RIVANNA WATER & SEWER AUTHORITY
695 Moores Creek Lane | Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-9016
434.977.2970
434.293.8858
www.rivanna.org

RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
May 23, 2023

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, May 23, 2023 at 2:15 p.m.

Board Members Present: Mike Gaffney, Michael Rogers, Brian Pinkston, Ann Mallek, Lauren Hildebrand, and Gary O'Connell.

Board Members Absent: Jeff Richardson.

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, Lonnie Wood, Jennifer Whitaker, Victoria Fort, Santino Granato, Betsy Nemeth, Katie McIlwee, David Tungate, Deborah Anama, Jacob Woodson.

Attorney(s) Present: Carrie Stanton.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Gaffney convened the May 23, 2023 regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority at 2:37 p.m.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Mr. Pinkston moved that the Board adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, and passed unanimously (6-0).

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ON APRIL 25, 2023

Mr. Rogers moved that the Board approve the minutes of the April 25, 2023 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Connell, and passed unanimously (6-0).

4. RECOGNITION

There was no recognition.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mawyer stated that he was pleased to announce that one of their employees, Brenda Clifford, recently graduated from Liberty University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration with a concentration in Finance. He stated that Ms. Clifford was an Accounting Associate with RWSA in the Finance Department and had been in that position since August 2021. He stated that Mr. David Tungate, Director of Operations, recently attended a utilities leadership program in Cincinnati.

Mr. Mawyer stated that May 31, 2023 was National Dam Safety Awareness Day. He stated that

there were five reservoirs and the Lickinghole Creek stormwater basin, for a total of six dams managed for the community by RWSA. He stated that Ms. Victoria Fort would give an update in December about the dam safety program.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they continued to work on major projects with UVA and the UVA Foundation, including the South Fork to Ragged Mountain Reservoir Water Pipeline project. He stated that they delivered all the documents needed for UVAF to sign last week, including the deeds of easement, plats, and appraisals.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they hoped to move forward with signatures on easements from UVAF on the Westover and Foxhaven properties, plus purchase of a one-acre parcel on the Foxhaven property for a pump station. He stated that the University notified them in March that there was a conflict with the proposed route of the water pipeline in the Fontaine Avenue area, so they were working to determine where in that area the pipe should be located.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the Central Water Line through the City continued to move forward, with 60% of the design due to be finished in July. He stated that they would then do a team review with the City and ACSA just like they did with the 30% design documents. He stated that the project was due for advertisement in December, and when they had a contractor, they would meet with neighborhoods and give details on the area affected and how the project would proceed. He stated that the work would go down Jefferson Park Avenue to Cleveland, to Cherry Avenue, across 5th Street, to Elliott, cutting down East High Street to Free Bridge.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they were pleased to receive a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers to complete repairs on the Allen Farm Lane Bridge on the Buck Mtn property, where concrete piers needed repairs at the waterline in the stream. He stated that May 7 through 13 was National Drinking Water Week, which celebrated water professionals who made the essential drinking water in our community. He stated that Andrea Bowles, Water Resources Manager, participated in Rivanna Riverfest on Sunday, where she represented RWSA at the Rivanna Conservation Alliance event.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they met with the Moormans River Scenic Advisory Group and representatives of Trout Unlimited at the Sugar Hollow Reservoir on May 8 to talk about some options to better support the Moormans River and the trout population below the dam. He stated that they were working with those groups, DEQ, and Virginia Department of Wildlife Resources about possible changes to release more water into the Moormans River.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had a public meeting planned for May 16 to talk about the new flow measurement design plan and operations manual, but postponed the meeting in order to incorporate comments from the Moorman's River group into the plan and to discuss them with DEQ, so they would reschedule that meeting.

Mr. O'Connell asked if those changes would be incorporated into the permit.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the amount of water to be released, measurement of the water, and how they reported it possibly could be incorporated. He stated this was because they must report all

water released into the river, and they currently had a large meter that measured large flows but did not measure small flows very well. He stated that the Trout Unlimited representatives were advocating for a small amount of water to be released from the pipe all the time, and from the lower levels of the reservoir where the water is cooler. He stated that when there was no water overflowing the reservoir dam, they were required to release it from that pipe anyway.

Mr. Mawyer stated that Ms. Bowles presented images last month that depicted the transition period in which the bladder or gate at the top of the dam stopped the water overflowing from the dam as the weather got warmer throughout the day, and they previously were not adjusting to have any release during those times. He stated that sometimes, when the weather was cooler during the evening, the water would flow over the dam again, but the Trout Unlimited personnel had concerns that during the hours of no flow, there was negative effect on the trout and the stream ecology.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they had a camera that allowed them to watch the dam and see if it was overflowing 24 hours per day, and instead of looking at it and adjusting the valve once every three days, they now looked at it every day, multiple times per day during the transitions of flow to no flow. He stated that in instances of no flow, they could remotely open the valve and begin a small flow coming out of the bottom of the reservoir. He stated that they were attempting to accommodate the wishes of the Moormans River Group and help the river as best as possible, but they must discuss some of the proposed changes with DEQ before they could be incorporated.

Mr. O'Connell thanked Mr. Mawyer for balancing the needs of nature and the need for drinking water.

Mr. Mawyer stated that it was understood that the priority was providing water for the community, but they wanted to accommodate the stream as well, so that was what the DEQ monitoring would assist with. He stated that the Director of Engineering and Maintenance, Jennifer Whitaker, gave a presentation to the Crozet Community Advisory Committee on all of the projects for water and sewer in the Crozet area, including the Beaver Creek Dam Project and the GAC at the Crozet Water Treatment Plant.

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Gaffney opened the items from the public. He asked speakers to identify themselves for the record and noted that this was not the public comment time for the budget.

Mr. William Lucia stated that he resided at 3360 Ridge Road in Charlottesville, and was speaking as representative of the Thomas Jefferson Chapter of Trout Unlimited in addition to his own feelings on water management that Mr. Mawyer had already discussed. He stated that his purpose for speaking today was to ask that the Water Authority, as operator of the Sugar Hollow Reservoir and Dam, change the current method of water release into the Moormans River.

Mr. Lucia stated that it was a matter of river health, and it was the opinion of the Board of Thomas Jefferson Trout Unlimited that the current release method was injurious to the

Moormans River's health and ecosystem, a system prior to a year ago supported a wide population of spawning brook, rainbow trout, and many other species of fish and aquatic insects and invertebrates.

Mr. Lucia stated that the current method used by RWSA to meet its DEQ permit required for minimum in-stream flow that was to release water over the spillway in a manner that allowed the flow in the immediate vicinity of the dam to go from adequate to no flow at all. He stated that Mr. Mawyer alluded to this in discussing the heating of the bladder. He stated that while meeting the spirit of the DEQ permit, the current method did more harm than good for the overall health of the river and the tail water would end further downstream, and the result was a stream with little or no movement of water in the tail water section of the Moormans River below the dam.

Mr. Lucia stated that this in turn resulted in a river with fluctuating temperatures, as much as 10 degrees between releases, but expected to be much higher in summer months. He stated that additionally, lower dissolved oxygen levels resulted, with fluctuation of oxygen carrying capacity as well. He stated that lower flow, lower oxygen saturation, and higher water temperature all contributed to the inability of the aquatic life, insects, invertebrates, and fish to thrive and survive. He stated that algae proliferation and growth was increased in these conditions and resulted in further deterioration of the aquatic environment.

Mr. Lucia stated that in order to support a healthy Moormans ecosystem and mitigate the deleterious effects the current release method had created, they proposed implementation of a release method that would be beneficial to the ecosystem. He stated they would like the RWSA to consider using the cold water pipe system in a manner that released the required minimum in-stream flow to provide continuous release from the pipe, 24 hours per day, every day. He stated that this would result in more consistent flows, lower in-stream temperatures in the tail water, and high, more consistent dissolved oxygen levels.

Mr. Lucia stated that using this method would improve water quality in the river and all aquatic life would benefit. He stated that they welcomed the opportunity to work with the RWSA to improve the river ecosystem in a manner that allowed the RWSA to meet its permit requirements and its purpose of providing clean, safe drinking water to Charlottesville area communities.

Jim Bennett stated that he lived at 6430 Sugar Hollow Road. He stated that he was a northwest Albemarle County resident and spoke on behalf of the Moormans Scenic River Advisory Board. He stated that this Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation Board was formed in 2022 of volunteer individuals who were approved to serve based on their interest in the health of the state scenic Moormans River.

Mr. Bennett stated that they had spoken to the RWSA several times recently and thanked them for the opportunity to speak today. He stated that they encouraged the prioritization of biodiversity of the Moormans River corridor as a major consideration in the water supply permit being prepared. He stated that it was recognized that this represented a paradigm shift in their approach to water supply design, but it was necessary for all of them to recognize and incorporate 21st century ecological science into their thinking.

Mr. Bennett stated that in that context, and being concerned about the effects on aquatic life, water flow, water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and chemical nutrients, they had the following concerns. He stated that they had documented proof from pictures taken and personal observations that the in-flow rates in the north fork of the Moormans River into the Sugar Hollow Reservoir frequently exceeded the water delivery into the Moormans River immediately downstream of the Sugar Hollow Dam. He stated the second was that the replacement in 2021-2022 of the rubber bladder on top of the Sugar Hollow Dam resulted in expansion of the reservoir volume such that previously dry areas at the western end of the reservoir were now inundated with 3 to 4 feet of water.

Mr. Bennett stated that they did not know the effects that these new wetlands had on the net volume of the reservoir, or their observations of lack of overtopping of the Sugar Hollow Dam when there appeared to be no reduction of water in-flow into the reservoir from the north fork. He stated that they planned on supplementing their personal observations and pictures with quantitative data about water in-flow into the reservoir from the north fork. He stated that as soon as they could acquire the water technology to measure flow, they would do this, and these data would supplement water temperature and dissolved oxygen levels at multiple locations that they were beginning to measure.

Mr. Bennett stated that third, the USGS Moormans River flow gauge, about 12 miles downstream of the Sugar Hollow Dam, did not provide meaningful data about flows in the upstream Moormans River below the dam. He stated that a review of recent flow data from this gauge showed recorded flows peaking on May 14, 2023 at 64 cubic feet per second, returning to 40 cubic feet per second on May 16, and then having an approximately linear decline to about 30 cubic feet per second on May 22. He stated that it was noted that over this period of time, their observations and digital images revealed minimal if any change in in-flow from the north fork and variable Sugar Hollow Dam overtopping on different days.

Mr. Gaffney informed Mr. Bennett that he had exceeded his three-minute timeframe and could submit his remaining comments to be included in the record.

Mr. Bennett stated that the group had a number of recommendations about these concerns, and he hoped they would include those concepts as aspirational guidelines to help conserve and protect the biodiversity of the Moormans River corridor and the water supply permit they were poised to submit to the DEQ.

Dede Smith stated that she was in the City of Charlottesville and was a rate-payer. She stated that she attended the May 16 meeting at the Crozet library, and there was no one there, but it was not a public meeting about this issue, for which there had not been one, so she was disappointed to say the least that things were proceeding without the potential input of people who would pay for it. She stated that she was an environmentalist who believed in doing the right thing by the rivers, but she also had a strong science background and did not think that personal observation was science, as heard by the last speaker.

Ms. Smith stated that with that being stated, it was important as they discussed this matter whether they were talking about releasing natural flows of water or unnatural flows of water. She

stated that they were listening to people at Trout Unlimited who had a legitimate private interest in fishing as opposed to what might be a problematic river. She stated that they always knew that Moormans had been a flashy river, and she wanted to know whether anyone in that group had discussed taking the dam down in regard to creating natural flows.

Ms. Smith stated that in a bad drought when they really needed that water, the water would never reach the Rivanna but would be absorbed by the groundwater and by all the people in between who were not rate payers and who would stick their pumps in that river. She stated that was known from experience and from data in the original community water plan. She reiterated that they should take the dam down if they wanted natural flows. She stated that they did not need it anymore with the massive Ragged Mountain Dam.

Ms. Smith stated that the capital improvement discussion would also highlight who they were listening to versus who was paying the bill. She stated that the whole system would never be equitable in a system where a lot of people paid water bills, but a lot of people with a lot of influence did not. She repeated that it would never be equitable, and stated that she expected her City representatives to represent the rate payers, but did not always see it.

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Mawyer stated that Mr. Bennett was present with the group they met with at Sugar Hollow and were aware of his thoughts on the matter. He stated that Mr. Lucia was not at the meeting, but appreciated his thoughts from Trout Unlimited. He stated that group did have a representative at their meeting. He stated that they were looking at the various items that they suggested, and as Ms. Smith discussed whether they were considering releasing natural or unnatural flows, they would release natural flows. He stated that if water was coming over the dam, they could supplement that with a small amount of water out of a lower pipe. The Trout Unlimited representatives were interested in using the lower gate in the tower of the reservoir, which contained the coldest water.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they released some of the water from the lower gate all the time, and Ms. Bowles, the Water Resources Manager, had concern that the water in the lower reaches of the reservoir had very low oxygen, especially in the summer, and could have a negative effect on the ecology downstream. He stated that they were trying to gather as much information as possible in order to try different water releases in the future and see how they worked. He stated that they looked to their customers first to make sure they were not unduly draining the reservoir for the purpose of maintaining the Moormans River.

Mr. O'Connell stated that the DEQ permit was focused almost exclusively on administering flows and not the water supply issue and bigger scheme, so they would not be balanced in the issue.

Mr. Mawyer stated that was correct. He stated that DEQ looked heavily at environmental impacts of building a dam and impounding the water. He stated that the Authority wanted the water for customers and the DEQ was protecting the environment as best as possible by requiring minimum flow releases to the stream, and they achieved the balance of both needs

through the permit. He stated that DEQ worked with environmental agencies and created requirements for how much water must be released and when. He stated that the environmental concerns were protected through DEQ.

Mr. Mawyer stated that a comment was made that the new bladder was causing a different operational process at Sugar Hollow. He stated that they were unfamiliar with that, so they would have to research the matter. He stated that the new bladder was the same size and operated the same way the old one did, and any differences should be minor. He stated that it inflated five feet to maintain a higher pool level, but for stormwater control, the bladder could deflate and allow more water to go over the dam and lower the normal pool level.

Mr. Gaffney stated that he heard Mr. Bennett say that when water was overflowing, the reservoir was 3 to 4 feet higher than it used to be.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they were unaware of that being the case. He stated that the new bladder was essentially the same size as the old bladder. He stated that they would continue to work with all groups about this and try to work out a good solution.

Mr. Pinkston asked Mr. Mawyer if there had been any consideration of removing the Sugar Hollow Reservoir and Dam.

Mr. Mawyer stated not in his time at the Authority. He asked Ms. Whitaker if she had heard of consideration of the subject.

Ms. Whitaker stated no.

Mr. Mawyer stated that it was viewed as a critical component of the water supply system, and when they had the Rivanna to Ragged Mountain Pipeline built, they would have Ragged Mountain connected to Rivanna Reservoir and effectively to Sugar Hollow Reservoir through the stream. He stated that Ms. Smith may be correct that in a major drought the amount of water that went through the reservoir to the stream may be affected, but he could not really comment on that. He stated that however, under normal circumstances, the Sugar Hollow Reservoir was an essential part of their collective water supply in the community.

Mr. O'Connell requested that Mr. Bennett's statement be shared with Board members.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

- *a. Staff Report on Finance*
- *b. Staff Report on Operations*
- *c. Staff Report on CIP Projects*
- *d. Staff Report on Wholesale Metering*
- *e. Staff Report on Drought Monitoring*
- *f. Approval of Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Pay Scale Adjustment, Restructuring, and Regrading*
- *g. Approval of Engineering Services–Beaver Creek Dam Design Services–Schnabel Engineering*

h. *Approval to Increase Construction Contingency–MCAWRRF 5 kV Electrical Infrastructure Improvements–Pyramid Electrical Contractors, LLC*
i. *Approval of Engineering Services–South Fork Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir Pipeline, Intake & Facilities Project–Pipeline Design, Bidding, and Construction Administration–Kimley-Horn*
j. *Approval of Engineering Services–South Fork Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Reservoir Pipeline, Intake & Facilities Project–South Fork Rivanna Reservoir Intake and Pump Station Preliminary Engineering Report–Kimley-Horn*
k. *Approval of Engineering Services–Crozet Pump Stations Rebuild–Design, Bidding, and Construction Administration–Wiley/Wilson*
l. *Approval of Engineering Services–Emmet Streetscape Water Line Betterment Design Services–Whitman, Requardt & Associated, LLP*
m. *Approval of Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Personnel Management Plan Update*

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to adopt the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Connell and passed unanimously (6-0).

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. *Presentation, Public Hearing, and Vote to Consider Approval of the Resolution to Adopt the FY 2023-2024 Rate Schedule, FY 2024-2028 Capital improvement Plan and FY 2023-2024 Budget; Bill Mawyer, Executive Director*

Mr. Mawyer stated that the CIP was presented in February and the Operating Budget was presented in March. He stated that the budget was an incorporation of the Capital account and operating expenses, so he would give a brief review of both of those before the public hearing was held on the items. He stated that the strategic plan guided this process, and the focus of the FY 2023-2024 budget was to address the objectives of the 2024-2028 Capital Improvement Program, to establish a framework with resources to achieve the strategic plan priorities, to support the workforce during a period of extreme inflation, and to translate their objectives and priorities into reasonable charges to the City and ACSA.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the FY24-28 CIP included 56 projects at a cost of $326.1M, and the funding for the program was an accumulation of funds from different sources. He stated that they had available funds that they had already borrowed, grants, reserves, new debt, and had already paid $35.6M toward the full expense of these projects. He stated that the primary objectives of the CIP included accelerating completion of the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir to Ragged Mountain Pipeline and Pumping project to 2030 rather than 2033, providing additional Granular Activated Carbon treatment capacity at Crozet and Red Hill Water Treatment Plants, leverage of partnerships with the City, UVA, and VDOT on drinking water piping projects in Emmet Street, and to improve drinking water capacity and reliability in the Route 29 North area.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the CIP and Operating expenses accumulated to a $47.7M budget, which was a $5.8M or 13.9% increase from FY23. He stated that the debt service was one of the largest components of the budget, totaling $23.3M, which was an increase of 18.2% over last year, in large part because they accelerated a major piping project. He stated that the operations cost was $24.4M, which was a $2.2M increase or 10.1%. He stated that City charges were estimated to be

$17.8M, which was a $1.5M or 9.3% increase, and the ACSA charges would be $27M, which was a $3.2M or 13.4% increase over this year.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the debt service was $23M or 49% of the budget because the Authority carried the major utility debt for the City and County by design. He stated that workforce expenses would be $11.6M or 24%. He stated that operations and maintenance were $7.5M or 16%, and general services was $5.4M or 11% of the budget. He stated that the cost increases for FY2024 compared to FY2023 were substantially composed of debt service, which was $3.6M or 62% of the increase, workforce costs were $1.1M or 19%, chemicals were $680,000 or 11%, and information technology was $453,000 or 8%. He stated that the total increase was $5.8M.

Mr. Mawyer stated that through operational optimization savings, they created $187,000 in savings largely through technology improvements and injecting need-paced chemicals in the water treatment process via sensors giving instantaneous readings on what the levels in flows were, allowing for injection of chemicals at a variable rate based on need rather than setting the injection pump at a constant rate to pump all day. He stated that this variable, paced flow process would save chemical costs.

Mr. Mawyer stated that major programs in FY2024 included construction of the Airport Road Water Pump Station, the MC 5kv Electrical Upgrade, the South Rivanna River Crossing, the Ragged Mountain Reservoir to Observatory Water Treatment Plan Pipeline and Pump Station, the Central Water Line, the Red Hill Water Treatment Plant Upgrades and Granular Activated Carbon, the Scottsville WRRF Emergency Power Generator, and the Moores Creek Administration Building Renovation and Addition. He stated that in design for FY2024 were the South Fork Rivanna River to Ragged Mountain Reservoir Pipeline, the Beaver Creek Dam, Pump Station and Piping project, and the Crozet Water Treatment Plant GAC System. He stated that also requested to be approved for FY2024 was the new Administration and Communications Division in the Authority.

Mr. Mawyer stated that expense increases included the cost-of-living increase proposed for staff of 6% with a 2% merit pool, retirement and insurance increases, and four additional positions as part of workforce investment. He stated that the additional positions included a Director of Administration and Communications in the first quarter, then a Finance Manager, IT Technician for cybersecurity, and an Engineering Inspector Supervisor in the second quarter. He stated that they had eliminated a part-time position, so this would result in a net total of 3.6 FTE positions. He stated that operations and maintenance expense increases included costs for chemicals, technology, communications, and equipment maintenance. He noted that they had reduced the professional and other services costs by $160,000.

Mr. O'Connell asked what specifically was causing the increase in chemical costs.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they received higher bid prices for chemicals used for water and wastewater treatment..

Mr. Tungate stated that between FY22 and FY23, costs for chemicals went up 60%, and the bids were due for FY24 on Thursday, so he would see where they were at that point.

Mr. O'Connell asked if the issue was isolated to GAC.

Mr. Tungate stated no, it was across the board for all chemicals. He stated that it was thought to be tied to the unpredictability of the diesel fuel market, but they had also heard that raw materials had changed, and odor control prices had gone up based on the market rates, and the conflict in Ukraine and Russia had an impact on supply as well.

Mr. Mawyer stated that with the pandemic behind them, and if the national legislature could pass a budget, and if fuel prices stabilized, and if OPEC did not have a special meeting, then perhaps chemical prices would go down. He stated that currently there were multiple reasons why the prices were up.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the new Administration and Communications division would manage the Human Resource programs, including recruiting, hiring, payroll, and benefits, as well as public-facing brand identity initiatives identified in the strategic plan goals. He stated that they were transferring the Safety Program to this group to manage the enhancements of the Safety Program. He stated that the Finance Manager would supervise staff and become proficient with all finance programs of RWSA and RSWA. He stated that the Information Technology Technician would support systems including cybersecurity, SCADA, asset management, and Human Resources Information System. He stated that the Engineering Inspectors Supervisor would supervise and manage the work programs of the four Engineering Inspectors, as well as the consultant inspectors, while also providing special inspections.

Mr. Pinkston asked if the Inspectors would be inspecting weld quality and other things of that nature.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would be inspecting for contract compliance, so their responsibility was to make sure the contractor followed the construction contract, including materials specified, approval of submittals, and correct installation of materials.

Mr. Pinkston asked if they currently leaned on architects and engineers for that work.

Mr. Mawyer stated they did, but they were growing the internal inspector group during his tenure, and they would now have five inspectors.

Mr. O'Connell asked if they had run the numbers as to whether it would cover most or all of the consultant expenses that would otherwise be incurred.

Mr. Mawyer stated that he would have to return with that information because it had been collected a few years ago. He stated that they still needed consultant inspections to some degree, especially special inspections if there was unusual construction with which they had less familiarity. He stated that the growth of the RWSA employees had been slow and steady for the past 18 years, and had added 19 positions, or a little over one position per year, which was reasonable for their growing population and the services provided at their multiple large facilities. He stated that they forecast the rates for the ACSA and the City based on the Capital

Budget for this year and the CIP, and anticipated about $230M in new debt over those five years. He stated that they issued the debt, and the City and ACSA reimbursed them for the debt costs.

Mr. O'Connell stated that there was a large shift in future years.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the total budget proposed was $47.7M, of which the City charges would total about $17.8M and the ACSA charges total $27M. He requested the Chair to conduct a public hearing on the proposed rate schedule if there were no questions or comments. He stated the public hearing was advertised twice in the local paper.

Mr. Gaffney opened the public hearing for the Rate Schedule, CIP, and FY 2023–2024 Budget.

Ms. Dede Smith stated that after the Ragged Mountain option was chosen for the community water plan, an expensive pipe project between Ragged Mountain and South Fork was proposed. She stated that the project was initially delayed because the required rate increase to fund the project was too high. She stated that the current proposed rate increase was similar. She stated that there was an affordability crisis, and people were often evicted for not being able to afford utilities.

Ms. Smith stated that low-cost housing was less efficient and more expensive to heat and cool. She stated the proposed CIP was reckless, racist, and went against historical precedent. She stated the County ratepayers would see worse rate hikes compared to the City, and County ratepayers had almost no representation on the Board. She stated that Ms. Mallek did not pay utility rates and neither did her predecessor.

Mr. Gaffney noted there were no more speakers and closed the public hearing.

Mr. O'Connell stated that there were weekly headlines about how water systems were failing in other parts of the country and water safety was in question. He stated that trust in public water had declined rapidly. He stated that the Authority had invested and continued to invest in initiatives to ensure safe, reliable drinking water. He stated that many of the projects were major maintenance requirements that had been delayed. He stated that they were concerned about affordability for retail consumers and low-volume consumers. He stated that they had a lower cost than the state average and national averages. He stated that the discussion should not only be focused on the rates because the quality of the product was also important.

Mr. Pinkston noted that there was an escalation of project costs across the country. He stated that they should take advantage of the opportunity to fill Ragged Mountain Reservoir. He stated that in terms of the infrastructure, they were in good shape, and he supported the proposed budget.

Ms. Mallek stated that the budget was a bold step. She stated that she supported the addition of the communications division. She stated that she and Mr. Tungate hosted a table-top exercise on risk communications at the EPA event. She stated she supported the budget.

Mr. Gaffney stated that prior to the 2002 drought, they had some of the lowest rates in the state, but their infrastructure was aging. He stated that they had to address the sewer infrastructure

before addressing the water supply due to a consent order from the DEQ. He stated that they sought to continue building state-of-the-art water and sewer utilities.

Mr. Pinkston noted the rate increases for the City were about 9% year-over-year. He asked if there was a six to 10-year range. He stated that the Urban Water Master Plan was close to completion. He asked whether they would reach a peak investment and then transition to mainly maintenance costs.

Mr. Mawyer stated that regulations may change the requirements. He stated that they were awaiting regulations for PFAS. He stated that they hoped the budgets would stabilize where they could focus on infrastructure renewal. He stated that they had a long-range CIP, and they would have a presentation on the long-range vision for the water and wastewater system in June.

Ms. Mallek clarified that the long-range CIP would include paying off loans to take on new debt.

Mr. Mawyer responded that debt would increase, but they made monthly debt payments which decreased overall debt.

Ms. Mallek stated that downstream localities used the water as drinking water. She stated there was a moral obligation to do the best to preserve water quality.

Mr. Pinkston moved to adopt the rate schedule for FY 2023–2024, effective July 1, 2023. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pinkston moved to approve the FY 2024–2028 CIP. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Pinkston moved to approve the FY 2023–2024 Budget. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

(Joint Session with the RSWA)

a. *Presentation: Asset Management Program Update*
   Katie McIlwee, Asset Management Coordinator

Ms. Katie McIlwee, Asset Management Coordinator, stated that the Strategic Plan guided all of the Authority projects, and the Asset Management Project was no different, and that this project falls under the goals of the Planning and Infrastructure team. She stated that the Asset Management Policy linked to the Strategic Plan to aid in setting goals for asset investment and development. She stated that asset management was a long-term program to attain and sustain the chosen level of service for the life of an asset in the most cost-effective manner. She stated there was a framework of five core questions, developed by the EPA that aids in the development of a comprehensive asset management program. She stated the questions helped to determine the current state of assets, required level of service, business risks, best operations/maintenance practices and CIP investment strategies, and the best long-term funding strategy.

Ms. McIlwee stated that the Authorities had approximately $320M in total assets, which included horizontal and vertical assets. She stated that horizontal assets mainly encompass underground assets, such as manholes, water and sewer lines, system valves, and other related devices. She stated that there were approximately 764 horizontal wastewater assets and approximately 1,644 horizontal water assets. She stated that vertical assets were those that were at the WTPs including buildings and contained within infrastructure. She stated that for wastewater, there were about 1,858 vertical assets, and for water, that were about 1,426 assets.

Ms. McIlwee stated they reviewed the benefits of the program and determined that it would prolong the life of assets and improve decisions about asset rehabilitation, repair, and replacement. She stated that the program would reduce the overall cost for operational and capital expenditures, and it would help meet customer demands. She stated that they would be able to set rates based on operational planning, and the budget could focus on critical activities. She stated the program would improve emergency response and improve the security, safety, and reliability of all assets.

Ms. McIlwee stated that the goals of the program were to integrate information across the Authorities, monitor asset lifecycle, quantify asset condition and risk, achieve consistent and accurate performance monitoring, compare and prioritize potential capital project and maintenance activities, achieve benefit/cost efficiencies for customers, and increase and retain institutional knowledge.

Ms. McIlwee stated that there were four phases of the asset management program. She stated that the first phase, developing an asset management framework, had been completed, which included conducting a gap assessment, developing a Strategic Asset Management Plan, and identification of software requirements. the initial development of the asset management framework. She stated that the second phase, Test AM Framework, included development of the asset register and completing a Tactical Asset Management Pilot plan for the Rivanna Pump Station. She stated that the third phase was nearly complete, and it was the Cityworks software implementation phase. She stated that the fourth phase was full asset management program implementation.

Ms. McIlwee noted several major milestones throughout the project. The first milestone was the start of Phase 1 in 2018 with the asset plan development. She stated that in 2019, Phase 2 began and included asset hierarchy development. She stated in 2020, they completed the strategic asset management plan and the tactical asset management plan. She stated in 2021, they began Phase 3 with the asset register development and Cityworks configuration. She stated in 2022, the full asset management program implementation began, and in 2023, Cityworks had gone online.

Ms. McIlwee stated that Phase 3 was a large part of the project. She stated that Cityworks was chosen to be the computerized maintenance and management system (CMMS) in September 2020, and implementation began December of that year. She stated that configuration and systems testing were completed in March 2023. She stated that on May 8, Cityworks went live. She stated that the program maximized preventative maintenance. She stated that Cityworks was an Authority-wide initiative to provide tangible benefits for asset management. She stated that the system had all asset information in one location and it was linked to the GIS. She stated that

the system allowed work order tracking across departments.

Ms. McIlwee stated that the asset management program budget was about $1.18M. She stated that the largest portion of the budget was Phase 3. She stated that as part of Phase 4, they were looking to complete the Level 1 and Level 2 condition assessments, and after completion, they would assign consequence of failure scores and mitigation factor scores to the vertical assets. She stated the consequence of failure scores would be assigned to the linear assets, and those would be used to calculate risk. All of this information would then be used in conjunction with a decision support tool to help make well-informed planning and financial decisions.

Ms. McIlwee stated long-term goals included full implementation of the program. She stated they would develop capital investment needs and a business case evaluation process. She stated that they would develop tactical asset plans for all assets, and they would refine the level of service performance standards. She stated that they would seek to reduce maintenance costs, implement performance monitoring processes, and implement an asset management program with the RSWA.

Mr. Pinkston asked if a consultant helped in the implementation of Cityworks.

Ms. McIlwee stated they hired a consultant (GHD) to implement Cityworks and the asset management program. She stated the consultant helped with the procurement of Cityworks.

Mr. Smalls asked how they selected Cityworks.

Ms. McIlwee stated that when they began looking for a system, neighboring localities and municipalities were using Cityworks. She stated that they issued an RFP, and by that time, Cityworks had transitioned its platform. She stated once the vendor had transitioned, they were able to provide 95% of the Authority's request at the lowest cost.

Mr. Smalls asked whether RSWA assets were included.

Ms. McIlwee stated they were not yet included.

Mr. Mawyer responded that they would be in the near future.

Mr. Pinkston asked if the consultant helped develop and identify the risk assessments and points of failure.

Ms. McIlwee stated that they had developed several metrics to aid in decision making. She stated that the usage and surrounding infrastructure influenced the risk of failure score.

Mr. Mawyer asked what all the metrics added together would indicate.

Ms. McIlwee stated that it indicated the business risk exposure.

Mr. Gaffney stated he supported the program. He asked if there was a method to sell assets that

were no longer needed or used by the Authority.

Ms. McIlwee stated that they currently perform a surplus sale of equipment every year.

Mr. O'Connell asked if they would be able to gather enough data for the next CIP process.

Ms. McIlwee stated that they hoped to gather enough data. She stated that they were six to eight months from being able to input the first data into the decision support tool. She stated that the information would become more robust every year.

Mr. Smalls asked for more information about the decision support system.

Ms. McIlwee stated that after a decision support tool was implemented, there would be a review process for the recommendations provided by the software, and no recommendation would be taken without a review.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would integrate maintenance history and opinions about the assets. He stated that they would have to prioritize the most important assets for repairs or replacement.

Mr. Smalls stated that the program was a good way to reduce costs.

Ms. Mallek asked whether the 20% priority for site visits was based on age or value.

Ms. McIlwee stated that it was based on a calculation using the consequence of failure scores, condition scores, and the mitigation factors.

b. Presentation: Leadership Development Program Betsy Nemeth, Human Resources Manager

Ms. Betsy Nemeth, Human Resources Manager, stated that she would provide an update on the organization's succession planning. She stated that the objective of the succession planning process was to continue organizational growth and development of the Authorities by recognizing, developing, and retaining leadership talent and strategically planning for the future. She stated that they developed a leadership development program to develop in-house leadership at all levels of the organization.

Ms. Nemeth stated that there were three groups, and Group 1 encompassed the directors and high-level managers. She stated that they included the Clifton Strengths assessment tool to identify leadership strengths. She stated that they had held the first learning session, Strengths-Based Leadership, and the next sessions would include Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management, Managing Change, and Visionary Leadership. She stated that everyone in the group would develop and present a capstone project in pairs in December. She stated that they were using an Executive Leadership Coach with Barren Ridge Consulting named Tim Smith.

Ms. Nemeth stated that groups 2 and 3 included managers, assistant managers, supervisors, and other staff. She stated that the groups had four development learning sessions, Strengths-Based Leadership, Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management, Effective Communication, and

Managing Change. She stated that the groups had already undergone the strengths-based leadership session. She stated that the refreshed leadership development program would support the objectives of the succession management plan. She stated that the structured leadership program had been successful for the first session, and employees seemed willing to return for future sessions.

Mr. Mawyer asked how many employees were in the program.

Ms. Nemeth responded that there were a total of 26 staff members from both Authorities.

Mr. Rogers asked who was providing the training.

Ms. Nemeth responded that the leadership coach consultant provided training to the executive group, and she provided training to the other two groups.

Mr. Rogers stated that he supported internal executive leadership programs.

Ms. Nemeth stated that the programs invested in employees and aided in retention.

Mr. Pinkston asked how many people had gone through the program and how many they anticipated.

Ms. Nemeth stated that this was the first group of sessions, and there were 26 staff members participating.

c. *Presentation: Administration Building Renovation and Addition*
Santino Granato, P.E., Senior Civil Engineer
Steve Davis, AIA, LEED Fellow–Principal, Thrive Architecture

Mr. Santino Granato, Senior Civil Engineer, stated that Brian Bergstrom from Short Elliot Hendrickson Engineers was also present. He stated that the Moores Creek Administration Building was constructed in the 1980s and was approximately 12,850 square feet. He stated the building provided space for 26 staff positions, including the water and wastewater laboratory. He stated in 2018, a needs assessment was completed and identified the need for an addition of 15,000 square feet for a total building size of 27,850 square feet. He stated the 2018 renovation was designed to accommodate 48 staff positions, and the project cost estimate at the time was $8M.

Mr. Granato stated that they aimed to move Engineering staff into the newly renovated building and out of the trailers they currently used. He stated that the building would provide space for 49 staff positions upon completion in 2026, and there would space for 68 staff positions by 2035. He stated the building would include offices, a laboratory, a data center, and education, conference, and support spaces. He stated that it was currently estimated to be 30,400 square feet. He stated they would implement a phased staffing occupancy approach, and initial construction would accommodate 58 staff positions by 2030.

Mr. Steve Davis, Thrive Architecture, provided an overview of the site plan. He stated that

adjacent to the existing building was the proposed addition. He noted that the proposed addition would be three stories. He stated that they were designing for 120 on-site parking spaces to accommodate staff vehicles, fleet vehicles, visitors, and public meeting attendees. He stated that they were beginning to evaluate some of the other safety features, such as storm water facilities. He stated that they would preserve as many of the large oak trees along the road as possible. He stated the master plan specified the location of future facilities, and there would be a new service drive-in and loading dock to support the lab facilities.

Mr. Davis stated that they considered having the board meeting room on the first floor, but there were constraints regarding space, so they made the decision to host meetings on the top floor. He stated the first floor included a portion of administrative staff, the receptionist, and a significant portion of the IT department. He stated that the public circulation areas were secured from the staff areas with ballistic glass.

Mr. Davis stated that the ground floor of the existing building would be connected to the second floor of the new building. He stated that the labs were located in the same general location, but they would be entirely renovated. He stated the entirety of the engineering department would be located on the second floor. He stated that the new boardroom would be located on the third floor, and the room would be designed for a variety of uses. He stated the board room had an example configuration to be able to support 14 Board members at the head tables and accommodate 60 guests. He stated that the remainder of the administrative department would be located on the third floor along with the leadership suite, the future legal department, and the remainder of the IT department.

Mr. Davis stated that while the normal ceiling height would be 9', they had opportunities to increase the ceiling height for the boardroom. He stated the lowest level of the addition would be at the parking lot level. He stated that they implemented architectural strategies to reduce the width and height of the building. He stated that there was no plan to change the exterior of the existing building, so they selected building materials to match. He stated that they intended to keep the rooftop as clean as possible to accommodate future renewable energy production. He stated there would be a narrow connector between the new and the old buildings. He noted that the rooftops were intended to be similar but not matching.

Mr. Davis stated that the engineering team would evaluate low-impact development strategies. He stated they would look for ways to mitigate stormwater impacts and preserve waterways. He stated that they wanted to limit the use of glass from an energy-use and glare-reduction perspective. He stated that they wanted to emphasize the use of natural materials and materials with low energy requirements.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether solar power was included.

Mr. Davis stated that they planned to allocate space for a solar system on the rooftop of the building. He stated that solar panels were not included in the initial project budget.

Mr. Granato stated they would submit the site plan to the County in June 2023, and they anticipated to have completed design by December. He stated they planned to award a

construction contract by May 2024. He stated construction was anticipated to begin in June 2024 and be complete by June 2026. He stated that the estimated project costs were done at a conceptual level, and they would be refined at the 30% design submission. He stated that total project costs were about $17.5M, and they included one-time contingencies for inflation and design.

Mr. Granato stated that the total project estimate did not include solar panel installation or educational outreach. He stated they were working with consultants to determine costs for those installations. He explained that solar panel installation on the building would be included with the next cost estimate, and they would try to include it within the project budget.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether they were pursuing grant options for solar power.

Mr. Mawyer stated no, but they were open to opportunities and suggestions.

Mr. Granato stated that the project would renovate 12,850 square feet of the existing building, and there would be an addition of 17,200 square feet. He stated the engineering staff would be relocated into the building, and the labs would be modernized. He stated that the renovation and addition would accommodate staff growth to 68 positions by 2035. He stated that the construction schedule was June 2024 through June 2026, and the estimated budget was $17.5M.

Mr. Rogers asked for clarification about the projected number of employees.

Mr. Mawyer responded that there were currently 26 employees in the existing Administration building, and there were 16 employees in the trailers who would move into the renovated Administration building. By 2035, they anticipated 68 employees would be located in the building.

Mr. Pinkston asked whether the project was included in the CIP.

Mr. Mawyer stated yes.

Mr. Pinkston asked whether they received a value engineering (VE) review.

Mr. Mawyer responded yes. He explained that all projects over $5M received a VE review.

Ms. Hildebrand responded that the $18M would be at the earlier stages of the CIP.

Mr. Pinkston stated that the renovation seemed to be needed.

Ms. Mallek asked how they would manage energy efficiency in the summer.

Mr. Davis stated that most of the glass was facing north, and it was located on an open floor. He stated that there was not a lot of direct solar gain on the glass. He stated that some of the glass panels on the lower levels were opaque panels. He stated that they had to perform more studies on the east side to mitigate the solar gain. He stated that there were tall trees in the area to reduce

sunlight.

Mr. Smalls asked whether the construction timeline would impact the Board's ability to meet.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they may have to find other locations to meet during construction. He stated they had considered rotating the meeting to various City and County locations during the construction, but they had to consider technology logistics.

Mr. Rogers asked whether staff would be relocated.

Mr. Mawyer stated they were working on a staff relocation strategy. He stated that constructing the new building, relocating staff into the new addition, then renovating the old building would create two project cycles, lengthen the timeline, and increase costs. He stated that they were considering a trailer for the laboratory. He stated that they would look to integrate a work-from-home program, as well.

Mr. Pinkston asked whether the cost estimates included costs for staff phasing and relocation.

Mr. Granato stated that they generated a cost savings by relocating staff out of the building during construction. He stated that they were looking to finalize the plan, and the costs would be adjusted. He stated that the relocation costs were not currently incorporated into the total project estimate.

Ms. Hildebrand asked whether there was consideration for cubicle-type offices in certain areas.

Mr. Granato stated they did consider cubicles in some situations, such as in the engineering space, the inspector offices, and the interns. He stated the majority of the building was designed for individual offices.

Mr. Stewart asked if the project would receive a green building certification.

Mr. Granato stated that would be discussed within the project team.

Mr. Mawyer asked if there were different levels of certification.

Mr. Stewart responded that there were different ratings. He stated a code change required local governments to use the system.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they would have to look into it.

Mr. Stewart noted that the building had only one elevator and suggested they add an additional elevator in case one broke. He stated that it was important to have solar on the building. He stated that the proposed timelines seemed to be optimistic. He stated that the County site planning process could take multiple attempts.

Mr. Granato stated that they would do their best to maintain the proposed timeline.

Mr. Mawyer asked whether there was a preference for installing solar panels at the beginning versus installing them at a later time.

Ms. Mallek asked whether the Authority was allowed to use the contract companies which installed solar panels at no cost, such as was used with the schools. She stated that the Authority may not be eligible.

Mr. Stewart stated he believed the Authority was eligible for the programs, but the project was too small.

Mr. O'Connell asked for clarification about the top needs for the project. He noted that eliminating the Engineering trailers and renovating the lab were priorities.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the building was the original construction from the 1970s and needed renovation. Additional space would be needed to accommodate anticipated growth in staffing. He stated that there were pests in the building that they needed to address.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether there were growing staffing and space needs.

Mr. Mawyer stated that there were growing staff needs with the strategic plan. He stated that they wanted to build the space to accommodate future staffing needs until 2035.

Mr. Gaffney clarified that there would be increased lab space.

Ms. Mallek asked whether the renovated lab space would double.

Mr. Davis stated there was not significantly more space, but the internal layout was more efficient.

Mr. Gaffney noted that the manager's office and lab storage had been moved out of the lab space.

Ms. Mallek asked whether there was an enterprise opportunity to use the laboratory resources for other localities.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the more local testing they could perform, the most cost effectively they could operate. They would investigate enterprising opportunities.

4. *OTHER ITEMS FROM BOARD/STAFF NOT ON AGENDA*

Mr. Mawyer announced that Ms. Carrie Stanton was leaving the organization and Williams Mullen for a better opportunity. He thanked Ms. Stanton for her work for the Authority.

Ms. Mallek stated that the Authority and the County had the resources to accomplish initiatives that were not possible in other localities. She stated she appreciated the redundancy and work that went on in the Authority. She stated that the City-County-University partnership made more

possibilities possible.

5. *CLOSED MEETING*

There was no reason for a closed meeting.

6. *ADJOURNMENT*

At 4:49 p.m., Mr. Rogers moved to adjourn the meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Jeff Richardson
Secretary - Treasurer