

Board of Directors Meeting

October 25, 2022 2:15pm



BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority

- **DATE:** October 25, 2022
- LOCATION:Conference Room, Administration Building
695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, VA
- TIME: 2:15 p.m.

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. AGENDA APPROVAL
- 3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2022
- 4. RECOGNITION
- 5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT
- 6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

- 8. CONSENT AGENDA
 - a. Staff Report on Finance
 - b. Staff Report on Operations
 - c. Staff Report on Ongoing Projects
 - d. Staff Report on Wholesale Metering
 - e. Authorization to Increase Engineering Services Contract Birdwood to Old Garth Raw Water Line Project – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
 - f. Authorization for an Amendment of Professional Services Implementation of Computerized Maintenance Management System, GHD, Inc.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Presentation: Rivanna Conservation Alliance's Water Quality Monitoring and Restoration Efforts Lisa Wittenborn, Ph.D., Executive Director Claire Sanderson, Ph.D., Monitoring Program Manager
- b. Presentation: Major Capital Projects Construction Update Scott Schiller, P.E., Engineering Manager

10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON THE AGENDA

11. CLOSED MEETING

12. ADJOURNMENT

GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC COMMENT AT RIVANNA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

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

Members of the public requesting to speak will be recognized during the specific time designated on the meeting agenda for "Items From The Public, Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda." Each person will be allowed to speak for up to three minutes. When two or more individuals are present from the same group, it is recommended that the group designate a spokesperson to present its comments to the Board and the designated speaker can ask other members of the group to be recognized by raising their hand or standing. Each spokesperson for a group will be allowed to speak for up to five minutes.

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

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

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

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

Rev. September 7, 2022



1	
2 3	RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS Minutes of Regular Meeting
4	Sentember 27, 2022
5	
6	A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was
7	held on Tuesday, September 27, 2022 at 2:39 p.m. in the 2 nd floor conference room.
8	Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.
9	
10	Board Members Present: Mike Gaffney, Jeff Richardson, Michael Rogers, Brian Pinkston,
11	Ann Mallek, Lauren Hildebrand, Gary O'Connell.
12	
13	Board Members Absent: None.
14	
15	Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Jennifer Whitaker, David Tungate, Betsy Nemeth, Jeff
16	Southworth, John Hull, Andrea Bowles, Dyon Vega, Scott Schiller, Michelle Simpson, Daniel
17	Campbell, Santino Granato, Deborah Anama.
18	
19	Attorney(s) Present: Carrie Stanton.
20	
21	1. CALL TO ORDER
22	Mr. Gaffney convened the September 27, 2022 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the
23	Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority at 2:39 p.m.
24	
25	2. AGENDA APPROVAL
26	There were no comments or questions for the agenda.
27	
28	Ms. Mallek moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Hildebrand seconded the motion, which
29	carried unanimously (7-0).
30	
31	3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING
32	
33	a. Minutes of Regular Board Meeting on August 23, 2022
34	There exists a second in a second in the minutes of the most in the later. Associated 22
35	There were no comments or questions regarding the minutes of the meeting held on August 25,
36	2022.
37	Mr. Degans moved the Deard to enpress the minutes from the DWSA Deard's August 22
38	2022 mosting Mg Mallek seconded the motion which passed uponimously (7.0)
39	2022 meeting. Mis. Manek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).
40	A DECOGNITIONS
41 40	4. RECOGNITIONS
4∠ 42	
-±-5 4.4	5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT
 4 5	Mr. Mawyer noted that it had been 30 months since the Roard met in person. He asked staff to
ч 5 46	introduce themselves including.
τU	

Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Director of Engineering and Maintenance Mr. Daniel Campbell, Water Department Manager Mr. David Tungate, Director of Operations Ms. Betsy Nemeth, Human Resources Manager Mr. Jeff Southworth, Information Technology Manager Mr. Santino Granato, Senior Civil Engineer Mr. Dyon Vega, Engineer Ms. Andrea Bowles, Water Resources Manager Ms. Michelle Simpson, Senior Civil Engineer Mr. Scott Schiller, Engineering Manager Mr. Mawyer noted the emergency exits and restrooms for the building. He stated the meeting was live to the public. The public could view and listen to the meeting, but they could not speak at the meeting. Mr. Mawyer explained that the General Assembly recently authorized the Authorities to hold 25% of their meetings in a virtual format. He stated they would draft an all-virtual public meeting and remote participation policy for the Board to approve in November. He stated if approved, they would schedule three virtual meetings for the Board next calendar year. He stated a calendar would be presented at the November meeting of all the meetings in the coming calendar year, and they would determine which to designate as virtual. Mr. Mawyer reported that Daniel Campbell had provided a presentation at the Water and Wastewater Joint Annual meeting in Virginia Beach. He stated the presentation covered how they switched from a dry to a liquid lime product at the Crozet WTP as part of an optimization strategy. He explained that the liquid product was safer, as the dry product generated dust which could be explosive. He stated there was also an associated yearly savings of \$37K. Mr. Mawyer explained that Ms. Betsy Nemeth was helping to sponsor, along with Augusta Health, flu vaccinations at Moores Creek. He stated the ACSA invited the Authority to join them in CPR training at Piedmont Virginia Community College. He noted that joint trainings were now possible; before the pandemic, they always tried to have joint trainings. Mr. Mawyer explained that the CodeRED alert system was used to notify staff of emergencies on Rivanna properties.

Mr. Mawyer stated September was National Preparedness Month, and flooding was one of the
most common natural disasters in the country. He stated they were actively monitoring and
preparing for Hurricane Ian. He stated they had a Rivanna Emergency Operations Plan, which
included checklists for staff regarding filling fuel tanks and preparing equipment should there be
an emergency.

- Mr. Mawyer stated under the strategic plan goal of infrastructure and master planning, work on the Ragged Mountain to South Fork Rivanna pipeline continued. He stated the easement acquisition map had been updated. He noted the areas where easements had been obtained. He noted where they were working on acquiring easements. He noted the section where the pipe had already been installed in 2018 and 2019 adjacent to the Birdwood property. He noted where a section of the pipe would be installed to cross beneath Route 250 once the easement from the UVA Foundation (UVAF) was obtained.
- 106

Mr. Mawyer noted where a pump station would be located on the UVAF property near the
Ragged Mountain Reservoir. He stated the station would pump water from the Ragged Mountain
Reservoir to Observatory WTP, and to the South Fork Rivanna WTP when needed. He stated
they considered the pump station as two projects—one from the South Fork Rivanna WTP to
Ragged Mountain, called the Rivanna to Ragged Reservoir Water Line, and one from Ragged
Mountain to Observatory. He stated they still needed to acquire easements from the University to

- 112 Mountain to Observatory. He stated they st 113 get from Fontaine Avenue to the OB WTP.
- 114
- 115 Mr. Gaffney asked what the schedules were for each of the projects.
- 116

Mr. Mawyer explained that the Rivanna to Ragged project was currently planned from 2027 to 2033, and the Ragged to Observatory project was planned for 2024 to 2026. He stated there may be discussion in the budget and CIP review on whether to accelerate the Rivanna to Ragged pipeline by a couple of years. He stated they were evaluating the financial impact of accelerating the project. He noted the increasing occurrence of droughts across our country created a need to increase our drinking water supply as soon as possible. He stated the community would have a longer term water supply when the pipeline was installed.

- 125 Mr. Gaffney confirmed that in either case, the pump station would be built to completion.
- Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct. He stated the pump station would be built with the Ragged
 to Observatory project. He explained when the pipeline from Rivanna to Ragged was built, they
 would add pumps to the pump station to convey water from Ragged to SR Water Treatment
 Plant.
- 131

124

Mr. Mawyer stated they continued to maximize use of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir for
water supply. He noted that recently, Sugar Hollow, Ragged Mountain, and Beaver Creek
stopped overflowing, but South Rivanna continued to overflow. He stated because it was
overflowing, they would continue to maximize use of the water from South Rivanna. He stated
they would switch the priority to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir once the water stopped
overflowing at South Rivanna.

138

Mr. Mawyer stated they calculated about 20 million gallons per day were flowing over the dam. 139 He stated the pending storms should replenish any deficits, but they were in good shape. 140 141 Mr. Mawyer noted Ms. Mallek had asked the previous month about erosion at the Moores Creek 142 outfall pipe. He explained that there was rip-rap stone at the end of the pipe so there was no 143 erosion. 144 145 Mr. Mawyer noted Mr. Pinkston had asked how much water was returned to Moores Creek 146 compared to what came to the WTP. He stated they returned about 95% of what came into the 147 plant back to Moores Creek. He explained that there were some evaporation losses and possible 148 metering calculation margins of error. 149 150 Mr. Mawyer noted Mr. Gaffney had requested information about the historical odor complaints 151 at Moores Creek. He stated they provided a chart which indicated in 2016 there were 34 odor 152 complaints at Moores Creek, one in 2017, and zero in 2018 and 2019. He stated there were three 153 complaints in 2020, two in 2021, and two in 2022. He stated all of the complaints from 2020 154 onwards were from the recently completed and neighboring Willow Tree development. He 155 explained that wastewater sometimes had to be stored in the equalization basins after storms, and 156 those open-air basins could create odors. 157 158 Mr. Gaffney clarified that all seven complaints from 2020 onwards were from the same person. 159 160 Mr. Mawyer stated the complaints originated from the same development. 161 162 Mr. O'Connell asked if the development had residential uses. 163 164 165 Ms. Whitaker stated the development was all restaurant space and office space. 166 Mr. Mawyer noted the development included a wedding venue. He stated all the wastewater 167 from Crozet was pumped to the Moores Creek plant. He stated there had been periodic odor 168 concerns along Route 250 West. He stated they added a chemical to the wastewater to reduce the 169 odors. 170 171 Ms. Mallek asked if hurricane preparations included the drawing down of tanks in preparation 172 for a large inflow. 173 174 175 Mr. Mawyer responded that preparations mostly involved filling fuel tanks, emergency backup generators, tanks, and other items. 176 177 Mr. Tungate added that if they know it is going be a significant storm, they will reduce the 178 wastewater stored in the holding ponds. 179 180 181 Mr. Mawyer emphasized that they try to be proactive in the advance of a storm but not create operational and odor problems. 182 183 6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC 184

185	Th	ere v	vere none.
L86 L87	7.	RE	SPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS
88	The	ere w	vere no comments from the public, therefore, there were no responses.
L89			
190	8.	CO	NSENT AGENDA
191		а.	Staff Report on Finance
192			
193		<i>b</i> .	Staff Report on Operations
194			
195		С.	Staff Report on Ongoing Projects
L96			
L97		d.	Staff Report on Wholesale Metering
98			
99		е.	Staff Report on Drought Monitoring
200		0	
201		f.	Authorization to Increase Term Engineering Services Contract Contingency, South Fork
202			Rivanna River Crossing Project – Michael Baker International
203	3.6	р'	
204	Mr	. P1r	ikston requested an explanation be provided for Item F of the Consent Agenda.
205	М.,	М	www.ar avalained that they alanged to install a second nine under the Diverge Diver from
206	IVII tho	. Mit	wyer explained that they plained to install a second pipe under the Rivanna River from wth Biyanna WTD to north of the river. He explained that a second pipe uses needed for
207	rod	bund	and consist. He stated that Michael Paker International Engineers were bired to
208	dor	ign	the project. He stated that they planned to use a horizontal direction drill under the river to
209	hor	ngn ægi	unpel. He stated that they needed to complete additional subsurface soil borings to
210	COL	ofirm	how much rock they would encounter. He stated they had to increase the contingency to
212	alle	ow f	or the cost
213	un	J W 1	
214	Mr	0'	Connell stated that he noticed there had been meter issues. He asked that there be a
215	fol	low-	up in the upcoming reports about the status of the metering issues and the impacts on
216	rea	ding	S.
217		2	
218	Mr	. Ma	wyer stated they would include an update in the monthly report on past meter issues.
219			
220	Mı	r. Pi	nkston moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion,
221	wh	ich j	passed unanimously (7-0).
222			
223	9.	OT	HER BUSINESS
224		а.	Presentation, Public Hearing and Vote on Approval; Resolution to Amend FY 2022 -
225			2023 Water Rates and Charges
226			
227	Mr	. Ma	wyer explained that the Board approved the budgets and urban water rates and charges in
228	Ma	ıy 20	022. He stated that staff had worked with the ACSA and the City to draft a Northern Area
29	Dri	inkir	ng Water Projects Agreement, which changed the debt service allocation for some of the
230	cap	oital	projects, located north of the South Rivanna River.

231	
232	Mr. Mawyer stated that the reallocation caused an adjustment in the budget and the debt service
233	charges between the ACSA and the City, and the Board was requested to approve the new
234	charges created by the Agreement. He stated the four projects primarily involved in the
235	Agreement were the Airport Road Water Pump Station and Piping Project, the South Rivanna
236	River Crossing, the North Rivanna River Crossing, and a Water Storage Tank at the Airport
237	Road Water Pump Station site.
238	1
239	Mr. Mawver explained that the new Agreement would pertain to all future capacity and non-
240	capacity water facilities located north of the South Fork Rivanna River. He stated the Finance
241	Director calculated it would cause a shift of about \$22,030 per month from the City to the ACSA
242	to effect the change in debt service costs.
243	
244	Mr. Mawyer explained that they advertised twice in the newspaper the change to the rates. He
245	stated the prior month, the Board authorized advertisement of the rate change, and the public
246	hearing was scheduled for the September meeting on the adjusted rates.
247	
248	Mr. Gaffney opened the meeting for a public hearing. He stated for those who wished to speak to
249	identify themselves for the record. He noted there were no public speakers. He closed the public
250	hearing.
251	
252	Mr. O'Connell moved to approve the amendments to the FY22–FY23 water rates and
253	charges. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion.
254	
255	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork
255 256	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.
255 256 257	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.
255 256 257 258	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement.
255 256 257 258 259	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about
255 256 257 258 259 260	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to
255 256 257 258 259 260 261	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263	Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects.Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 263 264 265	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 265 266 267 268 269	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which
255 256 257 258 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to so dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP. The
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP and to
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP. The resources could be allocated to future improvements to the South Fork Rivanna WTP and to build a second nine beneath the South Rivanna River
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP. The resources could be allocated to future improvements to the South Fork Rivanna WTP and to build a second pipe beneath the South Rivanna River.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP. The resources could be allocated to future improvements to the South Fork Rivanna WTP and to build a second pipe beneath the South Rivanna River.
255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276	 Mr. O'Connell asked for an explanation about how the decommissioning of the North Fork Rivanna WTP fit into the aforementioned projects. Mr. Mawyer explained that it was part of the Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement. He stated the Board previously approved decommissioning the North Rivanna WTP in about 2025. He stated the existing 2003 South Rivanna Water Agreement allocated 52% of the cost to the ACSA and 48% to the City. He stated the City and ACSA agreed the ratio would remain despite the location of the project north of the South Rivanna River. Mr. O'Connell asked for more information about how the South Fork Rivanna WTP would serve the northern parts of the County and the growth areas in that part. He stated it would put them in a better position for the growth occurring there. Mr. Mawyer explained that the North Rivanna WTP required a \$12M project to provide necessary repairs. He stated the facility sourced water from the North Fork Rivanna River which tended to go dry when it was needed the most during times of minimal rainfall. He stated they did not feel it was a good investment to complete costly repairs to the North Rivanna WTP. The resources could be allocated to future improvements to the South Fork Rivanna WTP and to build a second pipe beneath the South Rivanna River.

- 277 Mr. O'Connell clarified the projects to decommission the North Rivanna WTP and build the 278 South Rivanna crossing pipe were currently in the CIP. 279 280 281 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct. He stated they wanted to have the South Rivanna crossing built before the North Rivanna WTP was decommissioned to ensure redundancy within the 282 northern area of the Urban Water System. 283 284 Mr. Richardson clarified whether there was a for-sure water tank to be constructed at Airport 285 Road or if it was just a possibility. 286 287 Mr. Mawyer stated they were confident there would be a water tank, but it was based on growth 288 and demand in the area. He stated their plan includes two ground level water storage tanks at the 289 site. He stated they would start with a single tank when needed in the future and add a second 290 tank also when needed. 291 292 The motion carried unanimously (7-0). 293 294 b. Presentation: Water Treatment Facilities Overview 295 296 Mr. Tungate showed a slide with a map of the County and the reservoirs and facilities, beginning 297 in the northwest with Sugar Hollow Reservoir, a pipeline connecting it to Ragged Mountain 298 Reservoir. He stated water from Sugar Hollow Reservoir flowed into the Moormans River and 299 the South Rivanna Reservoir, which provided water at the South Rivanna Treatment Plant. He 300 stated there was a reservoir in Crozet, Beaver Creek Reservoir, that supplied water to the Crozet 301 Water Treatment Plant. He stated the Ragged Mountain Reservoir provided water to the 302 Observatory Water Treatment Plant. He stated that the Red Hill Water Treatment Plant, south of 303 Charlottesville, was the only groundwater plant in our system. 304 305 Mr. Tungate stated the urban water system includes production from the Observatory Treatment 306 Plant, South Rivanna Treatment Plant, and the North Rivanna Treatment Plant. He stated at the 307 south end of the County is a water treatment plant in Scottsville. The Scottsville Water 308 309 Treatment Plant has two water intakes: one on Totier Creek and the other in the Totier Creek Reservoir. 310 311 312 Mr. Tungate stated that the South Rivanna Treatment had the largest permitted production capacity at 12 million gallons per day, and the average production in 2021 was 7.6 MGD. He 313 stated that the Observatory Treatment Plant has a permitted capacity of 7.7 million gallons per 314 315 day, and the average production at the Observatory was 1.6 MGD. He stated that North Rivanna was permitted for 2 million gallons per day, and the average production was 0.41 MGD. He 316 stated that the total urban permitted capacity was 21.7 MGD, but the average for 2021 was 9.6 317 MGD. 318 319 Mr. Tungate stated that the Crozet facility had recently been renovated and had an increased 320 321 treatment capacity to treat 1.6 MGD, and the average in 2021 was 0.68 MGD per day. He stated
- the Scottsville facility had a capacity of 0.25 MGD and the average production was 0.05 MGD or

53,000 gallons per day. He stated the smallest facility was Red Hill, which serviced about ten homes and a school on the system, permitted for 0.0068 or 6,800 gallons per day and the average production was about 0.002 MGD or 2,000 gallons.

326

327 Mr. Tungate stated that Hurricane Ian had been discussed internally since last Friday. He showed an image of the South Rivanna Dam as of last week, showing about six inches of flow over the 328 dam. He stated there had not been recent storms so the water had low turbidity. He showed an 329 image of the dam after a large rain event from May of 2018 and stated that the source water 330 could look clean or very turbid. It just took more work for the water operators to clean the turbid 331 water, and the finished water quality remains the same. The water customers never know that 332 there is a change in raw water quality, so the effort stayed with the treatment plants to ensure the 333 user side was never affected. He stated that certain water treatment chemicals can be in high 334 demand during large weather events like a hurricane. The RWSA Water Department has all 335 chemical supplies full going into a weather event, and they schedule the next chemical delivery. 336 During a large weather event, many of the water utilities in the Mid-Atlantic region will do the 337 same thing. If RWSA does not need the chemical, the chemical supplier will allocate their 338

- resources elsewhere.
- 340

Mr. Tungate stated that the slide shown had an image of a Giardia organism on the top, which 341 was treated through the use of chemicals, and a Cryptosporidium organism, which was treated 342 through filtration. He stated that RWSA operates five conventional surface water treatment 343 plants. The five stages of a conventional water treatment plant are: Coagulation, Flocculation, 344 Sedimentation, Filtration, and Disinfection. He stated that during coagulation, a coagulant is 345 added to the water and rapidly mixed to ensure proper mixing. During flocculation, the water is 346 slowly mixed and the small particles join together to make "floc". The next stage is 347 sedimentation where the newly created floc particles settle. The solids that accumulate in the 348 sedimentation basin are frequently removed and ultimately are dewatered and sent to Waverly, 349 Virginia to be made into commercially available compost. The clear water from the 350

- sedimentation basins passes over a weir and on to the gravity filters. During filtration, the water passes through the gravity filters where small particles are trapped in the filter media. The
- filtered water is then disinfected to produce potable or finished drinking water.
- 354

355 Mr. Tungate stated that at the RWSA Water Treatment Plants, they add aluminum sulfate as the coagulant. He stated they used a liquid lime product to adjust the pH of the water to stay 356 between 6.5 and 7. He stated they used sodium hypochlorite for disinfection and oxidation 357 throughout the water treatment process. He stated RWSA uses an orthophosphate corrosion 358 inhibitor product that prevents corrosion and leaching of lead and copper from the plumbing 359 system. He stated they added hydrofluosilicic acid at all their facilities for dental health. He 360 stated the finished water pH is adjusted to 7.5 before leaving the water treatment plants and 361 entering the distribution system. 362

363

Mr. Tungate showed a slide of the South Rivanna raw water pump station and the four raw water pumps that convey raw water from the intake structure to the plant for treatment. He showed an aerial view of the South Rivanna facility that was taken in April. He showed where the mixing basins were located and where the coagulant is added as well as the three flocculators. The

368 flocculators are where the destabilized particles in the water join to make larger floc particles.

The floc particles will settle in the sedimentation basins. Each of the sediment basins flowed 369 from right to left in the photograph and allowed the clean water to go through the filters. He 370 indicated the two filters were added to the plant during the current renovation project. 371 372 373 Mr. Pinkston asked where the GAC was. 374 Mr. Tungate stated he had a slide about the GAC that was upcoming. He showed an image of the 375 sedimentation basin and the flocculated particles falling out of the water. He then showed an 376 image of the two new filters at South Rivanna and stated they now had a total of six gravity 377 filters at the treatment plant. 378 379 Mr. Pinkston asked what the filter media was. 380 381 382 Mr. Tungate stated it is anthracite coal on top of a special sand. He stated in 2018 they went from a gravel filter bed to a different kind of under drain system that does not use gravel. He showed a 383 photograph of the South Rivanna Treatment Plant and indicated the different buildings and 384 facilities. He stated they had a new chemical storage facility for aluminum sulfate (alum) and 385 fluoride. The new storage building has 24,000 gallons of alum storage, which was significantly 386 more than 9,000 gallons the plant had before the renovation project. This is important to the 387 community because the South Rivanna Water Treatment Plant (SR WTP) is more resilient with 388 the additional alum storage. He indicated the SR WTP GAC building has eight 40,000-pound 389 GAC vessels 390 391 Mr. Tungate stated that they had a series of vertical turbine motors and pumps that pumped out 392 the potable water into the water distribution system. He stated that relating to Hurricane Ian, 393 RWSA has emergency generators that are tested monthly and have a rigorous maintenance 394 program to ensure they have backup power to the water and wastewater facilities. 395 396 He continued that at SR WTP there were both granular activated carbon vessels and powder 397 activated carbon. He stated the powder activated carbon was a one-time use and cost about \$1 398 per pound, and the granular activated carbon had a bed life of one to two years at a cost of \$1.43 399 per pound. The GAC is contained in a pressure vessel and the water passed through it from top 400 401 to the bottom. 402 Mr. Pinkston asked what the PAC and GAC were. 403 404 405 Mr. Tungate stated that RWSA has fed powder activated carbon (PAC) in the WTP for years, initially for taste and odor, and the issue was the product was a one-time use pass-through. 406 407 Mr. Tungate stated it took out taste and odors as well as disinfection by-products precursors or 408 Total Organic Carbon (TOC). 409 410 411 Mr. Pinkston asked what that was. 412 413 Mr. Tungate stated that the granular activated carbon was installed to remove the disinfection byproduct precursors or TOC. Disinfection by-products (DBPs) are formed during the disinfection 414

- 415 process. When chlorine is added to water with higher TOC concentrations, DBPs are
- undesirable chemicals formed. He stated that TOC is removed by the powder activated and
- granular activated carbon. He showed an image of where the PAC is added at the SR WTP.
- 418
- 419 Mr. Tungate showed an image of the eight GAC vessels at SR WTP. He stated that they ran in a
- parallel flow and the Empty Bed Contact Time (EBCT) is 15 minutes, which means the water
- takes 15 minutes to go from the top to the bottom of the vessel. He noted that they manage the
- flow through the GAC vessels to maintain a finished TOC target. The more water the GAC
- vessel processes, the less time the GAC media will last. The RWSA Water operations staff
- bypasses the GAC system to allow for better operational efficiency.
- 425
- 426 Mr. Tungate continued that the GAC building at the South Rivanna plant has eight vessels and
- holds 40,000 pounds of GAC in each vessel. Each 40,000-pound vessel can treat 1 million
- gallons per day. He stated that Observatory Treatment Plant had 2 GAC vessels with 80,000
- pounds total, but they would be adding another 4 vessels to this facility with the current
- 430 construction project that is underway. He stated at North Rivanna WTP, there is one vessel with
- 431 40,000 pounds of GAC, at Crozet WTP there are two GAC vessels for a total of 40,000 pounds,
- and at Scottsville there are two 6,000-pound vessels for a total of 12,000 pounds.
- 433
- 434 Mr. Tungate stated that in addition to meeting flow requirements in the City and County, they
- also had to submit monthly reports on the 10th of the month to the Virginia Department of
- Health, where they reported the daily volume of water pumped into the water plant and out into
- the distribution system, the amount of chemicals used to treat the water, the individual filter
- turbidities and backwashing frequency, raw water temperatures, and pH results. He stated that
- the proper amount of chlorine is added at the water treatment plants to maintain a chlorine
- residual in the distribution system to ensure proper water quality.
- 441
- Mr. Tungate reported that they did 88 water samples per month in the Urban Water System for 442 total coliform bacteria. Total coliform bacteria serve as indicator species for Giardia and 443 Cryptosporidium. Total coliform samples are also collected in the Crozet, Scottsville, and Red 444 Hill water systems. Safe Drinking Water Act compliance samples are collected on a schedule 445 determined by the EPA and Virginia Department of Health. For example, disinfection by-446 447 product samples are collected once per calendar quarter, lead and copper samples are collected in residences in the City and County in the summer months only and sampling for other water 448 quality parameters are completed daily in our distribution systems and water treatment plants. 449 RWSA will start testing in accordance with the Unlisted Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 450 5), a federal rule for contaminant monitoring, looking for 30 types of chemical contaminants, in 451 January 2023. 452
- 453
- 454 Mr. Tungate reported that they had 27 staff in the water department and listed the employee
- titles. He stated that the relief operators were paid a premium to operate the plant when
- conditions required them to. He stated the plants were staffed 365 days per year with varying
- hours at each plant. He stated the Red Hill facility was monitored 24 hours a day with the
- chemical levels and water quality data available online through the SCADA control system. He
- asked if there were any questions.
- 460

if 8 million gallons were going into the facility and they wanted to bypass 4 MGD and run 4 465 MGD through the facility, they could, as it was a matter of using the SCADA system. 466 467 Ms. Mallek asked what percentage of the volume of water was bypassed and not treated. 468 469 Mr. Tungate replied that it depended on the raw water quality. He stated they managed it by the 470 finished water total units of carbon, which was kept at about 0.75 mg/L, and they could do this at 471 all facilities but mainly at South Rivanna. 472 473 474 Ms. Mallek commented that there was more disturbance to the water at this location. 475 Mr. Tungate stated the turbidity was easily removed by our treatment process. 476 477 c. Presentation and Work Session: 2023-2028 Strategic Plan Update 478 479 Mr. Gaffney called the RSWA back to session. 480 481 Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. Thomas would be presenting the review of the final update on the 482 strategic plan's progress before working with staff to finalize the plan to be implemented in 483 January. 484 485 Mr. Thomas explained that he would give both Boards an update on the progress of the strategic 486 plan. He stated he would talk about the mission and values as well as the goals, which in this 487 plan were called priorities, then a high-level overview of strategies and measures. He stated that 488 the Board members had draft strategic plans, and the design and feel were similar without 489 significant departure from the previous, but there were some changes. He noted that on June 9, 490 they met with the leadership team who provide staff-level make decision-making for the strategic 491 plan. 492 493 Mr. Thomas explained that they then engaged with stakeholders, which included the RWSA and 494 RSWA, and held an online survey. He stated that all input from stakeholders was then compiled 495 into digestible information that could be consumed in a workshop setting. He noted that they 496 took time to define success and came back prepared to engage with the core planning team to 497 create strategies and measures to advance specific goals. He stated the goal was to complete the 498 499 strategic plan before the end of the year and then be in a position for the plan to be implemented in 2023. 500 501 Mr. Thomas stated the vision of the project referred to where they were going and required 502 working with staff. He stated the vision had not changed much and only had changes in phrasing, 503

Ms. Mallek asked what the criteria were for bypassing the GAC. She stated that the community

Mr. Tungate responded that it was based on the total organic carbon concentration. He noted that

was relying on that system to remove particles that the previous system was unable to.

461

462 463

464

- but the overall desired future stayed the same. He stated the mission was their purpose and why
- they existed, and there was only subtle change to this, so the organization recommended back to
- the Board to not change the vision or mission based on what was last given. He stated values had

not changed, but the revised strategic plan now offered clarity about what specifically was meant 507 by integrity, respect, teamwork, and quality. 508

509

Mr. Thomas stated that the last strategic plan had six goals, and in the new strategic plan, there 510 were only five. He stated the specificity in the last strategic plan goal about solid waste services 511 specifically had been removed because everything they were trying to accomplish in solid waste 512 from an environmental services standpoint was similar at the strategy level to what they were 513 attempting to accomplish at the water and wastewater side of the business. He stated the five 514 priority areas were presented with statements of success. 515 516 Mr. Thomas stated there may be slight adjustments to how success was defined for the five 517

- priority areas, and each one was representative of some of the goals of the last strategic plan. He 518 stated none of these things happen in a vacuum and were not mutually exclusive, so they tried to 519 make it apparent that progress with one area would allow progress in another because they were 520 connected. 521
- 522

Mr. Thomas stated the first priority was communication and collaboration, which had strategies 523 supported by higher focus on public-facing activities with engagement and communication. He 524 stated the second was environmental stewardship, which described the organization's willingness 525 to lead, teach, and engage in strong stewardship of the environment. He stated there was also a 526 focus on sustainability practices and equitable service delivery. He stated the third priority was 527 workforce, which was focused on recruiting, developing, and maintaining, and in addition to 528 these strategies was more focus on succession management. 529

530

Mr. Thomas stated that optimization and resiliency had strategies for efficiency, development of 531 standard work practices, knowledge capture acknowledgment, and ensuring the organization was 532 doing everything it could to be sustainable. He stated the final priority was planning and 533 infrastructure. He stated this organization delivered large infrastructure, which required good 534 planning. He stated that inside these strategies were effective asset management principles, 535

nimbleness when delivering capital projects in changing conditions, and recognition and focus of 536 the current situation while being proactive for the future.

537

539 Mr. Pinkston asked how many of the proposed measures included a target or a trend.

540

538

Mr. Thomas stated that the best practice oftentimes was to begin measuring and then reflect on 541 whether the trend seen was acceptable performance, then set goals. He stated the other option 542 was to benchmark some measures, but not all were able to be worked with in that regard. He 543 stated that also ultimately working with leadership to ask if that was the target performance they 544 545 wanted to achieve was an option.

546

Mr. Pinkston asked if this would be referred to as a Key Performance Indicator (KPI). 547

548

549 Mr. Thomas responded that they could. He stated that at the strategy level, this was a good place

- to think about the top-line outcome measures, but other measurements happened in 550
- 551 organizations, so this should not represent the entirety of organizational KPIs, but really was how
- they were doing at the highest level strategically to achieve the success they sought. 552

553 Mr. Pinkston asked if the last plan included similar measures. 554 555 Mr. Thomas replied that it did, and the Director periodically reported on that information to the 556 Board. He noted that there would be some same measures as well as some new ones. 557 558 Mr. Rogers stated that it was important to set goals, so they knew how to get there. He 559 understood the broad statement, but they wanted to measure how they were progressing, 560 particularly with climate change, as there was a level of accountability, they should feel about 561 how they were progressing with the climate change goals they set. 562 563 Mr. Thomas stated they had a designed document with a recommended design that was near-564 final, pending any additional Board input. He stated that it was not a radical departure from the 565 design they used the last time. He stated that the next steps were to complete and finalize the 566 strategic plan by the end of the year and pivot to active implementation. He stated that he 567 assumed Mr. Mawyer would present that as he had been doing against the progress of 568 implementation and performance of implementation against the KPIs. 569 570 Mr. Stewart stated that he was supportive of this. He stated that one of the priorities was 571 communication and collaboration, and collaboration among partners in the room was key, but 572 there were no measures listed regarding collaboration. He asked if there was a reason for this. 573 574 Mr. Thomas stated that sometimes measuring outside collaboration was tricky. He stated that 575 some measures included community service hours completed by employees, number of outreach 576 events, and how many members of the public attended meetings. He commented that the 577 measures were a good starting point, but there may be more powerful ways to measure in the 578 future that they had yet to identify. 579 580 Mr. Stewart stated collaboration between organizations was difficult to measure, but there were 581 also no strategies specific to that that he could find listed. 582 583 Mr. Pinkston stated it was quasi-internal collaboration if it was among various organizations. 584 585 Mr. Mawyer stated his performance goals included detailed specifics and metrics, however, more 586 could be added to the strategic plan. 587 588 589 Mr. Andrews stated there were four bullets under strategies on page 11 for environmental stewardship, but only three were reflected on page 13. 590 591 Mr. Thomas stated that would be fixed. 592 593 Ms. Mallek stated related to public-facing success, returning paint cans at the new transfer 594 station was a great change from when she had last done so. She stated it was very managed and 595 professional. 596 597 Mr. Pinkston asked about the phrasing of "led" or "lead" on page 8. 598

599	
600	Mr. Thomas stated they would correct it.
601	
602	Mr. Gaffney stated some photographs had descriptions and others did not.
603	
604	Mr. Pinkston asked about the asset management program.
605	
606	Mr. Mawyer stated they were in the process of getting the program underway, and CityWorks
607	was the new program.
608	
609	Mr. Thomas stated he lived in North Carolina and did not benefit from this organization, but he
610	had worked with many organizations across the country and could say this was a high-
611	functioning and well-led utility organization.
612	
613	Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any other comments or questions.
614	
615	Mr. Pinkston asked Mr. Mawyer if these were strategies that he and his leadership team wanted
616	to focus on.
617	
618	Mr. Mawyer stated yes. He stated they worked fairly exclusively on those strategies and
619	measures.
620	
621	Mr. Rogers stated he liked the framework, the approach, and the efficiency with which they put
622	the strategic plan together.
623	
624	Mr. Pinkston asked if there was any action to be taken on this now.
625	
626	Mr. Mawyer stated the Board could take action to approve the draft unless they wanted to bring
627	back a final version.
628	
629	Mr. Gaffney asked if they would bring back a final version.
630	
631	Mr. Mawyer stated they could bring it back for approval in November.
632	
633	10. OTHER TIEMS FROM BUARD/STAFF NOT ON THE AGENDA
634	There were no items to discuss.
635	11 CLOSED MEETING
636	The second
637	There was no reason for a closed meeting.
638	17 ADIOUDNMENT
039	
64U	At 3:57 nm Mr. Degars moved to adjourn the meeting of the Divenne Water and Sever
04⊥	At 5.57 p.m., wir. Rogers moved to aujourn the meeting of the Rivanna water and Sewer

642 Authority. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).



MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Recognitions

The professional qualifications of our staff continue to improve and enhance our services. We congratulate the following employees for successfully completing the requirements for a license from the State:

- Alison Henry Class 3 Water Operator
- Cary Wingo Class 1 Water Operator
- Jeremy Lawson Class 1 Wastewater Operator

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: OPERATIONAL OPTIMIZATION

Safety Grant

Liz Coleman, Safety Manager, applied for and received a \$4000 safety grant from the Virginia Risk Sharing Association, which was used to purchase manhole guards for use by our Engineering, Maintenance, Water, and Wastewater Departments.



STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: INFRASTRUCTURE AND MASTER PLANNING

S. Rivanna to Ragged Mtn Reservoir Water Pipe

We have obtained agreements with many private owners and VDOT for easements on much of the 8 mile long alignment required for the water pipe from the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir to the new raw water pump station located near the Ragged Mtn Reservoir. We continue to work with the UVA Foundation and 1 private owner for the remaining sections.

Ragged Mtn Reservoir to Observatory WTP Water Pipe and Pump Station

Discussions continue with UVA and the UVA Foundation for the last 2 sections of the easement along the 3 mile long alignment for the 36" raw water pipe and pumping station site.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL: COMMUNICATION & COLLABORATION

Rivanna River Conference

Andrea Bowles, our Water Resources Manager, attended the Rivanna River Basin Commission Annual Conference at the Lewis & Clark Exploratory Center. The Commission chair is our Board Member, Ms. Ann Mallek. RWSA, along with several participants, had a table at the event to share information about RWSA and RSWA. The theme of the conference was Solar Policy and Planning.

Regional Safety Meeting

Our Safety Manager, Liz Coleman, sponsored a virtual meeting with local safety professionals from ACSA, Charlottesville, and the Waynesboro School Division. The group discussed health and safety topics including COVID procedures and an emerging topic concerning polio virus in wastewater.

Clean Water Act of 1972

This year is the 50th anniversary of the Clean Water Act approved by Congress in 1972 to regulate the discharge of pollutants into waters of the U.S.. Years of dumping pollutants into the rivers and streams of our country were punctuated when the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, Ohio caught on fire. In Virginia, many years of dumping Kepone into the James River and Chesapeake Bay ended as a result of this legislation.







MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: LONNIE WOOD, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

REVIEWED: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AUGUST MONTHLY FINANCIAL SUMMARY – FY 2023

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022

Financial Snapshot

August ended with an overall net surplus of \$366,800 due to operating rate revenue being above average and the annual payment from the County for the septage receiving support agreement. Total revenues were \$507,500 over budget estimates and expenses were \$239,500 over budget as well. Revenues and expenses are summarized in the table below:

	Urban Water	Urban Wastewater	Total Other Rate Centers	Total Authority
Operations				
Revenues	\$ 1,665,175	\$ 1,831,731	\$ 434,342	\$ 3,931,248
Expenses	(1,642,975)	(1,634,802)	(388,749)	(3,666,526)
Surplus (deficit)	\$ 22,200	\$ 196,929	\$ 45,593	\$ 264,722
Debt Service				
Revenues	\$ 1,421,418	\$ 1,626,721	\$ 393,721	\$ 3,441,860
Expenses	(1,416,678)	(1,530,313)	(392,803)	(3,339,794)
Surplus (deficit)	\$ 4,740	\$ 96,408	\$ 918	\$ 102,066
Total				
Revenues	\$ 3,086,593	\$ 3,458,452	\$ 828,063	\$ 7,373,108
Expenses	(3,059,653)	(3,165,115)	(781,552)	(7,006,320)
Surplus (deficit)	\$ 26,940	\$ 293,337	\$ 46,511	\$ 366,788

A more detailed financial analysis is in the following monthly report and reviews more closely actual financial performance compared to budgeted estimates. There are comments listed that will reference to the applicable line items in the financial statement for each rate center and each support department in the following pages. Please refer to the Budget vs Actual financial statements when reviewing these comments.

Detailed Financials

The Authority's actual operating revenues for August were \$349,000 over the prorated annual budget estimates, and operating expenses exceeded budget by \$183,000. The following comments help explain most of the other budget vs. actual variances.

- A. Annual and Quarterly Transactions Some revenues and expenses are over the prorated year-to-date budget due to one-time receipts of revenues for the year and quarterly or annual payments of expenses. These transactions appear to be significant impacts on the budget vs. actual monthly comparisons but usually even out as the year progresses. Septage receiving support revenue of \$109,440 is billed to the County annually in July. Annual payments are made for leases, health savings account contributions, and certain maintenance agreements. Insurance premiums are paid quarterly.
- B. Personnel Costs (Urban Water page 2) The Urban Water rate center salaries are higher than budget due to pay increases for plant operators who achieved higher licenses.
- C. Professional Services (Urban Water, Urban Wastewater pages 2, 5) Urban Water and Urban Wastewater are over the prorated budget for engineering and technical services for various surveys and studies.
- D. Other Services & Charges (Urban Wastewater page 5) Urban Wastewater's utility costs are higher than originally estimated.
- E. Information Technology (Urban Water, Administration pages 2, 8) Urban Water incurred some unbudgeted computer hardware and software purchases. The Administration department has spent \$54,000 of its \$60,000 annual budget for computer hardware purchases. There were also some annual maintenance and license fees paid in July similar to those noted in A. above.
- F. Communication (Administration page 8) The Administration department switched to a new telephone system which was not included in the budget.

Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Monthly Financial Statements - August 2022 Fiscal Year 2023

\$	20,614,425	\$	3,435,738	\$	3,750,589	\$	314,852	9.16%
	85,000		14,167		22,672		8,505	60.04%
	639,000		109,333		109,487		154 30 111	0.14%
	150,000		25,000		-		(25,000)	-100.00%
	7,170		1,195		12,370		11,175	935.13%
\$	22,151,631	\$	3,691,939	\$	4,040,735	\$	348,796	9.45%
¢	10 404 727	¢	1 650 242	¢	1 600 042	¢	(20,700)	2 / 10/
φ	629 900	φ	1,050,342	φ	1,090,042	φ	(39,700) (16,318)	-2.41%
	3,427,460		571,243		543,141		28,103	4.92%
	200,342		33,390		42,967		(9,577)	-28.68%
	816,626		136,104		262,552		(126,448)	-92.91%
	39,950		6,658		5,728		930	13.97%
	5,222,531		870,422		919,594 40,688		(49,172) 29 328	-5.65% 41 89%
	900.000		150.000		150.000		- 20,020	0.00%
\$	22,151,636	\$	3,593,160	\$	3,776,013	\$	(182,853)	-5.09%
\$	(5)	\$	98,778	\$	264,721			
\$	19,522,929	\$	3,253,822	\$	3,253,822	\$	1	0.00%
	109,440		18,240		109,440		91,200	500.00%
	1,600		267		1,480		1,213	454.84%
	64 230		10 705		9,010 67,302		9,000 56,597	528 69%
\$	19,699,189	\$	3,283,198	\$	3,441,861	\$	158,663	4.83%
\$	16,165,241	\$	2,694,207	\$	2,694,207	\$	-	0.00%
	64,230		10,705		67,302		(56,597)	-528.69%
	725,000		120,833		120,833		-	0.00%
*	2,744,717	*	457,453	*	457,453	¢	-	0.00%
ծ \$	19,099,188	ֆ \$	3,283,198	ֆ \$	3,339,795 102,067	Þ	(36,397)	-1.72%
	Summar	v						
	Caminal	1						
\$	41,850,820	\$	6,975,137	\$	7,482,596	\$	507,459	7.28%
\$	41,850,824	*	6,876,358		7,115,808		(239,450)	-3.48%
	(4)	5	98.779	\$	366.788			
	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	 \$ (5) \$ 19,522,929 109,440 1,600 990 64,230 \$ 19,699,189 \$ 16,165,241 64,230 725,000 2,744,717 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 1 Summar \$ 41,850,820 41,850,824 	 \$ (5) \$ \$ (5) \$ \$ 19,522,929 \$ 109,440 1,600 990 64,230 \$ 19,699,189 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 64,230 725,000 2,744,717 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3 \$ 1 \$ 	\$ (5) \$ 98,778 \$ 19,522,929 \$ 3,253,822 109,440 18,240 1,600 267 990 165 64,230 10,705 \$ 19,699,189 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 64,230 10,705 725,000 120,833 2,744,717 457,453 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 0 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 0 \$ 1 0 0 0 \$ 1 0 0 \$ 41,850,820 \$ 6,975,137 \$ 41,850,824 6,876,358 6,876,358	\$ (5) \$ 98,778 \$ \$ 19,522,929 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 109,440 18,240 18,240 1,600 267 990 165 64,230 10,705 \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ \$ 1 0 \$ \$ 1 0 \$ \$ 1 0 \$ \$ 41,850,820 \$ 6,975,137 \$ \$ 41,850,824 6,876,358 \$	\$ (5) \$ 98,778 \$ 264,721 \$ 19,522,929 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 3,253,822 109,440 18,240 109,440 1,600 267 1,480 990 165 9,818 64,230 10,705 67,302 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 3,441,861 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 3,441,861 \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,441,861 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ 1 0 \$ 102,067 \$ 41,850,820 \$ 6,975,137 \$ 7,482,596 \$ 41,850,820 \$ 6,975,137 7,482,596 7,115,808	\$ (5) \$ 98,778 \$ 264,721 \$ 19,522,929 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 109,440 18,240 109,440 18,240 109,440 1,600 267 1,480 990 165 9,818 64,230 10,705 67,302 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 3,441,861 \$ \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 3,441,861 \$ \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ \$ 1 0 \$ 102,067 \$ 102,067 \$ \$ 1 0	\$ (5) \$ 98,778 \$ 264,721 \$ 19,522,929 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 3,253,822 \$ 1 109,440 18,240 109,440 91,200 1,600 267 1,480 1,213 990 165 9,818 9,653 64,230 10,705 67,302 56,597 \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ -64,230 10,705 67,302 (56,597) \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ -64,230 10,705 67,302 (56,597) \$ 16,165,241 \$ 2,694,207 \$ 2,694,207 \$ -64,230 10,705 67,302 (56,597) \$ 19,699,189 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,3441,861 \$ 158,663 507,453 2 \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ (56,597) \$ (56,597) \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ (56,597) \$ (56,597) \$ 19,699,188 \$ 3,283,198 \$ 3,339,795 \$ (56,597) \$ (56,597) \$ 102,067 \$ (239,450)

Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority

Monthly Financial Statements - August 2022

<u>Urban Water Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary			Budget FY 2023	Ye	Budget ear-to-Date	Ŋ	Actual /ear-to-Date		Budget vs. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual										
Revenues	Notes									
Operations Rate Revenue Lease Revenue		\$	9,014,863 60,000	\$	1,502,477 10,000	\$	1,642,589 17,465	\$	140,112 7,465	9.33% 74.65%
Miscellaneous Use of Reserves-GAC Interest Allocation			- 150,000 3 000		- 25,000 500		- 5 121		- (25,000) 4 621	-100.00% 924 22%
Total Operating Revenues		\$	9,227,863	\$	1,537,977	\$	1,665,175	\$	127,198	8.27%
Expenses										
Personnel Cost Professional Services Other Services & Charges	B C	\$	2,234,714 222,000 716,300	\$	352,929 37,000 119,383	\$	358,157 74,992 87,000	\$	(5,228) (37,992) 32,383	-1.48% -102.68% 27.13%
Communications Information Technology Supplies	E		100,920 104,950 5,400		16,820 17,492 900		13,576 36,784 1,735		3,244 (19,292) (835)	19.28% -110.29% -92.79%
Operations & Maintenance Equipment Purchases Depreciation	Α		2,511,396 16,000 300,000		418,566 2,667 50,000		515,181 2,667 50,000		(96,615) 0 -	-23.08% 0.00% 0.00%
Subtotal Before Allocations		\$	6,211,680	\$	1,015,757	\$	1,140,092	\$	(124,336)	-12.24%
Total Operating Expenses		\$	9,227,863	\$	1,493,435	\$	1,642,975	\$	(149,540)	- <u>5.26%</u> -10.01%
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(0)	\$	44,543	\$	22,200	-		
Debt Service Budget VS. Actual Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue Trust Fund Interest Reserve Fund Interest Lease Revenue		\$	8,302,224 400 31,000 1,600 8,335,224	\$	1,383,704 67 5,167 267 1,389,204	\$	1,383,704 3,593 32,641 1,480 1,421,418	\$	3,527 27,475 1,213 32,214	0.00% 5290.18% 531.77% 454.84% 2.32%
		<u> </u>	0,000,221	•	.,,	•	.,,	Ŧ		
Debt Service Costs Total Principal & Interest Reserve Additions-Interest Debt Service Ratio Charge Reserve Additions-CIP Growth		\$	6,964,724 31,000 400,000 939,500	\$	1,160,787 5,167 66,667 156,583	\$	1,160,787 32,641 66,667 156,583	\$	(27,475) - -	0.00% -531.77% 0.00% 0.00%
Total Debt Service Costs Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		<u>\$</u> \$	8,335,224	\$ \$	1,389,204	\$ \$	<u>1,416,679</u> 4,740	\$	(27,475)	-1.98%
		<u> </u>					, -	-		
		Ra	te Center S	Sun	nmary					
Total Revenues Total Expenses		\$	17,563,087 17,563,087	\$	2,927,181 2,882,639	\$	3,086,593 3,059,653	\$	159,412 (177,015)	5.45% -6.14%
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(0)	\$	44,543	\$	26,940	=		
Costs per 1000 Gallons Operating and DS		\$ \$	2.72 5.17			\$ \$	2.65 4.94			
Thousand Gallons Treated			3,397,700		566,283		619,144		52,861	9.33%
or Flow (MGD)			9.309				9.986			

Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority

Monthly Financial Statements - August 2022

<u>Crozet Water Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary		Budget FY 2023		Ye	Budget Year-to-Date		Actual ear-to-Date	Budget vs. Actual		Variance Percentage	
Operating Budget vs. Actual											
Povonuos	Notes										
Operations Rate Revenue		\$	1 197 084	\$	199 514	\$	199 514	\$	_	0.00%	
Lease Revenues		Ψ	25,000	Ψ	4,167	Ψ	5,207	Ψ	1,040	24.97%	
Interest Allocation			400		67		693		626	939.07%	
Total Operating Revenues		\$	1,222,484	\$	203,747	\$	205,414	\$	1,666	0.82%	
Expenses											
Personnel Cost		\$	352.559	\$	55.664	\$	56.850	\$	(1.185)	-2.13%	
Professional Services		Ŧ	22,900	Ŧ	3,817	•	9	Ŧ	3,808	99.78%	
Other Services & Charges			118,700		19,783		21,277		(1,493)	-7.55%	
Communications			17,600		2,933		2,990		(56)	-1.92%	
Information Technology			4,950		825		1,052		(227)	-27.57%	
Supplies			1,500		250		483		(233)	-93.10%	
Operations & Maintenance			358,500		59,750		32,261		27,489	46.01%	
Equipment Purchases			3,000		500		500		-	0.00%	
Depreciation			60,000		10,000		10,000		-	0.00%	
Subtotal Before Allocations		\$	939,709	\$	153,523	\$	125,420	\$	28,102	18.30%	
Allocation of Support Departments			282,780		44,798		47,102		(2,304)	-5.14%	
Total Operating Expenses		\$	1,222,489	\$	198,320	\$	172,523	\$	25,798	13.01%	
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(5)	\$	5,427	\$	32,891				
Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue Trust Fund Interest		\$	2,161,704 80	\$	360,284 13	\$	360,284 835	\$	- 821	0.00% 6159.05%	
Reserve Fund Interest			1.200		200		1.279		1.079	539.36%	
Total Debt Service Revenues		\$	2,162,984	\$	360,497	\$	362,397	\$	1,900	0.53%	
Debt Service Costs Total Principal & Interest		\$	1.217.280	\$	202.880	\$	202.880	\$	-	0.00%	
Reserve Additions-Interest		Ŧ	1,200	Ŧ	200	Ŧ	1,279	Ŧ	(1,079)	-539.36%	
Reserve Additions-CIP Growth			944,500		157,417		157,417		-	0.00%	
Total Debt Service Costs		\$	2,162,980	\$	360,497	\$	361,575	\$	(1,079)	-0.30%	
Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	4	\$	1	\$	822				
	R	ate	Center Su	mm	nary						
Total Revenues		\$	3,385,468	\$	564,245	\$	567,811	\$	3,566	0.63%	
Total Expenses			3,385,469		558,817		534,098		24,719	4.42%	
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(1)	\$	5,428	\$	33,713	:			
Costs per 1000 Gallons		\$	6.03			\$	4.33				
Operating and DS		\$	16.70			\$	13.40				
Thousand Gallons Treated			202,697		33,783		39,860		6,077	17.99%	
Flow (MGD)			0.555				0.643				

Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Monthly Financial Statements - August 2022

<u>Scottsville Water Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary		Budget FY 2023		Υe	Budget Year-to-Date		Actual Year-to-Date		Budget s. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual										
	Notes									
Operations Rate Revenue		¢	560 556	¢	04 026	¢	04 026	¢	_	0.00%
Interest Allocation		Ψ	200	Ψ	34,320	Ψ	322	Ψ	288	864.89%
Total Operating Revenues		\$	569,756	\$	94,959	\$	95,248	\$	288	0.30%
Expenses										
Personnel Cost		\$	212,797	\$	33,564	\$	34,637	\$	(1,073)	-3.20%
Professional Services			5,000		833		2,306		(1,473)	-176.72%
Other Services & Charges			27,100		4,517		3,724		793	17.56%
Communications			6,400		1,067		892		175	16.36%
Information Technology			4,400		733		526		207	28.24%
Supplies			100		17		138		(121)	-725.12%
Operations & Maintenance			97,925		16,321		13,242		3,079	18.86%
Equipment Purchases			1,600		267		438		(172)	-64.35%
		¢	40,000	¢	62.095	¢	62.570	¢	1 416	0.00%
Subtotal Before Allocations		φ	395,322	φ	27 666	φ	28.646	φ	(980)	-3 54%
		\$	569 755	\$	91 651	\$	91 215	\$	436	0 48%
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	1	\$	3,308	\$	4,032	•	100	011070
Debt Service Budget vs. Actual Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue		\$	150,300	\$	25,050	\$	25,050	\$	-	0.00%
Trust Fund Interest			10		2		88		87	5202.20%
Reserve Fund Interest		¢	451 460	¢	25 102	¢	8/5	¢	/33	517.58%
Total Debt Service Revenues		φ	151,100	φ	25,195	φ	20,013	φ	020	5.25%
Debt Service Costs										
Total Principal & Interest		\$	148,726	\$	24,788	\$	24,788	\$	-	0.00%
Reserve Additions-Interest			850		142		875		(733)	
Reserve Additions-CIP Growth			1,589		265	\$	265		-	
Total Debt Service Costs		\$	151,165	\$	25,194	\$	25,927	\$	(733)	-2.91%
Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(5)	\$	(1)	\$	86	-		
	R	ate	Center Su	ımn	narv					
	-					_		_		
Total Revenues Total Expenses		\$	720,916 720,920	\$	120,153 116,845	\$	121,261 117,143	\$	1,108 (298)	0.92% -0.25%
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(4)	\$	3,308	\$	4,118	-		
Costs per 1000 Gallons Operating and DS		\$ \$	33.07 41.84			\$ \$	23.19 29.78			
Thousand Gallons Treated			17,230		2,872		3,933		1,061	36.96%
Flow (MGD)			0.047				0.063			

<u>Urban Wastewater Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary			Budget FY 2023	Y	Budget ear-to-Date	Y	Actual ear-to-Date	v	Budget vs. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual	Notes									
Revenues										
Operations Rate Revenue Stone Robinson WWTP Septage Acceptance Nutrient Credits		\$	9,033,662 39,036 500,000 100,000	\$	1,505,610 6,506 83,333 16,667	\$	1,680,350 3,065 103,423 39,129	\$	174,740 (3,441) 20,090 22,462	11.61% -52.89% 24.11% 134.77%
Interest Allocation			- 3,300		- 550		- 5,764		- 5,214	948.06%
Total Operating Revenues		\$	9,675,998	\$	1,612,666	\$	1,831,731	\$	219,065	13.58%
Expenses										
Personnel Cost	Α	\$	1,325,384	\$	208,788	\$	229,997	\$	(21,209)	-10.16%
Professional Services	c		75,000		12,500		31,511		(19,011)	-152.09%
Other Services & Charges	Α, Ο		2,276,980		379,497 317		395,476 2 022		(15,980) (1,705)	-4.21% -538.49%
Information Technology			110,400		18.400		11.605		6.795	-556.4570 36.93%
Supplies			1,200		200		106		94	46.89%
Operations & Maintenance			1,698,660		283,110		283,426		(316)	-0.11%
Equipment Purchases			143,000		23,833		8,333		15,500	65.03%
Depreciation		<u></u>	470,000	¢	78,333	ሱ	78,333	ሱ	(0)	0.00%
Subtotal Before Allocations		Ф	0,102,524 3 573 476	Φ	566 353	Ф	1,040,010 593 992	Ф	(აⴢ,ბა∠) (27 639)	-3.37%
Total Operating Expenses		\$	9,675,999	\$	1.571,331	\$	1,634,802	\$	(63,471)	-4.04%
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(1)	\$	41,336	\$	196,929	-	(<i>,</i> ,	
Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue Septage Receiving Support - County Trust Fund Interest Reserve Fund Interest		\$	8,878,107 109,440 500 31,000	\$ •	1,479,685 18,240 83 5,167	\$	1,479,684 109,440 5,292 32,305	\$	(1) 91,200 5,209 27,138	0.00% 500.00% 6250.40% 525.25%
I OTAL DEDT SERVICE Revenues		Þ	9,019,047	φ	1,503,175	Þ	1,020,721	φ	123,340	0.22 /0
Debt Service Costs Total Principal & Interest Reserve Additions-Interest Debt Service Ratio Charge Reserve Additions-CIP Growth Total Debt Service Costs		\$	7,808,347 31,000 325,000 854,700 9,019,047	\$ \$	1,301,391 5,167 54,167 <u>142,450</u> 1,503,175	\$ \$	1,301,391 32,305 54,167 142,450 1,530,313	\$ \$	(27,138) - - (27,138)	0.00% -525.25% 0.00% <u>0.00%</u> - 1.81%
Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	-	\$	-	\$	96,408	=		
		Rat	te Center S	um	marv					
		1		u	intary					
Total Revenues Total Expenses		\$	18,695,045 18,695,046	\$	3,115,841 3,074,505	\$	3,458,452 3,165,114	\$	342,611 (90,609)	11.00% -2.95%
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(1)	\$	41,336	\$	293,337	=		
Costs per 1000 Gallons Operating and DS		\$ \$	2.85 5.51			\$ \$	2.59 5.02			
Thousand Gallons Treated			3,390,400		565,067		630,762		65,695	11.63%
Flow (MGD)			9.289				10.174			

F

<u>Glenmore Wastewater Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary			Budget FY 2023	Y	Budget Year-to-Date		Actual ear-to-Date	Budget vs. Actual		Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual										
	Notes									
Revenues		•		•	70.040	•	70.040	•		0.000/
Operations Rate Revenue		\$	443,640	\$	73,940	\$	73,940	\$	-	0.00%
Total Operating Revenues		\$	443.790	\$	73.965	\$	74.200	\$	235	0.32%
F		<u> </u>		•	,	•	,	•		
Expenses		¢	115 015	¢	10 000	¢	20.222	¢	(1 00 4)	10.020/
Personnel Cost Professional Sanvisos		Ф	115,815	\$	18,238	\$	20,233	ф	(1,994)	-10.93%
Other Services & Charges			35 750		5 958		5 256		702	11 79%
Communications			-		-		564		(564)	
Information Technology			4,425		738		395		`343 [´]	46.49%
Supplies			-		-		-		-	
Operations & Maintenance			134,950		22,492		13,618		8,874	39.46%
Equipment Purchases			3,800		633 1 667		633 1 667		(0)	0.00%
Subtotal Before Allocations		\$	309 740	\$	50 559	\$	42 365	\$	8 195	16 21%
Allocation of Support Departments		Ψ	134.045	Ψ	21.288	Ψ	21.388	Ψ	(100)	-0.47%
Total Operating Expenses		\$	443,785	\$	71,848	\$	63,752	\$	8,095	11.27%
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	5	\$	2,117	\$	10,447			
Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue Trust Fund Interest		\$	20,484	\$	3,414	\$	3,414	\$	-	0.00%
Reserve Fund Interest		*	80	*	13	*	67	_	54	404.68%
Total Debt Service Revenues		\$	20,564	\$	3,427	\$	3,481	\$	-	0.00%
Debt Service Costs Total Principal & Interest Reserve Additions-CIP Growth Reserve Additions-Interest Total Debt Service Costs		\$	18,717 1,761 <u>80</u> 20,558	\$	3,120 294 <u>13</u> 3,426	\$	3,120 294 <u>67</u> 3,480	\$		0.00% 0.00% -404.68% -1.57%
Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	6	\$	1	\$	1			
	F	Rate	Center Su	mn	nary					
Total Revenues Total Expenses		\$	464,354 464,343	\$	77,392 75,274	\$	77,681 67,233	\$	289 8,041	0.37% 10.68%
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	11	\$	2,118	\$	10,448	:		
Costs per 1000 Gallons Operating and DS		\$ \$	10.72 11.22			\$ \$	10.18 10.74			
Thousand Gallons Treated or			41,401		6,900		6,261		(639)	-9.26%
Flow (MGD)			0.113				0.101			

<u>Scottsville Wastewater Rate Center</u> Revenues and Expenses Summary			Budget FY 2023	Ye	Budget ear-to-Date	Ŷ	Actual ear-to-Date	Budget vs. Actual		Variance Percentage	
Operating Budget vs. Actual											
_	Notes										
Revenues											
Operations Rate Revenue		\$	355,620	\$	59,270	\$	59,270	\$	-	0.00%	
Interest Allocation		•	120	*	20	¢	210	*	190	951.35%	
Total Operating Revenues		\$	355,740	\$	59,290	\$	59,480	\$	190	0.32%	
Expenses											
Personnel Cost		\$	115,795	\$	18,235	\$	20,233	\$	(1,997)	-10.95%	
Professional Services			5,000		833		23		811	97.28%	
Other Services & Charges			26,650		4,442		2,806		1,635	36.82%	
Communications			3,770		628		684		(56)	-8.87%	
Information Technology			4,125		688		395		293	42.59%	
Supplies			-		-		-		-		
Operations & Maintenance			52,000		8,667		13,220		(4,553)	-52.54%	
Equipment Purchases			3,800		633		633		(0)	0.00%	
Depreciation			20,000		3,333		3,333		(0)	0.00%	
Subtotal Before Allocations		\$	231,140	\$	37,459	\$	41,327	\$	(3,868)	-10.33%	
Allocation of Support Departments			124,604		19,783		19,932		(149)	-0.75%	
Total Operating Expenses		\$	355,744	\$	57,243	\$	61,259	\$	(4,017)	-7.02%	
Operating Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(4)	\$	2,047	\$	(1,779)				
Revenues Debt Service Rate Revenue Trust Fund Interest Reserve Fund Interest		\$	10,110 - 100	\$	1,685 - 17	\$	1,686 10 135	\$	1 10 118	0.06%	
Total Debt Service Revenues		\$	10.210	\$	1.702	\$	1.830	\$	129	7.57%	
		<u> </u>		¥	.,	¥	1,000	*	.20	1101 /0	
Debt Service Costs											
Total Principal & Interest		\$	7 447	\$	1 241	\$	1 241	\$	_	0.00%	
Reserve Additions-Interest		Ψ	100	Ψ	17	Ψ	135	Ψ	(118)	-707 90%	
Estimated New Principal & Interest			2 667		445		445		(110)	0.00%	
Total Debt Service Costs		\$	10.214	\$	1.702	\$	1.820	\$	(118)	-6.93%	
Debt Service Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(4)	\$	(1)	\$	10	Ŧ	(110)		
		Rate	e Center Su	umr	nary						
Total Revenues		\$	365,950	\$	60,992	\$	61,311	\$	319	0.52%	
Total Expenses			365,958		58,945		63,080		(4,135)	-7.01%	
			-				<i></i>				
Surplus/(Deficit)		\$	(8)	\$	2,047	\$	(1,769)				
		¢	45.05			~	<u> </u>				
Costs per 1000 Gallons		\$	15.05			\$	21.90				
Operating and DS		\$	15.48			\$	22.55				
Thousand Gollano Tracted			00 E 1 0		2 044		2 202		(1 1 1 1)	20.020/	
			23,043		3,941		2,191		(1,144)	-29.02%	
Flow (MGD)			0.065				0 045				
			5.000				0.010				

Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Monthly Financial Statements - August 2022

Administration

<u>Administration</u>			Budget FY 2023	Y	Budget ear-to-Date	Ye	Actual ear-to-Date	v	Budget s. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budge	t vs. Actual									
Revenues		Notes								
Payment for Services SWA Bond Proceeeds Funding Bo	nd Issuance Costs		\$ 654,000 <u>-</u>	\$	109,000	\$	109,000	\$	-	0.00%
Miscellaneous Revenue			2,000		333		487		154	46.15%
	Total Operating Revenues		\$ 656,000	\$	109,333	\$	109,487	\$	154	0.14%
Expenses										
Personnel Cost		Α	\$ 2,450,092	\$	383,835	\$	386,771	\$	(2,936)	-0.76%
Professional Services			170,000		28,333		7,952		20,381	71.93%
Other Services & Charges			162,600		27,100		23,447		3,653	13.48%
Communications		F	24,780		4,130		17,495		(13,365)	-323.61%
Information Technology		A, E	404,876		67,479		190,996		(123,516)	-183.04%
Supplies			23,000		3,833		2,257		1,576	41.12%
Operations & Maintenance			67,850		11,308		7,107		4,201	37.15%
Equipment Purchases			13,100		2,183		2,183		(0)	0.00%
Depreciation			-		-		-		_	
	Total Operating Expenses		\$ 3,316,298	\$	528,203	\$	638,210	\$	(110,007)	-20.83%

	Department Summary											
Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers		\$	(2,660,298)	\$	(418,869)	\$	(528,722)	\$	109,853	-26.23%		
Allocations to the Rate Centers												
Urban Water	44.00%	\$	1,170,531	\$	184,302	\$	232,638	\$	(48,335)			
Crozet Water	4.00%	\$	106,412		16,755		21,149		(4,394)			
Scottsville Water	2.00%	\$	53,206		8,377		10,574		(2,197)			
Urban Wastewater	48.00%	\$	1,276,943		201,057		253,787		(52,730)			
Glenmore Wastewater	1.00%	\$	26,603		4,189		5,287		(1,099)			
Scottsville Wastewater	1.00%	\$	26,603		4,189		5,287		(1,099)			
	100.00%	\$	2,660,298	\$	418,869	\$	528,722	\$	(109,853)			

Maintenance

<u>Maintenance</u>			Budget FY 2023		Budget Year-to-Date		Actual Year-to-Date	v	Budget s. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual	Ľ									
	Notes									
Revenues										
Payment for Services SWA		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Miscellaneous Revenue	-		-		-		-		-	
Total Operating Revenues	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Expenses										
Personnel Cost		\$	1,477,565	\$	232,520	\$	238,183	\$	(5,663)	-2.44%
Professional Services			-		-		-		-	
Other Services & Charges			33,600		5,600		2,662		2,938	52.46%
Communications			24,500		4,083		2,678		1,405	34.41%
Information Technology			32,500		5,417		-		5,417	100.00%
Supplies			2,500		417		211		206	49.36%
Operations & Maintenance			104,900		17,483		25,954		(8,470)	-48.45%
Equipment Purchases			212,600		35,433		21,433		14,000	39.51%
Depreciation	-		-		-		-		-	
Total Operating Expenses	=	\$	1,888,165	\$	300,953	\$	291,121	\$	9,832	3.27%
)	outine out C							
	L	ep	artment 5	um	imary	_		_		
Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers	=	\$	(1,888,165)	\$	(300,953)	\$	(291,121)	\$	(9,832)	3.27%
Allocations to the Rate Centers										
Urban Water	30.00%	\$	566,450	\$	90,286	\$	87,336	\$	2,950	
Crozet Water	3.50%		66,086		10,533		10,189	•	344	
Scottsville Water	3.50%		66,086		10,533		10,189		344	
Urban Wastewater	56.50%		1,066,814		170,038		164,483		5,555	
Glenmore Wastewater	3.50%		66,086		10,533		10,189		344	
Scottsville Wastewater	3.00%		56,645		9,029		8,734		295	

Laboratory

Budget FY 2023 Budget Year-to-Date Actual Year-to-Date Budget Year-to-Date Variance Year-to-Date Operating Budget vs. Actual Percentage Notes Notes Notes Notes Notes Notes Personnel Cost \$ 415.324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) -2.71% Porteservices & Charges Communications Information Technology Supplies Operations & Maintenance Equipment Purchases Department Summary Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Met Costs Allocable to Rate Centers Urban Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Costs water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Soctts wille Water 2,00% Constandicable to Rate Centers <th>Laboratowi</th> <th></th>	Laboratowi										
Operating Budget vs. Actual Revenues N/A Expenses Personnel Cost \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) Personnel Cost \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) Professional Services 1.760 1.963 151 1.812 92.30% Communications 1.700 283 117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 0.2017 \$ 9,668 10,507 \$ 52.08% Operating Expenses 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation 5 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274 \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Urban Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Scottsville Water 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 <th>Laboratory</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Budget FY 2023</th> <th>Yea</th> <th>Budget ar-to-Date</th> <th>A Yea</th> <th>ctual ar-to-Date</th> <th>V</th> <th>Budget s. Actual</th> <th>Variance Percentage</th>	Laboratory			Budget FY 2023	Yea	Budget ar-to-Date	A Yea	ctual ar-to-Date	V	Budget s. Actual	Variance Percentage
Notes Revenues N/A Expenses Personnel Cost \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) -2.71% Professional Services 11,780 1,963 151 1,812 92,30% Communications 1,700 283 117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100,00% Supplies 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52,08% Depreciation 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52,08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0,00% Depreciation 5 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12,51% Met Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12,51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (38,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12,51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (38,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12,51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (38,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12,51% Urban Water 44,00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 442 36,319 5,194 Scottsville Water 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glemmore Wastewater 1,50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Scottsville Water 1,50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Scottsville Wastew	Operating Budget vs. Actual]	<u> </u>								
N/A Expenses Professional Services \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) -2.71% Other Services & Charges 11,780 1,963 151 1,812 92.30% Communications 1,700 283 117 166 100.00% Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Depreciation 1 5 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Vect Costs Allocable to Rate Centers Yether 40.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 40.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Urban Water 40.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,8	Revenues	Notes									
Expenses Personnel Cost Professional Services \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) -2.71% Professional Services 11,780 1,963 151 1,812 92.30% Communications 11,700 283 117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation -	N/A										
Personnel Cost \$ 415,324 \$ 65,246 \$ 67,013 \$ (1,767) -2.71% Professional Services 11,780 1,963 151 1,812 92.30% Other Services & Charges 11,700 283 1117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1221,050 20.8 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation - - - - - - Total Operating Expenses \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Milocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Libcations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Libcations to the Rate Centers \$ 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221	Expenses										
Other Services & Charges 11,780 1,963 151 1,812 92.30% Communications 1,700 283 117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation - - - - - - Total Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Met Costs Allocable to Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 5	Personnel Cost Professional Services		\$	415,324	\$	65,246	\$	67,013 -	\$	(1,767)	-2.71%
Communications 1,700 283 117 166 Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation - - - - - - Total Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Met Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 - - - - - - - - - - 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274 \$ 34,001 \$ 442 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - <td>Other Services & Charges</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11,780</td> <td></td> <td>1,963</td> <td></td> <td>151</td> <td></td> <td>1,812</td> <td>92.30%</td>	Other Services & Charges			11,780		1,963		151		1,812	92.30%
Information Technology 1,000 167 - 167 100.00% Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation - - - - - Total Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Met Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Murban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 442 4863 Crozet Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 166 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,3	Communications			1,700		283		117		166	
Supplies 1,250 208 40 168 80.56% Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Depreciation 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Total Operating Expenses Total Operating Expenses S 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Department Summary Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% 553,804 8 88,326 77,274 11,052 12.51%	Information Technology			1,000		167		-		167	100.00%
Operations & Maintenance 121,050 20,175 9,668 10,507 52.08% Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation rotal Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 11,052 12.51% Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers Urban Water 4.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% \$ 22,152 3,533 3,091 \$ 4422 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 11,052 11,052 11,052	Supplies			1,250		208		40		168	80.56%
Equipment Purchases 1,700 283 283 (0) 0.00% Depreciation Total Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Department Summary Department Summary (11,052) 12.51% Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 4863 Crozet Water 4.00% 221,152 3,533 3,091 4422 Urban Water 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 66 66 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Urban Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Operations & Maintenance			121,050		20,175		9,668		10,507	52.08%
Depreciation Image: state in the state in t	Equipment Purchases			1,700		283		283		(0)	0.00%
Total Operating Expenses \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052 12.51% Department Summary Department Summary 11,052 12.51% Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% \$ 22,152 \$ 3,533 \$ 3,091 \$ 442 \$ 4422 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 \$ 1,767 \$ 1,545 \$ 221 \$ 11,055 \$ 1,159 \$ 166 Urban Wastewater 47.00% \$ 260,288 \$ 41,513 \$ 36,319 \$ 5,194 \$ 14,052 \$ 1,159 \$ 166 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% \$ 8,307 \$ 1,325 \$ 1,159 \$ 166 1.50% \$ 8,307 \$ 1,325 \$ 1,159 \$ 166 Scottsville Wastewater 1.50% \$ 8,307 \$ 1,325 \$ 1,159 \$ 166 1.50% \$ 8,307 \$ 1,325 \$ 1,159 \$ 166	Depreciation			-		-		-		-	
Department Summary Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers \$ (243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 40.00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 442 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 I.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 I00.00% 553,804 88,326 77,274 11,052 11,052 11,052	Total Operating Expenses		\$	553,804	\$	88,326	\$	77,274	\$	11,052	12.51%
Department Summary Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 4442 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% 553,804 88,326 77,274 11,052											
Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers \$ (553,804) \$ (88,326) \$ (77,274) \$ (11,052) 12.51% Allocations to the Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 40.00% 22,152 3,533 30,911 4422 Scottsville Water 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Scottsville Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% 553,804 88,326 77,274 11,052		Depa	rtme	ent Summ	ary						
Allocations to the Rate Centers Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 4422 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers		\$	(553,804)	\$	(88,326)	\$	(77,274)	\$	(11,052)	12.51%
Urban Water 44.00% \$ 243,674 \$ 38,863 \$ 34,001 \$ 4,863 Crozet Water 4.00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 442 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Allocations to the Rate Centers										
Crozet Water 4.00% 22,152 3,533 3,091 442 Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 10.00% \$553,804 \$88,326 \$77,274 \$11,052	Urban Water	44.00%	\$	243,674	\$	38,863	\$	34,001	\$	4,863	
Scottsville Water 2.00% 11,076 1,767 1,545 221 Urban Wastewater 47.00% 260,288 41,513 36,319 5,194 Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Scottsville Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Crozet Water	4.00%		22,152		3,533		3,091		442	
Urban Wastewater47.00%260,28841,51336,3195,194Glenmore Wastewater1.50%8,3071,3251,159166Scottsville Wastewater1.50%8,3071,3251,159166100.00%\$ 553,804\$ 88,326\$ 77,274\$ 11,052	Scottsville Water	2.00%		11,076		1,767		1,545		221	
Glenmore Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 Scottsville Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Urban Wastewater	47.00%		260,288		41,513		36,319		5,194	
Scottsville Wastewater 1.50% 8,307 1,325 1,159 166 100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Glenmore Wastewater	1.50%		8,307		1,325		1,159		166	
100.00% \$ 553,804 \$ 88,326 \$ 77,274 \$ 11,052	Scottsville Wastewater	1.50%		8,307		1,325		1,159		166	
		100.00%	\$	553,804	\$	88,326	\$	77,274	\$	11,052	

Urban Water

Crozet Water

Scottsville Water

Urban Wastewater

Glenmore Wastewater

Scottsville Wastewater

Engineering

Engineering			Budget FY 2023		Budget Year-to-Date	Actual Year-to-Date	v	Budget s. Actual	Variance Percentage
Operating Budget vs. Actual									
	Notes								
Revenues									
Payment for Services SWA		\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	
Total Operating Revenues		\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	
Expenses									
Personnel Cost		\$	1,794,680	\$	281,322	\$ 277,969	\$	3,353	1.19%
Professional Services			125,000		20,833	4,508		16,325	78.36%
Other Services & Charges			18,000		3,000	1,340		1,660	55.32%
Communications			18,772		3,129	1,949		1,180	37.72%
Information Technology			145,000		24,167	20,799		3,367	13.93%
Supplies			5,000		833	758		75	9.05%
Operations & Maintenance			75,300		12,550	5,917		6,633	52.85%
Equipment Purchases			21,500		3,583	3,583		0	0.00%
Depreciation			-		-	-		-	
Total Operating Expenses		\$	2,203,252	\$	349,417	\$ 316,825	\$	32,592	9.33%
		De	partment S	um	nmary				
Net Costs Allocable to Rate Centers		\$	(2,203,252)	\$	(349,417)	\$ (316,825)	\$	(32,592)	9.33%
Allocations to the Rate Centers									

1,035,528 \$

88,130

44,065

969,431

33,049

33,049 2,203,252 \$ 164,226 \$

13,977

153,744

6,988

5,241

5,241

349,417 \$

148,908 \$

12,673

6,337

139,403

4,752

4,752

316,825 \$

15,318

1,304

14,341

32,592

652

489

489

Г

47.00% \$

4.00%

2.00%

44.00%

1.50%

1.50% 100.00% **\$** 1

Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Flow Graphs







434.293.8858 🛍

www.rivanna.org 🌐

MEMORANDUM

TO:RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORSFROM:DAVE TUNGATE, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

- **REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**
- SUBJECT: OPERATIONS REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2022
- **DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022**

WATER OPERATIONS:

The average and maximum daily water volumes produced in September 2022 were as follows:

Water Treatment Plant	Average Daily Production (MGD)	Maximum Daily Production in the Month (MGD)
South Rivanna	8.21	10.28 (9/2/2022)
Observatory	1.77	3.07 (9/8/2022)
North Rivanna	<u>0.50</u>	0.57 (9/6/2022)
Urban Total	10.48	12.26 (9/6/2022)
Crozet	0.65	0.84 (9/18/2022)
Scottsville	0.07	0.112 (9/30/2022)
Red Hill	<u>0.0021</u>	0.004 (9/21/2022)
RWSA Total	11.20	-

• All RWSA water treatment facilities were in regulatory compliance during the month of September.

Status of Reservoirs (as of October 18, 2022):

 \succ

- ➢ Urban Reservoirs are 98% of Total Useable Capacity
 - Ragged Mountain Reservoir is 96% full
 - Sugar Hollow Reservoir is 100% full
 - South Rivanna Reservoir is 100% full
 - Beaver Creek Reservoir (Crozet) is 100% full
- ➤ Totier Creek Reservoir (Scottsville) is 100% full

WASTEWATER OPERATIONS:

All RWSA Water Resource Recovery Facilities (WRRFs) were in regulatory compliance with their effluent limitations during September 2022. Performance of the WRRFs in August was as follows compared to the respective VDEQ permit limits:

WRRF	Average Daily WRRF Effluent		CBOD5 m)	Average Suspende (pp	e Total ed Solids m)	Average Ammonia (ppm)		
	Flow (MGD)	(low (IGD) RESULT LIMIT RESULT LIM		LIMIT	RESULT	LIMIT		
Moores Creek	9.33	<ql< th=""><th>9</th><th><ql< th=""><th>22</th><th><ql< th=""><th>2.2</th></ql<></th></ql<></th></ql<>	9	<ql< th=""><th>22</th><th><ql< th=""><th>2.2</th></ql<></th></ql<>	22	<ql< th=""><th>2.2</th></ql<>	2.2	
Glenmore	0.105	5.0	15	2.3	30	NR	NL	
Scottsville	0.046	1.5	25	4.0	30	NR	NL	
Stone Robinson	0.002	NR	30	NR	30	NR	NL	

NR = Not Required

NL = No Limit

<QL: Less than analytical method quantitative level (2.0 ppm for CBOD, 1.0 ppm for TSS, and 0.1 ppm for Ammonia).

Nutrient discharges at the Moores Creek AWRRF were as follows for September 2022.

State Annual A (lb./yr.) P	Allocation ermit	Average Monthly Allocation (lb./mo.) *	Moores Creek Discharge September (lb./mo.)	Performance as % of monthly average Allocation*	Year to Date Performance as % of annual allocation
Nitrogen	282,994	23,583	6,542	28%	24%
Phosphorous	18,525	1,544	652	42%	37%

*State allocations are expressed as annual amounts. One-twelfth of that allocation is an internal monthly benchmark for comparative purposes only.

WATER AND WASTEWATER DATA:

The following graphs are provided for review:

- Usable Urban Reservoir Water Storage
- Urban Water and Wastewater Flows versus Rainfall






MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

- FROM: JENNIFER WHITAKER, DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING & MAINTENANCE
- **REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**
- SUBJECT: STATUS REPORT: ONGOING PROJECTS

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022

This memorandum reports on the status of the following Capital Projects as well as other significant operating, maintenance, and planning projects.

For the current, approved CIP, please visit: <u>https://www.rivanna.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Final-2023-2027-CIP.pdf</u>

Under Construction

- 1. South Rivanna and Observatory Water Treatment Plant Renovations
- 2. Airport Road Water Pump Station and Piping
- 3. MC 5kV Electrical System Upgrades

Design and Bidding

- 4. Ragged Mtn Reservoir to Observatory WTP Raw Water Line and Pump Station
- 5. South Rivanna to Ragged Mtn. Raw Water Line Birdwood to Old Garth
- 6. Beaver Creek Dam, Pump Station and Piping Improvements
- 7. South Rivanna River Crossing
- 8. Central Water Line
- 9. Upper Schenks Branch Interceptor, Phase II
- 10. Red Hill Water Treatment Plant Upgrades
- 11. Emmet Street Water Line Betterment
- 12. Scottsville WRRF Whole Plant Generator and ATS
- 13. Crozet Pump Station Rehabilitation
- 14. Moores Creek Concrete Repairs
- 15. Moores Creek Compost Shed Roof Rehabilitation

Planning and Studies

- 16. South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mtn Reservoir Water Line Right-of-Way
- 17. Asset Management Plan
- 18. SRR to RMR Pipeline Pretreatment Pilot Study

19. Moores Creek Cogeneration Upgrades

Other Significant Projects

20. Urgent and Emergency Repairs

21. Security Enhancements

Under Construction

1. South Rivanna and Observatory Water Treatment Plant Renovations

Design Engineer:	Short Elliot Hendrickson, Inc. (SEH)
Construction Contractor:	English Construction Company (Lynchburg, VA)
Construction Start:	May 2020
Percent Complete:	70%
Base Construction Contract +	
Change Orders to Date = Current Value:	\$36,748,500 + \$718,669 = \$37,467,169
Completion:	May 2023
Budget:	\$43,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Improvements to the new Lab/Control Room in the Filter Building at SRWTP have been completed and lead abatement activities in the Filter Building began this month. Work at the OBWTP includes the new Chemical Storage Building, sedimentation basin improvements, foundation work for the GAC expansion, a large retaining wall and installation of a sludge control vault. Shutdown of the OBWTP is planned for December – February 2023.

2. Airport Road Water Pump Station and Piping

Design Engineer:	Short Elliot Hendrickson (SEH)
Construction Contractor:	December 2021
Percent Complete:	20%
Base Construction Contract +	
Change Order to Date = Current Value:	\$8,520,312
Completion:	December 2023
Budget:	\$10,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: The contractor has completed trench paving and cleanup at the Kohl's site and has demobilized from this area of the project for the winter since our easement does not allow work during their corporate "holiday blackout period" from October 15th - January 15th. Final water line interconnections, testing, and site restoration at Kohl's will resume next year. Excavation for the base slab at the pump station site is complete and the contractor will begin rebar and concrete work once the building permit is approved.

MC 5kV Electrical System Upgrades	
Design Engineer:	Hazen and Sawyer (Hazen)
Construction Contractor:	Pyramid Electrical Contractors (Richmond, VA)
	MC 5kV Electrical System Upgrades Design Engineer: Construction Contractor:

Construction Start:	May 2022
Percent Complete:	7%
Base Construction Contract +	
Change Order to Date = Current Value:	\$5,180,000 - \$970,000 = \$4,210,000
Completion:	June 2024
Budget:	\$5,050,000

<u>Current Status</u>: The Contractor is mobilizing to the site this month and has installed erosion and sedimentation control measures where general site disturbance will take place. Ductbank and equipment pad work will likely begin in November, following the Contractor's acquisition of applicable County building and electrical permits.

Design and Bidding

4. <u>Ragged Mountain Reservoir to Observatory Water Treatment Plant Raw Water Line and Pump</u> <u>Station</u>

Design Engineer:	Michael Baker International (Baker) (Right of Way)
Design Engineer:	Kimley-Horn (Design)
Project Start:	August 2018
Project Status:	Easement Acquisition & Design (30%)
Construction Start:	2025
Completion:	2028
Budget:	\$44,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Preparation of engineering plans and specifications continues. Easement negotiations with UVA and the UVA Foundation continue. Staff is coordinating with VDOT on Rt. 29 Bypass and Fontaine Avenue crossing locations, and the Consultant has started design for the pump station.

5. South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mtn. Reservoir Raw Water Line – Birdwood to Old Garth

Design Engineer:	Kimley-Horn
Project Start:	June 2021
Project Status:	90% Design
Construction Start:	January 2023
Completion:	December 2023
Budget:	\$4,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Engineering plans and specifications are substantially complete for a 0.25-mile section of this 36" raw water pipe from Birdwood to Old Garth Road. One remaining easement is under negotiation with the UVA Foundation for this phase of the project.

6. <u>Beaver Creek Dam, Pump Station and Piping Improvements</u>

Design Engineer:	Schnabel Engineering (Dam)
Design Engineer:	Hazen & Sawyer (Pump Station)
Project Start:	February 2018
Project Status:	85% NRCS Planning Process

Construction Start:	2024
Completion:	2027
Budget:	\$43,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: A Joint Permit Application and supporting documents were submitted to VDEQ last month and the review process has begun. Remaining NRCS requirements, including review and approval of the planning study, are scheduled for completion this winter. The revised Plan Environmental Assessment was submitted to the NRCS on August 15, 2022 and we are preparing for the public comment period. An NRCS construction grant will be requested for this project.

7. South Rivanna River Crossing

Design Engineer:	Michael Baker International (Baker)
Project Start:	November 2020
Project Status:	55% Design
Construction Start:	Spring 2023
Completion:	April 2024
Budget:	\$7,000,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Geotechnical investigation to determine rock depths for the trenchless crossing of the river has been completed. Easement acquisition will include County of Albemarle property in Brook Hill River Park along Rio Mills Road.

8. <u>Central Water Line</u>

Design Engineer:	Michael Baker International (Baker)
Project Start:	July 2021
Project Status:	10% Design
Construction Start:	2024
Completion:	2028
Budget:	\$41,000,000

Current Status: Detailed field investigation and design are underway.

9. Upper Schenks Branch Interceptor, Phase II

Design Engineer:	Frazier Engineering, P.A.
Project Start:	July 2021
Project Status:	Design
Construction Start:	TBD
Completion:	TBD
Budget:	\$4,725,000

<u>Current Status</u>: RWSA has prepared project, easement and valuation information for the County's review.

10. <u>Red Hill Water Treatment Plant Upgrades</u>

Design Engineer:

Short Elliot Hendrickson (SEH)

Project Start:	July 2022
Project Status:	60% Design
Construction Start:	April 2023
Completion:	December 2023
Budget:	\$450,000

<u>Current Status:</u> Design work continues following completion of the geotechnical evaluation. This project was selected by Albemarle County to receive ARPA grant funding.

11. Emmet Street Water Line Betterment

Design Engineer:	Whitman, Requardt & Associates (WRA)
Project Start:	September 2021
Project Status:	Ivy Corridor Public Realm – Complete
	Contemplative Commons – In Construction
	Emmet Streetscape – Preliminary Design
	Hydraulic/29 – Preliminary Scoping
Completion:	2030
Budget:	\$2,900,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Upgrading a section of 16" water main in Emmet Street to 30" as part of the UVA Ivy Corridor Public Realm project is complete. Upgrading a section of 16" water main adjacent to the Dell Pond to 30" as part of the UVA Contemplative Commons project started on September 6, 2022 and is expected to be completed during the week of October 17th. WRA and RWSA are developing a scope of work for design of a 24-30" water main in Emmet Street as part of the City's Emmet Streetscape Phase I project. RWSA has initiated discussion with VDOT on potential pipe routing in the upcoming design-build Hydraulic/29 project.

12. Scottsville WRRF Whole Plant Generator and ATS

Design Engineer:	Wiley Wilson
Project Start:	December 2021
Project Status	40% Design
Completion:	Summer 2023
Budget:	\$200,000

Current Status: The current back-up power generator at the Scottsville WRRF has reached the end of its service life, does not power the entire plant, and needs to be replaced. The generator at the treatment plant site will also be sized to provide backup power for the nearby wastewater influent pump station.

13. Crozet Pump Station Rehabilitation

Design Engineer:	Wiley Wilson
Project Start:	Fall 2022
Project Status:	Pre-Design Investigation
Completion:	2025
Budget:	\$590,000

<u>Current Status</u>: New wells have been installed at pump stations 3 and 4. Consultant is developing a scope of work to fully rehabilitate and replace components that have reached their useful life. This design effort will be initiated following an assessment of the existing pumps at Crozet Pump Station No. 2 which will occur this Fall.

14. Moores Creek Concrete Repairs

Hazen and Sawyer (Hazen)
November 2022
Design
Winter 2024
\$2,650,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Design is underway and will include additional structural improvements at the aeration basins and the Rivanna Wastewater Pump Station.

15. Moores Creek Compost Shed Roof Rehabilitation

Design Engineer:	TBD
Project Start:	Fall 2022
Project Status:	Design
Completion:	TBD
Budget:	\$1,360,000

<u>Current Status</u>: The shed roof rafters are deteriorated and need to be replaced. A consultant is being selected and work authorization development will follow. This work is being initiated following completion of the MCAWRRF Master Plan.

Planning and Studies

16. South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mtn. Reservoir Water Line Right-of-Way

Michael Baker International (Baker)
October 2017
Easement Acquisition
2022
\$2,295,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Progress continues in our efforts to acquire 8 miles of easements and agreements (with VDOT) for this 36" water line. Discussions continue for remaining easements with the UVA Foundation and one final private property owner.

17. Asset Management Plan

Design Engineer:	GHD, Inc.
Project Start:	July 2018
Project Status:	CMMS Implementation – 95% Complete
	AMP Implementation – 0% Complete
Completion:	CMMS Implementation – October 2022

	AMP Implementation – 2024
Budget:	\$1,180,000

<u>Current Status</u>: For implementation of the new Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS), GHD has completed updates to our facility geodatabase and is continuing the software configuration process. A recent software update has complicated the process and GHD and RWSA staff are working with Cityworks to resolve. Work has begun to fully implement the program across all applicable Authority facilities.

18. <u>SRR to RMR Pipeline – Pretreatment Pilot Study</u>

Design Consultant: Project Start:	SEH/DiNatale August 2020
Project Status:	100% Complete (Phase 1), 90% Complete (Phase 2)
Completion:	December 2022
Budget:	\$22,969 (Phase 1), \$116,401 (Phase 2)

<u>Current Status</u>: Final efforts by the consultant are underway to better clarify operations of the raw water transfer system and associated reservoir levels during drought conditions.

19. <u>Moores Creek Cogeneration Upgrades</u>

Design Engineer:	SEH
Project Start:	October 2021
Project Status:	Preliminary Engineering/Study (95%)
Completion:	June 2024
Budget:	\$2,145,000

<u>Current Status</u>: Manufacturers in the Cogeneration Industry are being interviewed and additional information is being gathered to determine acceptable providers before engineering plans and specifications are completed.

Other Significant Projects

20. Urgent and Emergency Repairs

Staff are currently working on several urgent repairs within the water and wastewater systems as listed below:

Project No.	Project Description	Approx. Cost
2021-01/2022-03	WBI and RVI Erosion	\$50,000
2022-09	CZI Force Main ARV Replacements	\$200,000
2022-02/05/12	Miscellaneous MCI/PCI/RVI MH Repairs	\$70,000
2022-10	MCAWRRF Primary Clarifier Building 36" Sanitary Sewer Leak	\$5,000
2022-13	SRW-ARV-09 Failure	\$75,000

- <u>WBI and RVI Erosion</u>: In February 2022, RWSA Maintenance staff notified Engineering staff of some ditch lines along the Rivanna Interceptor that are in need of repair. In addition, during the previous round of manhole inspections on the Woodbrook Interceptor, there was one small ditch identified to be in need of repairs there as well. Staff visited these sites in August and will be issuing the work to its On-Call Maintenance Contractors for repairs. The scope of work is likely to include installation of erosion control at the ditch crossings over the various sewer lines.
- <u>CZI Force Main ARV Replacements:</u> Over the past several years, staff have been monitoring the condition of the air release valves (ARVs) up and down the force main portions of the Crozet Interceptor, as they have been continuing to degrade. These valves are 1980s-vintage, and while they have been serviced and partially rebuilt over the years by the RWSA Maintenance Department, replacement of the tapping saddle and corporation stop has not been possible, since shutdown of the force main is required. Historically, it has taken several hours to drain the force main to allow for the work to take place, and by the time that has occurred, the upstream pump stations need to turn on to prevent overflow. Now with the Flow Equalization Tank nearing completion, this work can take place with the force main offline for up to a 24-hr period. Staff is waiting for the required materials to arrive, as well as a Construction Estimate from RWSA's On-Call Maintenance Contractor, Faulconer Construction, and is coordinating with VDOT on necessary permitting requirements. The work is anticipated to start in November, pending crew availability, completion of permitting, and arrival of the required materials.
- <u>Miscellaneous MCI/PCI/RVI MH Repairs:</u> Over the past several months, staff have identified issues with various manholes on the Moores Creek, Powell Creek, and Rivanna Interceptors (MCI, PCI, and RVI, respectively). These include one manhole on MCI that needs to be raised, as it was historically buried but found in Summer 2021 by the RWSA Maintenance & Engineering Departments, one manhole on RVI that needs a failing HDPE liner to be removed and cementitious mortar to be installed, and one manhole each on PCI and MCI that need to be coated with cementitious mortar due to root intrusion and groundwater infiltration. This work will be performed through the On-Call Maintenance contract with Digs, and staff visited the site with the Contractor on July 15th. The work will likely be completed in the fall, pending crew availability.
- <u>MCAWRRF Primary Clarifier Building 36</u>" Sanitary Sewer Leak: On July 7th, RWSA Engineering Staff was made aware of a small leak through the wall in the basement of the Primary Clarifier Building at MCAWRRF. An inspection was performed by Hazen & Sawyer on August 3rd, and a report with repair recommendations has been prepared. The repairs will include specialty grouting work to plug the voids discovered in the field in order to stop the leak, as well as possible installation of a coating system for further protection of the concrete. During the week of September 26th, RWSA Maintenance staff performed the required grouting work on the inside of the splitter box to stop the leak. Some further grouting work on the building side of the wall will be completed to ensure that the repair holds long-term, and then a coating system will be applied inside of the splitter box in the affected areas during the MCAWRRF Concrete Repairs Project discussed above.
- <u>SRW-ARV-09 Failure:</u> Around 2:30 AM on Wednesday, September 28th, a line break was reported along Route 29, near the intersection with Seminole Court, just across from the Northrup Grumman Building. Staff quickly responded to the site and found that the issue resulted from a failure of a 1960s-vintage manual air release valve (ARV), SRW-ARV-09. Upon reviewing the relevant site conditions (depth, traffic, etc.), the decision was made to utilize RWSA's On-Call Contractor, Digs, for this repair. An emergency water main shutdown was coordinated with ACSA and the City, and once Digs had mobilized, the 18" South Rivanna Waterline (SRW) was shut

down to allow for the ARV to be abandoned, as it is no longer utilized. The main was shut down around 12:00 PM, and repairs were completed around 5:00 PM. The water main was placed fully back into service by 6:30 PM. Site restoration efforts continued into the evening hours, and Route 29 was fully reopened to traffic by 10:00 PM.

21. Security Enhancements

Design Engineer:	N/A
Construction Contractor:	Security 101 (Richmond, VA)
Construction Start:	March 2020
Percent Complete:	50% (WA5), 0% (WA6)
Based Construction Contract +	
Change Orders to Date = Current Value:	\$718,428 (WA1) + \$91,130 (WA2) + \$128,166
	(WA3) + \$189,698 (WA4) + \$76,920 (WA5) +
	120,994 (WA6) + $4,853$ (WA7) = $1,330,192$
	(Total)
Completion:	October 2022 (WA5), May 2023 (WA6)
Budget:	\$2,810,000

<u>Current Status:</u> WA5, which authorizes card access installation at Glenmore Water Resource Recovery Facility (GWRRF), Scottsville Water Resource Recovery Facility (SVWRRF), and Red Hill Water Treatment Plant (RHWTP), began during the week of June 20th. Conduit and cable pulling is complete at all facilities covered in the WA, and the only work that remains is wiring and programming by Security 101, likely to be completed this Fall. WA6 will include card access installation at RWSA's remote sites, including all dams and pump stations. This work was authorized in early August, with completion scheduled for May 2023. WA7, which includes a pilot of a program that will test electronic padlocks at several RWSA facilities, has been authorized. These electronic padlocks have the potential to add an extra layer of security to unmanned facilities such as tanks, dams, and other facilities. If the pilot is successful, wide scale implementation of this technology is possible.

History

Under Construction

1. South Rivanna and Observatory Water Treatment Plant Renovations

An informational meeting with prospective contractors was held on September 26, 2019 to maximize interest in the project. A project kickoff meeting with staff was held on November 14, 2018 and 30% design documents were provided in February. A Value Engineering Workshop took place the week of April 8, 2019, and a memo summarizing the results has been completed. Agreed upon results were incorporated into the project. The project was advertised, and bids were received. English Construction was awarded the contract and a Notice to Proceed was issued on May 18, 2020. Coordination with UVA and Dominion on a new electrical easement at the plant has been completed and documents are being finalized.

Observatory: This project will upgrade the plant from 7.7 to 10 MGD capacity. Costs to upgrade the plant to 12 MGD were determined to be too high at this time. Much of the Observatory Water Treatment Plant is original to the 1953 construction. A Condition Assessment Report was completed by SEH in October of 2013. The approved Capital Improvement Plan project was based on the findings from this report. The flocculator systems were replaced and upgraded as part of the Drinking

Water Activated Carbon and WTP Improvements project (GAC). Four additional GAC contactors will be included in the design.

South Rivanna: The work herein includes expansion of the coagulant storage facilities; installation of additional filters to meet firm capacity needs; the addition of a second variable frequency drive at the Raw Water Pump Station; the relocation for the electrical gear from a sub terrain location at the Sludge Pumping Station; a new building on site for additional office, lab, control room and storage space; improvements to storm sewers to accept allowable WTP discharges; of new metal building to cover the existing liquid lime feed piping and tanks. The scope of this project will not increase the 12 MGD plant treatment capacity.

2. Airport Road Water Pump Station and Piping

The Rt. 29 Pump Station and Pipeline master plan was developed in 2007 and originally envisioned a multi-faceted project that reliably connected the North and South Rivanna pressure bands, reduced excessive operating pressures, and developed a new Airport pressure zone to serve the highest elevations near the Airport and Hollymead Town Center. The master plan update was completed in June of 2018 to reflect the changes in the system and demands since 2007. This project, along with the South Rivanna River Crossing and North Rivanna Transmission Main project, will provide a reliable and redundant finished water supply to the North Rivanna area. The proposed pump station will be able to serve system demands at both the current high pressure and future low-pressure conditions. These facilities will also lead to future phase implementation which will include a storage tank and the creation of the Airport water pressure zone. The North Rivanna Transmission Main improvements included under a separate CIP project have been added to this project to allow connection of the pump station to the distribution system.

Bids were opened on October 7, 2021 and this work was awarded at the October 2021 Board of Directors meeting. The contract was signed, and the pre-construction conference was held on December 9, 2021.

3. MC 5 kV Electrical System Upgrades

After discussions through the Moores Creek Facilities Master Plan, it was identified that several areas of the MCAWRRF, including the Blower Building, Sludge Pumping Building, Grit Removal Building, Moores Creek Pumping Station, and the Administration Building are all still connected to the original 5kV switchgear in the Blower Building. This equipment, including the associated cabling, switchgear, transformers, and motor control centers (MCCs), has a useful life expectancy of 20-30 years. Most of this equipment was installed around 1980. With the equipment having well exceeded its useful life expectancy at this point, safety is a concern given the large electric loads that the cabling and other equipment are handling on a day-to-day basis. Failure of the existing 5kV infrastructure could also result in temporary outages of certain treatment processes, and repairs could take weeks to months given the lead times associated with equipment of this age. A technical memo was provided in July 2020 by Hazen & Sawyer, which recommended that a CIP Project be added immediately to encompass replacement of the original 1980s-vintage 5kV cables, switchgear, transformers, and MCCs. A CIP Amendment Recommendation and Engineering Services Work Authorization was approved during the August 2020 Board of Directors Meeting. The Design Work Authorization was executed on October 6, 2020.

A Design Kickoff Meeting was held virtually on October 20, 2020. A site visit was attended on November 5, 2020 by Hazen & Sawyer staff, as well as RWSA Maintenance and Engineering

Department staff. 50% Design Documents were provided in Spring 2021, with staff feedback provided soon thereafter. A follow-up site visit by Hazen was performed in July 2021, in order to confirm the availability of spare conduits across the site and plan for the associated cable replacements. 95% Design Documents were provided by Hazen in September 2021, and staff returned comments in October 2021. Field work was conducted in Fall 2021 to evaluate the condition of conduits within the existing duct bank network, as well as verify pathways and connectivity within the network.

A Request for Bids (RFB) was issued on December 22, 2021, and bids were submitted on February 3, 2022. A Construction Contract Award for Pyramid Electrical Contractors was approved by the RWSA Board of Directors on February 22, 2022, and a Notice of Award (NOA) was provided to Pyramid on March 4, 2022. Notice to Proceed (NTP) was issued on May 17, 2022.

4. Scottsville WTP Lagoon Liners Replacement

The Scottville Water Treatment Plant (WTP) has two lined lagoons that receive filter backwash water, filter-to-waste water, and flow from the sedimentation basin sludge collectors. The lagoons are regulated under the Virginia DEQ VPDES permit program. The earthen lagoons are original to the plant and were lined at the request of DEQ in 2007 to prevent water infiltration out of the lagoons.

Recently, the lagoon liners have shown signs of degradation from ultraviolent sunlight. As such, a liner replacement project was added to the FY 22-26 CIP to begin in FY23 and be completed in FY24. Unfortunately, in early June '21, the liner in one of the lagoons failed during a high flow event. DEQ has been notified and the lagoon taken out of service, leaving the plant with only one remaining lagoon. In order to advance replacement of the liners, bid documents were developed, a Request for Bids was issued on January 4, 2022, and bids were received on February 1, 2022. A Notice of Award was provided to Haren Construction on March 4, 2022 and a Notice to Proceed was issued on May 2, 2022.

Design and Bidding

5. <u>Ragged Mountain Reservoir to Observatory Water Treatment Plant Raw Water Line and</u> <u>Raw Water Pump Station</u>

A Work Authorization was executed in December 2018 with Michael Baker International for the raw water line routing study, preliminary design, plat creation and the easement acquisition process for this portion of the project. Raw water is transferred from the Ragged Mountain Reservoir (RMR) to the Observatory Water Treatment Plant (WTP) by way of two 18-inch cast iron pipelines, which have been in service for more than 110 and 70 years, respectively. The increased frequency of emergency repairs and expanded maintenance requirements are one impetus for replacing these pipelines. The proposed water line will be able to reliably transfer water to the expanded Observatory plant. The new pipeline will be constructed of 36-inch ductile iron and will be approximately 2.6 miles feet in length. The segment of the project immediately east of the RMR will constitute a portion of the proposed South Rivanna Reservoir to RMR raw water main project as part of the approved 50-year Community Water Supply Plan.

The RMR to Observatory WTP raw water pump station is planned to replace the existing Stadium Road and Royal pump stations, which have exceeded their design lives or will require significant upgrades with the Observatory WTP expansion. The pump station will pump up to 10 million gallons

per day (MGD) of raw water to the Observatory WTP. The new pump station site selection and design are being conducted in coordination with the South Rivanna Reservoir to RMR pipeline in the interest of improved operational and cost efficiencies. An integrated pump station would also include the capacity to transfer up to 16 MGD of raw water from RMR back to the SR WTP.

Both Design Work Authorizations received Board of Directors approval on July 27, 2021. A kickoff meeting was held on September 17, 2021, and a meeting to begin establishing boundary conditions for the RMR Pump Station was held on October 25, 2021. An internal RMR Pump Station Operations workshop was held on February 23, 2022 to set the boundary conditions for the facility, and this information was provided promptly to the Design Consultant to allow design efforts to continue progressing.

6. South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mtn. Reservoir Raw Water Line -Birdwood to Old Garth

This project is the continuation of the SRR to RMR 36" raw water pipeline built on the Birdwood Golf Course. Design efforts were authorized in June 2021 with construction anticipated in Summer 2022.

7. <u>Beaver Creek Dam and Pump Station Improvements</u>

<u>Dam:</u> A spillway upgrade alternative for the dam has been selected and was presented in a public meeting on October 6, 2021. A new raw water pump station site and pipe access route were selected and approved by the Board in August 2021. RWSA operates the Beaver Creek Dam and reservoir as the sole raw water supply for the Crozet Area. In 2011, an analysis of the Dam Breach inundation areas and changes to Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) *Impounding Structures Regulations* prompted a change in hazard classification of the dam from Significant to High Hazard. This change in hazard classification requires that the capacity of the spillway be increased. This CIP project includes investigation, preliminary design, public outreach, permitting, easement acquisition, final design, and construction of the anticipated modifications. Work for this project will be coordinated with the new relocated raw water pump station and intake and a reservoir oxygenation system project.

Schnabel Engineering developed three alternatives for upgrading the capacity of the Beaver Creek Dam Spillway in 2012. Following the adoption of a new Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) Study on December 9, 2015 and the release of DCR guidelines for implementing the PMP study in March of 2016, RWSA determined it would proceed with an updated alternatives analysis and Preliminary Engineering Report for upgrading the dam spillway. Following the completion of an updated alternatives analysis by Schnabel Engineering, staff met with members of Albemarle County and ACSA staff to discuss the preferred alternative. It was determined that staff would proceed with design of a labyrinth spillway and chute through the existing dam with a bridge to allow Browns Gap Turnpike to cross over the new spillway.

In 2020, staff received grant funding for a planning and environmental study from the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The project kicked off in August 2020 and is expected to be completed in July 2022. Following completion of the study and acceptance of the Plan-Environmental document by NRCS, staff will pursue additional grant funding through NRCS that, if available, could cover up to 65% of final design and construction costs.

<u>Pump Station:</u> The Drinking Water Infrastructure Plan for the Crozet water service area, developed by Hazen and Sawyer, recommends installation of a new Raw Water Pump Station and Intake at the

Beaver Creek Dam in order to meet new minimum instream flow requirements and provide adequate raw water pumping capacity to serve the growing Crozet community for the next 50 years. The pump station will be moved out of its existing location at the toe of the dam to a new location, to be determined during design. The new intake structure will include enhanced controls to allow for access to the best quality water at any given time.

8. South Rivanna River Crossing

RWSA has previously identified through master planning that a 24-inch water main will be needed from the South Rivanna Water Treatment Plant (SRWTP) to Hollymead Town Center to meet future water demands. Two segments of this water main were constructed as part of the VDOT Rt. 29 Solutions projects, including approximately 10,000 LF of 24-inch water main along Rt. 29 and 600 LF of 24-inch water main along the new Berkmar Drive Extension, behind the Kohl's department store. To complete the connection between the SRWTP and the new 24-inch water main in Rt. 29, there is a need to construct a new river crossing at the South Fork Rivanna River. Acquisition of right-of-way will be required at the river crossing.

9. Central Water Line

Route alignment determination, hydraulic modeling, and preliminary design were underway in 2017. Due to the complicated nature of our finished water systems, it was decided at the August 2018 Board meeting that a more comprehensive approach was warranted, and we should complete the Finished Water Master Plan prior to moving forward with final design and construction of the Central Water Line (formerly referred to as the Avon to Pantops Water Main). The focus of this project was on the southern half of the urban area water system which is currently served predominantly by the Avon Street and Pantops water storage tanks. The Avon Street tank is hydraulically well connected to the Observatory Water Treatment Plant, while the Pantops tank is well connected to the South Rivanna Water Treatment Plant. The hydraulic connectivity between the two tanks, however, is less than desired, creating operational challenges and reduced system flexibility. In 1987, the City and ACSA developed the Southern Loop Agreement which laid out two key phases (with the first being built at the time). The 1987 Agreement and planning efforts were a starting point for this current project. An engineering contract was approved by the Board of Directors in July 2017. Recent efforts and modeling for the Urban Finished Water Infrastructure Master Plan have determined that a central water line corridor through the City is the best option to hydraulically connect the Observatory Water Treatment Plant to the Pantops area, with connections to City water lines to support the water distribution system in the City and County. The RWSA Board approved the Southern (Cherry Ave) Route in June 2022.

10. Upper Schenks Branch Interceptor, Phase II

The Schenks Branch Sanitary Sewer interceptor is a pipeline operated by RWSA that serves the City of Charlottesville. The 21-inch sewer line was originally constructed by the City in the 1950s. Evaluations from the flow metering and modeling from the Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Interceptor Study, and negotiations with the ACSA and City, resulted in an inflow and infiltration reduction plan from which it was concluded that increased capacity of the Schenks Branch Interceptor was needed for wet weather peak flow. Due to several road construction projects and the construction of the Meadow Creek Interceptor project along the sewer alignment, Schenks Branch was to be constructed in multiple phases. The completed sections, collectively known as the Lower Schenks Branch Interceptor, include the Tie-in to Meadow Creek, the section along McIntire Road Ext, and the section though the Route 250 Interchange.

The remaining sections, which are considered the Upper Schenks Branch Interceptor, were split into

2 phases. The first phase has been completed and is located within City-owned Schenks Greenway adjacent to McIntire Road, and the second phase is being evaluated to determine whether it will be installed in an easement on County property (baseball field and County Office Building) adjacent to McIntire Road or in McIntire Road itself.

12. Red Hill Water Treatment Plant – Upgrades

The Red Hill WTP was constructed in a joint effort of ACSA and RWSA in 2009 and consists of a well, a pneumatic tank and pump house that provides treated water to the Red Hill Elementary School and adjoining neighborhood. The project was constructed in response to groundwater contamination as a result of a nearby leak of underground fuel storage tanks. Originally the facility was operated primarily as a well head and pump house. More recently the facility has operated more as a water treatment facility with a well as source water. As such, there have been several chemical process additions, automation, online monitoring and an increase in operator wet chemistry testing. The current building is well beyond its physical capacity and this project will serve to expand the building and improve the configuration of the process and laboratory needs of the WTP.

13. Emmet Street Water Line Betterment

The Urban Finished Water Master Plan identified several necessary upgrades to the urban water distribution system to improve system performance and reliability. One of the identified improvements is an upgrade and extension of the existing RWSA water main along the Emmet Street corridor from the University of Virginia to Hydraulic Road. This project will utilize planned road, streetscape, utility, and development projects along the Emmet Street corridor to complete portions of the Emmet Street water main improvements as betterment, with the goal of completing the water main improvements by 2030. The project scope includes planning and coordination between RWSA, UVA, the City of Charlottesville, and VDOT, design services for the betterment and "gap" sections of water line, construction funding, and construction management services. Current identified projects with betterment opportunities include: the UVA Ivy Corridor Redevelopment, UVA Contemplative Commons, the City of Charlottesville Emmet Streetscape Projects (multiple phases), and VDOT intersection improvements at Barracks Road, the US-250/Emmet Street Interchange, and Hydraulic Road.

14. Crozet Pump Station Rehabilitation

The Crozet Pump Stations were constructed in the 1980's and many of the components are original. This project includes the replacement of pump and valves and other components at Pump Station 2 to improve pumping capabilities at this location, as well as Pump Stations 1 and 3 as the pumps are reaching the end of their useful life. It also includes roof replacements at all four pump stations, siding replacement for the wet well enclosure at Pump Station 3, and installation of new wells at pump stations 3 and 4. This project also now intends to include new back-up generators at Pump Stations 1 through 3 as the generators have also reached the end of their useful life.

15. Moores Creek AWRRF Concrete Repairs

The two Holding Ponds and the two Equalization Basins were built with the 1977 Moores Creek Upgrades and are critical to the plant infrastructure to contain wet weather flows. The 40-year-old concrete is showing signs of degradation. Following inspections in the Fall 2020, Hazen recommended we implement concrete repairs soon to extend the life of the concrete basins. Work will include crack repair, spalling repair, joint repair, and coating of miscellaneous metals and valves in the basins.

16. Moores Creek AWRRF Compost Shed Roof Rehabilitation

In the early 1980's a large metal-framed shed roof was constructed to house the biosolids composting operations. Subsequent to stopping composting at Moores Creek AWRRF, the shed serves as an equipment maintenance yard, solids handling facility and material storage lock-up. The shed roof is showing signs of rafter deterioration and ongoing drainage issues. This project will evaluate and perform remediation needs at this facility.

17. Scottsville WRRF Whole Plant Generator and ATS

The current back-up power generator at the Scottsville Water Treatment Plant does not power the entire plant, serving only the facilities needed to send flow to the lagoons. This project will offer greater treatment flexibility and monitoring capability for the operations staff, particularly when the plant is unmanned and monitored remotely.

Planning and Studies

18. South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mtn. Reservoir Water Line Right-of-Way

The approved 50-year Community Water Supply Plan includes the construction of a raw water line from the South Rivanna Reservoir to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir. This water line will replace the existing Upper Sugar Hollow Pipeline and increase raw water transfer capacity in the Urban Water System. The preliminary route for the water line followed the proposed Route 29 Charlottesville Bypass; however, the Bypass project was suspended by VDOT in 2014, requiring a more detailed routing study for the future water line. This project includes a routing study, preliminary design, and preparation of easement documents, as well as acquisition of water line easements along the approved route.

Baker has completed the routing study. Preliminary design, plat creation and the acquisition of easements are underway. Property owners were contacted to request permission to access properties for topographical surveying. A community information meeting was held in June 2018.

19. Asset Management Plan

Asset management is the practice of managing our infrastructure to minimize the total cost of owning and operating these assets while providing desired service levels. In doing so, it is used to make sure planned maintenance activities take place and that capital assets are replaced, repaired, or upgraded at the right time, while ensuring that the money necessary to perform those activities is available. RWSA has some components of an asset management program in place (i.e. GIS, work order system), but has identified the need to further develop the program as part of our Strategic Planning process. In order to continue to build the program, a consultant has been procured to assist with a three-phase process that will include facilitation and development of an asset management strategic plan, development, and management of a pilot study where the results of the strategic plan will be applied to a specific class of assets, and assistance through a full implementation process. As part of this three-phase process, the consultant also assisted RWSA with the procurement of a new CMMS software package to facilitate the overall program. Cityworks was selected and implementation has begun.

20. SRR to RMR Pipeline – Pretreatment Pilot Study

As part of the SRR to RMR Pipeline project, the impact of sending raw water from the SRR to RMR has been previously studied and a significant amount of pretreatment was initially identified as being needed to avoid reducing the quality of the raw water contained within the RMR. With the pipeline easement acquisition process well underway and additional information now available associated with the proposed timing of this overall project based on water demand projections, the intent of this project is to update the pretreatment needs anticipated.

The study is anticipated to be completed in 4 phases: 1. Analysis and Correlation of Existing Water Quality and Seasonal Weather Data 2. Enhanced Water Quality Sampling 3. Pretreatment Piloting 4. Level Setting for the Final Pretreatment Solution. Phase 1 commenced in January 2021 and was completed in July 2021. Phase 2 began in June 2021. The Excel Desktop Modeling portion of the analysis was completed in February 2022.

21. MCAWRRF Cogeneration Upgrades

The MCAWRRF has an existing cogeneration facility that was constructed in 2011. The purpose of the facility was to provide a beneficial use of the methane gas produced by the digester process at the plant, and in doing so, provide both digester heating and energy to the plant's electrical distribution system. Unfortunately, the existing cogeneration facility requires expensive recurring maintenance services, has proprietary equipment which further complicates servicing needs, and has had a number of operational issues that have impeded the benefit this facility was intended to provide. As a result, a Cogeneration System Analysis was performed to determine a recommended approach for proceeding with improvements to the existing facility, installation of a new cogeneration facility without the issues of the previous facility or removing the cogeneration facility altogether and providing a backup boiler. This project includes costs for installation of a new cogeneration facility as described in the Cogeneration System Analysis.

Other Significant Projects

22. Urgent and Emergency Repairs

• South Rivanna Dam Apron and Riverbank Repairs

Intense rainfall between May 30-31, 2018 resulted in extensive flooding throughout Charlottesville and parts of Albemarle County, with flows over the South Fork Rivanna Dam reaching more than 7 feet over the spillway crest at its peak. Staff has inspected the dam and abutments to determine the extent of damage resulting from the extreme flooding. Although there is no discernible damage to the dam itself, staff found erosion damage to the north downstream riverbank and substantial displacement of large stone downstream of the dam to form a rock dam and pool below the north apron. Additionally, some damage to concrete structures on both aprons was noted, including possible creation of voids beneath the concrete and loss of concrete joint filler. Repairs to the riverbank and removal of the rock dam were completed June 3-7, 2019 under RWSA's on-call construction contract.

• Urban Water Line Valve and Blow-off Repair

During its routine inspections of the Water System, the Maintenance Department discovered a blowoff (drain) valve along the Urban Waterline (UWL-017) that had significant leakage. In addition, during one of the numerous heavy rain events received in 2018, the water in the creek adjacent to the drain line rose, eroding the area around the drain line and causing the headwall to become disconnected from the end of the pipe. Staff will be coordinating internally to confirm the overall scope of the project, including whether the drain line will need to be further reinforced or restrained.

23. Security Enhancements

As required by the Federal Bioterrorism Act of 2002 and the American Water Infrastructure Act of 2018, water utilities must conduct Vulnerability Assessments and have Emergency Response Plans. RWSA recently completed an updated Risk Assessment of its water system in collaboration with the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA), City of Charlottesville (City), and University of Virginia (UVA). A number of security improvements that could be applied to both the water and wastewater systems were identified. The purpose of this project will be to install security improvements at RWSA facilities including additional security gate and fencing components, vehicle bollards, facility signage, camera system enhancements, additional security lighting, intrusion detection systems, door and window hardening, installation of industrial strength locks, communication technology and cable hardening, and an enhanced access control program.

RWSA Engineering staff held a meeting with Operations staff to discuss overall project needs and priorities in October 2018. Meetings with ACSA and City staff were held in Fall/Winter 2018-2019 to discuss how access control and intrusion detection systems have been implemented into the day-today operations of the two utilities. A Request for Proposal (RFP) for an Implementer to facilitate selection of an access control system, confirmation of design requirements based upon RWSA's facilities and project goals, and installation of the selected system was issued on June 6, 2019. RWSA conducted a Pre-Proposal Meeting on June 14, 2019, and proposals were opened on June 27, 2019. Interviews were conducted on July 15-16, 2019, and a Contract Award Recommendation was approved by the Board on July 23, 2019. Access Control System Installation at MCAWRRF began in March 2020. Access Control System Installation was completed in the Administration and Engineering Buildings by the week of November 30, 2020, completing installation of the physical access control system across the MCAWRRF site. Training for staff was completed on November 10, 2020. RWSA authorized improvements to locks and doors across the MCAWRRF site on May 4, 2021, in order to improve the condition of the hardware and subsequently, operations of the access control system. In addition, installation of the card access system on all exterior doors at the Scottsville and Crozet Water Treatment Plants (SVWTP and CZWTP, respectively) was authorized shortly thereafter. RWSA also authorized installation of security conduits not already included at SRWTP and OBWTP under the Improvements Project in August 2021.

Access Control on exterior doors at the CZWTP and SVWTP was substantially completed in November 2021. Conduit work at SRWTP and OBWTP was substantially complete in May 2022.



MEMORANDUM

TO:RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORSFROM:JENNIFER WHITAKER, DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING &
MAINTENANCEREVIEWED BY:BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTORSUBJECT:WHOLESALE METERING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2022DATE:OCTOBER 25, 2022

The monthly and average daily Urban water system usages by the City and the ACSA for September 2022 were as follows:

	Month	Daily Average	
City Usage (gal)	157,379,952	5,245,998	50.3%
ACSA Usage (gal)	155,265,927	5,175,531	49.7%
Total (gal)	312,645,879	10,421,529	

The *RWSA Wholesale Metering Administrative and Implementation Policy* requires that water use be measured based upon the annual average daily water demand of the City and ACSA over the trailing twelve (12) consecutive month period. The *Water Cost Allocation Agreement (2012)* established a maximum water allocation for each party. If the annual average water usage of either party exceeds this value, a financial true-up would be required for the debt service charges related to the Ragged Mountain Dam and the SRR-RMR Pipeline projects. Below are graphs showing the calculated monthly water usage by each party, the trailing twelve-month average (extended back to July 2021), and that usage relative to the maximum allocation for each party (6.71 MGD for the City and 11.99 MGD for ACSA). Completed in 2019 for a cost of about \$3.2 M, our Wholesale Metering Program consists of 25 remote meter locations around the City boundary and 3 finished water flow meters at treatment plants.

Note:

- Staff detected a read issue with Meter Site 24 Greenbrier Terrace in late July. The meter issue has been resolved.
- Staff detected a read issue with Meter Site 15 Ivy Road at Colonnade Drive in March. The meter issue has been resolved as of August 15, 2022.

Staff detected a read issue with Meter Site 32 – Fontaine Ave in July and has determined that the meter needs to be repaired. Maintenance received parts and has repaired the meter as of September 7th 2022. As a result of data not being available for September, an average of the last 3 months' worth of data was used to calculate the percentages above.













MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACT – BIRDWOOD TO OLD GARTH RAW WATER LINE PROJECT – KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022

This request is to authorize an increase in the Work Authorization from \$199,900 to a not-toexceed amount of \$230,000 for our design engineer to complete additional subsurface geotechnical investigations. Our procurement policies require Board approval of consultant contracts and Work Authorizations which exceed \$200,000.

Background

On February 23, 2021, the Board of Directors approved a professional engineering services term agreement with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (Kimley-Horn). In June 2021, RWSA executed a work authorization for \$186,182 with Kimley-Horn for design, bidding, and construction administration services associated with the South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir (SRR to RMR) Raw Water Line from Birdwood Golf Course to Old Garth Road. Subsequently, one amendment to the work authorization has been issued which brought the total authorization to \$199,000. To finalize our CSX railroad permit application, additional soil borings are needed as we plan to install the water line in a casing pipe beneath the railroad track.

Board Action Requested:

Authorize an increase in engineering services to \$230,000 for the SRR to RMR Raw Water Line -Birdwood Golf Course to Old Garth Road project and a 15% contingency above the revised Work Authorization amount.



MEMORANDUM

TO: RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

REVIEWED BY: BILL MAWYER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT:AUTHORIZATION FOR AN AMENDMENT OF PROFESSIONAL
SERVICES – IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPUTERIZED
MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, GHD, INC.

DATE: OCTOBER 25, 2022

This request is to authorize an increase totaling \$57,363 to the Work Authorization for additional upgrades to several existing software systems, as well as for identification of additional existing assets, to complete implementation of the Cityworks asset management software. The additional cost is within the total CIP budget.

Background

Asset management is the practice of managing our infrastructure to minimize the total cost of owning and operating assets while providing desired levels of service. The system is used to ensure planned maintenance activities take place and capital assets are replaced, repaired, or upgraded at the appropriate time. RWSA has some components of an asset management program in place (i.e. GIS, existing work order system), but has identified the need to further develop the program as part of our Strategic Plan. To continue to build the program, GHD, Inc. was procured to assist with a four-phase process that included development of an asset management strategic plan, development and management of a pilot study, implementation of a computerized maintenance management system (CMMS), and assistance with full implementation of the asset management program throughout the Authority.

As identified during development of the Strategic Asset Management Plan, and anticipated during the procurement of GHD, Inc.'s services, incorporation of a complete and fully utilized CMMS is an essential framework element for the successful implementation of the full asset management program. While RWSA currently utilizes a computerized work order system (Antero), it had several shortcomings that did not meet the needs of the asset management program. Through a competitive solicitation process and product demonstrations, "Cityworks" was selected as the Authority's CMMS in September 2020. The Board approved Work Authorization #4 in November 2020 for a total of \$345,000 to have GHD implement the Cityworks software.

The scope of the original work authorization included implementation planning, process mapping, data migration, software installation, configuration planning, system configuration and integration, system testing, training, deployment, and support. However, unanticipated upgrades to several systems integral to this project, identification of additional assets, and the standardization of naming conventions throughout the Authority have led to increased efforts for GHD, Inc.

Board Action Requested:

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment #1 to Work Authorization #4 with GHD, Inc. for Computerized Maintenance Management System Implementation Services, for an additional amount of \$57,363 to complete implementation of the software. The additional cost is within the total CIP budget.



Water Quality Monitoring and Restoration Efforts

Presentation to the Rivanna Water & Sewer Board of Directors

October 25, 2022



RCA Background

RCA formed in 2016 by merger of Rivanna Conservation Society (RCS) and StreamWatch

- <u>Vision</u>: We envision a healthy Rivanna River and watershed that benefits an engaged community
- <u>Mission</u>: Working with the community to conserve the Rivanna River and its tributaries through monitoring, restoration, education, and advocacy



Rivanna River Watershed





VA DEQ's Citizen Monitoring Data Levels

RCA is only nonprofit in Virginia to have Level III benthic and bacteria programs III Volunteer monitoring data used for environmental decision making as if the samples had been collected by state and local government.

Level

Level II

Volunteers collect samples, but the data must be verified by local or state government professionals.

Level I

Collected data may be used for educational purposes and to notify government professionals of possible pollution.

Certification Levels of Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VADEQ)

RCA Biological Monitoring







- Volunteers sample benthic
 macroinvertebrates
 (small organisms that live at
 bottom of streams)
- Number/diversity indicate water quality
- 50 sites sampled each spring and fall



RCA Biological Monitoring





Pence, R., Riscassi, A., Scanlon, T., Murphy, J., and Richter, B. (2021). Analysis of Long-term Benthic Trends in the Rivanna Watershed. Rivanna Conservation Alliance. https://www.rivannariver.org/powerpoints-pdfs/



RCA Bacteria Monitoring

- Volunteers test for *E. coli* bacteria levels
- 19 urban sites sampled monthly
- 8 potential recreation sites tested weekly in spring (to meet revised VA water quality standard)
- 3 high recreation sites tested weekly in summer



RCA Bacteria Monitoring

- Results reported to the public via:
 - RCA website (all sites)
 - James River Watch and SwimGuide websites (3 summer recreational sites)



	Welcome to the James River Watch Website!
444	This site is brought to you by the James River Association and is a source of information for recreational users of the James River and its thotutaries. How to use this map (roll over) . To bring you the latest information, this page will automatically refresh every 19 minutes. Learn more about the site.
	Legend
	Conditions
	Boating =
164	⊖Fishing ™
100	OSwimming *
	🗌 Boat Ramps 😂
质	River Alerts
	UDH Beach Alerts
	Fishing Alerts
•	Vatershed Boundary James River Tributaries



How is Monitoring Data Used?

- Identify pollution hotspots
- Guide local water resource planning/ protection efforts
- Assist DEQ and EPA with assessing water quality and identifying impaired waters
- Inform Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) assessments
- Evaluate impact of water quality improvement efforts

What Else Does RCA Do?

- Education Programs
- Scheier Natural Area
- River Stewards
- River Cleanups
- Restoration



Volunteers removing tires from the Rivanna River, south of Palmyra during the Rivanna River Round-Up

Rivanna River Round-Up 2022

- River-wide cleanup event in 21 locations
- Overall:
 - Engaged 243 volunteers
 - Covered 27+ miles of river and trail
 - Removed 173 tires, 148 bags of trash and lots of bulky debris




Riparian Forest Planting

- RCA partnering with the James River Buffer Program to plant riparian forest buffers in the Rivanna watershed
- In 2021, RCA led effort to plant 9 acres of native trees and shrubs in Dunlora along the Rivanna River
- VADOF is using natural regeneration to restore four more acres adjacent to the planting





Rivanna Restoration at Riverview Park

- Proposing to restore ~600' of Rivanna Riverbank and ~200' of eroding stormwater outfall
- Outfall is cutting rapidly back toward RWSA 60" line
- Engaging public on design plans in fall 2022 and applying for full design and construction funding in 2022/2023





Thank you for your ongoing support of clean water and RCA's Monitoring Program

www.rivannariver.org



Major Capital Projects Construction Update



Presented By: Scott Schiller, Engineering Manager October 25, 2022

Recently Completed Projects

Crozet Wastewater Flow Equalization Tank and Pumping Station Upgrade

- Store wet-weather flow to minimize impact on downstream sewer capacity
- 1 MG Capacity and improvements to existing Crozet Pump Station No. 4
- Completed: October 2020 October 2022
- Cost: \$5.4M





Crozet Wastewater Flow Equalization Tank and Pumping Station Upgrade

-Tank Flushing Process



Scottsville WTP Lagoon Liners Replacement

- Replacement of liners in both lagoons
- New draining devices, lagoon access walkways and access road improvements
- Completed : May August 2022
- Cost: \$540,000 (\$350k in ARPA funds from County)





MC Lighting Improvements

- Updated site lighting to improve safety and meet Albemarle County requirements
- Completed : April 2021 June 2022
- Cost: \$575,000





MC Clarifiers and Lime Silo Demolition

- Demolished 2 clarifiers to remove safety concerns and create space for future plant expansion
- Removed lime silo and the electrical enclosure
- Completed September 2021 July 2022
- Cost: \$790,000







Glenmore WRRF Influent Pump and VFD Addition

- New influent pump and VFD
- New exhaust fan for the wet well
- Completed September 2021 -September 2022
- Cost: \$370,000







Currently Under Construction

Observatory and South Rivanna WTPs – Rehabilitation and Expansion Project



- Increases OBWTP
 capacity from 7.7 to 10
 MGD and increases
 SRWTP reliability at 12
 MGD
- Includes plate settlers and new chemical building at OBWTP, new Alum, Fluoride and Admin Buildings +2 new filters at SRWTP
- OBWTP shutdown this winter (Dec Feb)
- Completion May 2020 -May 2023
- Budget \$43M

Observatory WTP – Rehabilitation and Expansion Project







Airport Road Pump Station and Piping

- Will reliably connect Piney Mountain and Urban pressure zones
- Will feed the Piney Mountain Tank and will be part of future Airport pressure zone
- Completion December 2021 December 2023
- Budget \$10 M



MC 5kv Electrical System Upgrade

- Replacement of major electrical components that are at the end of their useful lives
- Includes MCCs, transformers, new switchgear building
- Completion: May 2022 June 2024
- Budget \$5M



Design Phase and Upcoming Construction Projects

South Rivanna River Crossing

- Second crossing under the South Rivanna River
- Selected Option B HDD Crossing
- Completion 2023 2024
- Budget \$7 M





SRR to RMR – Birdwood to Old Garth

- Installation of a section of the 36" SRR to RMR transfer pipeline to precede private development and avoid costs
- Finalizing easements and permitting
- Completion 2023 2024





PROPOSED 92 LF 36" WATER MAIL IN 54" STEEL CASING SEE NOTE 7

Beaver Creek Dam, Pump Station & Piping Modifications

- Upgrade the spillway to meet DCR dam safety standards
- Replace the raw water pump station, intake, and pipe to the Crozet WTP
- Working through NRCS funding process
- Completion 2024 2027
- Budget \$43 M











RMR to OBWTP – Pump Station and Water Line

- Improves raw water conveyance capacity to OBWTP
- Replaces outdated infrastructure 40 and 70 year old pump stations and 70 - 110 year old water lines
- Working through pump station site acquisition with UVAF and final water line easements
- Refining pump station design
- Completion 2025 2028
- Budget \$44 M



Central Water Line

- Improve water flow, pressure, redundancy in Urban System
- Hydraulically connect the OBWTP to our transmission mains in the center and eastern parts of the City
- Selected Alignment #4 Southern (Cherry)
- Survey work and design are underway
- Completion 2024 2028
- Budget \$41 M



Red Hill WTP Upgrades



- Operated more as a water treatment facility as opposed to a well system
- Will provide for additional chemical storage, monitoring and automation
- Needs assessment completed and design is underway
- Completion 2023
- Budget \$450 k (\$400k in ARPA funding from County)



Moores Creek AWRRF – Various Projects

- Engineering and Administration Building \$10.5M
- Gas Sphere Rehabilitation \$995k
- Aluminum Slide Gate Replacements \$1.35M
- Compost Shed Roof Rehabilitation \$1.5M
- Operations and Maintenance Building Upfits \$3.4M
- Cogeneration Upgrades \$2.6M
- Structural Modifications and Miscellaneous Concrete Repair - \$5.05M
- Meter and Valve Replacements \$775k
- Digester Replacement/Repair \$4M
- Gravity Thickener Pumping and Chemical Feed Improvements - \$1.1M
- All at various stages of evaluation and design
- Completion 2027
- Budget \$31.3M



Questions?