



RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
March 25, 2025

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, March 25, 2025 at 2:00 p.m. at the Rivanna Administration Building, (2nd Floor Conference Room), 695 Moores Creek Lane, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

Board Members Present: Mike Gaffney, Brian Pinkston, Jim Andrews, Jeff Richardson, Sam Sanders, Steven Hicks, Jeffrey Dumars.

Board Members Absent: None.

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, Lonnie Wood, David Tungate, David Rhoades, David White, Leah Beard, Deborah Anama, Jacob Woodson.

Attorney(s) Present: Valerie Long.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney convened the March 25, 2025 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority at 2:00 p.m.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Mr. Andrews moved the Board to approve the agenda. Mr. Sanders seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ON JANUARY 28, 2025

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to approve minutes of the previous Board meeting on January 28, 2025. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

4. RECOGNITION

There was none.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, welcomed Jeffrey Dumars, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services for Albemarle County, to the RSWA Board of Directors. He stated that he had recently been appointed by the Albemarle Board of Supervisors. Mr. Mawyer stated that they had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Dumars in person, taking him on a tour of their McIntire and Ivy facilities, as well as a virtual tour, during which they discussed the budget and solid waste organizational features. He stated that they had moderately oriented him to their solid waste operations, and he appreciated his participation and looked forward to his membership.

Mr. Mawyer stated that he also wanted to recognize a new team member, David White, who had joined their construction management group as a project engineer. He stated that Mr. White had

started just yesterday, and he held a degree in mechanical engineering from North Carolina A&T. He stated that Mr. White was a good fit for their team, and they were glad to have him on board.

David White, Project Engineer, thanked Mr. Mawyer for the introduction. He stated that he was happy to be here and looked forward to contributing his work to Rivanna.

Mr. Mawyer stated that to further their strategic plan priority of communication and collaboration, they provided tours to Mountain View Elementary students and Scottsville Elementary at some of their facilities. He stated that moving forward, they had six presentations today, and their goal was to complete them efficiently. He stated that their tonnage had been increasing since 2021, with a slight decrease in growth over the past few years, as indicated by the red line for 2023 and the green line for 2024. He stated that however, 2025 was starting at a higher tonnage and they would continue to monitor progress throughout the year. He stated that all was going well at the Solid Waste and Recycling Center.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had recently hosted a successful special tire collection event at the Southern Albemarle Community Center (SACC), where 38 customers and residents of Albemarle delivered over five tons of tires, which they then took to Appomattox to be processed by another vendor. He stated that they were poised to launch additional special collection events. He stated that their spring schedule included a special e-waste collection event on Saturday, April 19, for which interested customers must register in advance to bring their electronics to the Ivy SWRC.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they paid an outside vendor to dispose of the electronic waste. He stated that they would host household hazardous waste collection events on Friday and Saturday, April 25 and 26, open to all the community, without the need for registration. He stated that these events were part of their spring collection schedule.

Mr. Mawyer stated that following a lengthy process that began around 2017, they leased 17 acres at Ivy SWRC to a vendor representing Dominion Energy. He stated that Dominion Energy, along with its partners, was moving forward with a solar project at Ivy. He stated that they had completed significant work on electric power infrastructure, with the goal of installing solar arrays at the landfill. He stated that by the end of this year, they expected to have 17 acres of solar cells installed at the Ivy facility.

Mr. Gaffney asked what their income would be and over how many years.

Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste Services, stated that this project would bring in approximately \$1,200 per acre/yr over a 20-year period. He stated that the total cost extended to 35 years, considering a 25-year initial term with two five-year renewal options.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Dominion had been paying them since 2017.

Mr. McKalips stated they had been paying them since before construction began, and they were paying construction rent as well.

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were none.

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Staff Report on Finance*
- b. Staff Report on Ivy Solid Waste and Recycling Center/Recycling Operations Update*
- c. Staff Report on Administration and Communications*
- d. Approval to Amend Professional Engineering Services Work Authorization – Northern Convenience Center – Draper Aden Associates/TRC*

Mr. Sanders moved the Board to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

9. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Presentation: Organizational Agreements of the RSWA
Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste*

Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste Services, stated that before Mr. Wood presents the budget, he would like to provide an overview of the structure they operate under through their agreements. He stated that they began in 1990 with the Solid Waste Organizational Agreement, which was followed by a settlement agreement with Ivy neighbors regarding groundwater contamination. He stated that subsequently, they established a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with UVA, the City, and the County to address environmental issues at Ivy.

Mr. McKalips stated that they then entered into local government support agreements, which had various amendments, and the recycling amendment in 2011. He stated that most recently, they have the SACC license agreement, which outlines their relationship with the County for projects like the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center on County-owned property. He stated that this agreement will serve as a model for the Northern Convenience Center.

Mr. McKalips stated that the Solid Waste Organizational Agreement, which was between the City, County, and RSWA, sets their rules for collaboration. He stated that it expires in June 2030. He stated that we should consider the possibility of renewing this agreement while consolidating other agreements into it to simplify tracking and establish a path forward.

Mr. McKalips stated that the settlement agreement and release, related to a 2000 lawsuit over groundwater contamination at the Ivy site, resulted in restrictions on continuing waste disposal operations and ended landfilling at the Ivy SWRC, but functionally resulted in long-term groundwater monitoring obligations for the Authority. He stated that it would also be effective until at least 2030. He stated that the Environmental MOU, allocated funding for groundwater remediation at Ivy, and was used to address environmental issues at Ivy.

Mr. McKalips stated that currently, the University of Virginia pays approximately \$80,000 per year, while the City and County each pay 35.5% and 64.5%, respectively, of the remaining amount. He stated that this payment includes reimbursement for administrative fees, which are accounted for in

the budget. He stated that the Local Government Support Agreement also included administrative reimbursement. He stated that the original agreement included Ivy operations, but the City withdrew from that in 2011. He stated that the first amendment to this agreement was in 2010, and when the City stepped out in 2011, the County established the Local Government Support Agreement for Recycling Programs.

Mr. McKalips stated that the City and County agreed to support recycling operations, with the City paying 30% and the County paying 70%, and also allowing for administrative charges. He stated that the Ivy MUC Programs Agreement outlined how the County would manage charges to fund Ivy operations once the City withdrew. He stated that the amended and restated Ivy MUC programs agreement was the last of the original programs agreement. He stated that all current agreements were based on the parameters established in the original program agreement. He stated that this agreement also set the parameters for the design and construction of the new transfer station and demolition of the existing one. He stated that it also established how tipping fees could be changed, requiring County approval for requests from the Authority.

Mr. McKalips stated that the Ivy Convenience Center Agreement of 2019 was a one-off agreement established under the same authorization as the previous agreements. He stated that the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center was a change in philosophy, and they returned to the original Solid Waste Organizational Agreement for the Northern Convenience Center. He stated that he believed this model was more suitable for future agreements, and hopefully, one-off agreements would be less frequently used.

Mr. McKalips stated that the SACC license was the most recent agreement. He stated they were using County-owned property to operate the Southern Convenience Center, which would also be the case for the Northern Convenience Center, but they did not have a clear structure outlining their obligations and the County's obligations regarding that property, should they need to vacate it. He stated that this SACC license model was intended to serve as a guide for future situations, including the Northern Community Center because the document was well-organized and easy to understand.

Mr. Richardson expressed his gratitude to Mr. McKalips and his team for their responsiveness in working with County staff to obtain data and performance-related information. He stated that staff had mentioned this to him last week that they had been very responsive in working with County staff to obtain data and performance-related information.

b. Presentation and Consider Vote to Approve: Introduction of FY 2025-2026 Budget and Resolution to Adopt the Preliminary Rate Schedule
Lonnie Wood, Director of Finance and Information Technology

Lonnie Wood, Director of Finance and Information Technology, started the presentation by providing a few highlights of the major services provided by the Solid Waste Authority. He stated that one of their largest operations is refuse disposal at the transfer station, where they processed approximately 130 million pounds of municipal solid waste (MSW) and construction and demolition debris (CDD) last year.

Mr. Wood stated that they also managed the closure of the landfill, performed environmental remediation, and offered recycling services at three separate sites to the public and the baling facility. He stated that they also provided recycling services for vegetative debris, collecting and processing it for reuse. He stated that they diverted 20 million pounds of material from landfills

198 through their recycling and vegetative services last year. Mr. Wood stated that they also collected
199 paint at these sites.

200
201 Highlighting recent achievements, Mr. Wood stated that a significant activity they had undertaken at
202 Ivy was the bulky clean fill program, which began in 2022 and generated approximately \$1.4
203 million in revenue which offset the need for local government support payments. He stated that they
204 recently completed the Southern Convenience Center, which was now fully operational.

205
206 Mr. Wood stated that they had been working on solar energy development, as Mr. Mawyer had
207 mentioned, and were nearing completion of that project. He stated that with Dominion Power, they
208 anticipated that the panels would be installed on the old closed CDD cell within six to 12 months.
209 He stated that they had also procured the construction services for the baling facility, which had
210 been awarded a contract of \$3.84 million by the Board in January.

211
212 Mr. Wood stated that their budget objectives this year included supporting the design and
213 construction of the Northern Area Convenience Center and the baling facility at Ivy. He stated that
214 they would continue to work on upgrading the scale house, maintenance shop, and office
215 conversion, as well as the charge ticketing system at Ivy. He stated that they had funding in place
216 for long-term planning of the transfer station facilities and would continue to assess and upgrade
217 their equipment as needed.

218
219 Mr. Wood stated that they had funding in place for permit modifications to accommodate long-term
220 remediation management, and there were no new full-time equivalent employees requested in this
221 year's budget. He stated that displayed on the screen was their organizational chart. He stated that
222 the Solid Waste Authority had 28 full-time equivalent employees, and all of those employees
223 represented this Solid Waste division. He stated that two divisions other two divisions
224 (Admin/Communication and Finance/IT) were actually water and sewer departments, but the Solid
225 Waste Authority shared in the cost of those two departments.

226
227 Mr. Wood stated that next was a high-level view of the budget. He stated that the revenues were
228 staying relatively the same, increasing slightly at \$18,000 to total \$5.6 million. He stated that
229 expenses will increase by approximately \$750,000, totaling \$10.5 million. He stated that the shaded
230 area in the slide showed how local government support would fund the net loss at the authority,
231 which was driven by agreements discussed by Mr. McKalips.

232
233 Mr. Wood stated that the next graph illustrated local government support over the last five years. He
234 stated that County support has increased sharply compared to City support, which is in the blue. He
235 stated that this was mainly due to the two new convenience centers that had come online over the
236 last five years. He stated that those two centers have led to the creation of a new cost center for
237 County convenience centers, resulting in an additional \$900,000. He stated that one of the first steps
238 they took was to review their administrative costs before budgeting for various cost centers.

239
240 Mr. Wood stated that they allocated these administrative costs based on the July 2010 Local
241 Government Agreement, which sets these percentages. He stated that revenues for the
242 Administrative Department come primarily from interest on late fees and finance charges. He stated
243 that this would increase by about \$35,000. He stated that expenses would increase by about
244 \$146,000, with \$93,000 of that being the cost shared with the Water Authority. He stated that the
245 cost shared with the Rivanna Water Authority is \$998,000. He stated that this leaves a net cost of
246 approximately \$1.3 million, and the allocation will be as shown on the slide relative to how it is
247 distributed to various call centers.

Mr. Wood stated that the two water and sewer departments, Admin/Communications and Finance/IT, were shown on the next chart. He stated that as an example, the salaries for those two departments total approximately \$3 million. He stated that the Solid Waste share of that is \$582,000 and so on for the benefits. He stated that these are some of the costs that are also split up between the two authorities through an annual allocation exercise that he conducts.

Mr. Wood stated that they use metrics such as total employees, particularly for Admin, which includes the HR department. He stated that they also track the total number of invoices processed, the number of checks cut, and the number of POs processed. He stated that these data points help them estimate a cost split. He stated that the \$998,000 figure on the previous slide represents an increase of \$93,000, resulting in a combined budget of \$6.3 million for the two departments. He stated that the Solid Waste Authority pays approximately 16% of the total costs. Each month, they bill the Solid Waste Authority on the Water side for those services.

Mr. Wood stated that next we will review the cost centers exclusively supported by the County, including the Ivy operations, Ivy Transfer Station, and County convenience centers. He stated that the cost centers were expected to increase by \$461,000 over the next year. He stated that revenues for these cost centers would increase by \$73,000, resulting in a net decrease of \$388,000. He stated that this slide included information to explain and identify the budget impacts.

Mr. Wood stated that they reduced the bulky clean fill program, which had led to a decrease in revenues of approximately \$78,000 and a reduction in tires and other material sales of \$47,200. He stated that they had a \$2 tipping fee increase and additional tonnage, which resulted in an increase of \$198,150. He stated that on the expense side, they had seen personnel increases related to administrative costs, and a 3% merit and 2% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), which had added about \$104,000 to the budget. He stated that engineering support costs were included to aid in the future planning of the transfer station, which was listed as one of their goals for the year.

Mr. Wood stated that additionally, they had contract costs for MSW transportation to disposal, including the contract cost per ton to process and transport, dispose, and transport MSW to the Republic Services facility in Henrico. He stated that all other changes accounted for \$21,090 of the total \$388,562 increase. He stated that to provide context, a slide showing the tonnages over the last four years is shown, which gave an indication of where they had come from.

Mr. Wood stated that the clean fill material, for example, had seen a significant increase after they created the bulky waste program, which had risen substantially over the next two years before starting to level off and decrease. He stated that grindable, vegetative material was particularly challenging to predict, as it was influenced by economic factors, storm events, and large-scale projects. He stated that compost, which they had discontinued a few years ago, was part of a program with UVA. He stated that tires had also seen a decline, although the reason for this was unclear. He stated that white goods, which should be zero on the slide for FY 2024, were actually included in the MSW stream, as they no longer charged for them separately.

Mr. Wood stated that the MSW revenue, which also included construction debris, had steadily increased but appeared to be stabilizing. He stated that the cost centers shared by the City and County, including the remediation and recycling programs, would see a decrease in revenue of \$90,000. He stated that the expense for these two cost centers was expected to rise by \$254,000, resulting in a net impact of \$343,902. He stated that the \$90,000 decrease was primarily due to fluctuations in material sales, which were affected by quantity and price per ton.

Mr. Wood stated that these sales could fluctuate by 40% to 60% in any given year, and they were currently experiencing a down period. He stated that the increase in personnel costs, administrative costs, and the installation of dry hydrants at Ivy, specifically related to the new baling facility, were also included in the recycling program's cost center. He stated that they also required new wells, specifically groundwater maintenance wells for remediation purposes.

Mr. Wood stated that Mr. McKalips could explain the details if anyone had questions on that matter. He stated that the admin allocation had increased, and their depreciation expenses had decreased, resulting in a positive impact on the bottom line. He stated that the engineering support for the permit and cap modifications, also mentioned in their goals, were also included. He stated that the impact of these changes on local support increases for the City and County were included.

Mr. Wood stated that these were some of the tonnages related to the recycling programs. He stated that cardboard remained a strong revenue generator, while mixed paper had seen a decline in tonnage over the past couple of years. He stated that they had consolidated their efforts with mixed paper, and the items listed here did not generate significant revenue. He stated that however, they were relatively stable. He stated that he had included the cost per ton for recycling programs, which was an actual number for 2024 and a projected number for 2025.

Mr. Wood stated that the projected cost for 2025 was \$750 per ton. He stated that next was the Capital Improvement Program. He stated that items in yellow were new, except for the Northern Convenience Center, which was split up differently this year. He stated that items not colored on the chart were approved in last year's CIP. He stated that some of these amounts would carry forward. He stated that the paper sort replacement facility, including the new baler, would be implemented this year and partially next year.

Mr. Wood stated that this program was valued at \$4.4 million over the next five years, with some amounts carrying over. He stated that the majority of this funding was allocated to the baling facility and the new facility for the Northern Convenience Center. He stated that displayed on the screen was the rendering of the baling facility and the Northern Convenience Center, which was currently in the planning stages with the County, was estimated to start construction approximately a year from now and would be operational in another year. He stated that the estimated cost was \$1.8 million, which was fully funded by the County.

Mr. Wood stated that one of the other projects here was the upfits, which would take place in this office building. He stated that the shed used to be a large garage, but it would be converted into offices. He stated that they planned to renovate some offices there and hoped to address the scale house facility, which had been in operation for over 25 years and was in rough shape. He stated that there was the inbound scale, the outbound scale, and as could be seen, these were the vehicles trying to exit the facility after depositing their materials.

Mr. Wood stated that they were hoping the charge capture system would help speed up the process for customers with an account, allowing them to save their tare weight and potentially increase efficiency. He stated that next were comparisons of the tipping fees for other regional facilities compared to Rivanna. He stated that they were currently at \$58, and they were proposing to increase the MSW and construction debris rates to \$60.

Mr. Wood stated that they were in line with the average of other regional facilities, which may also be increasing their rates next year. He stated that next was their rate schedule, which proposed to

keep all rates the same except for MSW and construction debris. He stated that the County approved the Authority's request to raise the fee at their March 19 meeting.

Mr. Wood stated that their budget calendar for today was for the Board to adopt the preliminary rate schedule, which would allow them to advertise in the paper two times in May, according to the Code of Virginia. He stated that they would have a public hearing on the proposed rates on May 27, adopt the rate schedule after the public hearing was closed, as well as the FY 2026 proposed budget. He stated that today's presentation included the preliminary rate schedule, which staff asked the Board to consider and adopt.

Mr. Richardson asked how they determined the figure of 20 million pounds of waste diverted from a landfill via recycling.

Mr. Wood stated that they monitored the recycled materials they ship to metal facilities, paper mills, and glass facilities. He stated that they tracked all of these materials, including a significant amount of vegetative waste, which they scaled in and out. He stated that they either sold or gave away the mulch, which they considered to be reused, rather than recycled. He confirmed they did keep track of these numbers.

Mr. Hicks recalled that during a presentation they had a while ago, it was stated that the remaining lifespan of their landfill space was 17 years.

Mr. Mawyer clarified that the 17 years was a statewide number.

Mr. Hicks stated that construction debris was a main contributor to quickly filling the landfill. He stated that the tipping fees for construction and demolition waste were comparable to those for domestic residential waste. He stated that he was wondering if there were any strategies that could be implemented to encourage contractors and the construction industry to be more selective in what they disposed of, thereby reducing the amount of waste sent to the landfill. He stated that he was curious about the adequacy of current practices when it came to managing construction and demolition materials versus domestic waste.

Mr. Wood stated that the construction debris and clean fill were likely separated to exclude bricks, mortar, rock, and dirt out of the waste stream, thereby keeping these materials separate from the landfill. He stated that as for the MSW and CDD, he questioned whether they had a sufficient justification for charging a separate fee when they were being processed through the same facility.

Mr. Mawyer stated that sometimes they arrived together on the same vehicle, carrying mixed loads. He stated that it was challenging to distinguish one product from another.

Mr. McKalips stated that the logistics of their current operations required that they store equipment in trailers, as they did not have sufficient floor space to keep the CDD separate. He stated that in reality, there were alternative avenues that could potentially save a few dollars, but currently, everything was being stored in the same trailers.

Mr. Mawyer asked if Van der Linde Recycling at Zion Crossroads offered an incentive for contractors to bring their CDD to them.

Mr. McKalips stated that was an interesting observation. He stated that just last week, Van der Linde Recycling began sending more of their materials to Rivanna. He stated that it appeared that they may be either reaching full capacity or adjusting their operations due to costs.

Mr. Mawyer asked if they only took CDD.

Mr. McKalips stated that they passed through MSW as well.

Mr. Wood stated that they previously had a separate CDD cell, and they charged a lower rate for it in an effort to keep it out of the MSW to prevent the landfill from filling up more quickly.

Mr. Andrews stated that the MSW and CDD market determined the clean fill large project, and he was curious about how that setting was established and when the market was adjusted for that particular project. He stated that he also wanted to know how the tonnages compared between the clean fill program and the large-scale program.

Mr. Wood stated that the bulky clean fill was likely 90% of all clean fill.

Mr. Mawyer initially set a price of \$3.50 per ton as an opening point to the market. He stated that only one contractor, Faulconer, had shown interest in opening an account with them. He stated that that they also sold clean fill when Faulconer needed it. He stated that this cooperative approach had led to specific negotiation with interested vendors, rather than a comprehensive market analysis to determine the optimal price for clean fill.

Mr. Gaffney stated that they were charging a storage fee, essentially.

Mr. Wood stated that many large contractors preferred to secure a location for their clean fill.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Faulconer was responsible for providing the necessary manpower and equipment at the site, including grading and environmental and safety work. He stated that this was factored into the price they charged them.

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board approve the Resolution to adopt the preliminary rate schedule including authorization to advertise the preliminary rate schedule for a Public Hearing to be held during the regular meeting of the Board of Directors on May 27, 2025. The motion was seconded by Mr. Andrews and passed unanimously (7-0).

(Motion and vote to Recess the RSWA Board Meeting)

Mr. Andrews moved the Board to recess the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority meeting. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

(Motion and vote to Reconvene the RSWA in a Combined Session with the RWSA)

Mr. Sanders moved the Board to reconvene the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority in a joint session with the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

*c. Presentation and Consider Vote to Approve: Amended and Restated By-Laws
Lonnie Wood, Director of Finance and Information Technology*

446
447 Lonnie Wood, Director of Finance and Information Technology, stated that this was primarily a
448 housekeeping item. He stated that a full Board attendance was required to make changes to the
449 bylaws. He stated that the agenda item was a proposal to approve the amended and restated
450 bylaws. He stated that the proposed changes aimed to clarify the Executive Director's authority
451 to execute contracts, leases, easements, deeds, and related compensation agreements.

452
453 Mr. Wood stated that the Executive Director's authorization to award procurements was also
454 increased from \$200,000 to \$300,000 to be consistent with purchasing policies and procedures.
455 He stated that this change was in line with the updated purchasing policies and procedures that
456 were implemented in July 2024, which were prompted by changes in the state procurement law.
457 He stated that the proposed by-law revisions were intended to align with the state law changes.

458
459 **Mr. Andrews moved the Board to approve the Resolution to adopt the Amended and Restated**
460 **By-Laws, effective on March 25, 2025. Mr. Sanders seconded the motion, which carried**
461 **unanimously (7-0).**

462
463 *d. Presentation and Consider Vote to Approve: FY 2025-2026 Compensation Study and Salary*
464 *Structure; Leah Beard, Human Resources Manager*

465
466 Leah Beard, Human Resources Manager, stated that this past fall, they had initiated a request for
467 a compensation study to be completed. She stated that as part of their strategic plan, the
468 workforce development strategy aimed to remain competitive in the market by evaluating their
469 salary structure in conjunction with job titles and functions within each position and aligning it
470 with their overarching goals of retaining engaged employees and recruiting quality talent.

471
472 Ms. Beard stated that they had worked with PRM Consulting, a company based in Washington,
473 D.C., which had experience evaluating salaries for numerous organizations in the D.C. area and
474 in Virginia. She stated that PRM worked with them to identify 26 peer organizations within
475 Virginia, which were all authorities, local municipalities, and government utility departments.
476 She stated that PRM requested salary information from these organizations, and 14 had
477 responded, providing a robust data set for comparison.

478
479 Ms. Beard stated that the findings indicated we should consider a new salary structure, which
480 involved identifying the median base salaries and pay grades. She stated that our current salary
481 structure includes 27 pay grades, which had been somewhat cumbersome. She stated that they
482 were reducing the salary structure to 17 pay grades and expanding each pay grade to allow
483 greater flexibility for managers to recognize and reward employees within our merit pay system
484 without reaching the top of a salary pay grade. She stated that the new structure would have
485 larger salary ranges.

486
487 Ms. Beard stated that staff were now seeking the Board's adoption of the new salary structure,
488 which would require four Water and Sewer employee salaries to be brought to the new
489 minimum, and 10 Solid Waste employees. She stated that the total impact of this change was
490 estimated to be around \$38,000, effective July 1.

491
492 Ms. Beard stated that the new salary structure, which consolidated 27 pay grades into 17, with
493 multiple levels within each, would help assess an employee's position within the organization,
494 particularly for those new to the organization based on their experience. She stated that the wider
495 pay bands were designed to reduce and alleviate compression, and the mid-range levels had been

based on competitive market data from the study. She stated that staff were requesting that the Board approve the new salary structure, which would take effect on July 1, 2025.

Mr. Hicks asked if Ms. Beard could provide an example for where an operator with a CDL would be placed in the salary structure.

Ms. Beard stated that an employee with a CDL would likely fall under pay grade 40 in their current structure and the salary for that position would be between \$44,000 and \$73,000. She stated that in the new salary structure, an employee would likely be a grade 2 with a slightly higher salary range of \$50,000 to \$82,000. She stated that Virginia increased the minimum wage by 3.4% in January to \$12.41/hr.

Ms. Beard stated that they were experiencing lower turnover rates, and were proposing a new salary structure to help retain and recruit employees. She stated that the combined turnover rate of both Authorities is currently 9.4%, which was a significant improvement from last year's 14.2%. She stated that with the new salary structure, we would become more competitive in the market, thereby reducing the likelihood of employees leaving. She stated that turnover costs around \$9,000 per employee.

Mr. Gaffney stated that the additional costs of the new salary structure only applied to existing employees because it only increased Rivanna's budget by \$6,000. Ms. Beard stated that the new salary structure primarily impacted Solid Waste and the unskilled positions within pay grade 1. Those employees would receive an increase to reach the minimum salary within the pay grade. She stated that Water Operators would likely start at pay grade 2, so the impact would primarily be on entry-level positions.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the actual pay increases included 3% for merit and 2% for a COLA as they had discussed with the proposed budget. He stated that this was a new pay scale, and the only increase to any individual was if they were below the minimum salary of the pay grade, which only affected four RWSA employees and 10 RSWA employees.

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to approve the amended Salary Structure to be effective July 1, 2025. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

(Complete and close the RWSA meeting, then complete and close the RSWA meeting)

10. OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were none.

11. CLOSED MEETING

There was no reason to hold a closed meeting.

12. ADJOURNMENT

At 3:48 p.m., Mr. Andrews moved the Board to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

546 Respectfully submitted,
547
548
549
550



Mr. Jeff Richardson
Secretary - Treasurer

