and the future needs. She stated the RWSA considered what was needed from a regulatory standpoint, demand standpoint, and community standpoint.

606 607

608

609

610

Ms. Whitaker stated the work was planned so that there was infrastructure to be built within adequate time. She stated the recent growth in the northern area of the County required the authority to reevaluate plans. She stated there were discussions with UVAF regarding its desires with rezoning, what could be done to serve them, and what limitations might exist. She stated a discussion about the best path forward should follow.

611612

Mr. Pinkston asked if UVAF had indicated a sense of whether the proposed housing at North Fork would be the tipping point for demand.

615

Ms. Whitaker stated the desires of the UVAF from a phasing standpoint were discussed. She stated modeling of the phasing was being examined. She stated all the housing would be able to be served, the question was regarding how quickly the housing would be brought online.

619

Mr. Pinkston asked if UVAF had indicated where the housing would be located.

621

Ms. Whitaker stated according to the public documents and discussions, the University of Virginia had one set of housing projects, and the UVAF research park had a separate but mildly overlapping housing discussion. She stated the plans did not appear to be the same.

625

Mr. Pinkston asked if the team working on the issue understood the importance of the decisions on the water system.

628

Ms. Whitaker stated they were aware of the importance. She stated the discussions had focused on how the system needed to evolve to serve the residents along the Route 29 North corridor.

631

Ms. Mallek stated housing projects used to contribute funds to speed up the delivery of services to the area. She asked if the funds only came from the rate payers and hook up fee.

634

Ms. Whitaker stated there were a few proffers she was aware of that had come to RWSA. She stated whether proffers had gone to other utility processes, she did not know.

637

Mr. O'Connell stated regarding wastewater, there was a sewer improvement accomplished with a special rate district—a special connection fee as new development came online to serve future development. He stated the project was \$10 million and was completed a decade ago.

641

Mr. O'Connell mentioned that there were a number of housing developments, potential rezoning

projects, and commercial developments throughout the system and not just in the northern area. He stated all the developments could have a significant effect on the urban system. He stated as the system adjusted to two water treatment plants and Observatory's expansion, they could have a large effect on other regional water facilities. He stated the whole system should be considered.

a. Presentation and Public Hearing: Approval of the Buck Mountain Property Management Plan; Bill Mawyer, Executive Director

Mr. Mawyer stated last month, Andrea Bowles had given a presentation about the Buck Mountain Property Management Plan. He stated they advertised the public hearing today on the plan, which was step one in a very conservative approach of how to follow the Virginia code and sell real estate. He stated last month, Andrea told them of the history of the completion of a master plan based on their Strategic Plan goals. He stated they identified the Elliott house as a property that was a liability to them that they wanted to dispose of since they no longer could rent it. He stated they worked with a surveyor to carve off 2.2 acres of the 1,300 acres at Buck Mountain to be the subdivision of the house to make it available for sale.

Mr. Mawyer stated they also proposed and recommended that they could carve off almost 14 acres at the cross-hatched area to make a boundary line adjustment for Mr. Lucas, who spoke earlier, which was recommended last month and approved by the Board to transfer the cross-hatched area through the boundary adjustment to Mr. Lucas. He stated third was to take the four parcels shown in light brown and put them together into a lease that they would advertise to the public for public leasing. He stated they had heard comments today about separating these parcels and working with the Hefners and Mr. Lucas to reduce these four parcels to two that would be leased to them and two that would be leased to the public. He stated they had a strategy of including the small parcel #29-35D to give road frontage so that a new lessee could have access to these parcels, otherwise they were landlocked.

Mr. Mawyer stated last month, the Board approved that they move forward with a process to proceed with the legal and financial procurement processes necessary to offer the 2.2-acre parcel with improvements including the Elliot House for sale to the public, offer about 14 acres to the adjacent neighbor for the boundary line adjustment, and offer four parcels as a combined single lease for passive enjoyment activities. He stated the most conservative process they had found in the Virginia code stated they should start with a public hearing before they would execute these transfers. He stated they could then take comments. He stated a number of people had spoken to this topic already today, and his suggestion was that if there were other speakers who had not already spoken, this would be the time to invite them to speak at the public hearing.

Mr. Gaffney stated in reading this again, he supposed they should have deferred those public speakers to this time.

Mr. Gaffney stated he agreed they should open the public hearing to see if there were others that would like to speak and recognize that those who spoke earlier would have their comments added to this public hearing and recognize they forgot this when looking at the minutes. He opened the floor to public comment on the Buck Mountain Property Management Plan. He asked Mr. Hull if there was anyone who wished to speak.

Mr. Southworth stated he was sitting in for Mr. Hull and that there were no hands raised to speak.

693 Mr. Gaffney stated he would guess that those who wanted to speak about this plan thought it was 694 the appropriate time earlier. He stated they would now close the public hearing and go to 695 comments and questions regarding the Buck Mountain Property Management Plan.

Ms. Mallek asked if this was the appropriate time to talk about the combined lease.

699 Mr. Gaffney stated yes.

 Ms. Mallek stated having non-resident people in there "recreating," whatever their chosen passive recreation was, had not been a happy circumstance for people living on all sides of the ravine. She stated the stream protection was the most important thing, and it was difficult for anyone to see from the road, and difficult for the police department to assist with people who were trespassing with weapons. She stated it created concern on the part of neighbors as well, so she would like separate leases to be possible, and if someone was willing to pick up something in addition to what they asked for originally to get all four of them assigned, that was fine. She stated she thought having the access off of Catterton Road to a landlocked area of vital stream was dangerous, so she hoped they would not do that.

Mr. Gaffney asked Mr. Mawyer if it had been determined if the straight line on #29-26A was not the right line for that property. He asked if it had been recalculated that.

Mr. Mawyer stated they had not recalculated it, but they had looked at it on a map. He stated their intent was that they were going to retain all property that would be in the normal pool, which was elevation 464, plus ten feet vertical, so they were working with their surveyor to establish that elevation as property they would not consider for sale. He stated that would make that straight line, particularly to the left, be more segmented to retain the property that they would envision for a future reservoir.

Mr. Gaffney stated he thought the property owner probably would think about a fence back there, so as straight or as regularly curved as they could put on that would make sense.

Mr. Mawyer stated they would work with their surveyor and try to come up with a practical property line that would work with Mr. Lucas as best they could.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any other comments or questions from the Board. He asked if
Mr. Mawyer was asking for approval of the Buck Mountain Property Management Plan at this
time.

Mr. Mawyer stated he would recommend they come back next month with some more detail on this process and a clearer recommendation that the Board could consider on how they offered leases and sales, because they were working on some criteria for the processes they would use to lease or sell property, and inclusion of the comments they heard recently, including today, about

the desires of adjacent property owners. He stated they were looking at leases that would start with the existing lessees, because they had a number of properties that were leased which they were renewing, and a second criterion was that they would lease to adjacent property owners, but if there were more than one, they would solicit all of the adjacent property owners and let them have an opportunity, and the third option would be that they go to a public offering for the lease. He stated on the sale side, there was a little less dealing with existing owners and more making it available to the public, and that was where the Board could offer its comments next month on giving the adjacent property owners and prior property owners priority as far as the sale goes. 

Mr. Pinkston asked if he were talking about coming back with a proposal for how selling might work in terms of a process of what he thought was accessible legally in terms of what the Authority could do.

Mr. Mawyer stated yes. He stated it would be in terms of what was practical and reasonable, and the Board could add its input.

 Mr. Pinkston stated he was sympathetic to the comments that were made earlier by people who had their property taken through eminent domain years ago, and he did not know how to square that with what Mr. Rogers was saying about the Virginia Public Procurement Act and ensuring that they got the best value and those sorts of things. He stated he assumed their team and legal counsel would help with that.

Mr. Mawyer stated they would as best they could. He stated he knew there would be an issue, because it was easy to go to a prior owner and give them the first right of refusal, but then a fair and reasonable price must be established. He stated they could use market value, do an appraisal to establish market value, but there had been inferences that somehow they should give prior owners a discounted price because of the challenges when they were, in their words, forced to sell 35-40 years ago. He stated that made it much more difficult to come up with an equation to which they could calculate that fairly for everyone.

Ms. Mallek stated she thought fair market value was the best way to go because it was best grounded in law, and therefore no special privilege was given, because their dollars were just as good as someone else's, and that made it better from everyone's point of view, and it was ancient history and anyone who was part of that decision was a part of it long ago, and she certainly was not, so she thought it was easier for us to deal with the current values and current state of things.

Mr. Gaffney stated if they looked at highest and best offer, they may look at legal precedent for allowing past owners to match that highest and best offer.

Mr. Mawyer asked if he was referring to under a bid scenario.

Mr. Gaffney stated if they put it on the market and they got multiple bids. He stated sometimes people would put bids on houses that went above the asking price. He asked if there was a way to allow a previous owner to match the highest bid on the house.

Mr. Mawyer stated that sounded like a great suggestion. He stated they could allow the public to

participate but give some priority to the prior owner, if that was what the Board would like to do, but it would not be at a discounted rate.

Ms. Mallek stated she was not proposing a bidding war, and she was assuming the Authority would establish a sale price for this. She stated she thought there were some elements of use of the property that were described at previous meetings that were very important, and discussion on the site as well of some similarity to the footprint size and tree preservation that she hoped would be hammered out by this Board before anything was offered to the market, because it would be sad to lose those hundreds of big trees and not have the stormwater protection they had there now as well as reuse of the property as it fit into the neighborhood.

Mr. Mawyer stated if it suited the Board, they would come back next month with more information.

Mr. Gaffney stated that sounded like a great plan. He asked if there were any other questions or comments to that effect. Hearing none, he introduced the next item.

b. Presentation and Approval: Introduction of the FY 2022 – 2023 Operating Budget and Adoption of the Preliminary Rate Schedule for Public Hearing: Bill Mawyer, Executive Director

Mr. Mawyer he stated for the Water and Sewer Authority, they based their budget on their five strategic plan goals: operational optimization, communication and collaboration, workforce development, environmental stewardship, and infrastructure master planning. He stated what they proposed and estimated for next year on the Water and Sewer side was a total budget of about \$41.8M, a \$2.9M increase or 7.4%. He stated their debt service was estimated to increase 6.9% or \$1.3M, and their expenses of \$22.1M were estimated to increase 7.8% or \$1.6M and they intended to contribute reserves of \$150K. He stated that had been their practice in the last several years to support the transition of the expense of the GAC material for their new GAC system, but this would be the last year they would be making that contribution from the reserves.

Mr. Mawyer stated the total effect was that City charges would be \$16.5M, which was a 6.9% increase above the current year, ACSA charges would be \$23.6M, a 9.6% increase above this year, and they noted with an asterisk that they set the water and wastewater operating cost proportionally based on the retail flow that the City and Service Authority reported to them, so the retail wastewater flows in the urban area for FY 2021 resulted in a \$116K shift in those expenses, or 0.73% decrease for the City and a 0.6% increase for the Service Authority. He stated in their simple pie chart of their \$41.8M budget, 47% was debt service to pay their bonds and 53% was for their expenses.

Mr. Mawyer stated the next slide showed a pie chart of their estimated expenses. He stated personnel was the single largest expense for them, and buildings, grounds, instruments, and maintenance, at \$2.6M, or 12%, was their second highest slice of the pie. He stated chemicals were a large cost for them as well as utilities. He stated there was also professional services, wastewater odor control which was for a turnkey operation to put chemicals in the wastewater on its way from Crozet to Moores Creek to reduce odors and corrosion. He stated they shipped their

biosolids to the McGill Composting Facility in Waverly, Virginia, which costs \$735K per year, or 3% of the budget.

Mr. Mawyer stated technology was a growing component of their expenses, with the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System, which ran most of their processes. He stated cybersecurity was a major issue that they were on high alert due to the events with Russia and with the warnings they were receiving from government sources. He stated they had to have the staff and systems to deal with that as well as manage all of their assets and document management and other electronic systems. Information technology was a growing component of their budget as he was sure it was with the City and the County.

Mr. Mawyer stated in their 17-year history, they saw a pretty straight line of a growing budget. He stated \$41.8M was projected for next year. He stated they had about \$390M in facilities and equipment in their assets, ranging from reservoirs, treatment plants, and miles of water and wastewater piping. He stated they had diversified assets which include a stormwater facility with the Lickinghole Creek Basin they managed and owned. He pointed out a photograph of the aeration basins, which was where they had the biggest challenge with the lighting. He stated they were procuring replacement fixtures now.

Mr. Mawyer stated some of their major achievements this year included getting the urban water master plan finished next month and presented to the Board in May. He stated they had a wastewater master plan for this plant about which they would present information in June. He stated they had completed the transition from their water corrosion inhibitor product. He stated there always had been a product used, but they transitioned over the last two years to a different product. He stated that was done successfully and without customer concerns or complaints about any issues with drinking water, so it was seen as a success.

Mr. Mawyer stated they replaced the rubber bladder that sat on top of the concrete dam at Sugar Hollow Reservoir. He stated they had almost completed the Crozet wastewater storage tank, where they took wastewater out of the pipe on its way from Crozet to Moore's Creek, and they stored it in this tank so the piping was not overwhelmed and caused sewer overflows when there was a rain event. He stated they produced well over 3 billion gallons of drinking water and processed over 3 billion gallons of wastewater.

Mr. Mawyer stated for the next fiscal year, they were going to be completing their water treatment plant renovations at South Rivanna and Observatory WTPs. He stated the Airport Road pump station was under construction, and the Birdwood to Old Garth waterline would be constructed over the next year and were working on the design for the Beaver Creek Dam pump station and piping project that was a major project in Crozet. He stated the design of the central waterline was ready to move forward as they finalized the route. He noted that they would begin to think more about climate change considerations and the possible impacts on our projects.

Mr. Mawyer stated the newspaper was full of articles about drought in the west and the Glen Canyon Reservoir may not be able to produce enough electricity through its hydroelectric facility for millions of people in the west. He stated in their package this month, they included the drought monitor report, which detailed that they ended last year eight inches below normal

precipitation in their area, so they were monitoring the rainfall carefully every month to stay attuned to whether they may be close to a drought.

Mr. Mawyer stated some of the expenses that increased were due to investments and inflation. They were proposing a 4% merit increase for their workforce, which was in combination with the 6% that was approved by the Board in February. He stated they also considered retirement, taxes, life insurance, and health insurance costs that could increase. He stated they were not proposing any additional positions for the first time in his six-year career, because they wanted to focus on their existing staff and recognized that the collective 10% increase over the last six months was significant. They also had bid out chemicals and were seeing an almost \$300k increase.

Mr. Mawyer stated also through the bidding process, their biosolids transportation and disposal costs had increased almost 27%, and wastewater odor control costs increased 13%. He stated technology costs went up because they needed to reprogram SCADA screens to provide consistency and optimization. He stated they currently had different screens at different locations, so they were trying to standardize for operational efficiency. He stated they were starting a new program to have a contractor service their aeration equipment. He stated that summarized the \$1.6M they proposed in additional expenses for the next year.

Mr. Mawyer stated there was no change to their organization chart, with no additional staff for the next year in Water and Sewer. He stated their financial forecast was a 6.9% increase to the City next year and 9.6% to the Service Authority. He stated the chart indicated how those charges may increase over the next five years. He stated they had a capital budget of \$25.8M next year, and their five-year CIP was \$205M, for which they planned to borrow over \$120M, which would create new debt. He then showed a chart that showed historical charge increases to the City and the County. He stated the dip in 2020 was during the Covid-19 pandemic when there were zero charge increases. He stated it rebounded the next year, but they could see the City charge increase forecast was about 7% for a few years, and the Service Authority's was between 8% and 10% for a few years. He warned that the reduction in those rates shown after 2028 may or may not occur as they identified needs, particularly in the CIP program.

Mr. Mawyer stated their outstanding debt was currently about \$204M. He stated it would need to grow to finance the projects planned. He showed a slide with the debt curves provided to the Board in 2018. He stated the light green showed the current debt and the dark green showed projected debt increases based on borrowings they would need to pay for their capital programs. He stated in 2018 when they were reviewing the Rivanna to Ragged pipeline project, one of the alternatives was that they went below the debt payment line around 2030, and that was when they would have capacity to add debt for that project.

Mr. Mawyer stated when they looked at the debt profile their current debt service was proposed to be \$19.7M. He stated that the light green was the current debt and the dark green was what would be added when they borrowed, which was typically every other year to not create more debt service requirement than they needed, but at the same time to have the capital to pay the capital construction bills.

- He stated in summary, there was a budget of \$41.8M, which was a \$2.9M increase, or 7.4%. He
- stated their debt service was projected to increase and their expenses would increase largely due
- to inflation issues, and their charges to the City would increase 6.9%, and to the Service
- Authority, 9.6% next year. He stated they were asking for adoption of the resolution that would
- allow them to publish the preliminary rate schedule and advertise a public hearing for those
- wholesale charges to the Service Authority and to the City to be held in May.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any comments or questions from the Board.

927

Mr. Pinkston asked to see the chart that showed the rate of increase for the County and the City.

929 He asked why the City's was less.

930

- Mr. Mawyer asked to see the project list for 2023. He stated the major pipeline from Rivanna to
- Ragged Mountain reservoirs was funded 80% by the Service Authority. He stated the Beaver
- Creek Dam project was 100% funded by the Service Authority. He stated that was generally why
- there was a difference in the charge increases to the Service Authority and the City. There were
- agreements in place about the allocation of capital projects costs which impacted the charge
- 936 increases.

937

- Mr. Pinkston stated that it was important that the County and City were in this together in terms
- of having a system that served the whole region.

940

- Mr. Mawyer stated that was the message communicated at neighborhood meetings. He stated
- Rivanna's mission was to provide for the entire area, not only the City or the County, but for
- both. He stated there were pipes located 100% within the County that served the City and the
- County, and the central waterline was 100% in the City and served the City and the County. He
- stated that was their mission with the reservoirs, water treatment plants, major pipelines, and the
- wastewater systems, to serve the entire community.

947

- Mr. Pinkston asked if 6.9% was basically what the wholesale rate increase would be for the City,
- and he assumed that increase was what was reflected in the final preliminary rate schedule which
- 950 was much more detailed.

951952

- Mr. Mawyer stated the preliminary rate schedule included their operating expenses of producing
- and selling water. He stated the debt service was an annual payment made that was collected
- through the charges. He stated the 6.9% was an overall charge increase to the City and would not
- be seen on the preliminary rate schedule. He asked if Mr. Wood could discuss this.

956

- Mr. Wood stated the debt service payments were basically those different allocation amounts
- tallied up by different projects and different bond issues. He stated it was a pretty extensive table,
- but they would tally it up for the annual payment needed and divided it by twelve, so there was
- one charge that was a monthly amount and one that was an operating charge per thousand
- gallons based on the consumption.

962

Mr. Pinkston asked if the 6.9% increase for the City charge was a total charge.

Mr. Wood stated yes, it included all services and was based on an estimated flow they may have.

He stated the flow would vary almost every year, but it was an estimate based on what they

estimated the flow would be.

969 Mr. Gaffney clarified that Mr. Mawyer stated that there was pipe that was 100% in the County 970 that benefited both the City and the County, and the central waterline that would be 100% in the 971 City would benefit the City and the County.

973 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct.

Mr. O'Connell noted that the wholesale rate that was shown there was not what the retail rate would be for the Service Authority and the City, but it would be a significantly lesser amount in the retail rate that would be announced by the ACSA at its April 17 meeting. He stated the Service Authority budget included some reserves they had been planning to use to create a rate stabilization reserve.

981 Mr. Richardson asked about earlier in the presentation when they projected water availability all the way out to 2120.

Mr. Mawyer stated with the pipeline from Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir, they projected they would have adequate water supply for approximately 100 years.

Mr. Richardson stated he would like him to discuss this further, because he knew Mr. Mawyer had been doing this for a while, and that was not normal for many communities. He stated if they went across other areas in the United States, there were a lot of communities that did not have a 100-year water supply looking out, and he caveated that by saying it would be true once they had the pipeline from Rivanna to Ragged Mountain Reservoir finished. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Mawyer stated yes, and that they were very fortunate. He stated the State acknowledged in its water supply report that Rivanna was doing a good job storing water with the multiple reservoir system. He stated in order to create extra water, a reservoir must be constructed to hold water for when it was needed, but the reservoir must be filled, and that was what the pipeline from the Rivanna Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir did. He stated it allowed them to fill their largest reservoir at Ragged Mountain. They could add up to 700 million gallons to the current water level after they got the pipeline built. He stated if our community was using ten million gallons a day from Ragged Mountain, the additional 700 MG gave them 70 days of additional water supply. He stated when there were drought conditions, like what was experienced in the west, a 70-day supply was significant. He stated that was why it was so important to get the pipeline project built.

Mr. Mawyer stated the community experienced the drought in 2002, and as a result they collectively decided to build a new dam at Ragged Mountain to make the reservoir larger, but they had not increased their ability to fill that reservoir and make use of it, which was what the pipeline would allow them to do. He stated they must be able to fill and refill the Ragged Mountain Reservoir, which could only be done in a timely manner with this pipeline. He stated essentially all of the rainwater west of Route 29 from Green County to Israel Mountain in

- Batesville theoretically drained to the South Rivanna Reservoir, which was why they were piping
- out of that reservoir with the largest watershed to fill Ragged Mountain. He stated Ragged
- Mountain ironically was the largest reservoir and yet had the smallest watershed. He stated that
- was acknowledged in the 2012 Community Plan, but they cured the issue of putting the bigger
- reservoir at Ragged Mountain by installing this pipeline.

- Mr. Richardson stated that overlaying Mr. Mawyer's remarks with the debt management
- program, when looking at the new pipeline in place in that 2032 2033 timeline, that was about
- the time when they would retire some debt and would maintain their debt service, so it appeared
- that was happening at an ideal time. He stated a final thing he would say was thanks to Mr.
- O'Connell and the Service Authority for the rate softening by creating reserves so that the
- ratepayer did not see the rates go up 9.6% in one year.

1023

- Ms. Mallek stated there was much work to be proud of from the past forty years. She stated the
- downzoning that happened in that area west of 29 from the north to the south that drained into
- the South Fork Reservoir, it was a significant sacrifice on the part of Albemarle County
- landowners to restrict their development considerably, and it was a great decision and supported
- with court appeals. She stated it was what allowed this availability of this water resource they
- were planning for in the future, and she was appreciative of those before them who made that
- hard decision and followed up with it for these forty years. She stated they had the capability to
- stay a little more cautious. She stated in 2017, a 70-day supply evaporated overnight in a way,
- because it took them five or ten days to figure it out. She stated her pastures were concrete right
- now from lack of rain in the northwest part of the County, and that was part of the prime rain
- band. She stated they were supposed to be providing water to the reservoir and they were not
- because there was not enough rain.

1036

- Mr. Mawyer stated they would discuss that more when they talked about climate change,
- because the concern was that they needed to have the most stored water they could as soon as
- possible, and it was unclear if they could really wait until 2033 to complete expansion of their
- water storage. He stated that was the concern. He stated they would roll the dice for ten years and
- hope they did not have the next drought of record in that period.

1042

- Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any other comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked if
- there was a motion.

1045

- 1046 Ms. Mallek moved to adopt the preliminary rate schedule. Mr. O'Connell seconded the
- motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

1948

- 1050 10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA
- There were no additional items from the Board. Mr. Mawyer stated there were no items from
- 1052 staff.

- 1054 **11.** *CLOSED MEETING*
- There was no closed meeting.

1056 1057	12. ADJOURNMENT
1058 1059	At 5:05 p.m., Mr. Pinkston moved the meeting be adjourned. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).
1060 1061 1062	Respectfully submitted,
1063 1064	Jan 5 Word
1065	Mr. Lonnie Wood
1066	Assistant Secretary - Tréasurer
1067	