

RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
October 24, 2005

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Monday, October 24, 2005 at 3:05 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, and Mr. Robert Tucker.

Board Members Absent: Mr. Gary O'Connell

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

Also Present: Mr. Chad Freckmann – RSWA Citizens Advisory Committee Chair, Mr. Kurt Krueger - RSWA Attorney, Mr. Phil McKalips – Environmental Standards, 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, October 24, 2005 at 3:05 p.m., and he noted that a quorum was present.

2.0 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Upon a motion by Mr. Tucker, and seconded by Ms. Mueller, the Board of Directors by a 4 - 0 vote approved the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on Monday, August 22, 2005.

3.0 Executive Director's Report

Mr. Frederick first gave special recognition for a milestone achieved at the Ivy site last week. The first substrate injection as part of the active bioremediation project was placed into the groundwater, which meant that Phase I of the enhanced system was now functioning in the pilot area. There would be additional substrate injections leading up to the injection of cultures that was anticipated to occur next spring. Monitoring activities were already underway, and the Board would be updated on the process.

Mr. Frederick next reported on the progress of the Cell 3 investigation that had occurred since the last Board meeting. He noted that the work was continuing and was summarized in Item 5d of the Consent Agenda.

- The hydrogeological investigative work had been completed, which basically confirmed that the water within Cell 3 lined moved much slower than originally anticipated and that the cell was probably more stable than was feared two

RSWA Board Minutes

3.0 Executive Director's Report (cont.)
October 24, 2005

months ago based on a worst-case scenario. The slower water movement could also result in a longer-term leachate removal process.

- The field work related to the investigation of the cell's cap has been completed, but some samples were still being analyzed by the laboratory. Any conclusions concerning the cap's integrity were pending until the completion of this evaluation process, but there was nothing noted during the field work that would raise a "red flag." RSWA should be able to provide a more definitive answer on the functionality of the cap at next month's Board meeting.
- Alternatives were also being explored by Environmental Standards, Inc. (ESI) for a new leachate collection system to replace the failed system at Cell 3. Options being evaluated included horizontal boring of the new system to allow gravity flow and the use of pumps to extract the liquid. If the liquid flow and yield were very low, it would mean that more vertical wells would need to be drilled and would make the horizontal boring option worthwhile to explore. Environmental Standards, Inc. (ESI) hoped to have comparison information by next month.
- Treatment options were also being evaluated, including on-site options, as well as continuing to haul the material to the Moores Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. There were no issues at this point that would rule out on-site treatment, but the size of the system and its cost would depend upon the yield from Cell 3 lined. Additional analysis of treatment options was needed before a recommendation could be presented to the Board.
- No Board action was needed at today's meeting. RSWA's authority to continue with the investigation work at Cell 3 for the next month was authorized by the Board at the August meeting. Mr. Frederick felt it was important that either he or Mr. Phillip McKalips, RSWA consultant from ESI who was also in attendance, address any questions the Board might have concerning the investigation process.

Mr. Frederick reported briefly on the October 11, 2005 meeting with the neighbors of the Ivy Landfill. It was an information session that he felt went well. He received a number of positive comments from others in attendance who were very appreciative of the information provided by RSWA staff and consultants. RSWA would entertain holding another meeting as appropriate in order to keep the interested neighbors and other citizens involved with the environmental clean-up of the Ivy site.

Mr. Frederick stated that the last item on his report concerned the Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) Day held at the Ivy Transfer Station on October 8, 2005. Given the weather conditions on that date, he felt it was a very successful event. The amount of participation was lower than recent past years, particularly during the early morning when heavy rainfall occurred. Since the HHW Day, Rivanna's office had received some

RSWA Board Minutes

3.0 Executive Director's Report (cont.)

October 24, 2005

calls inquiring if there would be a weather make-up date. Since RSWA had to commit the services of a hazardous waste firm well in advance of the event, scheduling a make-up day was not an option. Consistent with the budget, interested persons were being informed that another event was being planned for the spring.

Mr. Frederick next reported on an item not included in his written report that had just recently been brought to his attention. RSWA had been attempting through the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) to provide some follow-up information on the status of the Solid Waste Management Regional Plan. RSWA had been informed this morning by TJPDC staff that DEQ had not approved the plan that had been submitted several months ago. With the submission of Greene County's Recycling Rate Report, TJPDC was able to calculate the regional recycling rate for 2004. If the district had been under an approved plan in 2004, the regional recycling rate would have been 24.1 percent, which was below DEQ's 25 percent minimum. He stressed that RSWA's recycling rate, which included the areas of Albemarle County, the City of Charlottesville, and the Town of Scottsville, was 28.9 percent. Mr. Frederick commented that the regional recycling rate issue would place RSWA in a difficult position with a decision to move forward with a regional approach to solid waste planning. After further exploration of this issue, Mr. Frederick might have some additional comments or recommendations to present to the Board in the near future.

Ms. Mueller commented that her office also received calls concerning the HHW Day, and the citizens were informed about the spring event. She suggested that the wording "No Rain Date" be added to the advertisements for the spring HHW Day so that the residents understood upfront that this was not an option.

Ms. Mueller also stated that at the last financial update concerning Cell 3, RSWA presented funding needs only through October and inquired as to the current expenditure rate and financial status of the investigation. Mr. Frederick responded that the actual spending for the two-month period had been less than what had been projected. Ms. Mueller further questioned as to when the Board would receive a financial update, and Mr. Frederick stated that the information would be provided next month.

Mr. Gaffney stated that he had three questions concerning Mr. Frederick's report. The first one dealt with the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and TJPDC's statement that DEQ did not approve the plan. He asked if that meant the plan was rejected or was it still under consideration. Mr. Frederick replied that TJPDC had indicated to him that DEQ had not approved the plan. RSWA had requested copies of the written communication from DEQ, but as of today, he had not seen the most recent letter received by the TJPDC. Once he has had an opportunity to review that correspondence, he would have a better idea as to the status of the plan.

Mr. Gaffney next question concerned the Cell 3 lined investigation and whether the water not moving through the cell meant that there might be less water in the cell than originally projected. Mr. Frederick replied that it was possible but not yet confirmed.

The 47 million gallon estimate was based on the known water levels in the various wells

RSWA Board Minutes

3.0 Executive Director's Report (cont.)

October 24, 2005

and extrapolating the data through the entire cell. The assumption was also made that the entire waste mass below the liquid level was saturated. When a landfill was in use, a daily cover was placed on top of each day's activity that could become a somewhat impermeable barrier, depending on the cell's construction. Of the 13 wells that were drilled as part of the hydrogeological investigation, 12 showed water levels very close to the predicted levels and 1 was dry, which could be an indication of some dry pockets that could not be quantified at this time.

Mr. Gaffney also asked if the statement that there were no adverse affects from the heavy rainfall meant that the water in the wells remained close to the same level. Mr. Frederick stated that his understanding from discussions with the consultants was that the response to rainfall events did not indicate a badly leaking cap. From his perspective, it was also important to note that there were no signs of any structural stress at the bottom of the cell from the 7-inch rainfall during a 24- to 48-hour event at that location. Mr. Frederick then asked Mr. McKalips if there was any additional information that he wanted to provide at this time.

Mr. McKalips referenced back to Mr. Gaffney's question concerning the amount of water in the cell. The waste material acted somewhat like a sponge, and it was originally thought to hold a certain amount of water. Through the process of pumping the water out of the wells, it was determined that the vast majority of the liquid was gravity drained out into the wells. In addition to the water moving slowly in the waste material, the initial analysis projected a much smaller amount of gravity flow out. Based on those evaluations, there could be significantly less than the 47 million gallons originally projected.

4.0 Items From The Public

There were no items from the public.

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 July 12, 2005 Meeting

As there were no further questions or discussion, 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 4 – 0 vote.

6.0 Other Business

There was no Other Business this month.

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 Mr. Graham. All members voted aye, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Gary O'Connell
Secretary - Treasurer