A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, August 23, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Board Members Present: Mr. Tom Foley, Mr. Mike Gaffney – presiding, Ms. Kathy Galvin, Mr. Trevor Henry, Mr. Maurice Jones, Ms. Judith Mueller, and Dr. Liz Palmer.

Board Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Mr. Mark Brownlee, Dr. Richard Gullick, Ms. Teri Kent, Mr. Philip McKalips, Mr. Doug March, Ms. Michelle Simpson, Mr. Scott Schiller, Ms. Andrea Terry, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

Also Present: Members of the public and media representatives.

1.0 Call to Order

A regular meeting of the RSWA Board of Directors was called to order by Mr. Gaffney on Tuesday, August 23, 2016 at 2:03 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes of Previous Board Meeting

a) Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on June 28, 2016

Dr. Palmer moved to approve the minutes of June 28, 2016 as presented. Mr. Foley seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

3.0 Recognition

a) Mr. Dollins – Retirement

Mr. Gaffney read the following resolution into the record:

Resolution of Appreciation for John Dollins

WHEREAS, Mr. Dollins has served as a heavy equipment operator for the RSWA since January 1991, and prior to that served as a maintenance worker at the Ivy Landfill for the City of Charlottesville beginning in October 1983; and
WHEREAS, over the same period, in excess of 32 years, Mr. Dollins has demonstrated a strong work ethic in his field and has been a valuable resource to the Authority and its employees and; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Dollins’ understanding of the Authority’s operation and his dedication and loyalty to the Authority has positively impacted the Authority and its customers.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the RSWA Board of Directors recognizes, thanks and commends Mr. Dollins for his distinguished service, efforts and achievements as an employee of the RSWA and presents this Resolution as a token of esteem, with its best wishes for his retirement.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution be entered upon the permanent Minutes of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority.

Ms. Mueller moved to approve the resolution as presented. Dr. Palmer seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

b) Staff License Attainment

Mr. Wood stated a desire to recognize our employees who have obtained licenses. Mr. Wood acknowledged Mr. Langhoff for volunteering to obtain his transfer station operator’s license as it is not a requirement of his job. He stated that the Ivy site is required to have a licensed operator on site at all times, which both the manager and assistant manager are required to have, and Mr. Langhoff recognized that at times they were not always able to be present.

Mr. Gaffney commented that the Board is duly impressed and appreciative.

4.0 Executive Director’s Report

There was no report this month.

5.0 Items from the Public

There were no items from the public.

6.0 Responses to Public Comments – No Responses This Month

There were no responses to public comments from the June 2016 meeting.

7.0 Consent Agenda

a) Staff Report on Finance

b) Staff Report on Ivy Material Utilization Center/Recycling Operations Update

c) Staff Report on Ivy Landfill Environmental Status
Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items that the Board members would like to pull for questions or further discussion from the consent agenda. There were none.

**Dr. Palmer moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Jones seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.**

### 8.0 Other Business

Mr. Wood reported that the paint program began on August 2, with the container now half full and more people are anticipated to come in as word gets out, due to the popularity of the program.

Ms. Mueller noted that the City of Charlottesville will have its public works employees that answer the phone bring this program to the attention of callers.

Dr. Palmer contemplated how this might be handled at the county level, since it does not have a public works department.

Ms. Mueller said that they just need to let people know when they call the county, but the city planned to do an education effort. She added that she thinks this will save time from waiting in long lines during household hazardous waste days, and will save money as people will no longer have to bring paint in just on those days.

Dr. Palmer said that hopefully people will eventually stop throwing paint in their trash cans, as they end up dripping onto the roads or dumped in the gulley.

Ms. Mueller said that when the trash trucks compact that garbage, paint ends up on the roads, and it was a good idea to let people know about the new paint disposal option.

Ms. Kent reminded the Board that Rivanna had sent out an email about it.

Dr. Palmer said that she had seen it, but wondered about people calling in.

Ms. Mueller stated that the city has made sure that everyone on staff who answers the phone would be able to inform people about it.

Mr. Henry commented that he wasn’t sure how many calls county staff received about it.

Dr. Palmer said she would be curious to know if they did, and mentioned that she would inform the Board clerk so that he can answer questions about it.

Mr. Wood noted that the information had already made it into area homeowners’ association newsletters, so word was getting out.

#### a) Update on Food Waste Composting Initiative at McIntire Recycling
Mr. Wood stated that in April, the Board had asked for staff to provide an update on the pilot composting program extended through December, and he also noted that he had provided the Board with positive comments received at the kiosk. Mr. Wood referenced updated cost figures for the first six months of the program: $3,200 for processing costs; bag costs were around $600 for a total of $3,800 over the six months. He stated that they have collected 9.1 tons during that time period, which translates into $416 per ton, and said there was growth in the amount collected over the first three months, but now it has leveled off from May to July. Mr. Wood expressed surprise that the number did not drop off after the City Market opened their composting, and said that Rivanna would soon be getting information on the volume there. He noted that staff expects a cost of $6,500–$7,500 this year, and extrapolating the pounds per week over the last few months would bring that cost to $8,000 to $9,500 per year to maintain the program. Mr. Wood stated that he could update the Board again in December, at which time they can decide whether to continue the program.

Mr. Gaffney said that it will be interesting to see if there is an increase at McIntire after the City Market closes down for the season.

Ms. Mueller responded that she thought it already had, because the City Market only operates it on Saturday, and there are people dropping compost off there in addition to the vendors providing it at the end of their sales day. Ms. Mueller agreed to provide that data at the next Board meeting.

Dr. Palmer said that Jesse Warren of University of Virginia told her the university is investigating different ways to approach their composting program due to the cost, and she would stay in touch with him about it and report back to the Board.

b) Update on New Transfer Station

Mr. Wood indicated that Phil McKalips would update the Board on the new transfer station.

Mr. McKalips stated that he had a PowerPoint presentation as well as information on paper. Mr. McKalips reported that based upon the letter of agreement between the Authority and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the RSWA has established a milestone schedule. He stated that we were a little behind on the RFP and the agreement but they are getting back on track now and should be in good shape, having accomplished some of the work they need to do and tentatively scheduled a community outreach meeting for September 22 at Henley Middle School.

Mr. McKalips next showed a slide with a rendering of a conceptual design done by SCS Engineers, stating that the original Draper Aden design—Option 2B as approved by the county—became the basis for starting the project. He said that some changes have been made since the conceptual design as they move into final design, but they are still planning for an 11,800 square foot building—top-loading, full tunnel—with capacity for 50 tons/day with some additional capacity for peak times. He stated that the tag bag and recycling would largely stay where it is now, to the right of the transfer station area, and the building size allows for some waste segregation within the building for materials such as metals and construction/demolition debris and other items as the waste stream allows.

---

1 This subsequently changed to Murray Elementary School.
Mr. McKalips reported that the changes are as follows: to move the entrance road out on top of the landfill, providing the cap is not disturbed, which will result in changes for the approach angles to the scales as customers leave the new facility. He noted that this would result in cost savings in both construction and storm water management as well. Mr. McKalips said that staff talked internally about how the facility will operate and how traffic will flow. He stated that the original design had a tunnel for the waste trailers, a passing lane and adjacent parking, all paved—but they no longer think they need the extra passing lane and paving. Removing extra pavement can decrease site work and reduce storm water runoff. Mr. McKalips said that since the road will come right into the tunnel, which exits below the scales, the public will not be able to wander off the beaten path by accident and bypassing the scales. He stated that they do not have the apron at the bottom because trailers always go straight into storage for transport later at night or during off hours. He stated that they have also moved the building entrance to the west side to enter on the side, to help reduce the amount of backing up by trucks and allowing for only one attendant on the floor to cover both operations. Mr. McKalips noted that this will provide more flexibility and greater ability to control traffic, as well as the ability to put waste on the floor in a more sensible manner.

Mr. McKalips said they have also made some operational changes to the original plan, and the original waste trailer tunnel was to have a scale inside that would only have been readable from inside the building by the person loading the trailers. He explained that as they have never had an issue with overloading trailers—and in the rare event when there is an exceptionally heavy trailer, they can use the two other scales onsite and run the trailer across it to check it before it gets parked. He noted that was also a marginal savings in maintenance costs. Mr. McKalips reported that the original design called for a three-sided facility—east, west and south—but they are looking to change this only to the sides on the south and part of the east side, as they want to maximize ventilation to reduce odors and have a good employee work environment. He commented that in the winter it would be difficult to keep the building warm, and whether it is two or three-sided won’t make much difference. He noted that the final change is to have an excavator instead of a front-end loader, after some research by staff and conversations with engineers, as this would be more efficient in maximizing loads.

Mr. Tom Foley asked about the change in moving the driveway on top of the cell and whether they have assessed whether it will affect liability, as the county is responsible for anything that happens as a result of the operation—and part of the original design tried to keep that separation.

Mr. McKalips responded that the original concern was two-fold: they didn’t want to go into landfill and make a cut, as they would then be going into the cap and be in the waste mass. He said that to avoid this, they made changes that moves the site to the south. However, DEQ said putting it on the cap is fine as long as the cap is not disturbed during construction and storm water management does not exacerbate erosion of the cap. Mr. McKalips also noted that the waste mass in the southern fringe of Cell 1 liner is not particularly thick and has been there a long time, so adding a road bed and traffic is not significant enough to cause significant disturbance of the waste mass below it.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they would do borings and have an engineer certify the road and design.
Mr. McKalips replied in the affirmative, stating that the road would be a different design than under the Draper Aden plan, and the load will be spread out more uniformly and would have a well-contained storm water to avoid erosion.

Mr. Foley speculated that this will assure that any storm water off the road is not creating leachate or eroding the cap.

Mr. McKalips confirmed that it would not create leachate or erode the cap, adding that he did not anticipate needing to line the ditches—but it is not such a big area, and it may be a matter of slight grading of the road to bring the water that falls on the roadway to the nearest side (southern side), which is off limit from waste. He stated that it solves a problem that Draper Aden had struggled with in terms of getting trailers onto the outbound scale and making the turn to go up the hill, and this change would allow that to go out a bit, softening the grade.

Mr. Wood added that this was the main reason for the change, as coming off the scales and making the turn into the new part of the transfer station was tight with the original entrance design, and they wanted to move the entrance up a bit to enlarge the turning radius.

Mr. Foley asked if the original Draper Aden design would have required more impact on the existing cell.

Mr. McKalips said it would not have, but it would have required a cut, and he noted the existing cut elevations on the existing cell grade down to the roadway grade—a total of eight feet of grade difference. He stated that they would be moving the whole facility up those eight feet and slightly northward, so it reduces cuts and fills further down.

Mr. Foley stated that Mr. McKalips had mentioned a couple of operational issues, including a change in the equipment and the attendant to monitor two scales, and asked if this change would have any impact on operating costs.

Mr. McKalips replied that it would not, and they had looked at this carefully to see where staff would need to be on a daily basis. He described how trailers are currently backing into the hopper and noted that drivers are not comfortable backing around the apron. He stated that the original design had trailers entering the building coming from a light apron into a dark building that has other vehicles that the driver might not see well, so that seemed like something to be avoided in the revised design. Mr. McKalips stated that the idea of trailers coming in on the west side driving forward enables them to see what is going on and be able to see the attendant directing them—with a straight shot out the building.

Dr. Palmer said she had several questions and thanked Mr. McKalips for all of his work including presenting information to the Solid Waste Committee. She asked him to confirm that they are back to the full height tunnel which Mr. McKalips confirmed. She said the original was 100 x 100’ and asked how much is “under roof.”
Mr. McKalips referenced a slide and said they have decided to go with excavator and not the grappler, but haven’t yet revised the drawing. He rephrased her question as being whether this is all under roof, and said it’s in essence the same roof as in the Draper Aden design.

Dr. Palmer said the shape looks different and asked if it is still 100 x 100’.

Mr. McKalips confirmed the size as 100 x 100’, with 11,800 square feet under roof—10,000 sq. ft. of which is tipping floor and 1,800 sq. ft. being tunnel.

Dr. Palmer said that Draper Aden had originally recommended 7,500 square feet of tipping floor, and the Albemarle County Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee (SWAAC) planned for an extra 2,500 sq. ft. for a recycling area. She stated that SWAAC had envisioned trailers backing up, not driving through—which changes how the building is used—and she asked him how many lanes he envisions for the building.

Mr. McKalips responded that he’d want to keep 20 feet between vehicles. He explained that there are two kinds of traffic: the public and contractors. He noted on his slide the location of the new transfer station square, and said that he would like to block off a portion for public vehicles dropping off small item amounts to keep these vehicles away from the big trucks and running equipment. Mr. McKalips stated that he imagines five or six lanes that are not “hard lanes,” and demonstrated with the slide how segregation of materials could be achieved, noting where they could put a box for metal and load it off the floor and an area where they could put a roll off. He added that they will have to see how people respond and how the traffic flow develops with the different waste streams.

Dr. Palmer said that the reason for her question is whether they still need that big of a building, since the size of the building was dictated by the need to locate the recycling there.

Mr. McKalips responded that he doesn’t have an answer and said the size of the building offers flexibility, which is good operationally for the RSWA.

Mr. Foley stated that the $450,000 difference in the two design costs is kind of shocking—and perhaps Draper Aden didn’t allow enough for their design, or perhaps it’s something else. He stated that it would be helpful for him in explaining to the Board of Supervisors if the original cost estimate should have been higher or if there is another story as to why the revised cost is higher.

Dr. Palmer pointed out that portions of the cost are lower such as the site work and the TS building.

Mr. Foley responded that the dramatic change was in the design.

Mr. McKalips said the answer is three things: Draper Aden didn’t budget for some things; there will be some support needed with procurement; and there will be additional costs as the project gets more refinement, which is to be expected.

Mr. Wood presented a slide with the original cost estimates and said that whenever there is a conceptual design of a project, there will be a plus or minus variance versus what the engineers
originally estimate, and it’s typical to have a 30-50% variance so Draper Aden’s conceptual estimate was not unreasonable. He stated that as they near the end of preliminary design, there is still a wide variance.

Mr. Foley stated the RSWA reduced costs enough to create a contingency that didn’t exist before which is a good thing with construction. He asked Mr. Wood if he feels there is a need to make an adjustment to the budget.

Mr. Wood replied that they would continue to make refinements to the cost estimates and try to get down to the $2.5 million number and try to negotiate some numbers down without affecting the scope of the project; at this stage in the project the need to adjust the budget is not there yet. The purpose in showing the high number here is to set the possible expectations of what may happen.

Mr. McKalips said there are still some costs that need to be negotiated.

Mr. Wood said that Draper Aden didn’t include some items such as the closure of the old transfer station in the cost estimate, which can be offset by the trust fund established for this purpose. He stated that they could also use their financial guarantee to offset it, and they don’t know yet what the overall costs and offsets will be. Mr. Wood stated that there were some permitting issues and the engineers will have to certify closure costs. The county will have a chance to review those costs, with the schedule being to have a site plan by the end of October—so perhaps in November it could go to the Board of Supervisors.

c) Work Authorization - SCS Design Engineering, Permitting & Bid Support

Mr. Wood reported that the SCS engineers would not need to start on the design right away but would need to start in early October, and since there is no RSWA Board meeting between now and November, he wanted to put in front of the Board the authority to sign the next work authorization concerning design of the project. Negotiations will take place before that work authorization is finalized.

Mr. Foley moved to approve Work Authorization #2 for SCS Design Engineering. Dr. Palmer second the motion, which passed 7-0.

9.0 Other Items from Board/Staff Not on Agenda

There were none presented.

10.0 Closed Meeting

There was no closed meeting.

11.0 Adjournment

Mr. Jones moved to adjourn the meeting. Dr. Palmer seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.
There being no further business, the RSWA Board adjourned their meeting at 2:48 p.m.