



**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**July 26, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, July 26, 2022, at 2:00 p.m. via Zoom.

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

**Board Members Absent:** None

**Rivanna Staff Present:** Bill Mawyer, Lonnie Wood, David Tungate, Jennifer Whitaker, John Hull, Jeff Southworth, and Deborah Anama.

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Gaffney convened the July 26, 2022 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority at 2:00 p.m.

**2. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR**

Mr. Gaffney read the following statement aloud:

“This is Mike Gaffney, Chair of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. I would like to call the July 26, 2022 meeting of the Board of Directors to order.

“Notwithstanding any provision in our Bylaws to the contrary, as permitted under the City of Charlottesville’s Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted on March 7, 2022, Ordinance number 0-22-029, Albemarle County’s Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020, and revised effective November 4, 2020, Ordinance number 20-A16 and Chapter 1283 of the 2020 Acts of the Virginia Assembly effective April 24, 2020, we are holding this meeting by real time electronic means with no Board member physically present at a single, central location.

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

Mr. Gaffney called the roll.

Mr. James H. Andrews stated he was located at 46 Guestwick Road in Sorrento, Maine.

48  
49 Mr. Brian Pinkston stated he was located at 575 Alderman Road in Charlottesville, VA.

50  
51 Mr. Jeff Richardson stated he was located at 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA (County  
52 Office Building).

53  
54 Mr. Michael Rogers stated he was located at 605 E. Main Street, Charlottesville, VA  
55 (Charlottesville City Hall).

56  
57 Mr. Stacey Smalls stated he was located at the Public Works Administrative Building at 305 4<sup>th</sup> Ave  
58 SW, Charlottesville, VA.

59  
60 Mr. Lance Stewart stated he was located at 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA (County Office  
61 Building).

62  
63 Mr. Mike Gaffney stated he was located in Quebec, Canada.

64  
65 Mr. Gaffney stated the following Authority staff members and consultants were joining the meeting  
66 electronically: Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, Lonnie Wood, David Tungate, Jennifer Whitaker, John  
67 Hull, Jeff Southworth, Deborah Anama, Catherine Carter, and Darin Thomas.

68  
69 Mr. Gaffney stated they were also joined electronically by Carrie Stanton (Williams Mullen),  
70 Counsel to the Authority.

71  
72 **3. AGENDA APPROVAL**

73 Mr. Gaffney asked if there was a motion to approve the agenda.

74  
75 **Mr. Rogers moved that the Board approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded**  
76 **by Mr. Andrews and passed unanimously (7-0).**

77  
78 **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING**

79 *a. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on May 24, 2022*

80  
81 Mr. Gaffney asked if there was any discussion on the minutes. Hearing none, he asked if there was a  
82 motion to approve the minutes.

83  
84 **Mr. Andrews moved that the Board approve the minutes of the May 24, 2022 regular meeting**  
85 **of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rogers and passed unanimously (7-0).**

86  
87 **5. RECOGNITIONS**

88 There were no recognitions presented.

89  
90 **6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

91 Mr. Mawyer recognized Finance Director Lonnie Wood and Senior Accountant Kathy Ware and  
92 their staff. He stated they had received the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) of  
93 the United States and Canada Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting  
94 Program to the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority for their comprehensive financial report from June  
95 30, 2021. He congratulated Mr. Wood, Ms. Ware, and their group for receiving this award. He  
96 stated they had received this award for at least 25 years so it was a great tribute to continue the  
97 tradition.

Mr. Mawyer noted that June was National Safety Month, and that was emphasized with the staff and public as was possible at their recycling facilities and the Ivy Transfer Station. He stated this was because it was brought to their attention that in Spotsylvania County, one of their employees was killed in a recycling compactor. He showed an image of the compactor at the McIntire Center. He stated the portion of the container on the far right was where all the cardboard went, and the shorter section in the middle was the plunger that pushed in and compacted the recyclable cardboard. He stated that an employee was unfortunately inside the container and killed.

Mr. Mawyer stated there were signs on the local containers to warn people not to get into the compactor for any reason; it was actually an official confined space, so employees were not allowed to go into any confined space. He stated further, they had lock-out, tag-out procedures when maintenance may have to work on this machine so that no one could turn on the compactor and crush them. He stated what happened in Spotsylvania was that the equipment was not locked out and someone turned it on while the employee was inside. He stated it was very tragic. He stated safety was an important part of their program and they worked hard to keep staff and the public safe.

Mr. Mawyer stated lastly, in accordance with their understanding of the local emergency ordinances, they would return to in-person Board of Directors meetings starting in September. He stated they would convene in the Moores Creek Administration Building in the second-floor conference room on September 27.

Mr. Mawyer stated February of 2020 was their last in-person Board meeting, so they looked forward to having the members return to Moores Creek.

## **7. 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 asked Mr. Hull if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak.

Mr. Hull stated there were no members of the public who wished to speak at this time.

Mr. Gaffney closed the Items from the public.

## **8. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT**

As there were no Items from the public, there were no responses.

## **9. CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. *Staff Report on Finance*
- b. *Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update*
- c. *Amendment of the 2022-2023 Capital Budget*

**Mr. Rogers moved that the Board approve the Consent Agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Andrews and passed unanimously (7-0).**

## **10. OTHER BUSINESS**

*(Motion and Vote to Recess the RSWA Board Meeting)*

At 2:11 p.m., Mr. Rogers moved to recess the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

*(Reconvene RSWA in a Joint Session with the RWSA)*

At 2:28 p.m., Mr. Gaffney reconvened the RSWA Board of Directors meeting and called the joint meeting with the RWSA Board of Directors to order.

*a. Presentation: Physical and Cyber Security Update*

Ms. Whitaker stated she was presenting today with Jeff Southworth from their IT management group. She stated they would be providing an update to the Board on the physical and cyber security program. She stated that infrastructure security had been a longstanding concern for the water and wastewater industry, in part because water and wastewater had historically been fundamental to the security and health of a community.

Ms. Whitaker stated that shortly after the 9/11 tragedy there were significant regulations that looked at the best practices to assess risk to critical infrastructure. She stated there were 16 federally recognized critical infrastructure sectors, and of those 16, three applied to Rivanna Water and Sewer and Solid Waste Authorities. She stated that included the dam sector, the water and wastewater sector, as well as the government facilities sector. She stated more recently, the American Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 mandated that utilities develop and routinely update risk assessments and emergency response plans.

Ms. Whitaker stated the physical security program is used in combination with other mitigative measures to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience within the Authority. She stated their key programs included door hardening and replacement. She stated many of their facilities were a bit older, so the doors themselves had physically deteriorated. She stated it could be seen on the right side of the slide that they had put in new and more modern doors with locking hardware and more intrusion-resistant facilities.

Ms. Whitaker stated they had looked at lock strengthening, key inventory, and gating and fencing improvements at all the facilities, as seen with the new front gate to the Observatory Water Treatment Plant. She stated they were looking at cameras and lighting; the camera system that had been set up and many cameras had been added over the last few months in an effort to get a sight on all critical infrastructure and ingress and egress out of their facilities.

Ms. Whitaker stated they had also done a tremendous amount of lighting work at Moores Creek and other facilities, both security lighting as well as employee safety lighting. She stated that the program also included landscaping and housekeeping, such as clearing fence lines to keep a good line of sight. She stated last on the list was access control and badging, which was what they likely thought of when discussing physical security. She stated funding for this program came from many different places.

Ms. Whitaker stated that security was included in both specific independent Capital Improvement Projects, as well as other capital projects and more general projects, such as the water treatment plants getting upgraded doors and badging systems. She stated they had routine maintenance activities where they hired out vendors, and they also had specialized tasks that in-house maintenance staff did as well. She stated they were currently seeking funding from Homeland Security for the Moores Creek entrance gate project, which she would discuss more in a moment.

198  
199 Ms. Whitaker stated access control referred to door locks, badging, and cameras that allowed  
200 people to enter and exit buildings in a controlled fashion. She stated they hired a company called  
201 Security 101, who had been their consultant for about two years now. She stated they helped  
202 them select a system based on their needs. She stated they helped with software installation,  
203 training, and support, as well as hardware design and installation, and they had been working  
204 their way from the larger facilities to the smaller facilities.

205  
206 Ms. Whitaker stated they were getting close to having enhanced access control at all Rivanna  
207 facilities. She stated they also had an ongoing maintenance contract with Security 101, so they  
208 were able to call them if a component or piece of equipment stopped working and they could  
209 come out and repair it for them. She stated for instance, they occasionally had trucks hit their  
210 gate access control devices and they were able to get them out relatively quickly and repair  
211 those.

212  
213 Ms. Whitaker stated that the key thing about the access control system was that they were able to  
214 get RFID badges for employees, vendors, and contractors, so they had been able to keep better  
215 control of who was exiting and entering facilities and their location permissions. She stated they  
216 were able to designate permissions by department, time of day, facility, and position of the  
217 person. She stated this allows them to prove their identification of employees, as well as vendors,  
218 visitors, and licensed contractors. She stated it also gave them intrusion notifications and open-  
219 door notifications, so if a door was propped open or broken, they were able to see that.

220  
221 Ms. Whitaker stated they were more easily able to mitigate lost keys and lost badges; they were  
222 able to turn them on and off quickly. She stated they were investigating an electronic padlock  
223 system which they would be able to remotely control through smart phone devices.

224  
225 Ms. Whitaker stated the other capital project she wanted to discuss was at Moores Creek  
226 Advanced Water Resource Recovery Facility. She stated in September, they would all get the  
227 opportunity to see the gate firsthand. She stated displayed on the screen was a map of the Moores  
228 Creek facility entrance, which is off Franklin Street in the City, and the red arrow indicated  
229 Moores Creek Lane. She stated the orange bar was their current front gate, which was the  
230 entrance to the main entrance and exit to the entire 80-acre facility. She stated anyone that had  
231 business at the facility—whether it be an employee, a vendor, contractor, the mailman, parks,  
232 delivery—everyone passes through this main gate.

233  
234 Ms. Whitaker stated while it gave a single point of control, it came with a downside. If the gate  
235 was open like it is during the day to allow the public to enter, everyone had access to the entire  
236 facility, and then at night it was locked and no one had access to the facility. She stated they  
237 were going to get a little more nuanced about how they secured the facility.

238  
239 Ms. Whitaker showed the same graphic along with photographs of the entrance to Moores Creek  
240 Lane. She stated the picture at the bottom was looking back towards Franklin Street and coming  
241 down the lane was how one entered the facility. She stated the front entrance sign was located at  
242 the first island. She stated one could either make an entrance into the septage receiving area  
243 where they received septage trucks, usually from the County, and those came in day and night,  
244 so having access to this facility in both the day and night was important. She stated if not  
245 entering the septage receiving area, drivers could enter this main road, which was shown in the  
246 third picture.

Ms. Whitaker stated once making it past the first island, there was a choice of turning back into septage receiving, turn and go to the north side of the plant, which would take one under the bridge at Moore's Creek and to the north side of the facility, or continuing straight across the top of the bridge and to the south side of the plant. She stated there were a lot of turning movements at the front end of this facility and a lot of conflicting uses. She stated because of the geometry, there also was the main pump station, septage receiving area, duty pump station, which was an office facility as well as a functional part of the process, and some maintenance activities, all coming in and intermixing at this location as well as at least three road splits. She stated they had to get creative in their thought process about securing this front facility.

Ms. Whitaker stated shown on the slide were four red arrows, one coming into the main plant and main gate, which when opened, they would have badge-controlled access to the gate, which would allow employees to have access after hours, or anyone who had authorized access would be able to come in after hours through that main gate. She stated normally, during the day that main gate would be left open. She stated septage haulers would be able to pull into the septage receiving facility and employees would be able to continue straight down the road, and with their badge system, access through the gate to either the north or south side of the plant through the north and south gates.

Ms. Whitaker stated visitors would have a visitor lane that would allow people without badge access to pull over into the stippled area. She stated they would be able to go through a camera and access the administrative staff who can buzz them in or provide escorted access to the facility. She stated in addition, they would be installing gates that went down to the creek and fencing to create a holding area at the front of the plant, where people who needed to access septage receiving would be able to do so, but visitors could be greeted. She stated it would greatly reduce the public interaction with their wastewater process, which they felt was necessary. She stated it would integrate with their access control and camera system, so the staff had easy access in and out of the gates without too much slow-down.

Ms. Whitaker stated again, it would allow them to continue to operate septage receiving during normal hours as well as after hours, and it would dramatically improve their visitor check-in process. She stated this project of the Moores Creek gate, doors, and access control were all in their current capital plan and estimated at about \$2.8 million. She asked if there were any questions on the security program.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any questions for Ms. Whitaker.

Mr. Southworth stated cybersecurity was the practice of defending computers, servers, mobile devices, electronic systems, networks, and data from malicious attacks. He stated common cyberattacks included computer viruses, malware, phishing emails, social engineering to obtain passwords from users, impersonation, which was pretending to be someone in order to gain information or task performed, and intercepting communications. He continued that there were two different sources for guidance, one being the Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), which was part of the Department of Homeland Security, setting security standards and giving guidance and threat alerts. He stated the other was AWWA guidance tool, which closely aligned with CISA and was used in security assessments.

Mr. Southworth stated for what they needed to protect and why, they needed to understand the risks in both technology and physical security and know that 90% of successful cyberattacks were caused by human error, such as clicking a link, answering questions, or allowing someone

inside the network. He stated that third-party vendors could damage the network as well. He stated how the evaluated options and prioritized solutions helped the Authority allocate the resources they needed to secure the network. He stated based on the risk assessments, they were developing a cybersecurity plan and protocols. He stated the Rivanna IT team was the leader for cybersecurity within the organization, but it encompassed all the employees as well as the top management.

Mr. Southworth explained that the CISA Security Assessment looked at the categories of: IT risk assessment; IT asset management; supply chain risk management; identity management, i.e., authentication and access control; awareness and training; data security; IT response planning; and disaster recovery planning.

Mr. Southworth stated for the CISA Security Assessment completed by the outside contractor, they used network mapping tools, the Security Event and Information Management (SEIM) tool, and a vulnerability scan tool. He stated there was a network assessment and a penetration vulnerability testing completed by outside contractors. He provided AWWA recommendations on a slide. He noted one of the recommendations was to implement network segmentation by firewalls. He stated that had been completed. He stated the administrative network was separated from the operational network, so if one network was breached, it did not affect the other. He stated the administrative network was more vulnerable than the operational network.

Mr. Southworth stated they began using strong passwords and had changed the default passwords. He stated they were reviewing other access controls. He stated they had a strong password policy in place. He stated they were evaluating using more multi-factor authentication (MFA) methods. He noted a recommendation was to implement an employee cybersecurity training program. He stated it would be an ongoing training with staff.

Mr. Southworth stated they had adopted a defense-in-depth approach with five different categories—application and data security; host security; network security; physical security; and policies and procedures. He stated a 90-day password expiration policy and strong password requirements were implemented. He stated the password requirements were over eight characters, to include special characters, uppercase and lowercase characters, and at least one numeric character.

Mr. Southworth stated they were cleaning up the Microsoft Active Directory. He stated there were stale items that had been identified. He stated they were using UltraBac Software for file and folder backups. He stated those backups were taken offsite. He stated they used a Barracuda Microsoft Office 365 backup. He stated the organization used Microsoft Exchange, OneDrive, Teams, and SharePoint. He stated there were backups in place for any instance the cloud may be breached.

Mr. Southworth stated they were working on the monthly patching for the servers and computers. He stated they used Sophos Antivirus on the servers, computers, and phones. He stated there was a mobile-device-management (MDM) process for cellphones and laptops. He stated in regard to network security, they were creating a geo-fence to examine the trouble spots. He stated they installed a firewall to protect the network. He stated on a daily basis, there was anywhere from 20,000 to 25,000 access attempts. He stated there was router antivirus software.

Mr. Southworth stated there were IPSEC tunnels between the internal routes, so there were virtual, private connections to those networks. He stated those protections were still being

strengthened. He stated they were constantly monitoring the network to ensure there had been no breaches.

Mr. Southworth stated in regard to physical security, they had implemented a building access badging system. He stated he agreed that they needed more video cameras. He stated they were using email phishing campaign training. He stated they used the KnowBe4 service, and it had been successful. He stated it was rolled out in the past six months, and the staff response had been good.

Mr. Southworth stated they had updated IT policies. He stated they implemented non-disclosure agreements with their IT vendors as well as SCADA vendors coming into the organization. He stated there was a bring-your-own-device (BYOD) policy being developed. He provided an overview of the threat modeling. He stated in terms of geofencing, they were keeping a tight rein on the areas. He stated they were receiving spam mail from all over the world.

Mr. Southworth stated the cybersecurity program was a continuous process of assessing, testing, and implementing the changes to defend against the latest threats. He stated the IT team was committed to leading and fostering a cybersecurity culture with the employees, and providing a security ecosystem that included technology, user training, and leadership awareness.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were questions or comments.

Ms. Mallek noted the non-disclosure agreement (NDA) for contractors. She asked if the contractors had to provide employee clearance and verification.

Mr. Southworth stated they worked with different, specific companies. He stated they vetted the process before the vendors connected to the internal network. He stated they were also shadowed by the IT department, so they were aware of everything the vendors did on the network. He stated it was also logged.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was a written record of the actions taken, like a keystroke log.

Mr. Southworth stated there was always caution exercised towards outside vendors. He stated they did not have keystroke loggers. He stated they had logs in place for what changes were made to the SCADA system and the internal network. He stated they fully vetted all of the contracted companies before they came into contact with the Authority's network.

Mr. Pinkston asked if the amount of access requests and spam was typical for a utility.

Mr. Southworth stated yes. He stated from his previous experience, cyberattacks could be done remotely and automatically. He stated there were programs that constantly sent out spam requests. He stated the spam was not exclusive to utility organizations. He stated it was typical. He stated the amount of spam depended on how visible and disseminated the organization's email addresses were. He stated Mr. Mawyer, Mr. Wood, and Ms. Nemeth were more vulnerable due to their public exposure. He stated they received nearly 3,000 spam emails a day.

Mr. Pinkston stated he presumed all of the steps taken were also mitigating the risk of a ransomware attack.

Mr. Southworth stated that was correct. He stated he had not mentioned ransomware. He stated



there were backups located offsite, so there was an airgap. He stated the cloud services were also backed up to a third party in two different locations.

Mr. Pinkston asked if the SCADA system was provided by a proprietary vendor or if it was home-grown.

Mr. Southworth stated SCADA was the process that the program logic controllers (PLCs) ran in the devices out in the treatment plants, such as the motors to open the gates or the controls for the chemical treatment of the water. He stated the SCADA programmed monitored the PLCs and the treatment. He stated it was important to separate the systems so that they were more secure.

Mr. Mawyer stated the system was proprietary.

Mr. Southworth stated they did not write the program. He stated they worked with a couple different vendors, and GE was one of them. He stated all utilities used the SCADA system.

Mr. Mawyer stated he believed the system was a GE system.

Mr. Pinkston asked what SCADA stood for.

Mr. Mawyer explained SCADA stood for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition. He stated the acronym was about monitoring the treatment process through data acquisition and controlling the process through supervisory control in response to the data. He stated it was one of the greatest vulnerabilities for the Authority, that someone would hack into and take control of the SCADA system to potentially impact the treatment process.

Mr. Pinkston noted Mr. Southworth was working hard to protect the system.

Mr. Mawyer stated isolating the system from the administrative network was one of the key components of protecting the SCADA. He stated it was not hooked in with the other internet systems.

Mr. Gaffney noted the Badge system. He asked if they proactively reviewed where the badges went on a regular basis, or if they only reviewed them if an event occurred.

Ms. Whitaker stated there were a variety of ways of examining the problem. She stated they had looked at vendor activity through a facility. She stated they had reviewed individual buildings. She stated she did not know how much random auditing was performed. She stated they had historically looked for specific patterns for different reasons.

Mr. Mawyer stated the badges were programmed to only provide access to the places that employees needed to go. He stated people did not have unlimited access because they had a badge.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were further comments or questions.

Mr. Rogers asked if the camera system was monitored 24/7.

Ms. Whitaker stated operators could view the camera feeds and certain camera feeds were available at their workstations. She stated if the cameras were applicable to the work being done,

then the feed may be available to operators. She stated as an example, the South Rivanna WTP had a camera on the dam, and the operator was able to access that camera feed at all times. She stated they did not have access to the entire network of cameras.

Mr. Roger asked if an alarm system had been installed at key vulnerability points to alert the system to intruders.

Ms. Whitaker stated the systems in place could be set for several different purposes. She stated cameras could be set to provide internal notifications if there was a particularly heightened concern. She stated the issue became what to do with the information once the alarm was triggered. She stated there were intrusion devices at key doors, hatches, and fences that will trigger an alarm alerting that someone entered the facility unauthorized.

Ms. Mallek stated if someone were busy, they could be notified to review the camera feed when there were people where they should not be. She stated she hoped they were programming the cameras to detect those situations so they were not triggered by the motion of the water.

Ms. Whitaker stated occasionally, they also caught a few bears and deer on the camera.

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

Mr. Darin Thomas, Vice-President of Raftelis Financial Consultants Inc, stated Ms. Catherine Carter, Senior Manager of Raftelis Financial Consultants Inc, was also present. He stated the intent of the presentation was to provide the Board with a briefing on where things stood relative to the development and update of the Authority's strategic plan. He stated the organization had a rich history of strategic planning. He stated he and Ms. Carter did this as a living for utility authorities and local governments around the country.

Mr. Thomas stated he lived in Greensboro, North Carolina, and Ms. Carter worked from the headquarters in Charlotte, North Carolina. He stated they were involved with the development of the previous strategic planning document. He stated typically, it was best practice to update the plans on a five-year cycle. He stated the planning had been initiated by the Board. He stated they had requested a readout on where the Authority was going, what its goals were, and the direction of the organization. He stated he would provide an overview of the process and the timeline. He stated stakeholder input had been gathered. He stated it was best practice when drafting a strategic plan to get the input from people who were leading the organization. or a stakeholder in the organizations.

Mr. Thomas stated he would discuss the stakeholder feedback. He stated the Board had items in their packets that provided more details. He stated he would review vision, mission, and values. He stated they did not recommend, nor was the steering committee recommending—composed of Mr. Mawyer, his leadership team, and a few others—significant changes to the vision, mission, and values. He stated they would discuss emerging or proposed areas of focus for the organization—also known as goals, focus areas, or priorities. He stated the presentation would wrap up with next steps.

Mr. Thomas provided a project timeline for the overall project. He stated there were six events. He stated there had been a kickoff meeting—a structured conversation with the core strategic planning team. He stated the team had about 12 people, including Mr. Mawyer, Ms. Whitaker, Mr. Tungate, Mr. Wood and other leaders in the organization. He stated the event was on June 9, and they produced a project charter and defined the stakeholders to consult at the meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated shortly after the June 9 meeting, many members of the Board were interviewed as part of the portfolio of stakeholder engagement. He stated the engagements included structured interviews, online surveys, and others. He stated stakeholder engagement was concluded in July. He stated on July 7, there was a foundation workshop. He stated at the workshop, development of the draft strategic plan was advanced. He stated moving forward, after receiving Board input, they would have another workshop with the core planning team on August 18. He stated it was a strategy workshop where they add more specificity to the strategic plan.

Mr. Thomas stated that in the August and September timeframe, they would start designing and writing a new, updated, five-year strategic plan for the Authority that would be presented to the Board for its input. He stated once they received the Board's input, they would finalize the draft. He stated in September and October, they would transition into implementation.

Mr. Thomas stated Ms. Carter was involved in driving the stakeholder feedback. He stated the Board had two deliverables in the packets, and Ms. Carter would provide a high-level discussion on the contents.

Ms. Carter noted about 76% of the employees in the Authority took the survey. She stated they performed interviews with members of the leadership team and employee focus groups. She stated about 35 people participated across three different focus groups. She stated Board interviews and external stakeholder interviews were conducted as well. She stated they were still working to schedule some of the interviews, but had been in contact with most of the people identified as high-priority stakeholders. She stated the results were captured in the Board's informational packet.

Ms. Carter stated when they performed stakeholder interviews and employee engagement, they often focused on different types of questions. She stated the first question revolved around aspirations—what would make them proud of the organization in five years, and what did they want the Authority to be known for. She stated there were themes common across the responses. She stated key aspirations focused on regional leadership and being the model for other organizations and utilities. She stated there was focus on workforce development and engagement.

Ms. Carter stated other key themes included topic such as updated facilities and infrastructure. She stated people wanted to work in facilities that met their needs, and people wanted the infrastructure to continue to meet the needs of the client population. She stated another topic was streamlined and efficient operations. She stated the workforce was professional, and strides had been taken to make the operational processes more efficient. She stated employees were especially proud of the work done in those areas. She stated it would make them proud if the stakeholders and community had an understanding of the value of the services provided.

Ms. Carter stated they then asked respondents and interviewees about strengths. She stated there was a lot of energy around the professional and knowledgeable workforce. She stated excellent product quality was mentioned. She stated people felt strongly about the leadership and organizational culture. She stated long-term and capital planning was a strength of the organization. She stated stakeholders and others felt the Authority was responsive and reliable. She stated members of the leadership team and the Authority general felt they had sufficient resources to fulfill the organizational missions—financial resources, operational resources, and

548 internal expertise.

549  
550 Ms. Carter stated there was the desire for the Authority to seize the opportunity to increase  
551 regional visibility through engagement in regional conversations. She stated there were  
552 opportunities for external partnerships to help support the Authority goals. She stated an example  
553 may be the relationship with PVCC. She stated in light of the Great Resignation, there was still  
554 the feeling of opportunity around employee recruitment and retention, but continued effort was  
555 needed.

556  
557 Ms. Carter stated there was the feeling they would have the opportunity to expand internal  
558 opportunities. She stated a cohesive, shared vision with RSWA was emphasized. She stated there  
559 were big opportunities and discussions around environmental stewardship. She stated they were  
560 ensuring the operations and activities of the Authority were environmentally friendly. She stated  
561 there was the conversation around increasing the organizations focus on diversity, equity, and  
562 inclusion. She stated it was a common point.

563  
564 Ms. Carter stated they asked questions regarding the critical issues, such as the barriers that  
565 needed to be addressed and the things they needed to ensure they were capturing and responding  
566 to in the strategic plan. She stated there was a real need to address technology upgrades and  
567 cybersecurity needs. She noted the growth of the population of the service area and the future  
568 impacts. She noted supply chain issues - materials that the organization needed to operate - were  
569 less available, more expensive, or both.

570  
571 Ms. Carter stated there was discussion around the lack of community understanding and  
572 awareness of the services the Authority provided. She stated it was a topic that needed to be  
573 addressed for the organization to be successful. She stated there was discussion around service  
574 affordability, capital project financing, and regulatory requirements. She stated a lot was  
575 uncertain, and the uncertainty could be addressed through capital projects. She stated addressing  
576 changing regulations was expensive. She stated there was discussion around staff workload and  
577 capacity. She stated with the turnover and the range of activities at the Authority, people were  
578 moving in many directions.

579  
580 Ms. Carter stated there was the issue of climate change and operational resiliency. She stated the  
581 organization would be forced to adapt to mitigate the impacts of climate change. She stated in  
582 the survey, they asked employees to give a sense of the performance in various areas. She stated  
583 employees were asked to rate performance from "Excellent" to "Poor," and the responses were  
584 given an average numerical score. She stated the same questions were asked in 2017 and in 2022.  
585 She stated in every one of the categories, employees considered performance to have increased  
586 between 2017 and 2022.

587  
588 Ms. Carter stated employees felt performance increased the most in the areas of workforce and  
589 employee/leadership development, and in infrastructure stability. She stated both were focus  
590 areas of the previous strategic plan. She stated there was a bigger awareness of what the  
591 Authority did among the employees and clients. She stated there was deliberate effort to improve  
592 in those areas.

593  
594 Mr. Richardson asked if the improvements related to performance in workforce was related to  
595 the employee perception of the employer's commitment to employee development.

596  
597 Ms. Carter stated for each of the categories, there was a short accompanying statement to provide

598 more context. She stated in the case of workforce, it was focused on employee and leadership  
599 development—the organization’s ability to attract, develop, and retain a highly skilled and  
600 professional workforce. She stated the increase was a reflection of employee’s perception of the  
601 categories and concepts.

602  
603 Mr. Thomas stated the Board could be comforted that the organization appeared to make  
604 progress. He stated it had been five years since his firm last engaged with the Authority. He  
605 stated they were able to feel the improvements throughout the organization. He stated in some  
606 cases, perception was reality. He stated the data reflected the perception of the employees.

607  
608 Mr. Thomas stated they needed to determine a way to deal with the input they received. He  
609 stated it was the job of the consultant to help the core planning team convert the input to decision  
610 making. He stated they had the tendency to rely on the aspiration questions. He stated they  
611 reviewed the aspirational themes against the vision statement. He stated the strengths were used  
612 to inform the mission of the strategic plan.

613  
614 Mr. Thomas provided the current vision of the organization. He stated after the previous  
615 workshop, there was an edit made to the vision statement that smoothed the wording. He stated  
616 there was no significant energy from the core planning team to make a radical change to the  
617 vision statement. He stated they proposed to make a small change to the vision statement. He  
618 read the current vision statement:

619  
620 “To serve the community and be a recognized leader in environmental stewardship by providing  
621 exceptional water and solid waste services.”

622  
623 as compared to the proposed vision statement:

624  
625 “To serve the community as a recognized leader in environmental stewardship by providing  
626 exceptional water and solid waste services.”

627  
628 Mr. Thomas asked if the Board had any reactions or thoughts in response to the changes made to  
629 the vision statement.

630  
631 Ms. Mallek stated either wording was fine. She stated she appreciated seeing the written vision  
632 statement because it showed the provision of services was the priority, and being a recognized  
633 leader was a byproduct of providing services. She stated she was concerned all the energy would  
634 be devoted to being a regional leader, but the change in the vision statement addressed that  
635 concern.

636  
637 Mr. Gaffney noted in the current vision statement, there were two goals, and in the proposed  
638 statement, there was only one. He stated he supported the conciseness.

639  
640 Mr. Thomas read the current mission statement:

641  
642 “Our professional team of knowledgeable and engaged personnel serve the Charlottesville,  
643 Albemarle, and UVA community by providing high quality water treatment, refuse, and  
644 recycling services in a financially and environmentally responsible manner.”

645  
646 and the proposed mission statement:

647

648 “Our knowledgeable and professional team serves the Charlottesville, Albemarle, and UVA  
649 community by providing high-quality water treatment, refuse, and recycling services in a  
650 financially responsible and sustainable manner.”

651  
652 Mr. Thomas stated there was a subtle change in the mission statement. He stated the mission  
653 statement was the purpose of the organization and communicated the reason it existed. He stated  
654 the emphasis of the statement was on a fiscally responsible and sustainable manner at the end.  
655 He stated there was sufficient input from all of the stakeholders about the recognition of  
656 environmental stewardship and sustainability, and the revisions better emphasized those  
657 categories.

658  
659 Mr. Gaffney noted financial stability and responsibility meant the Authority was breaking even.

660  
661 Mr. Thomas stated utilities were expensive to operate.

662  
663 Ms. Mallek stated she was glad the statement did not say “financially feasible,” because there are  
664 things that must be done even though they were expensive.

665  
666 Mr. Thomas stated there were no proposed changes to the values. He stated during the previous  
667 work session, the core planning team thought through what the most deeply held beliefs were  
668 and what it wanted the culture to be. He stated values were used to make decisions when no one  
669 was watching. He stated the values were still representative of the organization’s beliefs.

670  
671 Mr. Thomas stated all of the stakeholder input was used in the foundation workshop. He stated  
672 they would review what they had focused on in the past and consider what needed to be done to  
673 be responsive to some of the opportunities that had been brought up by the stakeholders. He  
674 stated the organization had been focused on advancing workforce development. He stated that  
675 was visible in survey results that had been presented. He stated operational optimization had  
676 been a focus area along with being an efficient organization that used resources wisely. He stated  
677 communication and collaboration served to allow the organization to support its primary  
678 customers.

679  
680 Mr. Thomas stated the organization had a focus on and strategies for communication and  
681 collaboration. He stated they were an environmental company at the core and focused on  
682 environmental stewardship. He stated a lot of feedback was received related to infrastructure  
683 master planning. He stated solid waste services was another topic of focus.

684  
685 Mr. Thomas stated there were proposed or emerging areas of focus. He stated the solid waste  
686 service goal was not as prominent. He stated it had been assumed by the emerging focus areas.  
687 He stated there were six goals in the previous strategic plan. He stated the core planning team  
688 was considering having five goals. He stated those five goals were displayed on the slide. He  
689 stated they recognized that workforce was a focus of the organization. He stated they needed  
690 highly skilled, competent, engaged, and highly performing employees to accomplish the  
691 organizational goals. He stated workforce was about attracting, developing, and retaining an  
692 adequate and competent workforce.

693  
694 Mr. Thomas stated in addition to optimization, the organization needed to be resilient. He stated  
695 the second emerging goal category focused on the notion of organizational optimization and  
696 resiliency. He stated the organization should be efficient, leverage technology, and be able to  
697 know where its risks were and be able to mitigate those risks. He stated the third proposed area

of focus was on planning and infrastructure. He stated the organization, as a utility, must always take a long-term view. He stated the fourth proposed goal area related to communication and collaboration with stakeholders. He stated they did that to elevate the brand and the awareness of the organization.

Mr. Thomas stated the fifth goal of environmental stewardship was about the organization being a strong voice for sustainability, locally and in the region. He stated the message to the Board was that they were proposing five goal areas instead of the former six. He asked for thoughts or reactions from the Board. He asked if there were other priorities that the Board believed should be considered that would not fall under one of the five proposed categories.

Mr. Rogers asked if diversity, equity, and inclusion would fall under the workforce category.

Mr. Thomas stated yes.

Ms. Carter stated they did not put all the information on the slide. She stated at the previous work session, they determined what concepts fell into the five goal categories. She stated diversity, equity, and inclusion was included in the workforce theme and the stakeholder communication and collaboration theme.

Mr. Rogers asked if there would be a work plan within each one the goals to realize the intent.

Mr. Thomas stated that was correct. He stated the next work session would add more specificity and detail to the goals. He stated they would address specific strategies to drive success.

Mr. Rogers stated the five areas were right. He stated he supported the messaging and the intent of the proposed goals.

Ms. Mallek confirmed that the five proposed goals would apply to RWSA and RSWA.

Mr. Thomas stated that was correct.

Ms. Mallek asked when the adjustments for new regulations would be implemented. She stated they had discussed the uncertainty regarding future regulations.

Ms. Carter stated it depended on which regulations. She stated if they were discussing the American Water Infrastructure Act, then it would fall under operational resiliency. She stated some regulations would be addressed through planning and infrastructure, and some planning would fall under environmental stewardship. She stated it would depend on what the content of the regulation was and where they came from. She stated regulations could come from the EPA or be related to the workforce.

Ms. Mallek asked if water quality regulations would be addressed through efficient operations and performing whatever capital investments were required. She stated new water regulations were coming with new testing guidelines.

Mr. Pinkston stated he supported the proposed goals and reflected how he felt about the organization. He stated many people had no concept of what the Authority did. He stated for instance, with the CWL, roughly half the cost was borne by the County. He stated elevating the brand was important.

748  
749 Mr. Smalls asked if climate action would be included under environmental stewardship.

750  
751 Mr. Thomas stated exactly.

752  
753 Mr. Smalls stated it was difficult to have to interpret the goals. He asked if using the Authority's  
754 expertise was included under stakeholder communication.

755  
756 Mr. Thomas stated that would be his reaction, but he would take that input from Mr. Smalls. He  
757 stated these were the conversations needed to sort through the details.

758  
759 Mr. Richardson noted solid waste was not included at all within the five proposed goals. He  
760 stated his assumption was that as staff worked with the consultant and received input, then they  
761 were looking at topics such as waste-stream reduction and performance measurements to take  
762 advantage of recycling technology. He stated they looked to be an Authority in a leadership role  
763 as technology improved. He asked if solid waste and environmental stewardship connected.

764  
765 Mr. Thomas stated he thought it did. He stated Mr. Richardson provided great input because it  
766 was helping them prepare from a strategy development perspective. He stated they would weave  
767 the themes throughout each of the goals.

768  
769 Ms. Hildebrand stated she liked that the "infrastructure and master planning" category had  
770 evolved to "planning and infrastructure." She noted the large projects the Authority had  
771 undertaken. She stated the master planning that had been accomplished would be put into long-  
772 term goals for infrastructure planning.

773  
774 Mr. Thomas stated they had that very same discussion.

775  
776 Mr. Gaffney asked what the next steps were.

777  
778 Mr. Thomas stated the Board's input was appreciated. He stated they would begin to incorporate  
779 the feedback, and it would inform how decisions were made for the next work session. He stated  
780 they would be able to work with the leadership team to define the specificity around each of the  
781 particular focus areas.

782  
783 Mr. Thomas stated the specificity would be in the form of various strategies. He stated they  
784 would ensure they identified key metrics. He stated they would return to the Board in September.  
785 He stated after the September meeting, the goal was to draft a strategic plan by October. He  
786 stated the Board would deliberate on the final draft. He stated the plan was then passed to Mr.  
787 Mawyer to implement. He stated the plan would then guide the organization for the next five  
788 years.

789  
790 Mr. Rogers stated he had been through many strategic planning sessions and processes through  
791 the years. He stated he supported the way the plan was being done.

792  
793 Mr. Stewart stated he was familiar with the current strategic plan. He stated there were more  
794 details to revisit and work through with stakeholders. He asked if there were future plans to gain  
795 input from stakeholders, such as himself, the County representative for RSWA, Mr. Smalls, and  
796 others.

797



Mr. Thomas stated the part of the data collection from stakeholder engagement was complete. He stated there were a few people to touch base with. He stated as some of the strategies began to develop, and if there were key stakeholders impacted by some of the strategies, it was in their purview to reach out and get input from the stakeholders who may participate. He stated they did not have a formal point where they would validate the specificity of the plan to outside stakeholders.

Mr. Mawyer stated it sounded like a good plan. He stated if there were particular items that related, then they could reconnect with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Smalls.

**11. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA**

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were other items from Board members or staff not on the agenda and heard none.

**12. CLOSED MEETING**

**At 3:59 p.m., Mr. Pinkston moved the RSWA to enter into a joint closed session with the RWSA. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

Mr. Gaffney asked if a roll call vote was required to leave the closed session.

Ms. Stanton stated the boards would reconvene in public and take a roll call vote to certify the closed session. She explained that any resolution or motion agreed to in the closed session must be voted on in the public meeting for it to be effective. She stated after the certification vote, there would need to be a motion, a second, and a vote to approve whatever was agreed to in the closed meeting

**At 4:51 p.m., Mr. Smalls moved the RSWA to certify the closed session. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).**


Mr. Gaffney requested both boards make a motion that gave the Executive Director, Mr. Mawyer, a 6% increase in his salary as of July 1, and increase his vacation from 4 weeks to 5 weeks after 5 years of service in keeping with the Rivanna Employees Standard Policy.

**Mr. Rogers made the motion for the RSWA to approve an increase to the Executive Director's salary by 6% and his vacation time to 5 weeks after 5 years of service in keeping with the Rivanna Employees Standard Policy. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).**

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

**At 4:53 p.m., Mr. Smalls moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Rogers seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mr. Michael Rogers  
Secretary - Treasurer