

**RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**May 22, 2006**

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, May 22, 2006 at 2:43 p.m. in the Conference Room, Administration Building, 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

**Board Member Absent:** Ms. Judith Mueller.

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

**Also Present:** Mr. Kurt Krueger - RSWA Attorney, 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, May 22, 2006 at 2:43 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

Mr. Gaffney welcomed his fellow Board members, RSWA staff, and members of the public in attendance at today's meeting.

**2.0 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the Board of Directors by a 4 - 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, April 24, 2006.

**3.0 Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Frederick first commented that as reported last month, the recycling rate for calendar year 2005 for the area served by RSWA, which included the City of Charlottesville, the County of Albemarle, and the Town of Scottsville, was 30.7 percent. This surpassed the 25 percent figure that was required by Virginia law. There was also discussion concerning RSWA being part of the Thomas Jefferson Solid Waste Region, which included the communities served by RSWA, as well as Fluvanna County, Greene County, and Nelson County. Since the last meeting, the Authority received a report from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) that the recycling rate for the region was 26 percent, which was an increase over the 24.1 percent reported last year. This was the first year that the region's recycling rate has exceeded the 25 percent threshold. It was not certain at this time how this might "pave the way" toward DEQ approval of the Region's Solid Waste Plan. The TJPDC was following up on this issue with DEQ.

Mr. Frederick next drew attention to an item that was included in the Ivy Environmental Report on the Consent Agenda. Environmental Standards, Inc. (ESI) had been undertaking enhanced biological remediation in the pilot area at the Ivy site since February when the first bacteria solution was dispensed into the well field. Groundwater sampling results have been very positive, especially the reduction of chlorinated solvent compounds, which has been a key compound targeted for remediation in the Corrective Action Plan (CAP). The Authority continued to be hopeful, will continue to monitor, and will present a report to the Board later this year on the progress of the enhanced biological remediation in the pilot area, as well as a plan for implementation throughout the entire site. He felt this work, along with other improvements such as the proposed Cell 3 Treatment options, was a move in the right direction and would make a substantial difference in how this site is viewed in the future.

#### **4.0 Items From The Public**

Mr. John Martin, resident of Free Union, Virginia, commented that two Saturday's ago he loaded up the back of his jeep with nine years' worth of accumulated paints, solvents, antifreeze, and all other "nasty stuff" and drove it to the Ivy Landfill for the Household Hazardous Waste Day. He felt it could not have been a more convenient operation. When he drove in with his load, he was told to not even get out of his car as it would be unloaded for him. He got out of his car anyway because he wanted to see what was going on. He never saw the people before and did not know who they were, but it was very efficient. It was a real public service.

Mr. Gaffney thanked Mr. Martin for his comments and also Mr. Bruce Edmonds who assisted with the Household Hazardous Waste Day event.

#### **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 Recycling Operations
- 5d) Staff Report on Environmental Status
- 5e) Amendments to the Personnel Manual
- 5f) Citizens Advisory Committee
  - Approved Minutes of March 24, 2006 Meeting

Mr. Graham moved, which was seconded by Mr. Tucker, that the Board of Directors vote to approve Items 5a), b), c), d), e), and f) of the Consent Agenda. The motion was approved by a 4 – 0 vote.

#### **6.0 Other Business**

In regards to **Item 6a), Cell 3 Treatment Options**, Mr. Frederick stated that this issue has been discussed at several Board meetings with the last update being presented at the March meeting.

Although the condition itself has existed as a latent condition for many years, developing a remedy has been an emerging challenge as new information requires modifications to the thought process. After several months of investigating, RSWA was ready at today's meeting to put forth recommendations on leachate treatment options for the closed Ivy Landfill.

Mr. Frederick then reported that during sampling of the leachate contained within Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined, a very high ammonia content was found as well as a high biochemical oxygen demand, which was the amount of oxygen that was needed for organic breakdown of dissolved and suspended constituents in water. The high demand meant that a pretreatment facility needed to be located at the Ivy site so that the water drawn from Cell 3 Lined and Cell 3 Unlined could be treated to the quality that would allow discharge to the Moores Creek facility or the exploration of other options.

Mr. Frederick next stated that after pretreatment of the leachate, which included aerating the existing lagoon at the site, two options were being considered that were competitive with respect to capital costs. One option was to create a "closed loop" system, which would sprayback the water on top of Cell 2 Unlined where there was enough flat land space to handle the amount of liquid that would be withdrawn from the site. This option would also provide storage of the pretreated water in an upgraded stormwater pond with lining. The key advantage with this option was that it assured this community that there would no additional nutrient discharge to the Rivanna River.

Mr. Frederick also reported that the second option consisted of constructing a force main and pumping the pretreated water to the Crozet Interceptor, where it would eventually make its way to the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. This option removed the contingencies and uncertainties of what would happen to the material if it remained at the Ivy site. The option did present the issue of increasing the nutrient discharge at the Moores Creek plant.

Mr. Frederick then commented that DEQ was pushing for this project to proceed on a fast timeline. The Authority was aware that it would need to put the treatment system into operation before the many complex issues were resolved regarding the upgrade of the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mr. Frederick added that as reported previously, a public meeting was held in March to discuss the leachate treatment options. The meeting was well attended by citizens who lived around the Ivy Landfill who voiced their preference for the Crozet Interceptor and some concerns about retaining and managing the liquid on-site.

Mr. Frederick also reported that the Authority did follow-up with DEQ as indicated two months ago concerning the viability of permitting a "closed-loop" system. DEQ indicated at that time that the option was permissible, but there would be strict controls in place on the manner and rate of application to ensure that the water was taken up by the vegetative cover and also on the method of harvesting the vegetation, either through composting, disposal, or other options, to prevent soil accumulation.

Mr. Frederick next stated that Crozet Interceptor option offered many advantages, including public support, but there were also some issues that needed closer examination as potential

disadvantages and included the potential for increased nutrient discharge and higher operating costs than the sprayback irrigation option. The Authority then asked Malcolm Pirnie to scrutinize further the conceptual design of the aerated lagoon in an attempt to minimize nutrient increases in the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant discharges to the Rivanna River. Mr. Frederick added that during that time, RSWA staff have held discussions with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) concerning integrating the Crozet Interceptor option with sewer service to the westbound rest area on I-64, located about one mile east of the Ivy Landfill area. He had positive news to share on both of those challenges. Without any increase to capital costs for the Crozet Interceptor option, the aerated lagoon could be designed to create pockets of anoxic zones, to permit nitrates to be reduced to nitrogen gas, and achieve additional nutrient reduction. This conceptual change would not offer a clear guarantee that there would not be a nutrient increase in the effluent discharge of the Moores Creek plant but did provide a greater assurance than what was presented two months ago. Based on a very conservative analysis, it was felt that with the recent change in conceptual design, the increase in nutrient discharges could be limited to 5 percent and more likely under most conditions the increase would be closer to 0 percent. The change in conceptual design would create a more complex lagoon. If this option were pursued, RSWA could have one of the most complex aerated lagoons of any landfill in Virginia because it would be similar to operating a mini-nutrient reduction wastewater plant.

Mr. Frederick next commented that VDOT was interested in a joint sewer project, as the costs proposed by RSWA were consistent with the amount their agency had budgeted if they were to pursue sewer service for the rest area. With joint financing, the Authority felt it could lower its contribution to the capital costs enough to offset the increase in operating costs that would be experienced over the next three to five years. The Authority did not have a formal written agreement with VDOT at this time, but there was a good understanding of what would be required to finalize the joint process.

Mr. Frederick further stated that VDOT also wanted to provide sewer service for the eastbound rest area and would probably request the water service as well. He did not feel that RSWA needed to be involved with the question of water service and that VDOT would need to make that proposal to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors on its own. VDOT's consultant had recommended that the eastbound rest area, which was west of the Crozet exit on I-64, be served by force main that would go into a sewer transmission system that Rivanna operated near the J. T. Henley Middle School and Western Albemarle High School area. RSWA examined this proposal, and the alternative of extending the transmission line from the eastbound rest area further east to approximately the Ivy site to join the pipeline from Ivy to the Crozet Interceptor would increase VDOT's costs over the current proposal. RSWA and VDOT were in agreement that VDOT would continue to pursue their current recommended plan for the eastbound rest area separate from the joint project. There would be clear economies of scale for both RSWA and VDOT by participating in a joint sewer project that would include the pretreated leachate and the westbound rest area.

Mr. Frederick then commented that the Crozet Interceptor option was not very different from the one that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors approved a few years ago. RSWA would review the details of that plan to determine if it was consistent with what was adopted by the Board or whether a new request would need to be made. The Authority wanted the proposal to

be in the best interest of this community now, given that some of the conditions appeared different than what was proposed a few years ago.

Mr. Frederick next addressed the Board actions that RSWA would be recommending today. Before a significant amount of work was done in additional engineering planning and other expenses, the Authority was requesting the opportunity to present the two alternatives for leachate treatment and a recommendation to pursue the Crozet Interceptor option to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors at their June 7, 2006 meeting. If the Board of Supervisors concurred with RSWA's recommendation, RSWA would immediately solicit proposals to begin preliminary design work on this option, recognizing that there were site plan and other issues that would need to go back to Albemarle County for approval under its Zoning and Comprehensive Plan before moving toward final design. Based on the option being favorably received during this process, RSWA planned to bring back a recommended award of an engineering contract for Board approval at the July 24, 2006 Board meeting.

Mr. Tucker inquired about DEQ's timeline for completing this project. Mr. Frederick responded that DEQ had not provided the Authority with a firm deadline but have indicated that they wanted it completed as soon as possible. Mr. Tucker felt that a definite deadline being provided by DEQ would serve as an impetus for VDOT to make a firm funding commitment for this joint project. Mr. Frederick added that RSWA on its own developed what it felt was a feasible schedule for completing this project. If the decision were to move forward with the Crozet Interceptor option, the first task would be to prepare a plan to amend the landfill permit with DEQ to incorporate this option. The Solid Waste Permit amendment would not have to contain significant detail about the piping configuration once the liquid left the Ivy site, but the improvements to the Ivy site would need to be submitted for permit even before it went to final design. The permit would then undergo DEQ review and a public input process. Moving forward on a parallel track to DEQ's process by proceeding with the site planning requirements needed for the County's Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors and also the selection of a pipeline route was the most expedient manner to complete the project. After RSWA received the Solid Waste Permit and completed the final design work, the Authority felt that it could take several months for construction to occur. The Authority planned to pursue this timeline unless DEQ imposed a different deadline for the project's completion. RSWA would advise DEQ if it was felt that the deadline was unachievable. Mr. Frederick added that he felt it was important that the Authority make a commitment to DEQ to move as quickly as possible to complete this project.

Mr. O'Connell asked if the Board's decisions today would be affected by VDOT not participating in this project. Mr. Tucker stated that he felt that the Authority would use the same alignment on the westbound side of I-64 whether or not VDOT was a joint partner. Mr. O'Connell then inquired if it would be more of a financial than a planning issue. Mr. Frederick stated that Mr. O'Connell was correct. Mr. O'Connell then questioned if the transmission line would be restricted and dedicated only for the project purpose. Mr. Tucker commented that he felt that it would not be opened up for development as he anticipated that the line would be very small in size. Mr. Frederick added that the line could be 3 to 4 inches in diameter.

Mr. Tucker moved, and was seconded by Mr. Graham, that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to present the two alternatives for leachate treatment, a summary of the March 23 public meeting comments, and a recommendation to pursue the Crozet Interceptor option to the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors on June 7, 2006. Further, if the Crozet Interceptor option is favorably received by the Board of Supervisors, the Executive Director is authorized to solicit consulting engineering proposals through a competitive negotiation for a firm to prepare all documents necessary for final County approval, DEQ solid waste and wastewater permitting, and final design (following approvals previously stated) of the aerated lagoon and sewer pumping and piping improvements with the award of a consulting engineering contract to come back before the Board for approval on July 24, 2006. The motion was approved by a 4 – 0 vote.

In regards to **Item 6b), Public Hearing on Adoption of FY 2007 Budget**, Mr. Gaffney formally opened the Public Hearing at 3:02 p.m.

Mr. John Martin, resident of Free Union, Virginia, stated that he did not intend for his comments to be at all a criticism of staff. He felt that staff has done everything that they could do on this budget, which budgets a net loss of over half a million dollars. The problem was that the Board of Directors has failed to resolve the Service Contribution Fee issue with the City. He understood that negotiations have gone well and that an agreement was very close. In fact, he heard that an agreement was being drafted up. He felt it was very unfair to the public to go forward with this budget until the public knows what that agreement was and how the agreement would affect this budget. Certainly, it would affect this budget. He thought this budget was not ready for public comment today, and he did not think it was ready for approval today. “Take first things first, resolve that agreement, revise the budget, and come back in a special meeting in a couple weeks or at the meeting next month so it would be approved by July 1. It was really unfair to the public to go forward with it today. You are budgeting a net loss of \$538,000. Somebody was going to pay that money; you have to come up with that money someplace. Where was the money coming from? It was going to come from the people of this community, one way or the other. Either through General Revenues of the City or the County or some other way, but it was going to come from the public.” He felt it was very, very troubling to have this net loss in the budget, and he thought it should go forward only after all necessary information was revealed.

Mr. Ed Strange, resident of Ivy, Virginia, stated that he wanted to echo Mr. Martin’s comments. He was surprised that the Authority did not have a balanced budget. It made him wonder where the Authority was going get their money. The Service Contribution Fee dispute has been going on since September 1, 2001 – almost 5 years. He stated that all he could say was “show me the money. I don’t see it.” He did not know if that was how RSWA planned to balance the budget. He wished the Authority well and hoped it was successful. He was real surprised about the Debt Service. “I guess that slipped by me.” He wanted to know more about it, such as what was the initial amount, when was it first taken out, had there been any additional withdrawals, when was the projected payoff, and how much would it cost per year. The debt and the unbalanced budget all bring into question the Authority’s ability to meet its schedule for remediation at Ivy. That was not very comforting as an Ivy neighbor. He was really concerned about the financial well being of this Authority. We have a lot to lose and will be paying along with every other taxpayer. “Make them show you the money and figure out what you are going to do because you

can't keep borrowing forever. You have to meet expenses. The only people who could do that were the federal people. They get to print money; you don't."

Mr. Gaffney thanked Mr. Martin and Mr. Strange for their comments.

As there were no other members of the public in attendance at the meeting who wanted to speak on the proposed RSWA FY 2007 budget, Mr. Gaffney closed the Public Hearing at 3:08 p.m.

In regards to **Item 6c), Recommended Adoption of FY 2007 Budget**, Mr. Frederick reiterated some of the key provisions that were in the proposed budget. He stated that there were no proposed increases in the Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) tipping fees for next year. He referenced the total fee schedule and noted some minor increase in fees for Hauling, Vegetative Waste and Clean Fill. There was also a request for a 4 percent merit pool for employees similar to the Water and Sewer Authority's budget. The Authority was proposing to hold the City and County contributions to the Ivy Environmental to the same amount as this year. Funding for the work on the design of the new leachate treatment and collection systems for the two perched cells will come from reserves to the extent that it cannot be fully funded through the Memorandum of Understanding among the Authority, the City, the County, and the University of Virginia for environmental costs. He added that there were not adequate reserves to fund these projects into the construction phase. The Authority will be working very closely with City and County staffs over the next few months on proposed funding options to cover construction costs. These discussions will be held during a time frame that supported the County and the City budget process for FY 2008. Also in the proposed budget was a request to fill a Solid Waste Manager position and called for a Strategic Plan for meeting the long-term future needs of the Authority, incorporated with substantial coordination with the City, County, and public comment.

Concerning Service Contribution Fees, Mr. Gaffney commented that statements made last year at this same time indicated that an agreement was close and would be completed in the near future. He had recommended approval of last year's budget based on that information in addition to the commitment made by the City and County to operate RSWA in a manner that would meet the community's needs. He was sorry to report that an agreement had not been finalized to date, but from what he has heard, it would be completed in the near future. Mr. Gaffney would recommend that the proposed FY 2007 Budget be approved based on the same reasoning that an agreement was close to completion and the commitment by the City and County to operate the Authority in a proper manner.

Mr. Tucker commented that he would not have a problem delaying a vote on the proposed budget until next month. However, an agreement would need to go before City Council and the Board of Supervisors for approval, and he doubted whether this could be accomplished within the month of June. The Authority would then be faced with no budget beginning on July 1, 2006, which he thought would be a really large problem for implementing environmental remediation at the Ivy site. He would agree with Mr. Gaffney's comments concerning the progress of the current negotiations and the need to approve the proposed budget at this time. Once the agreement was finalized, which he felt would occur after July 1, the budget would need to be amended in order to identify those revenues and then presented to the Board for approval.

Mr. O'Connell stated that from the City's standpoint it was important to note that the dollars were already in the City's adopted budget. He felt it would be disastrous if the budget was not adopted today. He also agreed that once a conceptual agreement was reached, it would take two to three months before it could be finalized.

Mr. Graham next commented that he concurred with the previous statements. He added that if you looked back at the history for the past two years, outside of the environmental costs, RSWA has done a very good job of managing the operational expenses and gave staff credit for that accomplishment. He felt this was a very good budget, and he was anxious to see the budget implemented. Mr. Graham also wanted to see the agreement finalized, and he felt it was important to have that done as soon as possible. He did not feel that it justified holding up adoption of this budget and putting the staff "in limbo" for the next couple of months while the details of the agreement were being worked out.

Mr. Frederick also commented that if the budget was not adopted at this time, he felt it would send the wrong message to DEQ concerning the Authority's commitment to resolving the Cell 3 issues.

Mr. Tucker moved, which was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, that the RSWA Board of Directors vote to approve the following resolution detailing the proposed tipping fees and the supporting RSWA Budget for Fiscal Year 2007 to be effective July 1, 2007:

## **RESOLUTION**

### **ADOPTION OF THE RIVANNA SOLID WASTE AUTHORITY BUDGET AND RELATED TIPPING FEES RATE SCHEDULE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007**

**WHEREAS**, the Authority has advertised and held a public hearing on May 22, 2006, on the proposed Fiscal Year 2007 budget and related rates in accordance with Section 15.2-5136(H) of the Code of Virginia, as amended;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Board of Directors hereby adopt the accompanying rate schedule effective July 1, 2006, and the Fiscal Year 2007 budget as summarized in the attached table.

**RSWA Board Minutes**  
**6.0 Other Business (Cont.)**  
**May 22, 2006**

Material Charge Detail

Per Ton Charges

Code	Description	'06 Fee	Proposed '07 Fee	Unit	Inbound/Outbound
CLEAN-FILL	Brick Block & Soil	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.50	ton	Inbound
CONST	Construction Debris	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	ton	Inbound
DOCUMENT	Document Shredding	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	ton	Inbound
DOMESTIC	Domestic Waste - IVY TRANSFER	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	ton	Inbound - Ivy
	Domestic Waste - BFI TRANSFER	\$ 62.00	\$ 62.00	ton	Inbound - BFI
MSW	Domestic Waste - UVA	\$ 4.66	Contract	ton	Inbound
MSW 2	Domestic Waste - County	\$ 5.83	Contract	ton	Inbound
PALLETS	Pallets	\$ 46.00	\$ 46.00	ton	Inbound
SLUDGE-RV	Sludge from S. Rivanna WTP	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	ton	Inbound
TIRES	Tires Bulk	\$ 166.00	\$ 166.00	ton	Inbound
VEG-WASTE	Vegetative Waste	\$ 44.00	\$ 46.00	ton	Inbound
WHITE-WT	Non-Freon White Goods-Appliances	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	ton	Inbound
COMPOST	MCWWTP Compost	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	ton	Outbound
MULCH	Mulch	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.00	ton	Outbound
LUMBER-LOG	Lumber Log	\$ 15.00	\$ 15.00	ton	Outbound

*\$5.00 minimum on all per ton charge items.*

Per Item Charges

Code	Description	'06 Fee	Proposed '07 Fee	Unit	Inbound/Outbound
FREON-CT	Freon Appliances	\$ 16.00	\$ 16.00	ea.	Inbound
PCT-OR	Passenger Car Tire Off Rim	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	ea.	Inbound
PCT-WR	Passenger Car Tire With Rim	\$ 10.75	\$ 10.75	ea.	Inbound
TT-OR	Truck Tire Off Rim	\$ 15.50	\$ 15.50	ea.	Inbound
TT-WR	Truck Tire With Rim	\$ 30.75	\$ 30.75	ea.	Inbound
WHITE-CT	Non-Freon Appliances	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.00	ea.	Inbound
TAG-A-BAG	Trash Stickers (sheet of 12)	\$ 12.00	\$ 15.00	ea.	Outbound

Hauling & Other Charges

Code	Description	'06 Fee	Proposed '07 Fee	Unit	Inbound/Outbound
DOC PULL	Document Pull Charge	\$ 75.00	\$ 85.00	ea.	
LUMBER PUL	Lumber Pull Charge	\$ 75.00	\$ 85.00	ea.	
SLUDGE-50	Sludge Pull Charge	\$ 75.00	\$ 85.00	ea.	
OUT-MISC	Base Delivery Fee	\$ 75.00	\$ 85.00	ea.	
OUT-MISC	Delivery Within 1st Area	\$ 10.00	\$ 15.00	ea.	
OUT-MISC	Delivery Within 2nd Area	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.00	ea.	
	Delivery Fee Over County Line	\$ 30.00	\$ 35.00	ea.	
OUT-MISC	Encore Shop Sales	VARIES PER ITEM		ea.	Outbound
	Credit Application Fee	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	ea.	
TICKET CHG	Ticket Request Pull Charge	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	ea.	

**VOTE**

**AYES:** Mr. Gaffney, Mr. Graham, Mr. O'Connell, and Mr. Tucker

**NAYS:** 0

**ABSENT DURING VOTE:** Ms. Mueller

**ABSENT DURING MEETING:** Ms. Mueller

In regards to **Item 6d), Personnel Changes**, Mr. Frederick stated that RSWA was recommending that the Board approve a 4 percent merit pool to fund pay for performance employee raises effective FY 2007. A 2.5 percent adjustment to the salary ranges for all pay grades across the board was also being requested. Staff was working on a job description for the new Solid Waste Manager position and a recommendation on the job description and assigned pay grade will be presented to the Board in June.

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the Board of Directors voted to approve the 2.5 percent adjustment to the salary pay scales effective July 1, 2006 and authorize those changes to be incorporated into Section E of the RSWA Personnel Manual. The motion was approved by 4 – 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. O'Connell moved the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Mr. Graham. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Mr. Gary O'Connell  
Secretary - Treasurer