

RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
March 27, 2006

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, March 27, 2006 at 3:00 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. Mark Brownlee, 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. Kurt Krueger - RSWA Attorney, 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, March 27, 2006 at 3:00 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Graham, and seconded by Mr. Tucker, the Board of Directors by a 5 - 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, February 27, 2006.

3.0 Executive Director's Report

Mr. Frederick briefly reported on the item under Other Business, which was a continuing discussion about the closed Ivy facility and the environmental mitigation work with emphasis on Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined. He stated that when RSWA encountered some anomalies that needed to be identified and resolved, those actions were undertaken openly because the Authority was a public agency. Some news media sources have recently reported these anomalies as a new problem at the site. He wanted to clarify that none of the issues related to Cell 3 recently reported by RSWA represent a new problem; instead, RSWA is more aggressively monitoring the site and in that process has revealed latent conditions that were in place for some time. Mr. Frederick emphasized that regardless of how citizens might have viewed the Authority in the past, the current posture and attitude of RSWA was to work cost effectively but yet very beneficially to renew the Ivy site and perform the necessary and required corrective action in a positive manner. Some of that work started when a Settlement Agreement was reached that called for additional monitoring, including an odor abatement study that was conducted at the

site in 2004-05. These measures went well beyond what the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality would require at the site. RSWA as an organization was building upon those proactive measures to ensure the continued close scrutiny of the site. Even though bioremediation activities were underway, the Authority wanted to better understand the past operations of that facility and how to best address those issues. He felt that the public could better accept that RSWA was now taking a proactive and not a reactive stance by viewing the issues related to the treatment of the elevated leachate within Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined.

Mr. Frederick further stated that as mentioned in his report, it was hoped that the proposed FY 2007 budget for RSWA could be introduced at today's meeting. However, through our consultant's continued efforts to address the issues related to Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined, changes to the nature, direction, and costs associated with this project have continued to occur. Since the proposed treatment of leachate at the Ivy site was a significant component of next year's budget and cost estimates are not yet complete, Mr. Frederick had determined that the presentation of the budget should be postponed until the April meeting.

4.0 Items From The Public

Mr. Michael Weber, Albemarle County resident, stated that he would be commenting on two items at this time. The first item was in follow-up to the "very elegant remarks" just made by Mr. Frederick. He felt that most of the citizens who lived in the area around the Ivy Landfill were beginning to appreciate Mr. Frederick's comments concerning the Authority's proactive stance and that the staff appeared to be genuinely interested in attempting to identify any problems and dealing with them proactively. During the meeting held last Thursday at St. John's Episcopal Church, Mr. Frederick described the situation related to how the water was found in the cells, which Mr. Weber understood began with air monitoring that led to a question about how the contaminants got into the air. In the process of testing the vents to determine if they were operating properly, it was discovered that the vents were filled with water. Mr. Weber felt that he and many of his colleagues would expect that "in the prior administration" when contaminants were found in the air, there would be an attempt to minimize the situation and state that it was insignificant – "It was just the way the wind was blowing," – and not try to investigate further as to what was the underlying cause of the problem. Mr. Weber had been very impressed with the description that "if you have seen smoke, let's just make sure whether there was a fire there or not."

Mr. Weber further stated that at the meeting last Thursday, there remained not surprisingly a certain level of hostility from the "old-timers" who had been through this before. He then addressed Ms. Mueller, Mr. O'Connell, and Mr. Tucker and stated that those feelings resulted not because there was a lack of confidence in the current administration but was because they were still "being the bosses." They were now being judged on whether they had learned from the past by first identifying the problem in order to do the right thing and then determine the most economical way to do it, rather than starting off by trying to save money. "Doing things on the cheap, trying to undercut, ignoring the neighbors was how you got into this mess in the first place." He strongly

RSWA Board Minutes
4.0 Items From The Public (cont.)
March 27, 2006

advised that “if they did not want to live it over again, not to go down that path a second time.”

Mr. Ed Strange, resident of Ivy, Virginia, next thanked RSWA for holding the public meeting. He felt it went really well and was informative.

Mr. Strange then commented that this summer the passive gas wells at Cell 2 Unlined would be connected to the active gas system and flare. He felt that after the connection had occurred, the Authority might find that there was a similar leachate problem with Cell 2 Unlined, which was the largest cell at the Ivy site and located close to the sides of the Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined. As far as could be determined, landfilling started in 1968 and Cell 2 Unlined was one of the few original cells. The cell was first used for municipal solid waste (MSW) and then not used for a few years. The cell was again used for stumps and brush and then not used. The cell was finally closed out as a construction and demolition debris (CDD) cell. Cell 2 Unlined had been open well over 30 years, and if there were no water in that cell, Mr. Strange would like to know what happened to the liquid.

Mr. Strange also commented on the two options that were being proposed for leachate treatment. He suggested that any plan be expandable so that if the “worst-case scenario” were to occur and Cell 2 Unlined had similar problems, it could be handled in the same manner and would be less expensive than having to develop a secondary plan. Based on the comments that he had received from the neighbors’ e-mails and phone calls, the Crozet Interceptor appeared to be the favorite option as it gave the greatest assurance that there would not be an odor issue or other problems.

Mr. John Martin, resident of Free Union, Virginia, next commented that he had brought forward an issue previously in 2003 and was bringing it up again. He stated that for nearly five years the City had refused to pay Service Contribution Fees to RSWA and has placed sums due and owing in an escrow account. He was informed that this account now contained approximately \$1.6 million plus interest, and with late fees that had been assessed, the City presently owed RSWA \$2.3 million. He was further informed that during the same period the City had been withholding Service Contribution Fees, the total actual payments of Service Contribution Fees from all other private hauler accounts, which mostly involved County resident waste, has totaled approximately \$2 million. In a letter to RSWA dated October 22, 2001 in which the City first announced its intention to withhold Service Contribution Fees, and which the City professed in the first paragraph to be concerned “about the future of the Authority in light of the recent denial of an extension for operating Cell 2 at the landfill and the potential increase in costs for construction of Cell 5,” the City made the following statements that were related to its reasons for its action to withhold needed revenue from RSWA:

“It is our understanding that the majority of municipal solid waste produced by homes and businesses in Albemarle County does not generate any income for the Authority ... The City of Charlottesville is alone in providing the Authority with a subsidy of that magnitude, and that simply is not fair or defensible to City taxpayers ... We simply

cannot afford to continue to be the unilateral source of such a large subsidy for the Authority.”

With that preface, Mr. Martin asked the following questions:

1. “Could the City Directors elaborate upon the factual basis for these statements and explain more fully the nature of the unfairness the City taxpayers in light of the fact that Service Contribution Fee revenue is in fact generated from County resident waste and has been paid to the RSWA and the City has been alone in withholding Service Contribution Fee revenues?”
2. “Could the County Directors share your views with respect to the City’s claims of unfairness, especially in light of the annual revenue sharing contributions that the County makes to the City?”
3. “Is the City willing to pay to the RSWA Service Contribution Fees presently due and owing as a condition precedent for further negotiations with the County regarding this matter to remove any public perception that an attempt is being made to coerce the County government into a new agreement, not necessarily in the best interest of County residents?”
4. “Will the City Directors recuse themselves from any further votes on RSWA matters until this matter is resolved, given the appearance of conflicts of interest between their dual roles as City officials and RSWA Board members?”

Mr. Gaffney thanked the members of the public who provided comments at today’s meeting.

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
- 5d) Staff Report on Environmental Status
- 5e) Citizens Advisory Committee
 - Approved Minutes of January 10, 2006 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), Update on the Leachate Treatment for Closed Ivy Landfill**, Mr. Frederick stated that an updated status report was being presented to the Board today

RSWA Board Minutes
6.0 Other Business (cont.)
March 27, 2006

because of the considerable additional developments that have occurred on this particular issue since January 2006. He further reported that Mr. Steve Nesbitt with Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. (MPI) was in attendance to discuss the two leachate treatment alternatives.

Mr. Frederick further reported that the generation of higher levels of leachate with the removal of the liquid from Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined presented the questions of how to handle the higher volume and should it be different from the current process of trucking the limited amount of leachate to the Moores Creek facility for treatment. From the additional samples that were taken and MPI's more detailed examination of the data, it could be concluded that there were no unusual characteristics of the leachate than what would normally be found in a landfill cell. There were more intense levels of concentrated biodegradable substances detected in the leachate samples, which were measured in the wastewater industry as biochemical oxygen demand (BOD). BOD is a term that expresses how much oxygen would be needed to treat the waste so that it would be acceptable for the environment. An intense amount of ammonia was also found in the leachate. Nitrates would be formed if ammonia were treated with oxygen. Nitrates did not have the same toxic affect on aquatic organisms as ammonia, but the creation of too much of the substance in the water could lead to algal blooms and other types of issues. The completion of the nitrogen treatment cycle would require another process that will be associated with the future upgrades to the Moores Creek facility.

Mr. Frederick then stated that at the January Board meeting, MPI suggested that there may need to be a limited discharge of water to the Broad Axe Creek and the Mechums River. After the January meeting, through further preliminary design and discussions with DEQ, MPI expressed to RSWA staff that it would not be practicable to treat the leachate to the conditions required for a surface discharge. As a result, the option of a surface discharge was now "off the table" and would not be considered any further.

Mr. Frederick also reported that the findings of high BOD and ammonia in the leachate require that a two-step process be implemented. The first step would be to aerate the existing leachate lagoon to provide biological treatment. The second step could be one of two alternative proposals. The two proposals being offered today were the result of new information gathered during the past two months and were the same ones that were presented at the community meeting last Thursday night. Some of the reactions from that meeting were voiced today during the public comment period. Mr. Frederick then asked Mr. Nesbitt to present MPI's findings and recommendations for the leachate treatment alternatives.

Mr. Nesbitt first stated that during the course of this study, MPI examined six alternative means of handling and treating the leachate. Those alternatives could be divided into simple categories, one being the treatment off-site at the Moores Creek plant. He noted that the facility could deal with ammonia but would not be able to treat the nutrients. Any additional nutrients that were in the leachate would pass through the Moores Creek plant and would subsequently move downstream toward the Chesapeake Bay, which would be a movement in the opposite direction from the recently adopted regulations concerning nutrient wasteload allocations. An evaluation of any off-site option would

RSWA Board Minutes
6.0 Other Business (cont.)
March 27, 2006

need to consider the impact on the nutrient load of the Moores Creek plant. The leachate could reach the Moores Creek plant by either continuing to truck the liquid up and down Interstate 64 or constructing a force main that would pump the leachate from the existing lagoon at the landfill into a pump station. This process would entail pumping the leachate into a fairly small diameter four-inch pipeline from the landfill up to the existing Crozet Interceptor where the leachate could travel back down to the Moores Creek plant, which was referred to as the Crozet option.

Mr. Nesbitt then discussed the on-site treatment options. Because the leachate was high in strength with ammonia and BOD, any of these options would require pre-treatment of the leachate. It was originally thought that the leachate could be discharged into the receiving stream, such as was being done at the Frederick County facility in Winchester, Virginia. After detailed discussions with DEQ, it was determined that there was insufficient assimilative capacity between the landfill and the start of the public water supply designation on the Mechums River to allow a discharge. Although the leachate could be treated to meet those water quality discharge requirements, it was deemed economically unfeasible due to budgetary constraints. Since many of the processes associated with this option were biological and temperature dependent, there were concerns with being able to implement the treatment consistently during the colder winter months. For those reasons, the off-site discharge option was taken “off the table.”

Mr. Nesbitt next commented that a “zero discharge system” or a “closed loop” was developed for the remaining on-site treatment alternative. This system entailed taking the leachate out of the waste mass and putting it into the existing leachate lagoon, which was presently a static holding pond. The lagoon would be upgraded to include active aeration by inserting tubing in the bottom of the lagoon that would inject air to create an oxygen-rich environment allowing the leachate to breakdown biologically. The solids that followed the leachate would then be recirculated, which in essence would be creating a small version of the Moores Creek plant at the Ivy Landfill. The process would not only treat the leachate to a very high degree and remove most of the BOD and ammonia but would also create a nutrient load on the Moores Creek plant. One of the advantages of the Crozet alternative was by injecting the material into the force main, under the right conditions, the nitrogen in the leachate would actually function as an odor suppressant and would provide the added benefit of reducing the present reliance upon Bioxide®, which was being injected at a fairly high cost into the Crozet Interceptor system. Although he could not state that any nutrient load could be eliminated, it was felt that this option had the technical advantage with the right design process of controlling the amount of nutrient so that it could reach a manageable level at the Moores Creek plant.

Mr. Nesbitt then discussed the second component of the “closed loop” system described above, which entailed using the treated water from the aerated lagoon as spray-back irrigation on top of Cell 2 Unlined. The vegetative matter on top of the cap system would absorb the remaining nutrients and metals. Any excess runoff from the top of the cell would be channeled down into the existing stormwater pond, which would be upgraded to have sufficient capacity to hold the liquid in the wet weather seasons when it could not be discharged. Over the estimated 27-year life-cycle period for post-closure care at the Ivy

RSWA Board Minutes
6.0 Other Business (cont.)
March 27, 2006

Landfill, there would be a \$500,000 or \$600,000 cost savings associated with the “zero discharge system,” which entailed the “sprayback” irrigation function.

Mr. Nesbitt next explained the “downsides” associated with the alternatives under consideration. Treating the leachate at the Moores Creek plant would increase the nutrient load for the facility. The neighbors had expressed concerns with the on-site option related to odor, air quality, and the accumulation of metals. Technically he felt that the site could be designed to minimize the odor and air quality concerns. Mr. Nesbitt also believed that the vegetative mass and the application’s rate could be designed so that the uptake of metals could be controlled within the vegetative matter. In order for that to occur, the “sprayback” irrigation field needed to be actively managed and the vegetation harvested and disposed of to prevent the accumulation of metals.

Mr. Tucker asked if there had been any further contact with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) concerning undertaking a joint project if the Crozet Option was selected and what impact would the additional effluent from the rest area off Interstate 64 have on the odor and nutrient loading issues.

Mr. Frederick referred back to the January Board meeting where he had stated that RSWA had received insufficient interest from VDOT to discuss this matter further. Shortly thereafter in response to a phone call made by Ms. Sally Thomas, VDOT did contact RSWA and a meeting was held. The VDOT representative indicated that although there was no money that he could commit at this time, he expressed interest in holding further discussions if RSWA pursued the Crozet alternative. Mr. Frederick had informed him that based on RSWA’s discussions at the January Board Meeting, the Crozet Interceptor may not be the preferred option. It was agreed that RSWA would take the initiative to reestablish the dialog with VDOT if the decision were made to move forward with the Crozet option, with the understanding that VDOT would need to act quickly with committed funding for this joint venture. Mr. Frederick added that since there appeared to be a shift toward the Crozet Interceptor as the preferred alternative, he felt it was time to reestablish contact with VDOT. Mr. Tucker was in agreement that further discussions would be beneficial in identifying specific needs for a joint enterprise, such as pipeline size. Mr. Frederick responded that he would not be able to comment on pipeline requirements until the Authority had the opportunity to review data provided by VDOT. He further stated that if the decision were made to pursue this option and there was a need for a larger pipeline to accommodate VDOT’s needs, the larger flow provided by this joint project would have the potential benefit of increased odor suppression. There were also costs associated with a joint project, and VDOT would need to commit appropriate funding to cover the costs of including the rest area off Interstate 64. Mr. Tucker also expressed concern that without a firm funding commitment from VDOT based on their current revenues, those monies could be allocated to other projects.

Mr. Gaffney inquired if there were special requirements related to harvesting the vegetative cover over Cell 2 Unlined. Mr. Nesbitt stated that it would require either some type of composting operation or disposal at a landfill through RSWA’s Transfer Station.

RSWA Board Minutes
6.0 Other Business (cont.)
March 27, 2006

Mr. Freckmann then asked if he understood correctly that the vegetative cover would need to be periodically cut in order to keep the metal accumulation levels down. Mr. Nesbitt stated that the vegetation would take up the nutrients and some species of vegetation would take up some species of the metals, so that the compost operation would be the ultimate fate of those metals. Mr. Freckmann further inquired about the quality of the compost using vegetation with metals. Mr. Nesbitt replied that the metals would be very low in concentration and would stay with that material. The metal concentrations in the soil on top of the cap system as well as the vegetation would need to be monitored during composting operations. Mr. Frederick added that if the vegetation could not be used for compost material, then it could be put in with the municipal solid waste at the Transfer Station and transported for disposal at a landfill.

Mr. Tucker next asked if there were a way to place a value on the benefit of treating the nitrate and reducing the use of Bioxide® by employing the force main approach. Mr. Nesbitt replied that it cost \$60,000 per year to use Bioxide® as an odor control measure. There would be approximately two years' worth of savings from not using Bioxide®, which would be an additional cost savings from what was listed in the Board report.

Mr. O'Connell inquired as to what would be the regulatory impacts and risks associated with the Moores Creek facility with moving forward with the Crozet Interceptor option. Mr. Frederick stated that the proposed aeration of the leachate in the lagoon would reduce the ammonia levels to a point where it would be very acceptable for treatment within the Moores Creek facility, but that the by-product of ammonia treatment, which is nitrates, could pass through the plant as presently built. They were currently exploring ways to minimize the amount of additional nutrient (nitrate) load for the Moores Creek facility. The RWSA expected to learn within the next few months when the Moores Creek facility would fall under a permit requirement to restrict the amount of nitrates that went into the stream. It was anticipated that the processes that were being proposed for Cell 3 would progress faster than the process for upgrading the Moores Creek facility, and there was the possibility for higher levels of nitrates going out of this plant until the plant upgrades were completed.

Mr. Graham next asked that with the assumption that the plant would need to be upgraded to meet a total nitrogen cap could it also be anticipated that the additional volume of leachate would result in a significant increase in capital costs and operational expenses for this facility. Mr. Frederick stated that it could impact operational and maintenance costs on the order of 2 to 3 percent due to the expenses for treating nitrate and use of chemical additions, such as methanol, to the extent that it might be required and pre-treated leachate was still coming into the facility at the time the plant upgraded to nitrogen removal. He further stated that it was forecasted that about 22,000 gallons per day would initially be withdrawn from Cell 3 into the leachate pond for required treatment. The reduction of the leachate levels in Cell 3 in approximately 3 years would reduce the amount of flow into the Crozet Interceptor, which could coincide when the plant was scheduled to begin nitrate removal in 2011. Mr. Nesbitt added that based on conservative analysis of flow rates, on day one at the peak flow there would be a

RSWA Board Minutes
6.0 Other Business (cont.)
March 27, 2006

2 percent increase in the nutrient loading at the Moores Creek. The flow rates dropped from the 22,000 gallons per day loading from the Cell 3 area exponentially over that three-year period.

Mr. Gaffney inquired how the flows would be measured for billing purposes. Mr. Frederick replied that a formula had not yet been developed.

Mr. Frederick then referred back to Mr. Graham's question and stated that he did not anticipate bringing the leachate to the Moores Creek facility would increase the capital costs of the Moores Creek plant upgrade. In the early years after the plant upgrades were completed to treat nutrients, the plant would have some excess capacity for the leachate. The Authority's goal was to reduce the leachate to very minimal levels by the time the Moores Creek plant needed to use its full capacity.

Mr. O'Connell requested that Mr. Frederick put in writing when he reported back to the Board the impacts to the capital and operating costs for the Moores Creek plant. Mr. Frederick stated that he would provide that information to the Board.

Mr. Graham also asked if there would be a pre-treatment agreement between RSWA and RWSA, and Mr. Frederick replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Graham also questioned if he understood correctly from what he has read that DEQ was not providing much guidance and direction to RWSA on a preferred alternative. Mr. Nesbitt responded that DEQ was sensitive to the Chesapeake Bay clean-up efforts and understood the strategic objective for nutrient removal, which he felt allowed DEQ to be receptive to an environmentally balanced approach in their consideration of other treatment alternatives.

Mr. Tucker then asked if DEQ had the ultimate decision on which treatment option would be implemented. Mr. Nesbitt stated that DEQ could make the on-site "sprayback" option very financially unattractive. At this time, the agency has not offered a definite statement as to the "sprayback" option being permissible. DEQ could impose additional technical requirements that would require the installation of a Subtitle D liner system on top of the Cell 2 Unlined area at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars per acre, which would add approximately \$5 million to the capital costs of that option. Mr. Tucker next inquired when it was anticipated that DEQ would offer its opinion on a preferred option.

Mr. Nesbitt stated that based on his conversations with DEQ staff on Wednesday, he felt RSWA would have that information soon. Ms. Mueller also asked if DEQ's response would be verbal or in writing and commented on the importance of receiving written direction from DEQ during this process. Mr. Nesbitt commented that RSWA would need to go through a permit amendment process with either of those options, which would take several months. He felt that RSWA would at least obtain verbal direction from DEQ in the near future.

Mr. O'Connell asked for clarification concerning the time line for moving forward with one of those options. Mr. Frederick stated that DEQ would like the Authority to move as

quickly as possible on the removal and treatment of the leachate in Cell 3, but recognized that the public input process and the local governmental approvals needed to occur first. This process would need to be completed in a responsible but expedient manner. He further commented that he did not include a recommended action in this report because at the time the report was distributed, the public meeting had not been held. He suggested that April be set as the target date for presenting recommendations for Board approval.

Mr. Frederick then clarified a written statement in the report with respect to the force main of the Crozet Interceptor that it would achieve a goal of no nutrient discharges at the Moores Creek plant. At the time the report was written, there was data that suggested that it was a possible goal. After reviewing the data, MPI discovered that some of the numbers were not correct in that assumption that all the nutrients would be eliminated but could handle a considerable amount of the nutrients in the Crozet Interceptor force main.

Mr. Frederick next identified three items that RSWA would focus its attention during the next 30 days. RSWA would first attempt by working with MPI to see if there was a process that could eliminate even more of the nutrients without additional costs to the budget. Secondly, RSWA would re-establish contact with VDOT to determine their degree of interest in a joint project. The third item entailed establishing contact with Albemarle concerning what process needed to be undertaken if RSWA wanted to petition Albemarle County for a sewer line that was not part of the Urban designated area.

7.0 Other Items From Board/Staff Not On Agenda

Mr. O'Connell announced that City Council would hold a public hearing on the City's budget on April 3, 2006 at 7:30 p.m. The proposal being made by the City Manager to City Council would be to fully fund RSWA's requirements out of City taxpayers' dollars. There was a lot of pressure to cut the tax rate and expenses. He felt that the comments from Mr. Martin, Mr. Strange, and Mr. Weber would be welcomed at the public hearing. The landfill costs for environmental cleanup at the site in the City Budget out of taxpayer money was the largest percentage increase of any single item in the budget, and one of largest dollar increases. To his knowledge, the City has never "backed off" from funding the cleanup efforts at the Ivy site. There have been disagreements on how to accomplish it. One of things that Mr. Martin left out during his comments was that the letter sent by the City was subject to an equitable City and County cost share agreement, which he felt was now very close to being achieved.

Mr. Gaffney reiterated Mr. O'Connell's comments and invited Mr. Martin to deliver the same message at the April 3 public hearing. Mr. Martin stated that he still did not understand why the Service Contribution Fees were retained and put in escrow in the first place, as no explanation has ever been given. It was clearly not because the County was not contributing any Service Contribution Fees. Mr. Gaffney responded that it was a short-term agreement that had continued well past the intended time frame. The City felt that there was a need to reach a long-term agreement with the County, which was an ongoing process. He expressed his hope that an agreement would be reached in the very near future.

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 Mr. Graham. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Gary O'Connell
Secretary - Treasurer