



**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**September 27, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. at the Moores Creek Advanced Water Resource Recovery Facility.

**Board Members Present:** Mike Gaffney, Jeff Richardson, Michael Rogers, Jim Andrews, Brian Pinkston, Stacey Smalls, Lance Stewart.

**Board Members Absent:** none.

**Rivanna Staff Present:** Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, David Rhoades, Betsy Nemeth, Jeff Southworth, John Hull, Deborah Anama.

**Attorney(s) Present:** Carrie Stanton.

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Gaffney convened the September 27, 2022 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:00 p.m.

**2. AGENDA APPROVAL**

There were no comments on or changes to the agenda.

**Mr. Andrews moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rogers and passed unanimously (7-0).**

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

*a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on July 26, 2022*

There were no comments on or changes to the minutes for the meeting held on July 26, 2022.

**Mr. Stewart moved to approve the minutes for the meeting held on July 26, 2022. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

**4. RECOGNITION**

There were no recognitions.

**5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Mawyer noted it had been 30 months since the Board had last convened in person. He stated the last time the Board met in person was February 2020. He introduced Ms. Carrie Stanton and Ms. Valerie Long, the attorneys for the Authority. He asked the staff to introduce themselves to the Board since it was the first time many had met in person, including:

Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Director of Engineering and Maintenance

48 Mr. Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste

49  
50 Mr. David Rhoades, Manager of Solid Waste

51  
52 Mr. Daniel Campbell, Water Department Manager

53  
54 Mr. Jeff Southworth, Information Technology Manager

55  
56 Ms. Betsy Nemeth, Human Resources Manager

57  
58 Mr. Dyon Vega, Engineer

59  
60 Mr. Santino Granato, Senior Civil Engineer

61  
62 Ms. Andrea Bowles, Water Resources Manager

63  
64 Ms. Michelle Simpson, Senior Civil Engineer

65  
66 Mr. Scott Schiller, Engineering Manager

67  
68 Mr. John Hull, Information Technology Administrator

69  
70 Mr. David Tungate, Director of Operations

71  
72 Mr. Mawyer noted the emergency exits for the building. He stated the public could attend the  
73 meeting in person as well as view and listen to the meeting virtually, but could not comment  
74 through the virtual platform. He stated the meeting would be recorded and posted to the Authority's  
75 webpage.

76  
77 Mr. Mawyer stated the General Assembly recently authorized limited virtual Board meetings. He  
78 stated they would draft a policy for the Board to approve that would allow 25% of the meetings to  
79 be held virtually. He stated if the policy is adopted, the following year, they would be able to twice  
80 meet virtually. He stated in November, there would be a policy for the Board to consider continuing  
81 virtual meeting opportunities.

82  
83 Mr. Mawyer stated Human Resources would be sponsoring flu vaccines at Moores Creek and the  
84 Ivy MUC as a workforce development initiative. He stated Augusta Health provided the vaccines  
85 for staff with the Authority's insurance.

86  
87 Mr. Mawyer stated September was National Preparedness Month, and flooding was one of the most  
88 common natural disasters in the country. He stated they were actively monitoring Hurricane Ian. He  
89 stated they encouraged the public to not walk, swim, or drive through flood waters, to stay off of  
90 bridges when there is fast-moving water, stay away from downed or damaged electric powerlines,  
91 and sign up for the community's CodeRED warning system.

92  
93 Mr. Mawyer explained that the code red warning system allowed the Authority to alert its  
94 employees to emergencies. He stated employees could receive notification via email, phone, or text  
95 message. He stated it was activated annually to ensure the system worked.

96

Mr. Mawyer stated the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services was hosted at the Ivy MUC to conduct a pesticide collection event. He mentioned he previously reported that he was on a Virginia DEQ solid waste fee study group. He reported the group had been charged with developing new fee schedules so the solid waste facilities in the state would pay enough in permit fees to make the DEQ 100% cost recoverable. He stated the schedule was drafted, but the Governor vetoed it, so it was not added to the legislation. He noted the new fee schedule would have cost the Authority a few thousand dollars annually.

## **6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Mr. Gaffney opened Items from the Public. He asked any speakers to identify themselves for the public record and noted that they each had three minutes to speak. He noted there were no speakers, so he closed Items from the Public.

## **7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no comments from the public, therefore, there were no responses.

## **8. CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were comments or questions on the Consent Agenda from the Board.

Mr. Mawyer stated there was no Consent Agenda for the meeting. He stated the two typical items had been pulled, and they would be discussed under Other Business.

## **9. OTHER BUSINESS**

### *a. Presentation and Vote on Approval: Staff Report on Finance*

Mr. Mawyer noted a financial summary report was included in the Consent Agenda, but he wanted to provide a brief review of the information in the report. He stated they would review the June 2022 report, and it covered the entire 2022 fiscal year—from July 1, 2021 through June 2022.

Mr. Mawyer reported the RSWA had total revenues of \$3.9M, and total expenditures of \$6.4M, leaving an operating deficit of \$2.5M. He noted the deficit was offset by the allocations from the County and the City to RSWA. He noted that \$2.9M was provided to the Authority through those allocations, and the Authority ended with a surplus of \$455K.

Mr. Mawyer mentioned that in July, they communicated to the Board those excess funds would be used to purchase a new baling machine needed for the Paper Sort facility. He explained that the current baling facility was at its end of life, and it was a critical element because it was the only baling machine owned by the Authority. He stated the recyclables from McIntire and Ivy were baled at the facility, and without the machine, they would struggle to have a recycling program.

Mr. Mawyer explained that the baling machine had broken down several times, and a new baling machine was ordered. He stated in July, the Board approved any year-end funds would be reallocated to the baling machine, and any remaining County funds would go toward a new roll-off truck for the Southern Area Convenience Center.

Mr. Mawyer explained that a similar approach would be used in FY 23 for any year-end funds. He noted that other items in the report were interesting. He explained that the Ivy Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) information included the refuse transfer operation. He stated 46,773 tons of material went through the transfer station the prior year resulting in a net operating cost deficit of \$808K. He stated the net cost deficit per ton was about \$17. He stated the Ivy Other category included the clean fill, compost, mulch, vegetative debris, and the encore shop where items were sold for minimal

147 prices. He noted the category generated \$4 per ton in revenue the prior year, attributable to the  
148 clean-fill program. He noted there was \$125K in net revenue for this service category.

149  
150 Mr. Mawyer stated there were 2,456 tons of recycled products processed, for a \$342 per ton net cost  
151 deficit to the Authority. He stated when all the tonnages and costs were added together, the net per-  
152 ton cost deficit to the Authority was about \$19.

153  
154 Mr. Gaffney asked if another comparative study of rates of neighboring facilities had been  
155 performed to determine if the Authority's rates were comparable.

156  
157 Mr. McKalips responded that they did a study in April 2022. He stated they were right in line with  
158 comparable districts.

159  
160 Mr. Mawyer stated they would review the information about the comparability of rates as they  
161 underwent the budget process for FY 24. He noted rates had not risen since 2019 when the transfer  
162 station was opened and fees were reduced from \$66 to \$52 per ton.

163  
164 Mr. Richardson mentioned the baling machine had been ordered. He asked if there was an  
165 indication as to when it would be delivered.

166  
167 Mr. Mawyer stated they were told the baler would be delivered in November. He noted there were  
168 supply chain issues, so they did not have confidence it would be delivered in November.

169  
170 Mr. Richardson asked if the current baler was ready to retire.

171  
172 Mr. Mawyer stated it was. He stated it was more than 20 years old and had reached the end of its  
173 service life. He stated they wanted to delay purchasing a new baling machine until the new baling  
174 facility was built, but because the machine had broken down several times in the spring, they had to  
175 order a new one.

176  
177 Mr. Andrews clarified the new baler would replace the old one in the same location on Meade  
178 Avenue.

179  
180 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct.

181  
182 Mr. Andrews asked where the new facility was planned.

183  
184 Mr. Mawyer stated it was planned to be at Ivy MUC. He stated they planned to have two baling  
185 machines at the new facility: a new one to be purchased for the facility, and the one currently on  
186 order would be relocated to the new baling facility.

187  
188 Mr. Mawyer explained that there was a summary of the Authority's recycling programs. He stated  
189 in FY 2022, they managed 1,635 tons of fiber products—newspaper, magazines, cardboard, mixed  
190 paper, phone books, and file stock—and 821 tons of plastic, metal cans, and glass, totaling 2,456  
191 tons processed and recycled in FY 2022. He stated the numbers were similar to FY 2021. He stated  
192 there was a 10% increase from FY 2020 to 2021, and there was a significant increase from FY 2018  
193 to FY 2021.

194  
195 Mr. Mawyer noted the recycling program was growing, and they were trying to maintain the  
196 facilities in reasonable condition while keeping costs as low as possible.

197  
198 Mr. Mawyer provided the report for July 2022, the first of FY 23. He stated there were 4,170 tons  
199 from the clean-fill mulch operation, and there was a net revenue of nearly \$15 per ton. He stated the  
200 transfer station performed similarly to the prior year, and there was a net cost deficit of about \$17  
201 per ton. He stated recycling was at a net cost of about \$371 per ton. He stated the report was updated  
202 every month to show a running total through the months of the fiscal year.  
203

204 Mr. Richardson clarified that in two years, the Southern Site would be online.  
205

206 Mr. Mawyer responded the Southern Site would be online in two months, and the new Baling  
207 Facility was planned to be completed in two years.  
208

209 Mr. Richardson noted a new baling machine was to be delivered to the Paper Sort facility. He asked  
210 what residents' options for recycling were and where they should go.  
211

212 Mr. Mawyer explained there would be three recycling centers; the Southern Center in Esmont,  
213 McIntire, and Ivy, and any of the three would be available when the Southern Center was  
214 completed. He stated the recycled products from all of the locations would be trucked to Meade  
215 Avenue to the Paper Sort facility where they would be processed through a baling machine and put  
216 in shipping containers. They would then be delivered to various locations—Lynchburg, North  
217 Carolina, or wherever the market was for the products.  
218

219 Mr. Pinkston confirmed the current baler at Meade was dying, so it was being replaced.  
220

221 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct.  
222

223 Mr. Pinkston clarified that another baler would be resourced for Ivy MUC.  
224

225 Mr. Mawyer stated they planned to have a second baler when the new facility was built.  
226

227 Mr. Pinkston confirmed there would be a net of two balers.  
228

229 Mr. Mawyer reiterated they would take the new baler from Meade Avenue and relocate it to Ivy  
230 when the new Baling facility was completed. He explained that the Authority was a leaseholder at  
231 Meade Avenue so once they built the new facility in Ivy, they would move baling operations to Ivy.  
232

233 Mr. Pinkston clarified that the Meade Avenue location would be shut down.  
234

235 Mr. Mawyer confirmed it would. He stated as soon as the new Baling facility was built, they would  
236 no longer need the Meade Avenue facility and they would move the baling machine to Ivy.  
237

238 Mr. Stewart clarified information about the Paper Sort facility. He stated that there were two studies,  
239 and one would shortly wrap up. He stated the studies were about the size, potential locations, and  
240 cost of the facility.  
241

242 Mr. Stewart stated a couple of different options for site location had been considered. He stated Ivy  
243 appeared to be the most cost-effective, and it was owned and controlled by the Authority. He stated  
244 the project had not yet been funded, and it was up to the Board of Supervisors and City Council to  
245 determine the allocation of funds. He stated it was not certain the Paper Sort facility would be  
246 replaced by a new baling facility in Ivy.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would begin discussions with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Smalls the following month regarding the budget for the next year, including an allocation of costs for the new Baling facility.

Mr. Gaffney asked what the schedule was.

Mr. Mawyer stated when the project is funded, the first step would be to complete the design. He stated the goal was to finish the design in FY 24, start construction in FY 25, and complete the construction in FY 26.

**Mr. Pinkston motioned to approve the Staff Report on Finance. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion which passed unanimously (7-0).**

*b. Presentation and Vote on Approval: Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling*

Mr. Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste, stated he wanted to explain the ideas in the memo that was delivered at each meeting. He stated he would summarize the scale crossing data—raw data about how many people came into the facilities and how much material they brought.

Mr. McKalips stated they had a vehicle count and a list of the general materials people brought in. He stated the other goal was to highlight information on other programs the Board supported financially and other items that may be interesting, such as trends related to solid waste in the community.

Mr. McKalips reported that since the transfer station had been built, the tipping fee lowered, and hours expanded to include Monday operations, they had been trying to provide average daily tonnage information to the Board. He stated they had generated enough additional traffic to the transfer station to justify the expenditures and increase revenues. He stated they included the item to show they were meeting the revenue goals and that they were providing more support for the community.

Mr. McKalips noted the pilot large clean-fill program that started in February 2022. He stated the project had been successful. He stated they had always operated a clean-fill operation where they charged \$10 a ton for clean-fill. He stated they had been approached by local businesses for ways to support the larger projects, such as the 30K ton projects.

Mr. McKalips stated a pilot was begun in February that ran through June, and Faulconer Construction ran the pilot. He stated the company had signed up twice more and intended to sign up again unless another company wanted to run the program.

Mr. McKalips stated they were at 107K tons to date of collected clean fill. He stated they were currently using an old landfill cell that had never been filled. He stated they were beginning to consider where to move once the area has been filled.

Mr. McKalips stated they provided daily paint collection services. He stated they ran household hazardous waste disposal days twice a year, along with e-waste days, and they hosted days to dispose of furniture, appliances, and tires. He noted there used to be traffic jams at Ivy, so they

made paint collection a daily process, and it had been that way since 2016. He stated resultingly, the household hazardous waste days were more manageable.

Mr. McKalips stated they were processing compostable food waste at Ivy and McIntire. He stated they used to source compost sold at Ivy from McGill, and there was an expensive associated haul charge from Waverly, VA. He stated Panorama Paydirt had been taking the compostable food waste, so that was where it was currently sourced.

Mr. McKalips stated they brought in more and more vegetative material to Ivy each year. He mentioned the issue of the spotted lanternfly, an invasive species from Southeast Asia that began spreading in Pennsylvania and was causing damage to wineries, hops, and fruit trees. He stated in early summer or late spring, the County was put under quarantine for moving agricultural products in and out of the County.

Mr. McKalips noted Ivy was the disposal center for several agricultural products—vegetation and yard waste. He stated they considered whether it would be helpful to have a surveillance spot at Ivy for the spotted lanternfly. He stated they recently started monitoring, and they had not identified any of the spotted lanternflies.

Mr. Andrews stated he wanted to know how the traffic situation was improving.

Mr. McKalips stated traffic was busy. He stated the daily traffic count had increased. He stated there were about 350 normal transfer station customers, about 150 vegetation customers, and about 150 truck trips from Faulconer Construction. He noted a scale had recently broken down, and so it made busy days even worse. He stated in response to the broken scale, they told Faulconer Construction to stop clean fill deliveries to decrease the traffic.

Mr. McKalips stated it would be worth studying ways to improve and aid traffic control around Ivy if they wanted to continue to provide the same level of service. He suggested a turn lane. He stated the site was established when the facility was processing 20 to 30 tons per day. He stated the prior week, 25 trucks queued before the scales opened.

Mr. Mawyer stated with the potential baling facility and the success of the clean fill program, they were going to complete a review of the entire site. He stated internal traffic along with the entrance and external traffic would be reviewed. He stated they would present the information to the Board when it was completed.

Mr. Smalls asked if the Department of Agriculture had reached out to the County or if the County reached out to the Department of Agriculture concerning the lanternfly.

Mr. McKalips explained that he had reached out to the Department of Agriculture. He stated the County was in the midst of grinding 4,000 tons of vegetation, and there was a buyer south of Lynchburg willing to take trailer loads. He stated he reached out to confirm whether transporting the mulch would violate the quarantine, and while they responded it would not, it did start the dialogue.

Mr. McKalips stated it was a strategic plan goal to coordinate better with external agencies. He noted the pesticide event hosted by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Gaffney asked if Faulconer Construction was the only company providing large clean-fill services.

Mr. McKalips confirmed Faulconer Construction was the only company to sign up. He stated the program had been tweaked from the initial pilot. He stated they aimed for a 90-day project completion window, but it was negotiable. He stated because the contractor authorized to bring the fill was doing all of the grading and stormwater controls, it did not seem viable to have multiple contractors participate concurrently. He stated they intended to only have one contractor at a time.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the Authority saved money by partnering with Panorama on compost.

Mr. McKalips stated they saved a lot of money. He stated they were able to do the trucking. He stated they paid \$24 per ton for compost for Panorama versus paying about \$50 per ton for the compost from McGill.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they could expect a change to the tipping fees in FY 24.

Mr. McKalips stated to change the tipping fees, they would have to start with the County because the Board of Supervisors had to request the tipping fees be changed.

**Mr. Rogers moved to approve the Staff Report on the Ivy MUC. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion which was carried unanimously (7-0).**

*(Recess RSWA in a JOINT SESSION with the RWSA)*

**At 2:37 p.m., Mr. Stewart moved to recess the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

**At 3:31 p.m., Mr. Gaffney reconvened the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority.**

*c. Presentation and Work Session: 2023-2028 Strategic Plan Update*

Mr. Gaffney called the RSWA back into session.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. Thomas would be presenting the review of the final update on the strategic plan's progress before working with staff to finalize the plan to be implemented in January.

Mr. Thomas explained that he would give both Boards an update on the progress of the strategic plan. He stated he would talk about the mission and values as well as the goals, which in this plan were called priorities, then a high-level overview of strategies and measures. He stated that the Board members had draft strategic plans, and the design and feel were similar without significant departure from the previous, but there were some changes. He noted that on June 9, they met with the leadership team who provide staff-level make decision-making for the strategic plan.

Mr. Thomas explained that they then engaged with stakeholders, which included the RWSA and RSWA, and held an online survey. He stated that all input from stakeholders was then compiled into digestible information that could be consumed in a workshop setting. He noted that they

took time to define success and came back prepared to engage with the core planning team to create strategies and measures to advance specific goals. He stated the goal was to complete the strategic plan before the end of the year and then be in a position for the plan to be implemented in 2023.

Mr. Thomas stated the vision of the project referred to where they were going and required working with staff. He stated the vision had not changed much and only had changes in phrasing, 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 by integrity, respect, teamwork, and quality.

Mr. Thomas stated that the last strategic plan had six goals, and in the new strategic plan, there were only five. He stated the specificity in the last strategic plan goal about solid waste services specifically had been removed because everything they were trying to accomplish in solid waste from an environmental services standpoint was similar at the strategy level to what they were attempting to accomplish at the water and wastewater side of the business. He stated the five priority areas were presented with statements of success.

Mr. Thomas stated there may be slight adjustments to how success was defined for the five priority areas, and each one was representative of some of the goals of the last strategic plan. He stated none of these things happen in a vacuum and were not mutually exclusive, so they tried to make it apparent that progress with one area would allow progress in another because they were connected.

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

Mr. Thomas stated that optimization and resiliency had strategies for efficiency, development of standard work practices, knowledge capture acknowledgment, and ensuring the organization was doing everything it could to be sustainable. He stated the final priority was planning and infrastructure. He stated this organization delivered large infrastructure, which required good planning. He stated that inside these strategies were effective asset management principles, nimbleness when delivering capital projects in changing conditions, and recognition and focus of the current situation while being proactive for the future.

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

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

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

446  
447 Mr. Thomas responded that they could. He stated that at the strategy level, this was a good place  
448 to think about the top-line outcome measures, but other measurements happened in  
449 organizations, so this should not represent the entirety of organizational KPIs, but really was how  
450 they were doing at the highest level strategically to achieve the success they sought.

451  
452 Mr. Pinkston asked if the last plan included similar measures.

453  
454 Mr. Thomas replied that it did, and the Director periodically reported on that information to the  
455 Board. He noted that there would be some same measures as well as some new ones.

456  
457 Mr. Rogers stated that it was important to set goals, so they knew how to get there. He  
458 understood the broad statement, but they wanted to measure how they were progressing,  
459 particularly with climate change, as there was a level of accountability, they should feel about  
460 how they were progressing with the climate change goals they set.

461  
462 Mr. Thomas stated they had a designed document with a recommended design that was near-  
463 final, pending any additional Board input. He stated that it was not a radical departure from the  
464 design they used the last time. He stated that the next steps were to complete and finalize the  
465 strategic plan by the end of the year and pivot to active implementation. He stated that he  
466 assumed Mr. Mawyer would present that as he had been doing against the progress of  
467 implementation and performance of implementation against the KPIs.

468  
469 Mr. Stewart stated that he was supportive of this. He stated that one of the priorities was  
470 communication and collaboration, and collaboration among partners in the room was key, but  
471 there were no measures listed regarding collaboration. He asked if there was a reason for this.

472  
473 Mr. Thomas stated that sometimes measuring outside collaboration was tricky. He stated that  
474 some measures included community service hours completed by employees, number of outreach  
475 events, and how many members of the public attended meetings. He commented that the  
476 measures were a good starting point, but there may be more powerful ways to measure in the  
477 future that they had yet to identify.

478  
479 Mr. Stewart stated collaboration between organizations was difficult to measure, but there were  
480 also no strategies specific to that that he could find listed.

481  
482 Mr. Pinkston stated it was quasi-internal collaboration if it was among various organizations.

483  
484 Mr. Mawyer stated his performance goals included detailed specifics and metrics; however, more  
485 could be added to the strategic plan.

486  
487 Mr. Andrews stated there were four bullets under strategies on page 11 for environmental  
488 stewardship, but only three were reflected on page 13.

489  
490 Mr. Thomas stated that would be fixed.

491  
492 Ms. Mallek stated related to public-facing success, returning paint cans at the new transfer  
493 station was a great change from when she had last done so. She stated it was very managed and  
494 professional.

Mr. Pinkston asked about the phrasing of “led” or “lead” on page 8.

Mr. Thomas stated they would correct it.

Mr. Gaffney stated some photographs had descriptions and others did not.

Mr. Pinkston asked about the asset management program.

Mr. Mawyer stated they were in the process of getting the program underway, and CityWorks was the new program.

Mr. Thomas stated he lived in North Carolina and did not benefit from this organization, but he had worked with many organizations across the country and could say this was a high-functioning and well-led utility organization.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any other comments or questions.

Mr. Pinkston asked Mr. Mawyer if these were strategies that he and his leadership team wanted to focus on.

Mr. Mawyer stated yes. He stated they worked fairly exclusively on those strategies and measures.

Mr. Rogers stated he liked the framework, the approach, and the efficiency with which they put the strategic plan together.

Mr. Pinkston asked if there was any action to be taken on this now.

Mr. Mawyer stated the Board could take action to approve the draft unless they wanted to bring back a final version.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they would bring back a final version.

Mr. Mawyer stated they could bring it back for approval in November.

#### ***10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA***

There were none.


#### ***11. CLOSED MEETING***

There was no closed meeting.

#### ***12. ADJOURNMENT***

**At 3:57 p.m., Mr. Andrews moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Stewart seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

544 Respectfully submitted,  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550



---

Mr. Michael Rogers  
Secretary - Treasurer