



695 Moores Creek Lane | Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-9016

434.977.2970

434.293.8858

www.rivanna.org

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
September 27, 2022

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, September 27, 2022 at 2:39 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Board Members Absent: None.

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Jennifer Whitaker, David Tungate, Betsy Nemeth, Jeff Southworth, John Hull, Andrea Bowles, Dyon Vega, Scott Schiller, Michelle Simpson, Daniel Campbell, Santino Granato, 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 Water and Sewer Authority at 2:39 p.m.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

There were no comments or questions for the agenda.

Ms. Mallek moved to approve the agenda. Ms. Hildebrand seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING

a. Minutes of Regular Board Meeting on August 23, 2022

There were no comments or questions regarding the minutes of the meeting held on August 23, 2022.

Mr. Rogers moved the Board to approve the minutes from the RWSA Board's August 23, 2022 meeting. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

4. RECOGNITIONS

There were none.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mawyer noted that it had been 30 months since the Board met in person. He asked staff to introduce themselves, including:

47 Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Director of Engineering and Maintenance

49 Mr. Daniel Campbell, Water Department Manager

51 Mr. David Tungate, Director of Operations

53 Ms. Betsy Nemeth, Human Resources Manager

55 Mr. Jeff Southworth, Information Technology Manager

57 Mr. Santino Granato, Senior Civil Engineer

59 Mr. Dyon Vega, Engineer

61 Ms. Andrea Bowles, Water Resources Manager

63 Ms. Michelle Simpson, Senior Civil Engineer

65 Mr. Scott Schiller, Engineering Manager

67
68 Mr. Mawyer noted the emergency exits and restrooms for the building. He stated the meeting
69 was live to the public. The public could view and listen to the meeting, but they could not speak
70 at the meeting.

71
72 Mr. Mawyer explained that the General Assembly recently authorized the Authorities to hold
73 25% of their meetings in a virtual format. He stated they would draft an all-virtual public
74 meeting and remote participation policy for the Board to approve in November. He stated if
75 approved, they would schedule three virtual meetings for the Board next calendar year. He stated
76 a calendar would be presented at the November meeting of all the meetings in the coming
77 calendar year, and they would determine which to designate as virtual.

78
79 Mr. Mawyer reported that Daniel Campbell had provided a presentation at the Water and
80 Wastewater Joint Annual meeting in Virginia Beach. He stated the presentation covered how
81 they switched from a dry to a liquid lime product at the Crozet WTP as part of an optimization
82 strategy. He explained that the liquid product was safer, as the dry product generated dust which
83 could be explosive. He stated there was also an associated yearly savings of \$37K.

84
85 Mr. Mawyer explained that Ms. Betsy Nemeth was helping to sponsor, along with Augusta
86 Health, flu vaccinations at Moores Creek. He stated the ACSA invited the Authority to join them
87 in CPR training at Piedmont Virginia Community College. He noted that joint trainings were
88 now possible; before the pandemic, they always tried to have joint trainings.

89
90 Mr. Mawyer explained that the CodeRED alert system was used to notify staff of emergencies on
91 Rivanna properties.

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

98
99 Mr. Mawyer stated under the strategic plan goal of infrastructure and master planning, work on
100 the Ragged Mountain to South Fork Rivanna pipeline continued. He stated the easement
101 acquisition map had been updated. He noted the areas where easements had been obtained. He
102 noted where they were working on acquiring easements. He noted the section where the pipe had
103 already been installed in 2018 and 2019 adjacent to the Birdwood property. He noted where a
104 section of the pipe would be installed to cross beneath Route 250 once the easement from the
105 UVA Foundation (UVAF) was obtained.

106
107 Mr. Mawyer noted where a pump station would be located on the UVAF property near the
108 Ragged Mountain Reservoir. He stated the station would pump water from the Ragged Mountain
109 Reservoir to Observatory WTP, and to the South Fork Rivanna WTP when needed. He stated
110 they considered the pump station as two projects—one from the South Fork Rivanna WTP to
111 Ragged Mountain, called the Rivanna to Ragged Reservoir Water Line, and one from Ragged
112 Mountain to Observatory. He stated they still needed to acquire easements from the University to
113 get from Fontaine Avenue to the OB WTP.

114
115 Mr. Gaffney asked what the schedules were for each of the projects.

116
117 Mr. Mawyer explained that the Rivanna to Ragged project was currently planned from 2027 to
118 2033, and the Ragged to Observatory project was planned for 2024 to 2026. He stated there may
119 be discussion in the budget and CIP review on whether to accelerate the Rivanna to Ragged
120 pipeline by a couple of years. He stated they were evaluating the financial impact of accelerating
121 the project. He noted the increasing occurrence of droughts across our country created a need to
122 increase our drinking water supply as soon as possible. He stated the community would have a
123 longer term water supply when the pipeline was installed.

124
125 Mr. Gaffney confirmed that in either case, the pump station would be built to completion.

126
127 Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct. He stated the pump station would be built with the Ragged
128 to Observatory project. He explained when the pipeline from Rivanna to Ragged was built, they
129 would add pumps to the pump station to convey water from Ragged to SR Water Treatment
130 Plant.

131
132 Mr. Mawyer stated they continued to maximize use of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir for
133 water supply. He noted that recently, Sugar Hollow, Ragged Mountain, and Beaver Creek
134 stopped overflowing, but South Rivanna continued to overflow. He stated because it was
135 overflowing, they would continue to maximize use of the water from South Rivanna. He stated
136 they would switch the priority to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir once the water stopped
137 overflowing at South Rivanna.

139 Mr. Mawyer stated they calculated about 20 million gallons per day were flowing over the dam.
140 He stated the pending storms should replenish any deficits, but they were in good shape.

141
142 Mr. Mawyer noted Ms. Mallek had asked the previous month about erosion at the Moores Creek
143 outfall pipe. He explained that there was rip-rap stone at the end of the pipe so there was no
144 erosion.

145
146 Mr. Mawyer noted Mr. Pinkston had asked how much water was returned to Moores Creek
147 compared to what came to the WTP. He stated they returned about 95% of what came into the
148 plant back to Moores Creek. He explained that there were some evaporation losses and possible
149 metering calculation margins of error.

150
151 Mr. Mawyer noted Mr. Gaffney had requested information about the historical odor complaints
152 at Moores Creek. He stated they provided a chart which indicated in 2016 there were 34 odor
153 complaints at Moores Creek, one in 2017, and zero in 2018 and 2019. He stated there were three
154 complaints in 2020, two in 2021, and two in 2022. He stated all of the complaints from 2020
155 onwards were from the recently completed and neighboring Willow Tree development. He
156 explained that wastewater sometimes had to be stored in the equalization basins after storms, and
157 those open-air basins could create odors.

158
159 Mr. Gaffney clarified that all seven complaints from 2020 onwards were from the same person.

160
161 Mr. Mawyer stated the complaints originated from the same development.

162
163 Mr. O'Connell asked if the development had residential uses.

164
165 Ms. Whitaker stated the development was all restaurant space and office space.

166
167 Mr. Mawyer noted the development included a wedding venue. He stated all the wastewater
168 from Crozet was pumped to the Moores Creek plant. He stated there had been periodic odor
169 concerns along Route 250 West. He stated they added a chemical to the wastewater to reduce the
170 odors.

171
172 Ms. Mallek asked if hurricane preparations included the drawing down of tanks in preparation
173 for a large inflow.

174
175 Mr. Mawyer responded that preparations mostly involved filling fuel tanks, emergency backup
176 generators, tanks, and other items.

177
178 Mr. Tungate added that if they know it is going be a significant storm, they will reduce the
179 wastewater stored in the holding ponds.

180
181 Mr. Mawyer emphasized that they try to be proactive in the advance of a storm but not create
182 operational and odor problems.

183
184 **6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were none.

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

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. Staff Report on Drought Monitoring

f. Authorization to Increase Term Engineering Services Contract Contingency, South Fork Rivanna River Crossing Project – Michael Baker International

Mr. Pinkston requested an explanation be provided for Item F of the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Mawyer explained that they planned to install a second pipe under the Rivanna River from the South Rivanna WTP to north of the river. He explained that a second pipe was needed for redundancy and capacity. He stated that Michael Baker International Engineers were hired to design the project. He stated that they planned to use a horizontal direction drill under the river to bore a tunnel. He stated that they needed to complete additional subsurface soil borings to confirm how much rock they would encounter. He stated they had to increase the contingency to allow for the cost.

Mr. O'Connell stated that he noticed there had been meter issues. He asked that there be a follow-up in the upcoming reports about the status of the metering issues and the impacts on readings.

Mr. Mawyer stated they would include an update in the monthly report on past meter issues.

Mr. Pinkston moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Presentation, Public Hearing and Vote on Approval; Resolution to Amend FY 2022 - 2023 Water Rates and Charges

Mr. Mawyer explained that the Board approved the budgets and urban water rates and charges in May 2022. He stated that staff had worked with the ACSA and the City to draft a Northern Area Drinking Water Projects Agreement, which changed the debt service allocation for some of the capital projects, located north of the South Rivanna River.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the reallocation caused an adjustment in the budget and the debt service charges between the ACSA and the City, and the Board was requested to approve the new charges created by the Agreement. He stated the four projects primarily involved in the Agreement were the Airport Road Water Pump Station and Piping Project, the South Rivanna River Crossing, the North Rivanna River Crossing, and a Water Storage Tank at the Airport Road Water Pump Station site.

Mr. Mawyer explained that the new Agreement would pertain to all future capacity and non-capacity water facilities located north of the South Fork Rivanna River. He stated the Finance Director calculated it would cause a shift of about \$22,030 per month from the City to the ACSA to effect the change in debt service costs.

Mr. Mawyer explained that they advertised twice in the newspaper the change to the rates. He stated the prior month, the Board authorized advertisement of the rate change, and the public hearing was scheduled for the September meeting on the adjusted rates.

Mr. Gaffney opened the meeting for a public hearing. He stated for those who wished to speak to identify themselves for the record. He noted there were no public speakers. He closed the public hearing.

Mr. O’Connell moved to approve the amendments to the FY22–FY23 water rates and charges. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion.

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.

Mr. Gaffney clarified there was no reservoir for water storage serving the North Rivanna WTP. Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct.

Mr. O'Connell clarified the projects to decommission the North Rivanna WTP and build the South Rivanna crossing pipe were currently in the CIP.

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 northern area of the Urban Water System.

Mr. Richardson clarified whether there was a for-sure water tank to be constructed at Airport Road or if it was just a possibility.

Mr. Mawyer stated they were confident there would be a water tank, but it was based on growth and demand in the area. He stated their plan includes two ground level water storage tanks at the site. He stated they would start with a single tank when needed in the future and add a second tank also when needed.

The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

b. Presentation: Water Treatment Facilities Overview

Mr. Tungate showed a slide with a map of the County and the reservoirs and facilities, beginning in the northwest with Sugar Hollow Reservoir, a pipeline connecting it to Ragged Mountain Reservoir. He stated water from Sugar Hollow Reservoir flowed into the Moormans River and the South Rivanna Reservoir, which provided water at the South Rivanna Treatment Plant. He stated there was a reservoir in Crozet, Beaver Creek Reservoir, that supplied water to the Crozet Water Treatment Plant. He stated the Ragged Mountain Reservoir provided water to the Observatory Water Treatment Plant. He stated that the Red Hill Water Treatment Plant, south of Charlottesville, was the only groundwater plant in our system.

Mr. Tungate stated the urban water system includes production from the Observatory Treatment Plant, South Rivanna Treatment Plant, and the North Rivanna Treatment Plant. He stated at the south end of the County is a water treatment plant in Scottsville. The Scottsville Water Treatment Plant has two water intakes: one on Totier Creek and the other in the Totier Creek Reservoir.

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 stated that the Observatory Treatment Plant has a permitted capacity of 7.7 million gallons per 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 stated that the total urban permitted capacity was 21.7 MGD, but the average for 2021 was 9.6 MGD.

Mr. Tungate stated that the Crozet facility had recently been renovated and had an increased 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.

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 dam. He stated there had not been recent storms so the water had low turbidity. He showed an image of the dam after a large rain event from May of 2018 and stated that the source water could look clean or very turbid. It just took more work for the water operators to clean the turbid water, and the finished water quality remains the same. The water customers never know that there is a change in raw water quality, so the effort stayed with the treatment plants to ensure the user side was never affected. He stated that certain water treatment chemicals can be in high demand during large weather events like a hurricane. The RWSA Water Department has all chemical supplies full going into a weather event, and they schedule the next chemical delivery. During a large weather event, many of the water utilities in the Mid-Atlantic region will do the same thing. If RWSA does not need the chemical, the chemical supplier will allocate their resources elsewhere.

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

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 between 6.5 and 7. He stated they used sodium hypochlorite for disinfection and oxidation throughout the water treatment process. He stated RWSA uses an orthophosphate corrosion inhibitor product that prevents corrosion and leaching of lead and copper from the plumbing system. He stated they added hydrofluosilicic acid at all their facilities for dental health. He stated the finished water pH is adjusted to 7.5 before leaving the water treatment plants and entering the distribution system.

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

369 The floc particles will settle in the sedimentation basins. Each of the sediment basins flowed
370 from right to left in the photograph and allowed the clean water to go through the filters. He
371 indicated the two filters were added to the plant during the current renovation project.

372
373 Mr. Pinkston asked where the GAC was.

374
375 Mr. Tungate stated he had a slide about the GAC that was upcoming. He showed an image of the
376 sedimentation basin and the flocculated particles falling out of the water. He then showed an
377 image of the two new filters at South Rivanna and stated they now had a total of six gravity
378 filters at the treatment plant.

379
380 Mr. Pinkston asked what the filter media was.

381
382 Mr. Tungate stated it is anthracite coal on top of a special sand. He stated in 2018 they went from
383 a gravel filter bed to a different kind of under drain system that does not use gravel. He showed a
384 photograph of the South Rivanna Treatment Plant and indicated the different buildings and
385 facilities. He stated they had a new chemical storage facility for aluminum sulfate (alum) and
386 fluoride. The new storage building has 24,000 gallons of alum storage, which was significantly
387 more than 9,000 gallons the plant had before the renovation project. This is important to the
388 community because the South Rivanna Water Treatment Plant (SR WTP) is more resilient with
389 the additional alum storage. He indicated the SR WTP GAC building has eight 40,000-pound
390 GAC vessels

391
392 Mr. Tungate stated that they had a series of vertical turbine motors and pumps that pumped out
393 the potable water into the water distribution system. He stated that relating to Hurricane Ian,
394 RWSA has emergency generators that are tested monthly and have a rigorous maintenance
395 program to ensure they have backup power to the water and wastewater facilities.

396
397 He continued that at SR WTP there were both granular activated carbon vessels and powder
398 activated carbon. He stated the powder activated carbon was a one-time use and cost about \$1
399 per pound, and the granular activated carbon had a bed life of one to two years at a cost of \$1.43
400 per pound. The GAC is contained in a pressure vessel and the water passed through it from top
401 to the bottom.

402
403 Mr. Pinkston asked what the PAC and GAC were.

404
405 Mr. Tungate stated that RWSA has fed powder activated carbon (PAC) in the WTP for years,
406 initially for taste and odor, and the issue was the product was a one-time use pass-through.

407
408 Mr. Tungate stated it took out taste and odors as well as disinfection by-products precursors or
409 Total Organic Carbon (TOC).

410
411 Mr. Pinkston asked what that was.

412
413 Mr. Tungate stated that the granular activated carbon was installed to remove the disinfection by-
414 product precursors or TOC. Disinfection by-products (DBPs) are formed during the disinfection

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.

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.

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 construction project that is underway. He stated at North Rivanna WTP, there is one vessel with 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.

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.

Mr. Tungate reported that they did 88 water samples per month in the Urban Water System for total coliform bacteria. Total coliform bacteria serve as indicator species for *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*. Total coliform samples are also collected in the Crozet, Scottsville, and Red Hill water systems. Safe Drinking Water Act compliance samples are collected on a schedule determined by the EPA and Virginia Department of Health. For example, disinfection by-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 quality parameters are completed daily in our distribution systems and water treatment plants. RWSA will start testing in accordance with the Unlisted Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 5), a federal rule for contaminant monitoring, looking for 30 types of chemical contaminants, in January 2023.

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.

461 Ms. Mallek asked what the criteria were for bypassing the GAC. She stated that the community
462 was relying on that system to remove particles that the previous system was unable to.

463
464 Mr. Tungate responded that it was based on the total organic carbon concentration. He noted that
465 if 8 million gallons were going into the facility and they wanted to bypass 4 MGD and run 4
466 MGD through the facility, they could, as it was a matter of using the SCADA system.

467
468 Ms. Mallek asked what percentage of the volume of water was bypassed and not treated.

469
470 Mr. Tungate replied that it depended on the raw water quality. He stated they managed it by the
471 finished water total units of carbon, which was kept at about 0.75 mg/L, and they could do this at
472 all facilities but mainly at South Rivanna.

473
474 Ms. Mallek commented that there was more disturbance to the water at this location.

475
476 Mr. Tungate stated the turbidity was easily removed by our treatment process.

477
478 *c. Presentation and Work Session: 2023-2028 Strategic Plan Update*

479
480 Mr. Gaffney called the RSWA back to session.

481
482 Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. Thomas would be presenting the review of the final update on the
483 strategic plan's progress before working with staff to finalize the plan to be implemented in
484 January.

485
486 Mr. Thomas explained that he would give both Boards an update on the progress of the strategic
487 plan. He stated he would talk about the mission and values as well as the goals, which in this
488 plan were called priorities, then a high-level overview of strategies and measures. He stated that
489 the Board members had draft strategic plans, and the design and feel were similar without
490 significant departure from the previous, but there were some changes. He noted that on June 9,
491 they met with the leadership team who provide staff-level make decision-making for the strategic
492 plan.

493
494 Mr. Thomas explained that they then engaged with stakeholders, which included the RWSA and
495 RSWA, and held an online survey. He stated that all input from stakeholders was then compiled
496 into digestible information that could be consumed in a workshop setting. He noted that they
497 took time to define success and came back prepared to engage with the core planning team to
498 create strategies and measures to advance specific goals. He stated the goal was to complete the
499 strategic plan before the end of the year and then be in a position for the plan to be implemented
500 in 2023.

501
502 Mr. Thomas stated the vision of the project referred to where they were going and required
503 working with staff. He stated the vision had not changed much and only had changes in phrasing,
504 but the overall desired future stayed the same. He stated the mission was their purpose and why
505 they existed, and there was only subtle change to this, so the organization recommended back to
506 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.

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

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 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Thomas stated that would be fixed.

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

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

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 ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON THE AGENDA**

634 There were no items to discuss.

635
636 **11. CLOSED MEETING**

637 There was no reason for a closed meeting.

638
639 **12. ADJOURNMENT**

640
641 **At 3:57 p.m., Mr. Rogers moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer**
642 **Authority. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).**

645 Respectfully submitted,

646

647

648

649

650

651

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeff Richardson", is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

Mr. Jeff Richardson
Secretary - Treasurer