



RWSA BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Minutes of Regular Meeting
April 22, 2025

A regular meeting of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Board of Directors was held on Tuesday, April 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, Jeff Richardson, Sam Sanders (arrived at 2:22 p.m.), Ann Mallek (arrived at 2:20 p.m.), Brian Pinkston, Quin Lunsford, Lauren Hildebrand.

Board Members Absent: None.

Rivanna Staff Present: Bill Mawyer, David Tungate, Lonnie Wood, Jennifer Whitaker, Daniel Campbell, Scott Schiller, Michelle Simpson, Austin Marrs, Betsy Nemeth, Westley Kern, Leah Beard, Rebecca Bodor, Keith Covington, Deborah Anama, Jacob Woodson.

Attorney(s) Present: Micah Schwartz

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

He opened the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and noted that they had a quorum.

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Hildebrand seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (5-0). (Ms. Mallek and Mr. Sanders arrived after the vote.)

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS BOARD MEETING ON MARCH 25, 2025

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to approve the minutes of the March 25, 2025 meeting as presented. Mr. Richardson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (5-0). (Ms. Mallek and Mr. Sanders arrived after the vote.)

4. RECOGNITION

a. Resolution of Appreciation for Rebecca Bodor

Resolution of Appreciation for Rebecca Bodor

WHEREAS, Ms. Bodor has served as an outstanding Water Treatment Operator in the Water Department since September 2005, including 13 years at the highest Class 1 licensing level

47 *while serving in our South Rivanna and Observatory Water Treatment Plants; and*

48
49 *WHEREAS, over the same period of almost 20 years, Ms. Bodor has demonstrated leadership in*
50 *her field and has been a valuable resource to the Authority and its employees; and*

51
52 *WHEREAS, Ms. Bodor's knowledge and understanding of the Water Department's operation as*
53 *well as her enduring dedication, loyalty, diligence, and personal contributions have positively*
54 *impacted the Authority and its employees.*

55
56 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority Board of*
57 *Directors recognizes, thanks, and commends Ms. Bodor for her distinguished service, efforts and*
58 *achievements as a long-standing member of the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, and*
59 *presents this Resolution as a token of esteem with its best wishes in her retirement.*

60
61 *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution be entered upon the permanent Minutes of the*
62 *Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority.*

63
64 *Michael Gaffney, Chairman*

65 *Lauren Hildebrand*

66 *Quin Lunsford*

67 *Ann Mallek*

68 *Brian Pinkston*

69 *Jeff Richardson*

70 *Sam Sanders*

71
72 **Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to adopt the Resolution of Appreciation for Rebecca Bodor.**
73 **Ms. Hildebrand seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Sanders**
74 **arrived late).**

75
76 Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, stated that Ms. Bodor had been a part of this organization for a
77 long time, during which they had grown significantly. He stated that she had been a great
78 member of their team and would be greatly missed.

79
80 Rebecca Bodor stated that she would miss all the people, too. She stated that this was what made
81 the organization so great.

82
83 *b. Resolution in Recognition of Earth Day*

84
85 *Resolution in Recognition of Earth Day*

86
87 *WHEREAS, April 22, 2025, is Earth Day, an internationally observed day to recognize the*
88 *importance of protecting the environment and our natural resources to ensure that current and*
89 *future generations will have a healthy community in which to live; and*

90
91 *WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority relies on our local waterways to provide the*
92 *water we treat; and*

93
94 *WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority is dedicated to returning treated, clean*
95 *wastewater effluent to our local waterways; and*
96

97 *WHEREAS, the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority is committed to demonstrating and promoting*
98 *best practices in sustainability, resource conservation, and environmental education in our local*
99 *community.*
100

101 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority Board of*
102 *Directors recognizes the important role the environment has in the services we provide, and that*
103 *the Authority will continue to collaborate with the community to protect the natural resources*
104 *that we use and be good stewards of the environment. We also recognize and appreciate the*
105 *efforts made by other organizations to protect our natural resources. We encourage everyone to*
106 *participate in Earth Day events that are being held throughout the community.*
107

108 *Michael Gaffney, Chairman*
109 *Lauren Hildebrand*
110 *Quin Lunsford*
111 *Ann Mallek*
112 *Brian Pinkston*
113 *Jeff Richardson*
114 *Samuel Sanders*
115

116 **Ms. Mallek moved the Board to adopt the Resolution in Recognition of Earth Day. Mr.**
117 **Pinkston seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).**
118

119 **5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
120

121 Bill Mawyer, Executive Director, stated that they were currently in a transformational time for
122 their organization. He stated that many positive developments were underway, all of which were
123 attributed to the support of the Board. He stated that their organization was experiencing a
124 natural turnover of senior staff members retiring, and they were pleased to see them move on to
125 new chapters in their lives and to introduce new members who were taking on leadership roles
126 within the organization. He stated that they were embarking on several generational Capital
127 Improvement Projects, which they were eager to get underway. He stated that the commitment of
128 this Board had been instrumental in making these initiatives a reality.
129

130 Mr. Mawyer stated that he would like to introduce Keith Covington, who had recently been
131 promoted to Supervisor in the Water Department. He stated that Keith had been with their
132 organization for nearly three years, coming from Louisiana. He stated that prior to joining their
133 team, he had served in the Marines as part of his distinguished career. He stated that they were
134 thrilled to have him as part of their team and wished him continued success in his new role.
135

136 Keith Covington stated that he was a graduate of the University of Memphis with a bachelor's
137 degree in operations management. He had been a Class 1 Water Operator for approximately 13
138 years. He stated that prior to his move, he spent 10 years in Louisiana at Baton Rouge Water

139 Works, the largest water provider in the state, where he served as a production foreman. He
140 stated that his family had been looking for a change of pace and some relief from hurricanes, so
141 they relocated to Virginia. He stated that they loved it here and he thanked the Board for the
142 recognition.

143
144 Mr. Mawyer stated that he also wanted to congratulate Dylan Schweickert, who recently
145 obtained his Class 1 Water Operator license, and Simon Troop, who obtained his Class 2 Water
146 Operator license. He stated that having Class 1 Operators on site at all times was essential, and it
147 was important that they had staff members progress to the Class 1 level to provide the most
148 support. He stated that this was a great achievement.

149
150 Mr. Mawyer stated that next week, they would be celebrating National Drinking Water Week,
151 recognizing the dedication and hard work of their team and professionals who worked 24/7/365
152 to provide drinking water for our community. He stated that through their Strategic Plan priority
153 of Communication and Collaboration, they'd had success with Career Day at Woodbrook
154 Elementary and tours of their wastewater treatment plant and gave UVA students a tour of the
155 Observatory Water Treatment Plant. He stated that they appreciated the staff's support for these
156 tours, including Mr. Brian Haney, Wastewater Manager.

157
158 Mr. Mawyer stated that they have been actively pursuing grants, and they were pleased to have
159 received \$10 million in awards. He stated that although they had not yet received all the funds,
160 they were optimistic about the future. He stated that recently, they received \$8,500 from Federal
161 Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for temporary repairs to the Ivy Creek stream bank,
162 which was damaged during Hurricane Helene. He stated that they had also applied for a
163 \$350,000 FEMA grant to support permanent repairs to the stream bank.

164
165 Mr. Mawyer stated that additionally, they had made progress on the Mechums River pipe repair
166 funding request, which would help offset costs. He stated that the news had been changing, but
167 yesterday they received notification that the Beaver Creek Dam project design grant, which had
168 been frozen for \$1 million, had been unfrozen. He stated that a court had ordered the release of
169 these funds, and they were now back on track with the design funding for the Beaver Creek
170 project. He stated that they planned to submit a \$20 million construction grant application in July
171 for that project, which had been part of their plan for some time.

172
173 Mr. Mawyer stated that they did have \$1 million in funding frozen for the Granular Activated
174 Carbon (GAC) project at the Crozet Water Treatment Plant, which was awarded through the
175 Virginia Department of Health's Emerging Contaminant Fund and funded by federal Bipartisan
176 Infrastructure Law dollars. He stated that this left them with \$6.2 million out of the \$7.2 million
177 they had initially been awarded. He stated that they were moving forward with the project and
178 expected to issue an invitation for bids as soon as the Virginia Department of Health completed
179 its review of their design plans. He stated that this project would add more GAC treatment
180 capacity at the Crozet Water Treatment Plant.

181
182 Mr. Mawyer stated that they also applied for a \$50 million grant through the Building Resilient
183 Infrastructure and Communities Program for the Rivanna to Ragged Pipeline project, but the
184 entire program was recently canceled by the federal government, making all those applications

void. He stated that in summary, out of the \$10 million they had initially reported as awarded in grants, they still had \$9 million actively moving forward. He stated that they would continue to monitor the situation and move forward with those projects.

Mr. Mawyer stated that from a legislative perspective, a bill had been recently approved by the Governor and the General Assembly that required waterworks owners such as Rivanna, to notify the Department of Health within two hours of an anomaly in the water system. He stated that this bill still requires discussion with the Health Department about what constituted an anomaly. He stated that this new requirement came on the heels of the Lake of the Woods water treatment plant problem last year, where a pump leak caused oil to enter the drinking water, and the Utility department failed to notify VDH in a timely manner.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the Richmond water treatment plant issue in January, where the plant went underwater, also exacerbated the need for improved communication with the Health Department. He stated that the legislator from the Lake of the Woods area put this bill forward, and it had been approved. He stated that the legislation initially required notification within six hours, but the Governor's Office had changed it to two hours.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they were establishing procedures for their chain of command to notify VDH within two hours of a significant problem within their water distribution or treatment systems. He stated that this was a collaborative effort with the City and the Service Authority to determine how to effectively communicate such notifications. He stated that additionally, the City, the County, and Rivanna participated in private development reviews for proposed projects, and House Bill 2660 had passed, which expedited review times for all of those organizations. He explained that where they once had 60 days, they now had 40 days, and where they had 30 days, they now had 20 days to complete action on the development application. He noted that this change would require the development review teams to adapt to the new guidelines.

Mr. Mawyer stated that additionally, a bill related to microplastics failed to pass, and a bill regarding monitoring PFAS from industrial wastewater was vetoed by the Governor. He stated that furthermore, a bill requiring 12.5% of labor hours to be performed by approved apprentices on their construction projects was vetoed, although it had been reduced to 8%. He stated that their professional organizations were working with the legislature and Department of Environmental Quality to address the feasibility of these proposed regulations in the future.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the DEQ had created the Middle James Regional Planning Unit #1, which included their area, and they were required to develop a regional water supply plan within five years. He stated Jennifer Whitaker was RWSA's representative on that committee. He stated that the group had its initial meeting at the County Office Building last month, and the next meeting was scheduled for May. He stated that he believed the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) would facilitate and oversee the committee to help develop the plan.

Mr. Mawyer stated that he would like to mention one other piece of legislation that was discussed last month. He stated that there was a federal discussion about removing the tax-exempt status for municipal bonds, which would increase the cost of their borrowing. He stated

231 that they would continue to monitor that proposal. He stated that removing the tax-exempt status
232 from municipal bonds would increase tax revenues for the federal government, but would
233 increase the cost of borrowing for municipal organizations such as Rivanna.
234

235 Mr. Mawyer stated that a few months ago, the Board discussed Rivanna's property at 1706 Buck
236 Mountain. He stated that the property included the house shown on the slide, which the Board
237 had authorized staff to sell. He stated that they had carved off two acres from the parcel, which
238 was intended for the reservoir planned for Buck Mountain many years ago. He stated that the
239 parcel was outside the proposed normal pool area, so a reservoir in the future would not be
240 impacted by the sale of this property. He stated that the house had previously been owned by
241 individuals with a life estate, who had passed away.
242

243 Mr. Mawyer stated until recently, people were living in the house and had been given a notice to
244 vacate. He stated that the house was in a state of significant disrepair, so they had demolished it
245 and cleared the area. He stated that they had issued an Invitation For Bids, with a minimum bid
246 price of \$100,000, to sell the 2.18 acres. He stated that they hoped to bring a high bidder to the
247 Board next month to sell that 2-acre parcel.
248

249 Mr. Richardson asked if they had an appraisal for that piece of property.
250

251 Mr. Mawyer replied that they had a County assessment, but it applied to the larger parcel and not
252 only to the 2 acres. He stated that their minimum bid number was based on their own
253 estimations, but they would likely hear more about this at the pre-bid meeting, where prospective
254 bidders could share their thoughts on whether the minimum price was too high or too low.
255

256 Mr. Richardson stated that he understood the staff's reasoning; he was simply curious about the
257 matter.
258

259 Mr. Mawyer stated that this property was a building lot, suitable for someone to construct a
260 house. He stated that a soil scientist evaluated the site and found two septic sites, making it a
261 very buildable lot.
262

263 Ms. Mallek noted that it was the only buildable area on the property, as everything else sloped
264 downward. She stated that she was surprised by the low minimum bid, as it was the only usable
265 part of the property. She stated that other lots in the County were priced at much higher rates.
266

267 Mr. Mawyer clarified that the decision to sell the property ultimately rested with the Board. He
268 stated that they would obtain bids and the Board would decide whether to proceed with the sale.
269 He stated that however, they had established the requirement for a minimum price when they
270 drafted the lease and sale procedures in 2022, at the Board's request, to prevent the property from
271 being sold for an unreasonably low price. He stated that even with a minimum price, it was still
272 within the Board's discretion to approve or reject the sale.
273

274 Mr. Gaffney stated that they could hire an appraiser before setting a minimum bid, if the Board
275 desired.
276

Mr. Mawyer stated that the market would ultimately dictate what the value of the property should be. He stated that was their approach.

Mr. Mawyer stated that the Rivanna Pump Station restoration was substantially complete. He stated that they had installed the six new pumps, which were rebuilt units with new motors. He stated that they were currently testing these new pumps before removing the temporary pumps, which were still in operation.

Mr. Mawyer stated that they were hopeful that by next month, they would be able to remove all the temporary equipment, as the new permanent pumps would be active and operational. He stated that their current budget estimate for this project was \$17 million, a significant reduction from the original \$22 million. He stated that they were working with Virginia Risk Sharing Association (VRSA), their property insurance company, to allocate the costs between repairs and improvements.

He stated that they expected VRSA to reimburse for the cost of repairs, but Rivanna would need to pay for the improvements. He stated that they were also hoping to bring a recommendation for award of the Central Water Line project to the Board next month. He stated that the bidding process was scheduled for May. He stated that they also had a powdered activated carbon equipment project to replace at the South Rivanna Treatment Plant out to bid. Grading and clearing work around Ragged Mountain Reservoir, which would allow them to raise the pool level by 12 feet and add 700 million gallons, is also out to bid.

Ms. Mallek commented that there would be considerable revenue from the timber at the reservoir.

Mr. Mawyer clarified that they actually had stated that the contractor must burn the timber in the burn boxes at the reservoir. He stated that this aligned with their previous understanding when the new dam was built, where the timber remained on-site. He stated that they planned to inquire with the bidders during the pre-bid process about the potential value of the timber. He stated that one downside was that the timber had to be transported in and out, which could have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Ms. Mallek noted that there may be significant negative impact to the air quality of the neighborhood with the burning of all the timber, too.

Mr. Mawyer stated that according to their current plans, these burn boxes that minimized smoke emissions would eliminate the need for timber removal. He stated that however, they would explore the option of selling the timber, as well.

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were none.

7. RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments, therefore there were no responses.

8. CONSENT AGENDA

a. Staff Report on Finance

b. Staff Report on Operations

c. Staff Report on CIP Projects

d. Staff Report on Administration and Communications

e. Staff Report on Wholesale Metering

f. Staff Report on Drought Monitoring

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Presentation: PFAS in Water and Wastewater

Mr. Gaffney stated that he was pleased to welcome Dr. Bryan Berger, Associate Professor of Chemical and Biomedical Engineering at the University of Virginia, to their meeting today. He noted that Dr. Berger held a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemical Engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Chemical Engineering from the University of Delaware. He stated that Dr. Berger was a postdoctoral fellow in the Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine. He stated that Dr. Berger had recently been awarded a \$1.6 million Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant to research methods for reducing the impact of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in food and farming communities.

Dr. Bryan Berger thanked Mr. Gaffney for the introduction. He stated that he had organized his presentation to serve as a general overview of his work. He explained that they had recently received the grant in the fall, so they were just beginning this project. He stated that he would discuss PFAS, what they had learned, and the project they would pursue. He stated that he would touch on some offshoots of this work, primarily related to detection.

Dr. Berger stated that his work intersected with biotechnology, agriculture, environment, and sustainability. He stated that much of their work focused on translation and technology development. He stated that he would cover two main topics today. He stated that first, he would focus on detecting and removing forever chemicals, primarily in agriculture, as part of the EPA grant they had been awarded. He stated that next, he would discuss how their work was intersecting with microplastics, environmental antimicrobial resistance, and the nexus of these issues in water and wastewater. He stated that they were working in partnership with the United States Department of Agriculture on this latter topic.

Dr. Berger stated that he was sure this would not require motivation for their group, but the

target was constantly changing and becoming increasingly challenging. He stated that the draft recommendations from the UK, dated December 2024, served as a starting point. He stated that PFOA and PFOS were the primary targets they had, as they were the most prevalent breakdown products of long-chain PFAS compounds in the environment. He stated that another industrial legacy chemical, PFBS, also showed up. What struck him was the extremely low level of detection, often just a single molecule in the water, which made it a significant challenge.

Dr. Berger stated that he would like to show an illustration of the challenge when it came to PFAS. He stated that they worked closely with communities in northern Maine, particularly collaborating with the Soil and Water Conservation District in that area. He stated that Maine was likely one of the leaders, if not the leader, in the US in terms of regulations surrounding PFAS because they had been disproportionately affected more than other states. He stated that the provided picture was a beautiful lake in northern Maine, located at the Aroostook County National Wildlife Refuge.

Dr. Berger noted that what was not immediately apparent was that it was a heavily polluted PFAS site. He stated that during their water testing at Malabean Lake, they found levels that were at least 100 parts per trillion, significantly higher than the current standard. He stated that this highlighted one of the biggest challenges with this issue: determining its presence, as PFAS were ubiquitous in the environment but not always obvious.

Mr. Pinkston asked why the concentration of PFAS was so high in Maine.

Dr. Berger replied that there were many reasons, one of which was that the site they were working on was a Superfund site, specifically the former Loring Air Force Base. He stated that the site had been closed for at least a decade, if not more. He stated there had been eight types of firefighting foam that were used due to the highly combustible materials stored there, including munitions and missiles.

Dr. Berger stated that it was the northeastern-most base in the United States; it was only a three-to four-hour flight to Ireland. He stated that this site was used during World War II, and as a result, it contained a significant amount of highly combustible materials. He stated that the presence of these materials led to the use of firefighting foam nearby, which was one of the largest sources of PFAS compounds. He stated that this was only one of the reasons for the high concentration of PFAS, however. He stated that in total, over 4,000 PFAS compounds had been identified. He stated that these compounds were ubiquitous in food, consumer, and industrial products.

Dr. Berger stated that on the slide was a graphic that illustrated some of these compounds. He stated that it took over a thousand years for them to biodegrade in the environment, and they were linked to a wide range of health issues. He stated that one question often raised was, why did these compounds persist for so long? He stated that to answer this, they needed to consider the properties of fluorine, which was a key component of these compounds.

Dr. Berger stated that fluorine was the most electronegative element and created a partial ionic character in the compounds. He stated that this ionic bond was a strong bond with electrons and

often referred to as the strongest bond in organic chemistry. He stated that fluorine was not an essential element for life, and as a result, there was no natural process in the body that used it, nor was there a natural process to eliminate it from the environment. He stated that this was one reason why these compounds persisted for thousands of years.

Dr. Berger stated that they examined the challenges in agriculture, and this project had been a focal point over the past few years, with numerous inputs involved. He stated that biosolids were one example. He stated that in Maine, where they were working, irrigation water posed a significant challenge. He stated that pesticides and other agrochemical inputs could contaminate soil, ultimately leading to groundwater contamination, which affected residential water and wastewater. He stated that people come into direct contact with it, and it ends up in crops, the food we eat, and the food that feeds animals, releasing it back into the environment and into finished food products.

Dr. Berger explained that approximately one-third of agrochemicals are fluorinated to increase stability, making them a significant source of PFAS. He stated that polyethylene fluorination was also common in packaging to reduce oxygen or moisture barriers, which affected a substantial amount of food packaging. He stated that these were just a few examples of where these contaminants originate. He stated that Randy, who was pictured on the slide, was the director of the Central Aroostook Soil and Water Conservation District and a professor at the University of Maine. He stated that they worked with him directly, and also pictured was his farm. He stated that he irrigated annually with water from the Aroostook River, and testing had revealed very high levels of PFAS.

Dr. Berger stated that farmers, particularly, were vulnerable to this issue. He stated that they collaborated with him extensively, and the listed articles also discussed the uncertainty of impacts on agriculture. He stated that the displayed map showed agricultural sites adjacent to industrial discharge sites in the U.S. He stated that on average, most agricultural sites, especially in the eastern half of the country, were within a reasonable distance of industrial PFAS discharge sites. He stated that this proximity posed a significant challenge, as PFAS were ubiquitous throughout food webs. He stated that he previously mentioned pesticides as one source. He stated that in Maine, they had tested fish, deer, livestock, game, and found bioaccumulation of PFAS in these species as well. He stated that it was now a full circle throughout the environment.

Dr. Berger stated that part of the EPA grant, and they would be happy to collaborate with Rivanna and others on this issue, was regarding how they all planned to test for these chemicals. He stated that currently, testing costs between \$300 to \$500 per test, with a turnaround time of 10 to 14 days to receive results. He stated that there was limited availability of this testing method. He stated that in Maine, for example, there was only one commercial lab capable of serving the entire state. He stated that considering the numerous farms and communities affected, this testing method was not a fast or easy solution for individuals to test for this problem. He stated that one of his labs at the University of Virginia was focusing on this issue.

Mr. Pinkston asked if they were focusing on how to test more reliably.

Dr. Berger replied yes; he would explain more about that. He stated that he had provided some of

461 their published papers, which led to the EPA grant. He stated that they were also currently
462 working with the state on developing low-cost, point-of-detection testing. He stated that the
463 method would allow them to dip a sample into water and determine if PFAS was present.
464

465 Dr. Berger explained that while it was not as accurate or sensitive as the standard mass spec
466 method, it offered significant cost and time savings. He stated that they estimated the cost of this
467 test to be around \$1 per sample, compared to hundreds of dollars for more traditional methods.
468 He stated that the trade-off was that they sacrificed some chemical information and sensitivity,
469 but they gained the ability to conduct rapid field testing. He stated that they had been validating
470 this method over the past few years, and this work aligned with Mr. Pinkston's earlier question.
471

472 Dr. Berger stated that much of the tribal land adjacent to the Loring Air Force Base was part of
473 the Mi'kmaq Nation, and they worked closely with them as part of the EPA grant. He stated that
474 they were an agriculture-driven community and disproportionately affected, as well as interested
475 in understanding how PFAS ended up in their communities. He stated that on the provided map,
476 the star indicated the location of their community, on the northeastern-most tip of Maine, near
477 New Brunswick.
478

479 Dr. Berger stated that the main question from the Nation was where the PFAS was coming from.
480 He stated that they tested different sources throughout central Aroostook County. He stated that
481 they were able to sample rapidly throughout the summer and at different times and conditions,
482 providing quick answers. He stated that it was crucial for predicting the fate and transport of
483 PFAS in the environment, which would be essential in the future. He stated that the data
484 presented here demonstrated the effectiveness of their method.
485

486 Dr. Berger stated that they had benchmarked their sensor against data provided and showed good
487 agreement between the two. He stated that this was their first validation of this approach. He
488 stated that they then ventured into more isolated areas of the wildlife refuge to investigate the
489 spread of PFAS beyond the Air Force Base and the Mi'kmaq tribal lands. He stated that the next
490 slide had photographs of their expedition into the woods in search of PFAS. In their previous
491 paper, published last year, they had conducted a head-on comparison of their biosensor results to
492 third-party independent testing using the gold standard mass spectrometry method, finding good
493 agreement between the methods. He stated that this was surface water sampling.
494

495 Dr. Berger stated that as a result, they now had a method available for surface water sampling
496 testing. He stated that he would be happy to share the paper where they documented their results.
497 He stated that looking ahead, the challenge was determining how to ensure that PFAS were
498 detected in food products, such as broccoli irrigated with water from the Aroostook River, which
499 was known to contain PFAS. He stated that their next step was to extend this method not just to
500 water, but also to food, as PFAS could end up in finished food products.
501

502 Dr. Berger stated that they had conducted some early testing for those interested. He stated that
503 northern Maine was a significant potato-producing region in the United States, historically the
504 largest before Idaho took over. He stated that he had heard many stories about the history of
505 potato production in Maine. He stated that Randy was a third-generation farmer, and potatoes
506 were crucial to the community. He stated that therefore, they were testing the red Norland

potatoes, their main varieties, from different water sources used by farmers in Maine to irrigate. He stated that they sampled continuously throughout the growth season to determine where PFAS accumulated.

Dr. Berger stated that interestingly, their findings showed that in the roots and tubers of the plant, no PFAS were detected, even though it was irrigated with PFAS-containing water. He stated that however, the leaves, which were the vegetative part of the plant, did accumulate PFAS. He stated that based on this study, one potential outcome was that they would need to educate farmers and consumers on ways to cultivate or process food to minimize PFAS exposure. He stated that in this case, even if the water contained tens to hundreds of parts per trillion of PFAS, it was unlikely that these contaminants would accumulate in the edible part of the potato. He stated that this data was crucial for informing the public, and they were working to generate and disseminate it.

Dr. Berger stated that another area of focus was the “plastisphere,” which referred to the concept that microplastics existed as a source of PFAS accumulation and vehicle to transport antimicrobial-resistant pathogens during wastewater treatment. He stated that they were also studying how microplastics could facilitate the deposition and mobility of PFAS in water, as well as the transport and fate of other contaminants such as enteric bacteria. He stated that their research was supported by the state, through Virginia Innovation Partnership Corporation (VPIC), and they were currently in the process of commercializing their biosensors.

Dr. Berger stated that the work had been conducted by Madison Mann, who was now working at a biotech company, and they had another student assisting them with this project. He stated that he was happy to answer questions and provide updates as they continued, as they had two years remaining on this four-year grant.

Mr. Gaffney asked if the testing in Maine included testing of groundwater from wells.

Dr. Berger stated that last summer, they had jumped the gun because they did not know if the grant would be funded, so they only conducted testing using irrigation water from the river. He stated that this summer, with the funding in place, they planned to expand their testing to include wells and other sources. He stated that most growers in central Aroostook relied on the river as their primary source of irrigation water, which was typically used for early crops such as Brussels sprouts and broccoli, their cash crop, which generated most of their income.

Dr. Berger stated that later in the season, they planted corn, soybeans, and potatoes, making them more vulnerable to fluctuations in water availability. He stated that this year, they would conduct more sampling to better understand the impact of different water sources. He stated that by September, he would be able to provide a clearer answer.

Mr. Gaffney asked if there was testing of the final food supply that came out of that region.

Dr. Berger stated that the report in question was written by Randy and himself for the Soil and Water Conservation District. He stated that as part of the grant, they were required to disseminate this information to the public. He stated that to fulfill this obligation, they typically

published quarterly reports, which focused on the crops themselves, with potatoes being the primary crop of interest. He stated that this year, they had data available, but they were hoping to collect more extensive information this summer, including corn, soybeans, other commodity crops, and vegetables such as broccoli and Brussels sprouts.

Ms. Mallek stated that dairy was a main concern for Maine farms, as well.

Dr. Berger stated that was right. He stated that the two articles he had referenced in the picture were where a lot of this began. He stated that the biosensor he had described for water was actually being tested in milk right now, using it as a milk sensor. He stated that this was due to the legacy of dairy, which was one of the most bio-accumulative substances because of its high fat content. He stated that as a result, animal tissue also accumulated it.

Dr. Berger stated that he believed that water limits were set at parts per trillion, but in game meat, the limit was parts per billion. He stated that routine sampling in Maine had shown that it was approximately a thousand times more concentrated in tissue due to grazing and vegetation in the wildlife refuge. He stated that dairy was another significant concern as well.

Ms. Mallek asked about the connection between sludge application to the fields and PFAS contamination.

Dr. Berger stated that was correct. He stated that there were various sources contributing to this issue. He stated that they initially discussed this problem due to the Superfund site, specifically the use of firefighting foam. He stated that in northern and central Maine, the farmland was far enough away from that site that it was primarily affected by biosolids. He stated that in Maine, biosolids were no longer allowed to be used, and he believed that other New England states, such as Vermont, were also taking steps to follow suit, primarily due to the bioaccumulation of the substance in biosolids being detected through sampling.

Mr. Gaffney asked what the outcome would be for the biosolids now that they could not apply them to the land.

Dr. Berger stated that was a good question. He stated that the treatment and destruction of biosolids, like PFAS, posed a significant challenge in itself. He stated that he believed there were emerging technologies that could address this issue. He stated that, to his knowledge, there was still active research being conducted to determine how these technologies would be effective in dealing with PFAS.

Ms. Mallek stated that the wastewater production was also a common excuse that people were using to justify the spread of biosolids. She stated that it was a problem that needed to be addressed because it was not a viable solution.

Dr. Berger stated that the challenge was huge, and in Europe, for instance, soil amendments were more prevalent than even in certain parts of the United States, largely due to the widespread practice of organic agriculture. He stated that in Europe, they had been approved to use biosolids for organic treatments for soil, which had led to a different approach. He stated that as a result,

they were more exposed to certain issues, which was not the case in this approach.

Ms. Mallek asked if they were applying biosolids from wastewater treatment or just cow manure.

Dr. Berger stated that to his recollection, it was both. He stated that he would have to locate the articles he had read about the subject, because he was unsure. He stated that recently, there was a significant European Union (EU) ban on wastewater-derived biosolids in the Netherlands and France, where it was discovered that these biosolids were being blended and used as soil amendments, posing an uncontrolled risk. He stated that this theme of finding the source of contamination was a common thread in this discussion.

Ms. Mallek stated that she would be glad to participate in giving local vegetable and animal samples to test for PFAS contamination. She stated that the issue had been all-consuming for her. She asked about the threshold tested was down to the 4 parts per trillion (ppt) yet.

Dr. Berger replied that it was not yet. He stated that the technical limitation of the actual detection device was likely the primary reason. He stated that they were working on overcoming this limitation, thanks in part to the VIPC grant, which was allowing them to collaborate with others. He stated that their current detection capabilities were in the parts per trillion range, as demonstrated in milk, which was a promising sign. He stated that in the context of animal tissue, their current detection method was adequate, but in water, the situation was more complex, as the concentrations of the compounds in question varied widely, from 400 parts per trillion to 0.4 parts per trillion.

Ms. Mallek stated that food may be PFAS-free when it was grown, but when wrapped in plastic, PFAS was transferred to the food in the grocery store. She asked if the future research would include testing of packaging.

Dr. Berger stated that the USDA was more interested in the downstream contamination of packaging. He explained that many corrugated materials fluorinated, and a byproduct of that generated PFAS. He stated that although the amount was relatively small, it was enough to be transferred into finished food products, particularly those with moisture barrier packaging such as fruits and vegetables, especially imported ones. He stated that the packaging industry was now rapidly seeking alternatives to these materials, as they had been used extensively.

Dr. Berger noted that cosmetics, skincare, and consumer products with moisture barrier properties also posed a risk. He stated that a good source of information on this was the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which provided routine testing results on its website. He stated that they would also conduct random sampling and report the results, which was often where he found more information.

Mr. Pinkston thanked Dr. Berger for his dedication to this work, which would ultimately benefit the community in a specific way. He asked how the 4 parts per trillion correlated to health risks associated with PFAS. He asked if it was a best estimation or determined from a result of testing.

Dr. Berger stated that their pilot project would provide valuable insights into the health impacts

and how environmental levels correlated. He stated that they would conduct testing to examine the effects of microplastics on fluoro-sclerotic lesions and plaques, which could behave similarly to those mentioned earlier. He stated that there were existing publications that had explored this topic, and he thought the focus should be on bioaccumulation.

Dr. Berger stated that in animal tissue, microplastics had been found to accumulate at a thousand-fold higher concentration, such as parts per billion compared to parts per trillion in water. He stated that it was this chronic exposure over time and bioaccumulation in the body that he believed was contributing to the observed health issues, which were more of a long-term concern rather than an acute problem.

Ms. Mallek asked if there was any research into how to filter it out.

Dr. Berger stated that there was a separate study that they had published that explored the use of plants for phytoaccumulation. He stated that the concept was to remediate soil using specific types of plants, particularly those known as hyperaccumulators. He stated that in that specific instance, they were intentionally searching for these plants.

b. Presentation: PFAS Regulatory and Class Action Litigation Update

David Tungate, Deputy Executive Director, stated that he would discuss their current status with PFAS class action litigation cases. He stated PFAS compounds are prevalent in consumable materials such as non-stick cooking materials, water-resistant clothing, as well as food packaging such as the coating inside microwave popcorn bags.

Mr. Tungate stated it was worth noting that PFAS is not easily absorbed through the skin, so showering, bathing, and washing dishes with water containing PFAS were activities unlikely to significantly increase the health risk. This aligns with an earlier presentation by Dr. Berger. He stated that the EPA established drinking water regulations on 5 PFAS compounds almost a year ago. He stated that the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for PFOA and PFOS were 4 parts per trillion, while PFHxS, GenX compounds, and PFNA were 10 parts per trillion. One part per trillion is equivalent to one inch in 16 million miles, one penny in \$10 billion, or one second in 32,000 years. These units are extremely low.

Mr. Tungate stated that the hazard index was a calculation used to measure exposure to the combination of 4 PFAS compounds (Gen X, PFBS, PFNA, PFHxS) to create a number to measure PFAS exposure. The Hazard Index is calculated quarterly, and compliance is done off of the 4 most recent quarters. If the Hazard Index is greater than 1.0, it is a violation.

Mr. Tungate stated that RWSA currently had granular activated carbon contactors at five of their water treatment plants and would soon add a GAC contactor to the Red Hill groundwater system. He stated that a CIP project was underway to add a GAC contactor to the Red Hill groundwater facility, primarily to maintain the same level of water treatment at all RWSA water treatment plants. He stated that GAC was considered the best management practice for PFAS treatment. He stated that RWSA began testing their drinking water for PFAS in 2014.

Mr. Tungate stated that RWSA's first PFAS samples had been collected as part of the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule 3 (UCMR 3), with minimal detections at very low levels. The UCMR 5 rule requires water utilities to test for 29 PFAS compounds. The UCMR process was designed to determine the prevalence of unregulated contaminants in their communities. The EPA will then use this UCMR information to formulate drinking water maximum contaminant levels.

Mr. Tungate stated that RWSA has collected PFAS samples more than 25 times at the five surface water treatment plants and 20 times at the Red Hill groundwater system. He stated that a PFAS sample kit required the sampler to fill approximately 20 containers for each sample location at approximately \$395 per sample. He stated that the samples contained a trip blank, which is a PFAS-free sample that remains with the sample bottles at all times. There is also a field trip blank to determine if there was any contamination during sampling and shipping.

He stated that these two blanks were crucial, as the lab is looking for parts per trillion, and any cross-contamination could affect the accuracy of the results. He stated that they must also be mindful of potential PFAS contamination from the sampler; makeup, sunscreen, Gore-Tex, and any PFAS containing materials. He stated that some of the PFAS detections in their system included an incident in May 2023 at North Rivanna Water Treatment Plant. RWSA samples indicated PFOA and PFOS sample results exceeded the current drinking water regulations. In 2023 there were no maximum containment levels for these chemicals. The North Rivanna Water Treatment Plant was shut down and sampled again. These second set of samples indicated that there were no further issues with PFAS detections at North Rivanna Water Treatment Plant.

Mr. Tungate stated that it was essential to note that the MCLs for the PFAS chemicals are calculated as a four-quarter running annual average. All four samples collected each quarter of the year are averaged to provide a number.

Mr. Tungate stated that moving on to their class action lawsuits, there were four defendants involved: 3M, Dupont, Tyco and BASF. The 3M class action lawsuit has \$10.5 billion dollars in it, Dupont has \$1.18 billion dollars, which are the largest of the class action lawsuits. Tyco has \$0.75 billion dollars, and BASF has \$0.31 billion dollars. Mr. Tungate estimated the settlement amounts we would receive for the 3M and Dupont class action lawsuits were approximately \$2 million over the course of 10 years, with \$200,000 predicted annually for the next decade.

Mr. Tungate stated that these numbers were more concrete than the 2024 PFAS report as the settlement amounts have been more finely tuned, which provides a clearer picture. He stated that they expect to receive the funds from these settlements soon. He stated that the next settlement will be the Tyco and BASF cases, with an approximate settlement to Rivanna of \$900,000.

Mr. Pinkston asked if they had any data that demonstrated that the GAC removed PFAS.

Mr. Tungate explained that when RWSA staff collected PFAS samples, they took samples from both raw and finished water samples. He confirmed that yes, the data demonstrated the removal of PFOA and PFOS from the water with their GAC contactors.

c. *Presentation: Wastewater Treatment, Facilities, and Staffing Overview*

Daniel Campbell, Director of Operations and Environmental Services, stated that today, he would be discussing the staffing, budget, facilities, and treatment processes for their wastewater department. He stated that he would start with the facilities. He stated that many of them were familiar with the Moores Creek Advanced Water Resource Recovery Facility, which they were currently operating. He stated that however, they also operated three other wastewater facilities in the area.

Mr. Campbell stated that in the top right-hand corner of the slide, they had Stone Robinson, a small package plant that served Stone Robinson Elementary School with a permitted capacity of 7,000 gallons a day. He stated that below that, they had the Glenmore treatment plant, with a 380,000-gallon-per-day treatment capacity serving the Glenmore community. He stated that also in the southern end of the County, they had the Scottsville treatment plant, with a 200,000-gallon-per-day permitted capacity.

Mr. Campbell explained that the wastewater entering the treatment plant was referred to as influent. He stated that they had two influent pumping stations: the Moores Creek Pump Station, located at the top of the screen, and the Rivanna Pump Station, located at the bottom. He stated that the service areas for each pump station were depicted on the map. He stated that Rivanna Pump Station service area, in yellow, extended from here to Piney Mountain, north of the airport, and Moores Creek Pump Station service areas, in blue, extended to the south, past the high school, and then to the west to Crozet. Mr. Campbell noted that the wastewater from Crozet was pumped into the Moores Creek Pump station through the four pump stations in Crozet.

He stated that next was a picture of the wet side of Moores Creek. He stated that the plant was essentially split into two sides, each operated independently. He stated that they had the wet side, which was the treatment process that would be released into Moores Creek, and the solids side, located towards the northeast. He indicated the elements of the wet side were the admin building, the two primary clarifiers, aeration basins, chemical storage, and secondary clarifiers, one on each side of the sludge pumping building.

Mr. Campbell stated that as the influent entered the plant through the pump stations, it passed through the headworks for screening and grit removal, then proceeded to the primary clarifiers. He stated that the influent flow traveled through the basin while the sludge settled to the bottom, and the primary effluent was directed to the aeration basins. He stated that skimmers on the top of the primary clarifiers removed grease and oils. He stated that these were covered to control odors. He stated that the primary clarifiers were a significant source of odors in the plant, so they were covered.

Mr. Campbell stated that a network of pipes above the aeration basins was for biological odor control, which would be explored further in the presentation. He stated that in this overview, it would not be necessary to delve into enhanced nutrient removal. He stated that the primary clarifier effluent was blended with microbes stored in the bottom of the secondary clarifiers, which were nitrifiers. He stated that these microbes converted ammonia to nitrogen gas. He stated that additionally, biological phosphorus removal occurred along the way.

Mr. Campbell stated that next, the aeration basin effluent was then directed to the secondary clarifiers, which followed a similar process to the primary clarifiers. He stated that the inflow flowed to the secondary clarifiers and to the tertiary filters for filtration. He stated that however, the sludge on the bottom was the activated sludge with microbes, which would be recycled and reused at the start of the aeration basins.

Mr. Campbell stated that to complete the wet side final treatment, they jumped to the other end of the property, which was highlighted on the next slide. He stated that they were now moving to the tertiary filters, Ultra Violet light disinfection, and outfall. He stated that the tertiary filters were where secondary effluent went next for filtration. He stated that the sand filters removed fine particles prior to UV disinfection, which was crucial because it enhanced the effectiveness of UV disinfection, allowing for greater intensity and reduced transmittance.

Mr. Campbell stated that the next picture was of the four UV channels shown here at Moores Creek. He stated that the number of channels in service at any given time was determined by plant operating conditions and flow through the plant. He stated that these channels provided disinfection prior to the outfall. He stated that they jumped back to the solids side, where the processing of sludge to biosolids occurred. He stated that this included the sludge that settled in the bottom of the primary clarifiers and the activated sludge that is trimmed and sent to the gravity thickeners.

Mr. Campbell stated that the trimmed inventory (waste activated sludge) from their activated sludge and sludge from the primary clarifiers was pumped to the three primary digesters, where anaerobic digestion took place. He stated that sludge was applied with heat, mixed, and subjected to no oxygen, resulting in a process that completed in under a month. He stated that the sludge then entered the secondary digester, where methane gas was captured and stored in the methane sphere. He stated that they used this methane to power the boilers that heated the digester. He stated that sludge was pumped from the sludge storage area and then transported to the solids handling building for processing.

Mr. Pinkston asked if, in the primary clarifiers, the process was continuous, or it required periodic filling and waiting. He stated that they had continuous input to the process, so he was wondering if it was stored or staged.

Mr. Campbell stated that Mr. Haney's team was constantly measuring the blanket depth in the facility, allowing them to track the amount of solids present and the necessary removal. He stated that typically, these remained in service at all times. He stated that at the bottom of the facility, rakes ran around, and Mr. Haney's team was deciding when to remove a sufficient amount and when to remove some of the sludge to the digesters.

Mr. Pinkston asked if they were measuring the conditions.

Mr. Campbell confirmed that was correct. He continued to state that once the sludge entered the solids handling building from the storage, it passed through one of two centrifuges, with only one in service at a time. He stated that these centrifuges dewatered the anaerobic sludge,

ultimately converting it into biosolids. He stated that in 2024, Moores Creek generated approximately 13,000 tons of biosolids and made 524 trips to McGill Environmental, the compost facility in Waverly, Virginia.

Mr. Campbell stated that the next two slides would discuss information on odor control. He stated that the biological odor control system, which they had observed in the primaries, utilized covers on top of the primary clarifiers. He stated that this system differed from Crozet's in that it relied on nutrients being fed to a series of media for biological growth, controlling odor levels. He stated that in contrast, Crozet's odor control process was more chemical based.

Mr. Campbell stated that Crozet pump station number four, the first station when leaving Crozet on the way to Charlottesville, employed bioxide to reduce odor-causing hydrogen sulfide, while the Crozet flow equalization tank (FET) provided surge relief in case of high flow rates, allowing the stations to process the waste more efficiently. He stated that odor control from Crozet cost approximately \$350,000 annually. He stated that the septic station, located by the main gate and adjacent to the Moores Creek Pump Station, served commercial haulers for emptying their trucks. He stated that in 2024, they had approximately 6,300 deliveries, totaling around 8 million gallons.

Mr. Pinkston asked if these deliveries were from facilities such as port-a-potties.

Mr. Campbell replied that yes, it included port-o-potty waste, as well as commercial plumbing waste and residential septic tank collection.

Mr. Pinkston asked if there was a collection basin located outside that was pumped to the wastewater treatment facility. Mr. Campbell replied yes; the basin was metered, and each vendor had their unique ID number that was entered, which corresponded to their billing system.

He stated that next was an overview of the staffing for the wastewater department. He stated that they had 10 total operators at Moores Creek, with staff on-site 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, and two operators per shift.

Mr. Campbell stated that they had two County plant operators who staffed Glenmore, Scottsville, and Stone-Robinson, with Glenmore and Scottsville staffed about four hours a day and Stone-Robinson staffed about one hour a day. He stated that they also had two relief operators in the wastewater department, who were trained to operate any treatment plant and could fill in for vacation or sick leave. He stated that their management staff consisted of one Wastewater Supervisor, the Assistant Manager, and Brian Haney, the Wastewater Manager.

Mr. Campbell stated that in total, they had 17 staff members of the Wastewater Department. He stated that Mr. Mawyer had previously mentioned that Rivanna set expectations for all operators to achieve their Class 1 license, and Mr. Haney and his staff had done a commendable job. Currently, they have 10 Class 1 operators, three Class 2 operators, one Class 3 operator, and three unlicensed trainees. He stated that the trainees had only been with them for about a month, so they had not yet had a chance to obtain a license.

Mr. Campbell stated that now he had a few slides on the industrial waste pretreatment program. He stated that the program aimed to regulate individual users in the distribution system based on volume or process wastewater characteristics prior to reaching the wastewater treatment plant. He stated that this regulation was required by the EPA and Virginia DEQ and involved setting discharge limits. He stated that their pretreatment program monitored a range of parameters, including fat, soils, and grease, metals, nutrients, nitrogen, phosphorus, pH, and carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand.

Mr. Campbell stated that these parameters were crucial because they impacted the overall health of their wastewater treatment system. He stated that currently, they had three industrial permittees: Virginia Diodes, Mikro, and Northrop Grumman. He noted that they were nearing the end of the current permit period and were working on renewals. He stated that each permittee was required to submit semi-annual reports to them for review in June and December of each year.

Mr. Campbell stated that finally, the Wastewater Department budget for FY26 was almost \$28 million, inclusive of \$2 million for employee salaries, \$1.4 million for utility costs, \$1 million for wastewater treatment chemicals, \$1.2 million for odor control, biosolids disposal and trucking, \$0.4 million for communications, IT, miscellaneous supplies, and professional services, \$2.7 million for operations and maintenance, \$5.9 million for central support, and \$13.2 million for debt service. He stated that for FY24, Moores Creek treated 3.6 billion gallons of wastewater at a cost of \$0.77 per 100 gallons.

Mr. Lunsford asked if, in the centrifuge, when dewatering occurred, the dewatered material then returned to the water that had been previously removed and re-entered the process.

Mr. Campbell confirmed that it did; it went back through Moores Creek Pump Station.

Mr. Lunsford asked if all of the pump stations from Crozet had alternative power supplies.

Mr. Campbell confirmed that yes, they had generators.

Mr. Richardson asked if they had any comparative analysis with other agencies regarding the \$0.77 per 100 gallons for the cost of treatment.

Mr. Mawyer stated that staff would look into that and provide an answer.

Mr. Richardson stated that he believed their system was refined enough to track that, and it would be good to know to ensure they were being cost-efficient.

Mr. Campbell stated that another factor to consider would be the quality of the treatment process. He stated that for example, at Moores Creek, it was an advanced water resource recovery facility, utilizing methane to run boilers and utilizing plant effluent for many of the plant processes, rather than relying on water from the system. He stated that he thought it would be interesting to see how this facility compared in terms of treatment quality.

Mr. Richardson stated that was a great point, and he appreciated the commitment to environmental sustainability that had been mentioned earlier. He stated that was very interesting.

Ms. Mallek stated that she was curious about what Waverly did with the sludge and what their treatment process entails. She stated that she was told that they blended their high-quality sludge with untreated sludge from the lagoon, which was of poor quality. She stated that she would like to know if they were getting their money's worth for this arrangement or if Waverly was simply using their material without proper treatment.

Mr. Mawyer stated that McGill had a diverse waste stream, which they had the opportunity to observe during a tour. He stated that they processed a wide range of materials, including food products, vegetation, and even shredded Federal Reserve currency. He stated that the resulting mixture was a unique blend of items that were then taken outside to cure, ultimately becoming compost. He stated that their biosolids was one of many components that contributed to the compost product. He stated that if the question pertained to regulations governing compost, he was unsure and would likely need to do some further investigation.

Ms. Mallek asked if Rivanna paid them to take it in addition to paying them to transport it, which they then sold again. Mr. Mawyer said they did pay McGill to receive biosolids from Rivanna.

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

Mr. Mawyer noted that in May, the Board would hold public hearings and consider approval of the Solid Waste and Water and Sewer budgets.

Mr. Richardson added that he would not be present at those meetings because he would be out of town.

11. CLOSED MEETING

There was no reason to hold a closed meeting.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Pinkston moved the Board to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Mallek seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

Respectfully submitted,



Mr. Samuel Sanders
Secretary-Treasurer

