

**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**January 23, 2006**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, January 23, 2006 at 3:10 p.m. in the Conference Room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

**Board Members Present:** Mr. Michael Gaffney, Mr. Mark Graham, Ms. Judith Mueller, Mr. Gary O'Connell, and Mr. Robert Tucker.

**Authority Staff Present:** Ms. Anne Bedarf, Mr. Bruce Edmonds, Mr. Tom Frederick, Ms. Mary Knowles, Ms. Jennifer Whitaker, Dr. Robert Wichser, and Mr. Lonnie Wood.

**Also Present:** Mr. Chad Freckmann – RSWA Citizens Advisory Committee Chairman, Mr. Robert Huff – Principal with Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, Mr. Kurt Krueger – RSWA Attorney, Mr. Phil McKalips – RSWA Consultant from Environmental Standards, Inc., Mr. Steve Nesbitt – RSWA Consultant with Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., members of the public, and media representatives.

**1.0 Call to Order**

The regular meeting of the RSWA Board of Directors was called to order by Mr. Michael Gaffney on Monday, January 23, 2006 at 3:10 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

**2.0 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Mr. Graham noted one correction to the minutes of the November 28, 2005 Board of Directors meeting. He stated that on page 3, in the second line of the paragraph immediately below the listing of Consent Agenda items which read “vote to approve Items 5a), b), c), d), e), f), g), g), and I), the second “g)” should be changed to “h).” Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the Board of Directors by a 5 - 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, November 28, 2005 as corrected by Mr. Graham.

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the Board of Directors by a 5 – 0 vote approved the minutes of the special Board of Directors Meeting held on Thursday, January 5, 2006.

**3.0 Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Frederick reported that he felt part of his responsibility as Executive Director was to look at past trends and plan for the long-term future across the broad spectrum of Authority operations and finances and advise the Board of any issues that might need to be addressed in the coming months. He would be commenting on some of those issues, which were discussed in his report as well as conveyed in previous discussions.

**RSWA Board Minutes**

**3.0 Executive Director's Report (cont.)**

**January 23, 2006**

Mr. Frederick stated that staff would be presenting recommendations on Cell 3 at the closed Ivy Landfill during the "Other Business" section of today's meeting. He felt it was essential that the Authority take the appropriate corrective action to ensure the public that the facility was under proper management and that staff understood the environmental implications at the site. RSWA has chosen to take a proactive approach at the site, which entailed asking and raising questions. One of the risks assumed with that approach was the possibility of uncovering issues not previously known. A plan would then need to be developed with an accompanying budget to remedy the situation. This scenario was essentially what had occurred at Cell 3 over the last few months. The recommendation being presented as a solution for the leachate accumulation within Cell 3 was supported by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and included an estimated budget of \$1.65 million.

Mr. Frederick then discussed emerging issues associated with other solid waste services offered by the Authority. There had been previous discussions concerning the Ivy Transfer Station nearing its operating capacity, which he felt required strategic planning for the future of the facility. He had also observed an increase in the number of citizens who were inquiring about ways to improve recycling operations in this community. He felt this trend would continue due to the number of citizens who were interested in recycling issues. Decisions would need to be based on both environmental and financial considerations.

Mr. Frederick noted that issues related to RSWA services that were not generating revenues being funded through the local government structure had not yet been resolved. He recognized that individual Board members were actively and very vigorously working to resolve this issue and commented that his report was meant to reach a broader perspective. He felt it was time to finalize an agreement so that the Authority could address other critical issues.

To follow-up on Mr. Frederick's comments, Mr. Chad Freckmann, RSWA Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairman, stated that during recent CAC meetings there have been discussions concerning ways to improve the recycling efforts in this community. He felt there was a lot of interest in the community for RSWA to explore new ideas on ways to make recycling more convenient for citizens possibly through long-term planning and offering educational programs in the schools. To his knowledge, there were no recycling programs being offered in any of the area schools at this time. He would encourage everyone to give serious attention to this matter.

**4.0 Items From The Public**

Mr. Chris Gensic, City of Charlottesville resident and former Chairman of the RSWA CAC, commented that serving on that committee was a wonderful experience and he learned a lot in the process.

Mr. Gensic further stated that since he learned that there was still a lot to learn, he felt it was time to conduct a factual scientific market analysis of the products being received, where they were going, and where they could go. He realized that Mr. Edmonds

**RSWA Board Minutes**

**4.0 Items From The Public (cont.)**

**January 23, 2006**

probably did this on a daily basis as time allowed, but he thought it would be worthwhile to have an outside individual or agency, such as the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), conduct a study to determine what recycling programs would be cost effective. There had been previous discussions on this issue, but he did not believe there had been a real scientific study to explore such topics as who was generating what kind of waste, what was the value of glass, what was the distance to the next sort facility, and similar types of issues. If there were any money in the budget, time, or staff activity that could be utilized for such a study, he would agree that the citizens in this community seemed to think that it would work. Since the County was currently developing a strategic plan, he felt it would be an opportune time for RSWA to conduct a scientific study.

Mr. Gensic thanked the Authority again for the honor of serving on the CAC and commented that Mr. Freckmann seemed like a wonderful person.

Ms. Lois Rochester, Albemarle County resident, stated that she had not originally planned to attend today's meeting. After she read Mr. Frederick's Executive Director's Report, she felt, "I just had to come and say my piece." She wanted to comment on the ongoing problem of funding RSWA. She was aware of some of the controversial issues that were holding up the support from the City and the County. She realized that many were trying to get some resolution, but the situation could not continue to go on this way as it had gone on for too long. Ms. Rochester did not know what would happen if RSWA ran out of money, but she hoped that it never happened. She did not know what was going on "behind the scenes" to resolve this issue. She was aware of committees that met from time to time. The Board members were all non-elected officials, so they were limited in what they could do. She really supported Mr. Frederick's suggestion that bold steps be taken, and quoting from Mr. Frederick's report, "to remove our short-term constraints and develop a strategic plan and begin looking to our long-term future". She did not know how that could be done and that maybe a summit could be called where all the parties would be gathered here at the table or hire a mediator. She wished she had some answers, but it was her hope that the process would move forward since she felt that the community was in a bad situation as far as solid waste management was concerned.

Ms. Rochester then thanked the Board members for their attention.

Mr. Gaffney thanked Mr. Gensic and Ms. Rochester for their comments.

**5.0 Consent Agenda**

Mr. Gaffney asked if there were any items that the Board members would like to pull for discussion from the Consent Agenda.

- 5a) Staff Report on Finance
- 5b) Staff Report on Ivy Landfill/Transfer Station
- 5c) Staff Report on McIntire Road Recycling Center/ Paper/Paper Sort Recycling Operations

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**5.0 Consent Agenda (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

- 5d) Staff Report on Environmental Status
- 5e) Citizens Advisory Committee
  - Approved Minutes of November 8, 2005 Meeting

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to approve Items 5a), b), c), d), and e) of the Consent Agenda. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

**6.0 Other Business**

In regards to **Item 6a), Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2005**, Mr. Wood stated that a copy of this report was included in the Board packet. The Authority's financial statements were required to undergo an audit on the accuracy of the information in the report, internal audit controls, and compliance with relevant laws and regulations. Mr. Robert Huff, a principal with Robinson, Farmer, Cox Associates, was at today's meeting to provide a review of the audit, discuss any audit findings, and answer questions from the Board.

Mr. Robert Huff stated that he was pleased to report that the Authority had its accounts verified and that all the opinions were unqualified. The change in net assets improved from the previous year but still experienced a pretty significant decline. Total net assets were now at \$1.8 million. A Management Letter was not issued to the Authority, but it seemed that finances were "the order of the day." Given the success that the Authority had experienced in the past, he felt that he would probably be presenting an unqualified report again next year. Mr. Huff concluded his remarks by stating that he would at this time entertain any questions that the Board had concerning the audit findings.

As there were no further questions or comments, Mr. Tucker moved, and was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to accept the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2005. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

In regards to **Item 6b), Cell 3 Update and Budget**, Mr. Frederick reported that as indicated in November, a goal was set to bring back final recommendations and estimated costs to the Board in January to address the accumulated leachate in Cell 3. The report included in the Board packet summarized the three distinct investigations that have been underway at the site concerning the cap, leachate collection system, and a comparison of the current treatment with new alternatives for leachate treatment and disposal. It was anticipated that the effective removal of leachate from the cell would significantly accelerate for a period of time the amount of leachate that would need to be treated.

Mr. Frederick further stated that Mr. Phil McKalips from Environmental Standards, Inc. (ESI) and Mr. Steve Nesbitt from Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. (MPI) were in attendance to provide a brief summary on their respective investigations, which would also include time tables and estimated costs. Mr. Nesbitt would report first

on the cap investigation and leachate treatment options, followed by Mr. McKalips who would discuss the leachate collection system investigation.

Mr. Steve Nesbitt commented that as previously mentioned, an evaluation was conducted on ways to deal with the accumulation of leachate within the waste mass. He and Mr. McKalips would be discussing their findings and recommendation on the three investigations just referenced by Mr. Frederick. The first investigation involved the cap system, which was the membrane that covered the waste mass and separated it from the environment. The cap was originally intended to minimize the infiltration of rainwater into the waste mass. The second investigation involved the leachate collection system and ways to remove the liquid out of the waste mass and reduce the leachate amount to an acceptable level. The third investigation looked at options related to the treatment and disposal of that leachate once it was removed from the cell. Mr. Nesbitt added that solutions would need to be integrated and take into account the prevention of future leachate accumulation in the cell.

Mr. Nesbitt first addressed the cap system investigation. He reported that an updated fugitive emissions survey was performed to determine if the cap were leaking. A few areas were identified where emissions were coming through the cap that were greater than the "background" ranges found across other areas of the site. The cover soil was excavated at those locations away from the cap and samples taken of the cap membrane, which consisted of a relatively thin geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) that was laid down in sheets. Laboratory tests found that the cap system still meets and exceeds the regulatory requirements for that cap system as specified by the Virginia Solid Waste Management regulations. There had been a slight increase in the permeability of that cap from the time that it was originally installed approximately seven years ago. It was believed that due to the repeated wetting and drying that the cap underwent, there was a tendency for an exchange to occur between the clay and the calcium and sodium minerals that bonded to the clay in that cap, resulting in the cap becoming slightly more permeable.

Mr. Nesbitt further stated that MPI's recommendation at this time was not to do anything further to the cap system, because the drainage system that ESI found to be most cost effective in removing the leachate from the waste mass was also capable of addressing and managing the cap in its present condition.

Mr. Nesbitt also commented that it was MPI's conclusion that the liquid in the waste mass was probably capped in place at the time the cell was closed. Based on the cap system's current performance, they were not able to account for the liquid in the waste mass as having entered through the cap. He felt it would be more likely that the leachate collection system, which was designed and installed 20 years ago, did not effectively drain the liquids that were in the solid waste or added by rainfall that occurred while the cell was still open, which allowed the leachate to accumulate over time.

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

Based on the results of the cap investigation, Mr. Nesbitt concluded that further augmentation of the cap would not be helpful. Further, the cap in its current condition does satisfy and meet regulatory requirements for a cell of this size.

Mr. Phil McKalips next discussed the leachate collection system investigation. He stated that information obtained last year pertaining to the hydrologic properties of the material within the cell was used to model different scenarios on how to lower the leachate level to a point where the cell was stable.

Mr. McKalips further stated that two basic approaches were evaluated. The first one involved traditional vertical wells that would be “peppered” across the top of the cell, and the second approach utilized horizontal wells. ESI compared the installation of about 100 vertical wells versus 3 horizontal wells at Cell 3. Costs were somewhat favorable to the vertical well option. All the vertical wells would need to be regularly pumped and the liquid moved around from the top of the cell to the collection point. The horizontal wells on the other hand could be gravity drained with only minor operational and maintenance costs associated with the occasional cleaning of the wells. Horizontal wells would also have the long-term advantage of being part of the replacement landfill collection system. With the use of vertical wells, a decision on their continued operation would need to be made at the point when the liquid had been drained to an acceptable level with only some ongoing leachate management needs to address.

Mr. McKalips then reported that ESI was recommending that the horizontal well scenario be implemented because it provided the lowest cost in the long term and could be utilized as part of the replacement landfill collection system.

Mr. Tucker inquired if the costs associated with the horizontal well option were included in the table attached to the Board report under the “Leachate Collection & Removal” item. Mr. McKalips replied in the affirmative and explained that ESI had models for three wells to manage the liquid in Cell 3 Lined in response to stability issues, the need to fix at some point the failed leachate removal system, and the impact to the gas system. It was their understanding that there would not be similar stability issues associated with Cell 3 Unlined due to the absence of a smooth synthetic liner. The liquid accumulation in that cell had adversely impacted the efficiency of the landfill gas collection system. It was felt that installing one horizontal well in Cell 3 Unlined would reduce liquid levels sufficiently to allow for efficient landfill gas operation over a longer period of time.

Mr. Nesbitt next provided a summary of the evaluation of alternative leachate treatment and disposal options. He stated that there would be a series of gravity-operated horizontal underdrains that would actually go inside the waste mass but above the bottom elevations so they would be contained within the limits of the waste. Those wells would reduce the liquid to an appropriate level over a period of time. Because of the uncertainties as to how the waste mass would behave, an alternative analysis of management options was performed and different methodologies for treating the leachate were evaluated as well as the costs

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

associated with those alternative treatment methods over various time frames. He then referred to the attached table, which was a life cycle cost comparison for a total of five alternatives broken down into 3-year, 10-year, or 20-year duration of dewatering effort for the Cell 3 area since it was not known at this time how long it would take to dewater Cell 3.

Mr. Nesbitt further explained that the five alternatives listed on the table represented three means of primary treatment and two means of secondary treatment of leachate. Options 1A and 1B dealt with the current treatment of the leachate at the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant but offered two methods for delivering the leachate to the plant. Alternative 1A was the continuation of the existing means and methods of trucking and hauling the leachate to and from the plant via Interstate 64. Alternative 1B involved the construction of a pump station and force main that would deliver the leachate from Ivy to the Crozet Interceptor and then to the Moores Creek plant.

Mr. Tucker asked what size pipeline was being anticipated for the pump station. Mr. Nesbitt replied that it would be a relatively small 3-inch diameter pipeline. The flow level strength would be very small in comparison to the flow levels within the existing line and at the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. Mr. Frederick added that the line was expected to handle 22,000 gallons per day at the outset, reducing significantly once the cell was essentially dewatered. Mr. Nesbitt noted that currently the Ivy site generated a base flow of 5,000 gallons per day of leachate across the entire site, and dewatering of Cell 3 would add another 17,000 gallons per day for a total of 22,000 gallons per day. Over the duration of that dewatering project, the total flow would eventually reduce down to the base flow amount of 5,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Tucker also asked if those flow figures reflected VDOT's involvement with this project. Mr. Frederick stated that no scenarios have been presented that included a partnership with VDOT. It had been mentioned previously that RSWA had contacted VDOT to express interest in meeting with them if they chose to discuss the possibility of a joint venture. Up to this point, the meeting had not yet occurred. Although this option had not been ruled out, he was concerned that waiting for a decision by VDOT would hold up this project.

Mr. Graham inquired if the system could be designed so that VDOT could connect to the pump station at a later date. Mr. Frederick responded that a 3-inch pipeline might not be sufficient to meet VDOT's needs. Mr. Nesbitt added that the cost comparisons were formulated on the basis of only RSWA undertaking the project. He also noted that the cost estimates were to be used as part of an alternative analysis and feasibility study and should not be equated to the Capital costs of the project.

Mr. Nesbitt next addressed Alternatives 2A and 2B, which dealt with the management of the leachate pond site and the possibility of taking the existing static storage lagoon and upgrading it to an aerated lagoon and essentially becoming

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

a biological treatment plant at the Ivy site. After the lagoon was upgraded, there were two possible uses for the leachate. The first one involved applying secondary treatment through constructed wetlands on-site that would be discharged to the receiving stream. The second option entailed taking the material after it had gone through primary treatment and using it for spray back irrigation.

Mr. Nesbitt further commented that there were potential odor issues associated with the aeration of the lagoon. MPI visited a facility located in Winchester, Virginia about six months ago that conducted a similar leachate aeration process in an open lagoon. No odors were detected during that visit, and the landfill operator indicated there were no odor concerns at this facility. He noted that there was always the potential for creating an odor problem at the landfill.

Mr. Nesbitt also reported that Alternative 3 was the last option evaluated and involved the installation of a so-called "packaged plant" on site and then dealing with secondary treatment discharge via spray back irrigation or constructed wetlands. This alternative provided a very high level of treatment and was by far the most expensive option.

In summary, Mr. Nesbitt then explained that the three options were evaluated based on a 27-year life-cycle cost analysis. The 27 years corresponded with the remaining post-closure care period at the Ivy landfill. The cost analyses included in the Board packet were not simply the costs for dealing with the Cell 3 issue, but also included a broad enough solution to handle the leachate over the entire site during the remaining post-closure care period.

Mr. Nesbitt added that the financial analysis included up-front Capital costs and the annual Operational and Maintenance (O&M) costs for each one of the alternatives over the remaining post-closure care period. He then referenced the "Net Present Value" column and stated that the \$1,051,000 cost for the installation of the underdrains was carried down for every alternative. The total "Net Present Value" for collection and treatment for a 3-year duration ranged from approximately \$1.79 million for delivering leachate to the Crozet Interceptor to approximately \$2.7 million for the on-site "packaged" plan. The lagoon upgrade with constructed wetlands was approximately \$1.82 million and the Crozet Interceptor was approximately \$1.79 million. He felt that at this level of detail for these analyses, these were basically the same numbers. If you compared the costs for those two alternatives over a 10-year duration, the figures varied from \$1.95 million and \$1.99 million. This pattern was repeated into a 20-year duration. The selection and financial ranking of the alternatives was unchanged no matter how long it took to dewater Cell 3. Mr. Nesbitt felt the final decision would be based on the issue of managing other constraints and limitations other than financial considerations.

Mr. Nesbitt next reported that the alternative to upgrade the lagoon with secondary treatment via constructed wetlands on-site was the recommended option. The potential for future odor with that option was an unknown at this time. On the other hand, it would remove the issue of adding a known odor potential into the

Crozet pipeline. The Lagoon Upgrade/Constructed Wetland and the Crozet Interceptor alternatives would both require regulatory and local government “buy-in” and would require a lengthy permitting process. There would be issues associated with the Crozet Interceptor alternative concerning right-of-way and acquisition of property, in addition to permitting at both the solid waste facility and at the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. Concerning the Lagoon Upgrade, the same permitting process would need to be followed at the solid waste facility as well as getting permission to discharge into the receiving stream. The choice would ultimately be based on managing the constraints and limitations that were other than financial since the costs were comparable.

Mr. Tucker commented that he thought odor would become more of an issue if the lagoon needed to be aerated and asked if it were a “given” that aeration would be necessary with this option. Mr. Nesbitt responded that costs associated with addressing an odor issue have not been included in this option, and he felt contingency funds should be earmarked for that purpose.

Mr. Tucker also questioned if the Crozet Interceptor or the Lagoon Upgrade would be of greater future benefit in dealing with any future leachate issues.

Mr. Frederick stated that MPI was requested to provide a project budget based on a 3-year, 10-year, and 20-year duration of Cell 3 dewatering efforts. DEQ strongly favored the 3-year option, which was the approach being taken in the collection system recommended by ESI. He felt it was interesting to note that the analysis on cost effectiveness did not change as the dewatering rate was extended over a longer time frame. This would suggest that within reasonable limits, additional leachate flow could be handled with the selection of either one of those two options.

Mr. Frederick further noted that the facilities would be constructed to handle a 22,000 gallons-per-day volume. If the decrease of anticipated volume was not as significant as predicted, the system could handle the additional flow with either option.

Mr. Frederick further stated that since the cost analysis for those two options were comparable, he felt it was important to make a specific recommendation today due to the number of issues that would need to be considered. Two factors influenced his decision toward recommending the Lagoon Upgrade alternative with Constructed Wetlands. With either the Crozet Interceptor or aerated lagoon alternative, Capital money would need to be invested up front for a longer term in return for lower operating costs than with the current method of hauling leachate to the Moores Creek plant. There was considerable interest from the regulatory agencies, and RWSA would concur based on a structural evaluation, that the Cell 3 Lined dewatering efforts get underway as quickly as possible. As time was considered an important factor, a re-examination of the time tables for the two alternatives was undertaken. RWSA felt that it could implement the aerated lagoon and constructed wetlands in about 18 months, whereas it might take up to 24 months to construct the connection to the Crozet Interceptor. The installation of a leachate collection system that could handle the anticipated 22,000 gallons-per-day

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

volume without a treatment option in place would mean that the additional volume would need to be hauled to the Moores Creek facility on a daily basis. The longer the current treatment method was utilized, the more the economy in operation and maintenance costs this Capital Improvement would generate would be reduced due to the continued costs associated with the hauling operation.

Mr. Frederick then commented that an aerated lagoon was a parallel process in a very small scale to some of the operations performed at the Moores Creek plant. The constructed wetlands was another secondary treatment process, which not only complemented the biological treatment but also accomplished some additional purposes. Wetland vegetation could absorb nutrients and other constituents, which could not be accomplished through the biological process. It was felt that these complementary on-site systems produced a higher water quality at the end of the process.

Mr. Nesbitt added that there were some constituents in the leachate that were present in low concentrations but were less than the permit level at the Moores Creek plant. Those constituents would pass through the Moores Creek plant, still below the permit level, and not disrupt the operations of the plant. However, those constituents were treatable through a secondary step, such as the wetlands. He felt the advantage of the Lagoon Upgrade/Constructed Wetland alternative was that it would be able to accommodate those types of constituents.

Mr. O'Connell asked if it was correct that with this option the existing lagoon would be upgraded and a wetlands area would be constructed next to the lagoon. Mr. Nesbitt replied in the affirmative and further explained that aeration would be added to the existing lagoon, which was lined, in order to accelerate the biological treatment that was occurring in that lagoon structure. The flow through that lagoon would then be entered into a lined constructed wetland area approximately 1.2 acres in size. The constructed wetlands would be divided into cells consisting of a variety of biological media, which would flow and migrate via surface water through the constructed cell, resulting in the secondary treatment process.

Mr. O'Connell also inquired if the water leaving the constructed wetlands would be tested for its water quality. Mr. Nesbitt stated that the treated water would be monitored on a regular basis, which would be specified by the state-issued permit.

Ms. Mueller stated that it appeared that both the horizontal wells and also the leachate treatment option each had about a nine-month permitting process. She assumed that these two could be handled on a parallel permitting basis. She then asked at what point did the local government "buy-in" need to occur in order to allow discharge into the receiving stream. Mr. Frederick replied that he felt it should happen as soon as possible. Ms. Mueller further questioned why the local government "buy in" did not take place first, as some options could be eliminated through that process. She felt very strongly that it would be financially irresponsible to move forward until written support from DEQ was received on the

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

recommended alternatives. If the Lagoon Upgrade/Constructed Wetland was the prime option, she would prefer before moving forward with the process that the local governments also make that determination, realizing that a second financially viable option was available.

Mr. Graham expressed agreement with Ms. Mueller's comments. He added that before presenting this option to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, he would suggest that another community meeting of Ivy neighbors be held in order to discuss the recommended alternatives.

Ms. Mueller stated that she would amend her recommendation to include Mr. Graham's suggestion of a community meeting prior to consideration by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the RSWA or Albemarle County would hold the public meeting. Mr. Tucker stated that he felt it would similar to the last information-sharing session held by RSWA with the Ivy neighbors at which time it was indicated that there would be follow-up meetings to discuss recommended solutions. Mr. Frederick added that the neighbors were supportive of RSWA's intent to continue this open dialogue as appropriate. Mr. Tucker further commented that input from the public meeting would be helpful to the Board of Supervisors in gauging public support for the alternatives under consideration.

Mr. Tucker also suggested that the reference to the 22,000 gallons per day would be more representative if the leachate flow was equated to specific flow amount over the long term, such as a quart per second. Mr. Nesbitt stated that from an engineering perspective, those were still small flow rates. Mr. Tucker and Mr. Graham expressed that it would be helpful it were defined so that a "lay person" would have a better visual understanding of the flow rate. Mr. Frederick added that during dryer periods, the treated water from the wetlands could be used for crop irrigation and would further reduce the amount of water that was discharged into the stream.

Mr. O'Connell asked for clarification purposes if it were correct that leachate treatment at the Moores Creek plant via the Crozet Interceptor would involve capturing the leachate through the installation of horizontal wells, transporting the liquid in a closed line through the entire system to eventually end up at the treatment plant. Mr. Nesbitt stated that his statements were correct.

As there were no further comments or questions, Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. Graham, that the Board of Directors vote to approve the Horizontal Well Leachate Collection System for Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined and also support RSWA moving forward with holding a public forum with the Ivy neighbors and then seeking approval by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors for the recommended Leachate Treatment and Disposal alternative. The motion was approved by a 5 – 0 vote.

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (cont.)**  
**January 23, 2006**

Mr. Tucker also moved, which was seconded by Ms. Mueller, that the Board of Directors vote to approve the transfer of \$200,000 initially set aside for financial assurance costs to implement the recommended Horizontal Well Leachate Collection System for Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined from funds already approved in the FY 06 Ivy Environmental budget.

Prior to the vote, Mr. Graham asked if RSWA planned to hold off on the actual design of the recommended Leachate Treatment and Disposal alternative until both public input and approval by the Board of Supervisors were obtained.

Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative and added that he was in agreement with Ms. Mueller's comments concerning obtaining DEQ's written approval before completing design and building of this project. DEQ had communicated its interest that this project move forward as quickly as possible, and it would be the Authority's position that such efforts would require a firm commitment on DEQ's part to facilitate the process.

The Board of Directors approved the motion by a 5 – 0 vote.

**7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda**

There were no other items from the Board or staff not on the agenda.

**8.0 Closed Meeting**

There was no need for a closed meeting.

**9.0 Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Tucker moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Ms. Mueller. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Mr. Gary O'Connell  
Secretary - Treasurer