



RSWA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
July 22, 2025

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority (RSWA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, July 22, 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, Sam Sanders, Steven Hicks, Jeff Richardson, and Jim Andrews (participating remotely).

Board Members Absent: Jeffrey Dumars.

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Phil McKalips, Lonnie Wood, David Tungate, Betsy Nemeth, Stephanie Deal, Deborah Anama, Jacob Woodson.

Attorney(s) Present: Valerie Long

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney convened the July 22, 2025, regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Gaffney stated that Mr. Andrews had requested to participate remotely in today's meeting. He asked Mr. Andrews to please state his location and reason for remote participation.

Mr. Andrews stated that he was currently in Sorrento, Maine, on personal and family business, which was why he was unable to attend in person.

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors allow Mr. Andrews to participate remotely in the meeting. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (5-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent.)

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors adopt the agenda as presented. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent.)

3. ADOPT MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ON MAY 27, 2025

Mr. Hicks moved that the Board of Directors adopt the minutes from the previous Board meeting on May 27, 2025, as presented. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent.)

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, stated that the transfer operation at the Ivy facility continued to perform well. He stated that from June 2021 to June 2025, they had seen a 45% increase in tonnage, as shown in the displayed graph, which indicated a significant growth in their operations. He noted

that at their last meeting, Mr. Andrews had asked about trends in the e-waste and hazardous household waste (HHW) collection programs. He stated that they had analyzed their data and found that the County and City had experienced increases in the number of residents using this program. He stated that use of the County's e-waste collection program by had increased by 35% over the five-year period, while the City's increase was 45%.

Mr. Mawyer stated that similarly, in their HHW Program, the County had seen an 180% increase in customers over an 11-year period, while Charlottesville had seen a 190% increase over that same period. He added that in other special collection trends, they had increases in both appliance collections and furniture and mattress collections. He stated that for appliances, there was a 200% increase by County residents and an 800% increase in usage by City residents over the last 11 years. In the furniture and mattress collection program, Albemarle had seen a 95% increase and Charlottesville had seen a 105% increase over the past 11 years. He stated that these programs were a good investment for both the City and County, as they were free to customers and were funded by City and County tax dollars.

Mr. Mawyer continued that one of their strategic plan priorities was to minimize staff turnover. He stated that unfortunately, they had not met their goal in FY25, which was to reduce turnover to 15%. He stated that they were at 18% turnover, although he would note that with a small number of employees in Solid Waste, even if only two or three people left, it would result in a large percentage. He stated that they would continue to work on minimizing staff turnover.

Mr. Gaffney asked how many of those employees had retired.

Mr. Mawyer replied that one of those employees had retired. He noted that employees may not be leaving because they were unhappy with the workplace; they may have other opportunities they wished to pursue or were ready for retirement. He stated that, however, they did not distinguish the reasons for turnover in their statistics.

Mr. Mawyer continued to state that they had recently hosted a First Aid Training program that included CPR, AED, and other first aid procedures, in which five Solid Waste employees participated.

He stated that in 2022, the Board approved a term contract with BFI to dispose of their Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) and Construction and Demolition Debris (CDD) through the transfer station. He explained that they were now renewing the contract, which was initially authorized in 2022, and was expected to cost approximately \$3.8 million. He stated that the contract covered both MSW and CDD, which would be transported daily to Henrico County for disposal.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the landfill was a busy facility, and they had several ongoing projects underway. He stated that the solar panel construction, sponsored by Dominion Energy, was nearing completion and was expected to be finished within a month or two. He stated that they had also begun construction on the baling facility with their contractor R2 Build, and the site was currently under grading and foundation work.

He stated that their Safety Manager, George Cheape, recently attended a safety conference and expanded his knowledge on safety training. He stated that their Communication Coordinator, Wesley Kern, had compiled a comprehensive newsletter to distribute to the Ivy Solid Waste facility neighbors, providing updates on the solar panel project, the baling facility project, and their ongoing groundwater testing programs.

99
100 **5. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**

101
102 *a. Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda*

103
104 There were none.

105
106 **6. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

107
108 There were none.

109
110 **7. CONSENT AGENDA**

111
112 *a. Staff Report on Finance*

113
114 *b. Staff Report on Ivy Solid Waste and Recycling Center*

115
116 *c. Staff Report on Administration and Communications*

117
118 *d. Approval of Contract for Professional Engineering Services – SCS Engineers*

119
120 **Mr. Sanders moved that the Board of Directors adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr.**
121 **Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent.)**

122
123 **8. OTHER BUSINESS**

124
125 *a. Presentation and Consider Vote to Approve: Lithium Battery Collection Program*
126 *Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste*

127
128 Phil McKalips, Director of Solid Waste, stated he would present staff's proposal aimed at
129 addressing lithium batteries in the waste stream. He explained that the proposal involved full-time
130 battery collections from the Ivy Convenience Center, which was currently located at the Ivy Solid
131 Waste Recycling Center. He stated that they believed they could accomplish this with the existing
132 staff, but they needed to establish a separate hazardous waste building in order to handle the lithium
133 batteries. He stated that they planned to fund this through the Environmental Cost Center, with the
134 cost split 64.5% County and 35.5% City.

135
136 Mr. McKalips stated that as Mr. Mawyer had discussed at the last Board meeting, they had been
137 experiencing issues with lithium battery fires at the transfer station since 2019, when a trailer had
138 caught fire at the transfer station. He stated that unfortunately, they had just been informed about 15
139 minutes ago that another fire had occurred on the floor of the transfer station, so it was clear that this
140 was an ongoing problem. He stated that their waste disposal contractors with Republic Services,
141 who contracted with MBI for hauling, were concerned about the risk to their assets. He stated that
142 every time a trailer containing lithium batteries was damaged, it could result in a \$125,000 loss.

143
144 Mr. McKalips stated that this was driving them to develop this proposal to minimize the risk to their
145 partners' assets and alleviate some of the risks they passed on to them. He stated that although they
146 could not inspect all the trash that came to the transfer station, they did remove and isolate the
147 batteries they could find. He stated that the Household Hazardous Waste Program, where people
148 could bring batteries to be disposed of properly, was only available twice a year and was not

sufficient to remove enough batteries from the waste stream to eliminate the fire risks. He stated that there were opportunities for people to dispose of lithium batteries in the public, but they were not well advertised and came with extra costs.

Mr. McKalips stated that they believed they needed to provide additional collection capacity in the community, which was the basis of this proposal. He explained that they would need to establish a battery collection facility, which would require air conditioning, proper signage, training, and containers. He stated that they planned to collect these batteries using five-gallon buckets and use their existing HHW contractor to pick them up on a monthly schedule. He stated that they also wanted to reach out to the community and conduct a robust advertising campaign to inform people about the service.

Mr. McKalips stated that the costs for the first year were estimated at \$135,000, with an additional \$30,000 per year thereafter. He stated that through the end-of-year true-up, they could use savings throughout the year to help pay for this initiative, minimizing the budget impact. He noted that they had previously discussed ways to make this program more robust and had come up with the idea of hosting pop-up events in the community at various locations around the County and City. He stated that these events would involve two staff members in a pickup truck visiting designated locations on a well-advertised day to collect batteries from the community. He stated that they had considered hosting these events at schools, public works facilities, and stores, among other locations.

Mr. McKalips stated that while they had not fully developed the details, the goal was to make the collection process as convenient as possible for participants. He stated that he had included some examples of batteries he had found in his home or office. He added that they had also explored a more extensive option, where they would accept all types of batteries, including car batteries, alkaline batteries, and other types. He explained that this approach would likely result in a volume problem; the issue was that batteries were heavy and dense, requiring additional staffing to process and containerize them safely. He stated that based on their previous HHW program numbers, this would be a significant undertaking, requiring additional staff, a forklift, and containers. He stated that if they had a program to process all types of batteries, it could potentially result in a substantial annual cost of \$440,000 in the first year and \$230,000 thereafter.

Mr. Andrews asked if they were aware of any other entities similar to theirs that were handling this type of waste. He stated that he was also interested in the scalability of this process, even if they only focused on lithium batteries and did not extend it to other forms of batteries. He stated that as he saw it, these batteries were becoming increasingly prevalent and would continue to require disposal, which may necessitate collection and disposal on a more frequent basis, potentially every month.

Mr. Andrews stated that also, he was aware that many of these batteries were embedded in devices, making them difficult to access. He stated that he was unsure if this posed any special challenges. He stated that additionally, he would like to know about recycling opportunities for lithium batteries. He stated that finally, with respect to the risks associated with other types of batteries, he was gathering that the risks associated with lithium were unique to lithium, whereas the risks associated with other batteries were not as severe.

Mr. McKalips stated that to address the last question first, lithium batteries posed a more catastrophic kind of failure risk, largely due to their chemistry and manufacturing process. He stated that in contrast, cadmium batteries or alkaline batteries tended to short out and create heat, but they

198 did not typically explode in the same manner as lithium batteries, so the risk associated with those
199 types of batteries was less acute.

200
201 Mr. McKalips stated that regarding recycling, their partner in the HHW program strived to recycle
202 as much as possible. He stated that if there were opportunities for recycling lithium batteries, they
203 would likely take advantage of them. He stated that regarding the next question about the size and
204 varied locations of lithium batteries, that would indeed be a problem. He stated that they had not yet
205 seen anyone attempt to recycle entire electric vehicle battery replacement at home, but it was likely
206 that someone would try in the future. He stated that they then may attempt to bring the entire battery
207 pack from a vehicle, which he was not familiar with.

208
209 Mr. McKalips stated that however, by and large, he proposed that they initially focus on collecting
210 batteries that could fit in a five-gallon bucket. He stated that he believed that five-gallon buckets
211 could be used to contain and package these batteries. For example, batteries from scooters and other
212 small batteries were often easily accessible and could be quickly removed. He stated that he hoped
213 this approach would suffice to meet most of the demand.

214
215 Mr. Mawyer added that as part of their marketing and advertising of this program, they would likely
216 inform the public about the types of devices that contained lithium batteries. He stated that the goal
217 was to educate the public on the importance of removing these batteries from devices before
218 disposing of them in the trash.

219
220 Mr. McKalips stated that regarding whether they would need monthly pickups for lithium batteries,
221 the facility would be open full-time, so whenever the Ivy Solid Waste Facility was open, the battery
222 disposal would be open to the public. He stated that if they needed to increase pickups due to
223 logistics or volume, he did not think it would be a problem and it would not add a substantial
224 expense. He stated that however, if they were to collect thousands of pounds of batteries per month,
225 the main challenge would be sustaining the program with the existing employees, as envisioned. He
226 stated that at that point, they may need to request additional staffing to support the program's
227 operations.

228
229 Mr. McKalips stated that in response to Mr. Andrews' question about what other communities'
230 approaches were for this issue, the situation varied widely, ranging from no collection services to
231 the Southeastern Public Service Authority's (SPSA) model. He stated that SPSA offered full-time,
232 all-time household hazardous waste collection, including lithium batteries, with its own staff and
233 hosting special pop-up events throughout their service area. He stated that there were also
234 individuals and organizations that organized HHW events similar to Rivanna's, so they could
235 consider hosting them more frequently, such as quarterly or monthly. He stated that staff's current
236 approach was to focus on lithium batteries with a comprehensive and full-time net for collecting
237 them.

238
239 Mr. Gaffney asked what staff's thoughts were on utilizing McIntire.

240
241 Mr. McKalips replied that the issue with McIntire was the real estate and existing traffic congestion.
242 He stated that if they continued to add more lines of service, it could create problems.

243
244 Mr. Andrews thanked Mr. McKalips for the thoughtful answers to his questions. He stated that he
245 was supportive of this initiative.

246
247 Mr. Pinkston asked if peer agencies had seen a similar frequency of these lithium battery fires.

Mr. McKalips stated that he had not been aware of this issue until they began experiencing the problems they had encountered at their own facilities. He stated that it was a national problem, with various government agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), issuing guidance on the matter. He stated that the experience of several other facilities that had faced similar issues seemed to follow a pattern, with problems emerging in waves. He stated that for example, Roanoke lost four trailers in just eight months, but then went five years without any losses. He stated that they had stepped up their efforts, increasing collections and implementing more initiatives to make it easier for people to remove batteries from the waste stream, which appeared to have had a positive impact.

Mr. Pinkston asked if that was what Mr. McKalips was hoping to achieve with the proposed program.

Mr. McKalips confirmed that was correct; there were only a limited number of options available to them to remove these from the waste stream. He stated that this seemed like a good starting point.

Mr. Pinkston agreed that it was a good starting point, as it was thoughtful and put-together.

Mr. Andrews stated that another issue he would like to bring up is that, based on his understanding, batteries could sometimes exhibit problems such as leakage, expansion, or overheating on their own. He stated that he wondered if they had any expectation that there was a way to address a battery that was not just disposable, but needed to be disposed of immediately.

Mr. McKalips stated that they were currently addressing a similar issue with the transfer station. He stated that to mitigate the problem, they had implemented a concrete planter filled with sand, which they packed in until the event. This setup isolated the area in case of a full-blown fire, allowing it to be absorbed and contained. He stated that he believed it was challenging for him to provide a straightforward solution to these unique challenges, as they would likely differ from one battery to another.

Mr. Pinkston asked if the battery storage facilities would have such safety features.

Mr. McKalips replied yes; it would be explosion proof, meaning that it keeps the explosion contained within. He stated that it had Fire Department hookups, allowing them to spray fire retardants into the inside without having to open the door and risk losing the contents outside the building. He stated that it was essentially a containment vessel for hazardous materials like this.

Mr. Mawyer noted that their vendor requested a meeting with them and asked them to share the cost, if not the entire cost, of one of their trailers that burned. He stated that this incident brought the issue into sharp focus, particularly with the \$125,000 figure. He stated that they declined the request, and they inquired about the vendor's insurance coverage and the process of obtaining insurance. He stated that this particular issue brought the matter to the forefront for their organization.

Mr. Pinkston stated that it would be greatly concerning if their partners did not want to haul their material due to the risk. He stated that while it was difficult to measure the impact, he felt that the safety issues meant that they did not have any other choice but to address it.

Mr. McKalips stated that he could not guarantee that batteries would be completely removed from the waste stream, but he believed this was a good starting point to begin to isolate them and dispose of them separately.

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to proceed with the implementation of a Lithium Battery Collection and Disposal Program and five local collections with first-year costs totaling about \$150,000. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

b. Presentation and Consider Vote to Approve: Credit, Debit, and Check Payment Program at the Ivy SWRC; Stephanie Deal, Finance Manager

Stephanie Deal, Finance Manager, stated that she was here to discuss a possible change in their main payment method at the Ivy SWRC. She stated that they had reviewed the current financial controls and procedures and identified areas for improvement and optimization related to cash handling and oversight. She stated that in discussions with the Directors, they learned that implementing standard practices for cash handling and oversight was challenging due to staffing and management commitments. She explained that as a result, they decided to pursue the removal of cash as a payment method. She stated that currently, they hold between \$4,700 and \$7,100 in cash on site, waiting to be transported to the bank. She stated that they also processed a significant number of checks.

Ms. Deal stated that for example, Brinks armored truck service visits their location every Wednesday and Friday to collect the cash, but their schedule could vary, resulting in a range of three to five days between collections. On July 3, they held on-site \$9,600 in transactions for four days, both in cash and checks. She noted that this cash was kept on-site in the landfill office. She stated that in FY 2025, 60% of payments were made by credit card, while 24% were paid in cash and 17% were paid by check. Credit card transactions accounted for 51% of the total transactions, while cash transactions account for 43% and 6% by check. While a significant number of transactions were paid by cash, most of the dollars were generated by credit card transactions. She stated that they discussed the pros and cons of implementing this change, and the primary benefits included improved security, reduced risk of theft and fraud, and increased efficiency of the scale house. She stated that this could lead to reduced waiting times for customers. She stated that it would also eliminate the need for armored truck services, which costs around \$10,000 per year.

Ms. Deal explained that it would also eliminate the need for staff to make trips to the bank for change and reduce the time spent on these tasks. She stated that it would allow for same-day remote deposit of checks, reducing the need to hold cash deposits for extended periods. She stated that this could also lead to improved staff health outcomes by reducing the handling of cash. She stated that it would enable quicker daily transaction closeouts, reducing the need for overtime hours and premium pay. She stated that there were also potential drawbacks, including the need for cash customers to adjust, and it potentially would negatively impact those who may not have access to credit or debit cards.

Ms. Deal stated that they would continue to cover credit card fees for these customers, ensuring they were not penalized for not using a credit or debit card. One concern was that the change could discourage the use of the facility, potentially leading to increased illegal dumping or customer account requests. She stated this change was likely to decrease wait times for all customers. She stated that it would also reduce the risk associated with the amount of cash they had on site at any given time.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they had conducted a survey of cash customers to determine how they would react if they were unable to pay by cash.

Ms. Deal replied that they had not.

Mr. Gaffney stated that he was concerned that people would no longer bring their trash to the dump and what would happen to it otherwise.

Ms. Deal stated that one thing they had planned was a long rollout to make customers aware of the changes. She stated they would give customers plenty of notice by providing information and posting signage. She stated that recognizing the challenges this initiative faced, they believed the benefits outweighed the difficulties.

Mr. Gaffney stated that he had no idea whether there were individuals who only paid cash and did not have access to other means of payment.

Ms. Deal stated that from her observations, the smaller transactions and older customers preferred cash, while young people preferred to pay by credit or with debit card.

Mr. Pinkston stated that the only concern he had was about what would happen with individuals who did not use cards. He asked how many transactions were paid with cash.

Ms. Deal replied that about 21,000 transactions were paid with cash, while credit cards were 25,000 and checks were around 3,000.

Mr. Gaffney noted that cash made up 43% of all transactions in 2025.

Mr. Richardson stated that his assumption was that the smaller transactions, such as \$20, were paid with cash because it was more convenient.

Ms. Deal stated that in addition to the other points they had discussed, one thing that stood out was that cash was the one area where they could not monitor it 100%.

Mr. Richardson asked how staff had decided on the implementation date of October 6.

Ms. Deal explained that she had initially suggested a three-month to six-month transition period, but she was considering this change to be coordinated with implementation of new financial software. Therefore, they were adjusting their timeline to fit within that realm. She stated that as a result, they would have a three-month window to make the public aware of the change and prepare them accordingly.

Mr. Mawyer stated that it was an arbitrary date, and if the Board believed a longer period would be suitable, that would be acceptable.

Mr. Richardson stated that he would ask the Board to consider the volume of cash customers. He stated that when considering the timeline, if they looked at the almost 15-year period, they might stretch the implementation period slightly to give a bit more time to see how many of those vehicles rolled through with the notice that affected that date. He stated that as they transitioned to a cashless system, it was essential to ensure that the public was aware of the change. He stated that if they

were to implement the change on February 1 over a multi-month period, it would be more effective in getting the word out. He suggested that they consider this approach.

Mr. Gaffney stated that he would also like a report to the Board on how these transactions by type have adjusted when the new system is implemented. He stated that he would like to know if this change has resulted in a loss of users. He stated that specifically, if they had a 97,000 count and transitioned to cashless, then had a new count of 85,000, that represented a loss of 12,000 transactions. He stated that he would like to understand the implications of the change and what was causing the decline in transactions. He stated that they should monitor this all the way through the process.

Mr. Hicks stated that he had concerns regarding this proposal. He stated that he did not support it. He stated that as a government agency, they had a responsibility to make processes convenient for their customers. He stated that they strived to create a safe environment for both their employees and customers; however, he was sensitive to the fact that not everyone had the means to obtain a credit card or debit account, which could create barriers to accessing their services. He stated that furthermore, individuals who faced challenges in obtaining these forms of payment may also be dealing with other issues that brought them to facilities like this. He stated that in general, he believed government agencies should be open to accepting all forms of payment, including cash. He stated that even if information came back to them, he would not be able to support this proposal.

Mr. Mawyer stated that one of the challenges was the use of cash in a scale house at the landfill by two staff members. The money was typically retrieved by Brinks on Fridays, unless it was picked up earlier in the week. He stated that if this facility were located in their administrative building with a customer service teller in a more controlled and secure environment, the concern would be less significant.

Mr. Andrews asked if there were alternative methods to achieve some of the goals they were trying to accomplish without going completely cashless. He asked if they could specify how much someone needed to bring for a specific service and tell them up-front they would not make change, so they would know ahead of time how much money they would need to bring, which would speed up the process. He stated that this would also discourage cash for those who had the option.

Ms. Deal stated that it was an option, but she believed it would be harder to promote.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had polled their partner utilities in the area, and most of them accepted cash. However, SPSA in the Virginia Beach area indicated they did not accept cash and were card-only.

Mr. Pinkston stated that he appreciated Mr. Hicks' point about a government agency being as accommodating as possible with all situations. He stated that however, the safety risks of keeping cash on-site were a serious concern. He asked if there had ever been incidents related to keeping cash on site.

Mr. Wood indicated that they had experienced internal fraud in the past.

Mr. Gaffney asked if they could provide a survey to cash customers during transactions. He asked what information they could gather in a two- or three-question survey.

Ms. Deal replied that they could try it, but she was unsure if customers would respond. She stated that adding that component would likely slow things down.

Mr. Andrews stated that if a survey was conducted, he would view it as an opportunity to educate the cash users about the reasons for wanting to move away from cash. He stated that otherwise, he was supportive, while understanding the issues related to it.

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors approve a change to the transaction process to accept only credit/debit cards or checks as payment at the Ivy Solid Waste and Recycling Center starting on February 1, 2026. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried (5-1). (Mr. Hicks opposed) (Mr. Dumars was absent)

9. RECESS

(Motion and vote to Recess the RSWA Board Meeting)

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors recess the meeting of the Solid Waste Authority. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

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

Mr. Sanders moved that the Board of Directors enter into Combined Session with RWSA. Mr. Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

(Combined Session with the RWSA)

c. Presentation: Succession Management and Strategic Plan Update Betsy Nemeth, Director of Administration and Communications

Betsy Nemeth, Director of Administration and Communications, stated that she would provide the Board with an update on their strategic plan and on their succession planning efforts. She stated that as part of this update, she would be sharing some key highlights from their strategic plan. She stated that the document outlined their vision, mission, and values, which were essential to their organization's success. She stated that this time, she would focus on sharing some specific initiatives that she believed were noteworthy.

Ms. Nemeth stated that their first goal was optimization and resiliency, advancing effective and efficient operational processes. She stated that a notable example was the work their lab recently undertook to improve their Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) Testing Method. She stated that they had acquired new equipment to facilitate this change, and as a result, they had reduced labor time per test by nine hours, from 12 to three hours, resulting in savings of approximately \$330 per test. She stated that she found this initiative particularly important. She stated that they had made significant reductions in hazardous waste generation, from two liters to 25 milliliters, and increased their capacity to handle 25 samples simultaneously, rather than the previous 14. She stated that additionally, they had seen a decrease in the cost of supplies, from \$200 per test to \$125 per test, resulting in estimated annual savings of \$10,000.

Ms. Nemeth stated that she would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Rob Woodside,

their Geographic Information Systems Coordinator for the pictures he provided. She stated that their environmental stewardship goal was to promote sustainability, and they had achieved that partially with their solar cell initiatives. She stated that in addition to the solar installation at the Ivy landfill, they planned to install solar panels on the Moores Creek Administration Building and the Ragged Mountain Raw Water Pump Station building roofs.

Ms. Nemeth stated that regarding their strategic goal of communication and collaboration, she had compiled a list of their recent activities. She stated that this included community tours, press releases, and website upgrades. She stated that they would be presenting an overview of these websites in September, which were already live.

Ms. Nemeth stated that she would like to highlight their planning and infrastructure efforts, specifically addressing the evolving drinking water needs of their community. She stated that she thought it was important to highlight these projects, as they were often referred to as "generational" initiatives. She stated that she had listed a few of the significant projects they were undertaking, which are either currently underway or in the planning stages.

Ms. Nemeth stated that these included the Ragged Mountain to Observatory Water Treatment Plant raw water line and pump station, and the South Rivanna River Crossing, which would help increase water supply to the northern part of the County. She stated that they were also working on the Ragged Mountain Reservoir pool raise, which would increase their water supply. She stated that additionally, they were in the scheduling stages of the Central Water Line project. She stated that they were planning a public information session at the Carver Recreation Center to share information with the community about the Central Water Line project. She stated that another significant project is the South Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir Pipeline, Intake, and Facilities, which would help achieve their goals in the Community Water Supply Plan.

Ms. Nemeth stated that regarding their workforce development initiative, she would like to provide an update on succession planning. She stated that they were proud of their plan, which had been working effectively. She explained that in 2023, Mr. Mawyer presented the Board with the graph of their organizational structure, highlighting key vacancies that were likely to happen due to impending retirements. She stated that three of those positions had already been filled due to retirements. She stated that considering their success in filling vacant positions with qualified individuals from within their organization, they had done a great job of preparing people to move up within the Rivanna Authorities.

Ms. Nemeth stated that she would like to show them their current RSWA organizational chart, which included career ladders. She stated that the career ladders allowed employees to see potential career paths within the organization. She stated that the current organizational chart for the Rivanna Solid Waste Authority was on the next slide. She stated that she would like to highlight their tuition reimbursement program, which had helped many employees, including David Rhoades, Solid Waste Manager, who had graduated with his bachelor's degree with assistance from Rivanna. She stated that their career ladder system allowed employees to progress through various roles, with a system that provided a clear path for advancement and career growth.

Ms. Nemeth stated that the current organizational chart for RWSA was also provided. She stated that they had several career ladders in place. She noted that a lot of positions had changed recently, and they would be reviewing staffing needs and succession planning for FY 2027

through 2031. She stated that to support their managers, they were providing a new training program, "Communicate with Impact," which would be rolled out to about 10 of their managers, mostly newly promoted. She stated that this training aimed to prepare them for effective communications. She stated that they were also offering individual leadership coaching for newly promoted managers.

Ms. Nemeth stated that additionally, they would be conducting a virtual training program for individuals who may be interested in pursuing leadership roles within the organization. They would identify about 10-12 high-potential individuals and provide them with virtual leadership training. This approach was beneficial as it was cost-effective and allowed these individuals to gain the necessary exposure to determine if they were interested in pursuing a leadership role. Ultimately, leadership roles should be chosen by those who were passionate about them, rather than being forced upon them.

Ms. Mallek stated that she thought it was encouraging for employees to be invited into career paths and leadership roles, so they knew they were valued in the organization.

Ms. Nemeth agreed, stating that she had seen many people promoted during the time she had been with the organization, and it was satisfying to see that they had been able to bring in and develop good people who were contributing to the organization.

10. CLOSED MEETING

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Solid Waste Authority enter into a joint closed session with the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority to discuss confidential information related to cybersecurity and the security of the authorities' physical premises as permitted by the public safety exemptions at Section 2.2-3711-A(19) of the Code of Virginia, and confidential performance evaluations, goals and objectives of specific personnel as permitted by the personnel exemption at Section 2.2-3711-A(1) of the Code of Virginia. Mr. Sanders seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

11. CERTIFY CLOSED MEETING

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Solid Waste Authority hereby certifies by recorded vote that, to the best of each member's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies. Mr. Hicks seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors approve a merit increase for above average or outstanding performance for Executive Director Bill Mawyer of 5%. Mr. Sanders seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

12. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board of Directors adjourn the meeting. Mr. Andrews seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Dumars was absent)

596 Respectfully submitted,
597
598
599
600



Mr. Jeff Richardson
Secretary - Treasurer

