The Board of Directors of the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) met in a regular session on February 18, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the Administration and Operations Center at 168 Spotnap Road in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members Present: Mr. Clarence Roberts, Chair, Mr. Bill Kittrell, Vice-Chair, Mr. Charles Tolbert, Mr. Richard Armstrong, Ms. Jennifer Sulzberger, and Ms. Kimberly Swanson.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jim Bowling, Gary O’Connell, Peter Gorham, Emily Shifflett, Quin Lunsford, Michael Lynn, Travis Marrs, Timothy Brown, Patrick Newton, April Walker, and Danielle Trent.

Staff Absent: None

Public Present: John Martin, Albemarle County Citizen, Richard Gullick, Ph.D., Director of Operations, RWSA.

1. Call to Order and Establish a Quorum
   The Chair called the meeting to order and a quorum was established.

2. Approve Minutes of January 21, 2016 (Recording Time: 09:04:07 a.m.)
   The Chair asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of January 21, 2016.
   Ms. Sulzberger moved to approve the minutes of January 21, 2016, seconded by Mr. Tolbert. All members voted aye.

3. Matters From the Public Concerning Items Not on the Agenda (Recording Time: 09:04:31 a.m.)
   There were no items from the public concerning items not on the agenda.

4. Response to Public Comment (Recording Time: 09:04:41 a.m.)
   There was no response to public comment.

5. Consent Agenda (Recording Time: 09:04:43 a.m.)
a. **Monthly Financial Reports** – Mr. Roberts stated that he had a question with regards to the financial reports. He stated that water consumption for the month is compared to the previous month and asked if it would not be more beneficial to compare consumption for the month to the same period of time for the previous year. Mr. O’Connell replied that the staff could provide the Board with both comparisons. He stated that the staff had charts showing both comparisons, thus it would be easy to highlight. He noted that one of the items scheduled for next month’s agenda was to look at all of the financial reports and different options for the Board in terms of what information they receive. He mentioned that the staff would look at what information is beneficial for the Board and how it is best summarized or presented, and offer some alternatives as well.

b. **Monthly CIP Report** – Ms. Swanson stated that she had a question regarding the updates to the Route 29 Solutions Project, specifically the Berkmar Drive Extended portion of the project. She asked what the betterments were that were being proposed with that part of the project. Mr. Gorham replied that VDOT would be crossing a sewer line close to Hollymead Town Center and the ACSA is asking for casing pipe to be placed under the new road, as that line is expected to be upgraded at some point. Ms. Swanson stated that the jurisdictional map showed that there was no water service for that area and asked if there was any discussion about changing the jurisdictional area to provide water service to that area. Mr. Gorham replied the ACSA would not be changing the jurisdictional area. Ms. Swanson asked if there was any effort being taken to provide water service along the new stretch of road. Mr. Gorham replied no. He stated that it was discussed early on in the pre-design stage and the final decision was not to go that route. Ms. Swanson asked if the size of the casing pipe that will be placed under the new road is part of the solution plan for the Airport Sewer Collector Project. Mr. Gorham replied yes. He stated that in building the
new road, a portion of the sewer line will have to be relocated and the
larger casing pipe will be installed at that time.

Mr. Roberts stated that he had a question regarding the soil
samples that were collected as part of the Fueling Station Project. He
stated that the soil was collected to be tested for fuel contamination and
asked what the results of those tests were. Mr. Gorham replied that he
did not know because the tests had just been completed and the
consultants were reviewing the results. He stated that he should have
the results pretty soon. Mr. O’Connell added that all of the contaminants
had to be removed. Mr. Gorham stated that all of the old tanks were
removed and taken away and there was no evidence of them leaking.

c. CIP Authorizations -
d. RWSA Monthly Update – Mr. Kittrell stated that he had a question
regarding the condition assessment of the pipeline from Sugar Hollow
to the Observatory Hill Water Treatment Plant. He stated that the
Board has had concerns about the condition of the pipeline given that it
is 100 years old and in a very remote area. He asked Mr. O’Connell if
there was a timeline as to when the condition assessment on the
pipeline would take place. Mr. O’Connell replied that the condition
assessment is planned to be performed on the pipeline that runs from
the Ragged Mountain Reservoir to the Observatory Water Treatment
Plant, and not the Sugar Hollow pipeline. He stated that the anticipation
was that the pipeline running from Ragged Mountain to the Observatory
Plant will be used in the long term future, so RWSA wanted to assess
its condition.

Mr. Kittrell stated that he felt there should be an assessment of the
Sugar Hollow Pipeline because it was a critical piece of infrastructure.
He stated that it might not be as old as the pipeline from Ragged
Mountain to the Observatory Plant, but it was very close. He stated that
he would ask Mr. O’Connell to raise the issue of performing a condition
assessment on the Sugar Hollow Pipeline as well, with the RWSA
Board. Mr. O’Connell asked if the rest of the Board concurred with Mr. Kittrell, and all members stated that they did.

Mr. O’Connell stated that it made sense to perform the condition assessment for both pipelines. Mr. Tolbert asked if the same technology used to perform the assessment on the pipeline from Ragged Mountain to the Observatory Plant could be used to assess the Sugar Hollow Pipeline. Mr. O’Connell stated that he was not sure and asked Dr. Gullick if it was possible. Dr. Gullick replied that he would assume so, but he would have to ask the RWSA engineers.

e. ACSA Board Policy Future Issues Agenda 2016-

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Mr. Kittrell. All members voted aye.

6. Presentation – Wastewater Treatment Process and Discharges – RWSA (Recording Time: 9:14:21 a.m.)

Mr. O’Connell stated that the ACSA staff had been asked several questions about wastewater treatment, and he felt it was a good idea to walk the Board through what happened during the wastewater treatment process, particularly at the Moores Creek facility. He stated that Rich Gullick, Ph.D., Director of Operations for RWSA, put together a great presentation (Attached as Pages____) which would address those questions, as well as other issues the Board has asked about including odor control and nutrient credits.

Dr. Gullick came forward to address the Board. He thanked the Board for allowing him to share with them what the RWSA does to provide service to its two customers. He stated that he wanted to give credit to Tim Castillo, the Wastewater Manager for RWSA, who was not able to be present today. He stated that he would talk about the potential environmental impacts of wastewater and what the RWSA does to prevent those impacts, and what might be the impacts of RWSA’s particular discharges. He added that he would also talk about the Moores Creek facility specifically, which was now referred to as the Advanced Water Resource Recovery Facility (AWRRF).
Dr. Gullick stated that there were many things found in wastewater, some of which were regulated and some that were not. He stated that one of the main things found in wastewater was pathogenic microorganisms, and that it was RWSA’s job to kill, remove, and/or sterilize them so that they do not reproduce. He stated that RWSA also removed particles and organic material, which was measured in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), or how much oxygen the organic matter will consume when it is degraded by bacteria. He stated that ammonia was another important component of wastewater to remove as it is toxic to aquatic life. He mentioned that nitrogen and phosphorus are also removed to protect the life of the bay. He added that basically anything that goes into a sink, drain, or toilet is found in wastewater, including water, which was one of the main resources RWSA recovered from wastewater.

Dr. Gullick stated that some of the potential impacts of untreated sewage were human disease and toxicity to aquatic life. He stated that sedimentation could also occur if the solids were not removed, as well as depletion of dissolved oxygen and impacts from pH. He stated that RWSA is regulated on each of these components at the Moores Creek AWRRF. He noted that smaller plants may not be regulated on all of those components.

Dr. Gullick next referred to a diagram that outlined how the wastewater treatment process works at the Moores Creek facility. He stated that the water is pumped in and collected by gravity. He stated that there were two pump stations, one in the plant and one near the plant, that lift the water up and bring it in the plant and then it flows by gravity throughout the rest of the plant. He stated that it was then screened to get rid of big objects, followed by a settling and clarification process to settle about 2/3 of the suspended solids and about 1/3 of the biochemical oxygen demand. He stated that the heart of the treatment plant was the biological treatment, which was a fairly complicated system. He noted that it involved the removal of ammonia, nitrogen, and phosphorus. He mentioned that the solids from this process were returned back to the wastewater because they were actually living organisms that consume the nutrients and nitrogen in the ammonia. He noted that some of the solids are then wasted and removed. He stated that this happened after the secondary clarification process, which yielded
some pretty clear water afterwards. He noted that most plants treatment
processes ended there, but Moores Creek also used sand filters and ultraviolet
(UV) light disinfection. He mentioned that this did not remove the pathogenic
organisms but rather sterilized them and changed their ability to reproduce. He
stated that if the organisms were not reproducing, then they could not cause
disease.

Mr. Roberts asked how often the UV light bulbs were changed. Dr. Gullick
replied that he did not know the exact frequency but that they were inspected
regularly and changed as needed, but they were not replaced that often. Mr.
Tolbert asked if there was testing done after the UV light disinfection process
before the water was released into the river. Dr. Gullick replied yes. He stated
that the water was tested at different points during the process. Mr. Tolbert
stated that if the UV light was not sterilizing the organisms to prevent them from
reproducing, that is something that the RWSA staff would want to know before
the water is released. Dr. Gullick replied that the staff would know that from
online data from the transmittance of the UV light. He added that all of the online
meters were also manually inspected on a regular basis.

Ms. Swanson asked if the Glenmore facility had a holding pond where the
water was tested before it was discharged. Dr. Gullick replied that the water was
discharged continuously and monitored continuously. He stated that it moved
much too fast to try and hold it to check it. He noted that it was checked as it was
discharged.

Dr. Gullick stated that the bottom half of the diagram illustrated what
happens to the solids as they are removed from the secondary clarifier. He
stated that they went to a waste-activated sludge thickener. He stated that
RWSA had recently separated their two thickeners, so that one takes in the
hauled septage waste, which allows the RWSA to treat the different types of
waste differently. He stated that this optimizes the solids that are sent to the
anaerobic digester, which takes the organic material and turns it into methane.
He stated that the methane is then stored and sent through a cogeneration
system, and eventually used to help operate the digesters. He noted that none of
the methane is sold, but rather it is all used internally. He stated that the
remaining solids from there are dewatered with a centrifuge and then hauled away to a facility in Waverly, Virginia where they are turned into compost and sold as compost fertilizer.

Mr. Tolbert asked where in that process did most of the odor problems occur. Dr. Gullick replied that some of the odor issues came from the clarifiers, which were big open basins. He mentioned that there used to be an odor problem with the thickeners, but they were now covered. He stated that the solids that are removed from the centrifuge used to be a big odor issue when they were composted on-site, but now the solids stored are bio-solids, which still cause some odor issues. He noted that the pump stations themselves already had odor control measures in place. He stated that the primary settler was a huge, open 100ft. diameter tank that produced a lot of odor because of the raw sewage that was already in a septic state, similar to the equalization basin. He noted that the primary settler would soon be covered and the flow equalization basin would be placed out of service, except for wet weather events.

Mr. Tolbert asked if the gases produced during the biological treatment got released. Dr. Gullick replied yes, but there was no intention to cover the basin because the gases did not spread much odor. He stated that the worst odors were produced when the staff switched from one equalization basin to another and they had to be cleaned out. He stated that the sludge became exposed and that was when the worst odor days occurred.

Mr. Bowling asked where the sludge was taken. Dr. Gullick replied that the sludge, which was a Class B solid, was taken to McGill Composting. He stated that they then turned it into a Class A material and then sold it as compost fertilizer. Mr. Bowling asked if the RWSA sold the sludge to McGill. Dr. Gullick replied no. He stated that the RWSA actually paid McGill to haul it and process it. He stated that RWSA used to compost it on-site, but it was a very odor-producing process that was ceased for the sake of the neighborhood. He stated that the elimination of that process was in Phase 1 of the odor control project.

Ms. Swanson asked how much power the cogeneration plant generates. Dr. Gullick replied that it was enough to power the mixers, heaters, and the digesters. He stated that it was basically a self-running system.
Dr. Gullick next took a close-up look at each system in the process. He stated that the intake screens rotate as the water comes in and the solids are taken out and put in a dumpster. He stated that this area would also be covered in the next phase of the odor control project, as it can get very odorous. He stated that the primary clarifier had a device under it that rotated and helped to remove the solids, as well as a scum remover on top. He stated that the biological treatment process had some parts where air is added and some parts where it was not. He stated that the biological process is called the Bardenpho Process, named after the man who invented it. He stated that the “pho” was added to indicate an additional mechanism for phosphorus removal. He stated that all water from there goes to the secondary clarifiers. He noted that the solids were removed and sent back to the biological process where they can consume more of the contaminants that they are designed to get rid of. He stated that the clean water flows over to the sand filters and through the UV light system. He mentioned that the water gets hit with a very high intensity, low wavelength light that disinfects the water very well before being discharged into Moores Creek.

Dr. Gullick stated that with regards to solids, the thickeners, one for waste activated sludge and one for septage, were covered during Phase 1 of the odor control project. He noted that the foul air from the thickeners is treated with a chemical odor scrubber. He mentioned that Phase 1 also included covering the intake for the Moores Creek Pump Station, eliminating the composting operation, and improving the wet weather flow management which allows RWSA staff to use higher flow rates through the plant.

Dr. Gullick stated that the anaerobic digesters were big tanks and the fourth tank has a floatable roof that moves up and down according to the amount of gas that it contains. He noted that this digester was not mixed or heated, both of which were required to get good gas production, but that most of the gas production occurred in the first three tanks. He stated that the gas goes from the floatable roof to a methane sphere, where it is run through a generator and used for heat and electricity to operate the digesters. He stated that the solids coming out of the digesters go through a centrifuge and come out in dump trucks, which are then transferred to trailers. He noted that part of the odor control project was
to eliminate this step because it was done outdoors. He mentioned that RWSA will purchase its own trailers and either haul the solids directly out of the building or store them, covered, on-site, to reduce the odor.

Dr. Gullick stated that the next slide was a snapshot of the discharge requirements from the RWSA’s permit with the Department of Environmental Quality. He stated that the requirements pertained to things such as the pH, or acidity, of the water, solids, bacteria, dissolved oxygen, ammonia, phosphorous, and nitrogen. He stated that the next slide looked at the monthly average limits for BOD, suspended solids, ammonia, nitrogen, and phosphorous. He stated that the RWSA had excellent removal rates, with BOD and suspended solids being removed at a little over 99% and 98% respectively. He noted that when the RWSA received a grant to build part of the nutrient removal facility, they agreed to a financing agreement. He noted that the agreement provided financial incentives for permit limits of 5.0 mg/L for nitrogen and 0.3 mg/L for phosphorous.

Mr. Kittrell asked if the grant came from the Virginia Resource Authority (VRA). Mr. O’Connell stated that he believed it came from the VRA. Dr. Gullick stated that he was not with the RWSA at the time and thus, did not have the full background. Mr. Kittrell asked how frequently the samples were taken. Dr. Gullick stated that the required sampling frequency was listed on the previous slide. He stated, for example, pH monitoring was required to be done once a day, but there was also an online meter that measured it constantly. He stated that the RWSA staff attempts to monitor online as much as possible, and that the state provides a minimum, but RWSA does not use that as their standard minimum. He noted that RWSA samples more frequently than what is required by the state.

Dr. Gullick stated that the information is reported to the state each month and that the RWSA has its own tracking system. He moved to the next eight slides which were graphs illustrating how the RWSA discharges compared to the permit limits. He stated that the first one looked at ammonia discharges. He noted that the ammonia limits change from the winter to summer months because ammonia is more toxic in warmer temperatures, thus yielding a higher limit during the winter and lower during the summer. He mentioned that RWSA
had not exceeded the limit, even in the summer months, for at least the last three years.

Dr. Gullick stated that the BOD$_5$ was usually around zero. He mentioned that some of the charts were expressed in terms of mg/L and some were shown in terms of loading per day. He noted that there were permit limits for both and the loading per day was found by multiplying the mg/L by the design flow. He stated that there was no limitation on the flow and if there was a lot of inflow and infiltration, there would be a higher flow rate. He noted that there was a higher level of BOD$_5$ in September, which he would explain shortly.

Dr. Gullick stated that suspended solids typically do very well, but there was brief upset in September. He stated that there was a huge rain storm, which caused power outages at a pump station that the operators had to tend to in order to prevent overflows. He stated that this resulted in an upset in the system for a three hour period that happened to be during one of the weekly samples. He stated that this put the levels over the monthly average.

Dr. Gullick stated that the pH limits were 6.0 for the minimum and 9.0 for the maximum. He noted that he was not sure why the minimum was 6.0, as rain water would be lower than that, creating a tough standard. He stated that there was no trouble in meeting the permit minimum for dissolved oxygen in the water. He noted that the E. coli numbers were good as well, with levels staying extremely low. Mr. O’Connell asked if that was due to the UV light. Dr. Gullick replied that it was because of both physical removal and UV light disinfection. Mr. O’Connell asked if the levels would be higher without the UV disinfection. Dr. Gullick replied absolutely. He stated that if RWSA did not use the UV disinfection, the staff would have to use chlorine and then dechlorinate the water, because the chlorine cannot be discharged.

Dr. Gullick stated that in terms of phosphorous and nitrogen, there was a permit maximum, as well as a maximum per the funding agreement. He noted that phosphorous was measured over the course of a year, not daily or monthly. He stated that RWSA could sell some of the difference between the permit limit and what was actually discharged. Mr. Bowling asked how much the RWSA received for the difference. Dr. Gullick replied that last year, RWSA received
$123,000 for the difference. He noted that most of that comes from the nitrogen, not the phosphorous. Mr. O’Connell asked who was buying them. Dr. Gullick replied that other utilities, for example, who do not meet their permit limits. Ms. Swanson asked if RWSA was allowed to trade within the state or just within the watershed. Dr. Gullick replied that RWSA could only trade within the James River Basin. Ms. Swanson asked how many potential buyers were in the James River Basin. Dr. Gullick replied that he did not know off the top of his head, but there were not as many buyers as suppliers because RWSA does not sell as many credits as it would like. Ms. Swanson asked if entities within the James River Basin were required to participate in the nutrient trading. Dr. Gullick replied that he did not think there was a requirement to participate, but he was not sure. Ms. Swanson asked if utilities were limited to only trading with other utilities. Dr. Gullick replied no.

Ms. Swanson asked if RWSA has worked with the septage haulers to ensure that they have access to the plant during hours that are convenient for the haulers. Dr. Gullick replied yes. He stated that the hours had actually just shifted to include an extra ½ hour in the morning and an hour in the evening. He stated that haulers could have access to the plant 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, but there was a surcharge if access was needed outside of normal business hours.

Mr. O’Connell stated that he thought the fees for access during the extended business hours had increased as well. Dr. Gullick stated that the fees had not increased. He stated that the hours changed, and there was an extra fee for access outside of normal business hours, but that those fees had remained the same for at least the last nine years. The septage receiving revenues are projected to increase by $50,000 in the FY 2017 budget.

Dr. Gullick stated that in terms of odor control, Phase 2 of the project is designed to contain the odors within the Moores Creek AWWRF property line. He stated that the approved cost for the project was a little over $9 million. Mr. Kittrell stated that he had a question about the cost. He stated that the information he had showed an approved cost of $8.78 million. Mr. O’Connell stated that originally, the estimated cost range was $8.78 million to $13.3 million. He stated that there was a presentation to the RWSA Board in December, which
the ACSA Board considered in January, and at that time $8.78 million was the
cost for capital improvements to the project. He noted that this cost included
screening in the bio solids storage area, which involved a contract amount that
would have been added to the operations budget. He stated that an analysis was
done a few months later, and it was found to be cheaper to change the way the
contract worked. He mentioned that this meant some physical changes including
RWSA purchasing trucks. He stated that this money was included in the odor
control project budget as opposed to the operating budget, which is why the cost
increased to $9.33 million. He stated that he did not have the analysis or the
specific numbers at that time, but he would get it to the Board for next month’s
meeting.

Mr. Kittrell asked if the resolution the ACSA Board passed needed to be
changed to reflect the new cost. Mr. O’Connell replied yes. He stated that in
January 2015, the ACSA Board adopted a resolution to support the odor control
project and the approved cost reflected in the resolution was $8.78 million. He
stated that for the record, the resolution should be readopted next month with the
new amount.

Dr. Gullick stated that RWSA could not control the bid environment, but
they were trying to change some of the processes. He stated that as part of
Phase 2 of the project, instead of covering the equalization basins which were
large tanks, RWSA was eliminating use of the basins except for wet weather
flows. He stated that it was great to have flow equalization but it was not
required. He stated that a new grit removal facility would be installed as well,
which was a fair amount of the project cost. He stated that the headworks, which
was the initial screen where the wastewater first comes into the plant, would be
covered and the foul air would be treated.

Dr. Gullick mentioned that RWSA would also be eliminating the use of the
clarifiers that are used to help settle the digested solids, as the centrifuge would
be sufficient for that purpose. He noted that the centrate holding tank would be
eliminated as well, which could be quite odorous, and the centrate would go back
to the head of the plant and dealt with there. Mr. Kittrell asked how the staff
planned to deal with the centrate without the holding tank. Dr. Gullick replied that
the centrate would be covered and by the time it is not covered in the process, the odor will be gone. Mr. Kittrell asked how the odors are removed. Dr. Gullick replied that the centrate is volatilized into the air, which then gets sucked out.

Dr. Gullick stated that the outdoor handling of biosolids would be eliminated and new trailers would be purchased to haul the centrifuge solids directly from the building. He noted that this would eliminate odor because biosolids would not be stored outside. He stated that new coating would be applied to the inside of the digesters to help reduce gas leakage. Ms. Sulzberger asked if it was a new type of coating or another layer of what was currently being used. Dr. Gullick replied that it would be a new type of coating, but that it needed to be redone regardless. He added that the grit would also be cleaned out of the equalization basins and holding ponds. He stated that water during wet weather events contained a lot of grit and it needed to be removed in order to use the basins more efficiently. Mr. Kittrell asked what grit was. Dr. Gullick replied that grit was just solid material such as sand that is found in wastewater. He stated that some types of grit are coarser than others, but it could be harmful to the pumps and other mechanical functions in the system.

Mr. Tolbert asked if there were things eliminated from the project in an attempt to reduce the cost that RWSA would like to add back to the system at some point. Dr. Gullick replied that the project focuses on function and not form. He stated that some of the changes were just choosing to use a different material for a pipe or cover, or coming up with new ideas to perform the same function. He noted that if there was any part of the project that the staff felt should be retained, they advocated strongly to retain it. Mr. Tolbert stated that the purpose of the project is to control the odor, and the original plan for the project was altered to reduce the cost. He asked if there was anything, if money was not an issue, that the RWSA staff would add to the project to improve the odor control. Dr. Gullick replied no.

Mr. Bowling asked where the cost would show up, if anywhere, in the future. Dr. Gullick replied that some of the changes would potentially make operations a bit more difficult. He stated, for example, that operators could only walk on top of the clarifiers in certain places and accommodations had to be
made for that. Mr. Bowling asked if the elimination of certain items from the project would result in costs being put off until later. Dr. Gullick replied no. Mr. Tolbert asked if the project was being designed in such a way that RWSA could go back and add items. Dr. Gullick replied that it was being designed so that adding items in the future would not be necessary. He stated that the intent throughout the entire process is to meet the fence line goal and that the goal would not be sacrificed just to reduce the cost. He stated that there were certain things such as how a foundation is built or how air pipes are hung, that would not affect the odor control but could affect the cost.

Dr. Gullick moved to the last two slides which outlined why the Moores Creek AWRRF is “advanced,” and the resource recovery aspect of the plant. He stated that the biological process used at the plant is advanced beyond conventional wastewater treatment. He noted that most wastewater treatment plants do not utilize sand filters or ultraviolet light disinfection. He added that the odor control system was fairly advanced as well because not all plants have covers. He stated that most plants just burned off the methane produced from the anaerobic digesters, but the Moores Creek plant recovers the methane through the use of a cogenerator and turns it into heat and electricity. He stated that, in addition to methane, the plant also recovers clean water to release to the Rivanna River and nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorous to use as fertilizers.

Dr. Gullick stated that, in response to Mr. Kittrell’s earlier question about the price per pound for nitrogen and phosphorous, nitrogen is $1.17 per pound and phosphorous is $0.89 per pound. Mr. Bowling asked if the purchase price was set by the DEQ. Dr. Gullick replied that the price is set by the Virginia Nutrient Credit Exchange Association, Inc. Mr. Tolbert asked if it cost more to buy it than it does to sell it, who received the difference. Dr. Gullick replied that there were organizational costs, but mostly the surplus gets rolled into a better rate for the next year.

Mr. Bowling asked what Dr. Gullick saw as the biggest problem for the plant in the near future. Dr. Gullick replied that he began employment with the RWSA 1 ½ years ago and the manager, assistant manager, and supervisor were
no longer with the RWSA which meant new leadership. He stated that the new leadership had new expectations for the plant operators, which meant learning new methods of operations. Mr. Bowling stated that he was thinking not so much in terms of organizational challenges, but rather challenges with the plant itself in terms of returning clean water to the environment. Dr. Gullick replied that RWSA was trying to improve the SCADA system to gain better control of the facilities. He mentioned that they were also attempting to get the cogeneration system working well as there have been issues with it that have been difficult to identify and fix. He added that implementing the odor control changes was a big challenge, as well as the new pump station project which will create an entirely new system to operate.

7. Resolution Amending By-Laws – gender neutral language (Recording Time: 10:21:41 a.m.)

Mr. O’Connell stated that the staff attempted to edit the ACSA by-laws to make them gender neutral. He stated that Mr. Bowling had a few suggested changes to add to those already outlined in the resolution. Mr. Bowling stated that in Article III, Section 3.3, the phrase “their successor” should read “a successor.” He stated that the second change was to Article V, Section 5.2. He stated that the phrase “as they may deem necessary” should read “as deemed necessary.”

Mr. O’Connell stated that Mr. Roberts raised a question about the language in the by-laws regarding the Executive Committee, specifically the second paragraph in Article V. He stated that, to his knowledge, the Executive Committee has never met nor acted but the by-laws give the Executive Committee the authority to act for the entire authority in any situation. Mr. Roberts stated that the Executive Committee could convene, for example, for the purpose of firing the ACSA attorney without the knowledge of the whole Board. He stated that a clause should be added specifying that meetings of the Executive Committee are for emergency purposes, as the current language suggests meetings that are general in nature.
Mr. Bowling stated that this provision in the by-laws is archaic, having been created in the 1960’s when email and certain legislation did not exist. He stated that the common sense and the law provide the Executive Committee with the mechanism to act on an emergency basis. He noted that, however, when the Executive Committee did act on an emergency basis, they were required to follow up and ratify that action. He mentioned that he had not had a chance to scrutinize the language in the ACSA by-laws, but that he would suggest adding a clause that stated any action taken in an emergency situation must be ratified by the Board at the next regular meeting.

Mr. O’Connell asked if the phrase could be removed altogether. He stated that the few times there was a need to meet outside of regular meetings, the entire Board met easily. Mr. Bowling replied that the Executive Committee had the authority to meet so the phrase was not needed. Mr. O’Connell stated that if, for example, a pump station went out and a contractor needed to be hired, the Board would probably receive an email or a phone call but the ACSA would go ahead and hire the contractor. He stated that the Board would be aware of the action, but the appropriation for the contractor would not be ratified until the next formal meeting.

Mr. Tolbert asked if there was language that could be added and voted on today, or did the Board need to wait until the next meeting. Mr. O’Connell replied that since it was a change to the by-laws, it needed to be advertised and considered first. Mr. Kittrell stated that his opinion was that the Board should vote on the changes already outlined in the resolution and vote on the proposed changes from today’s Board meeting next month.

Ms. Swanson asked if there was an attempt to convene the entire Board before arranging a meeting with the Executive Committee. Mr. O’Connell replied that the Executive Committee consisted of three Board members and a quorum of the Board required four members. He stated that he would attempt to get a quorum of the full Board, unless it was truly an emergency situation. He noted that even in an emergency situation, he would still email or call the entire Board.
Mr. Roberts stated that the Board would vote on the existing resolution, with the few wording changes from Mr. Bowling, today and discuss the other changes at the next meeting.

Ms. Sulzberger moved to approve the Resolution as amended, seconded by Mr. Kittrell. The Chair asked for a roll-call vote: Ms. Swanson, aye; Mr. Armstrong, aye; Mr. Roberts, aye; Mr. Tolbert, aye; Ms. Sulzberger, aye; Mr. Kittrell, aye.

8. Presentation – New ACSA Website (Recording Time: 10:29:352 a.m.)

Mr. O'Connell stated that there was a team of people that helped with the new website design but that April Walker, Systems Engineer for the ACSA, was the main force behind the project. He stated that Ms. Walker’s presentation (Attached as Pages____) would walk the Board through some features of the website they may not yet be familiar with, as well as the new ability to track users of the website. He added that she would also go over some items that the ACSA was looking to improve in the future with regards to the site.

Ms. Walker came forward to address the Board. She stated that the ACSA website is designed and maintained solely in-house and maintained on a separate network with separate firewall and intrusion information and detection software for security purposes. She mentioned that with the redesign, the staff wanted to implement the customer suggestions that were outlined in the strategic plan, as well as employee feedback. She stated that in 2015, a survey was distributed to all employees asking for their feedback and personal rating of the current website. She stated that the responses from those surveys were taken and a redesign committee was formed with representatives from each department. She noted that the committee also worked with RWSA to discuss collaborative efforts between both organizations.

Ms. Walker stated that one of the improvements made with the new website, in addition to the strategic plan items, was making the site easier to maintain. She stated that features and processes needed to be streamlined and in some areas they were automated. She stated that another improvement was the responsive design. She noted that the site is supported by, and easily
accessed through, most mobile devices such as tablets and smartphones. She
mentioned that the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) sets the standards for
how a website should display and function, and that the new website is in
compliance with those standards, including ADA requirements. She stated that
compliance with the standards entailed specific coding and formatting to ensure
that the website renders on all browsers. She mentioned that Google Translation
has also been added to the website, which was a suggestion made by the Board.
She stated that a huge improvement to the website is the addition of Google
Analytics, which allows the staff to monitor how the website is utilized and
accessed.

Ms. Walker next walked the Board through a demo of the new website.
She stated that the goal was to have the website open to the same homepage
and have all information accessible without using the scroll bar, regardless of the
type of device used to access it. She noted that all important ACSA events and
recent news items were listed on the homepage, and that Google Translation
would translate the website into any language. She stated that the search feature
was kept from the old website design.

Ms. Swanson asked how to get the word “search” to go away in the
search box. She stated that in some search boxes, it was not necessary to
delete the word “search” before typing. She stated that in some search boxes,
one the cursor is placed inside the box, it allowed the searcher to begin typing.
Ms. Walker stated that she put the word there as a placeholder. She stated that
dial-up customers had to turn off images in order to make their page rendering
faster. She stated that buttons, such as the one labeled “search” under the
search box, are considered images and thus, those customers would not know
that there was a search feature there. She stated, however, that she could
remove the word “search” from the box.

Ms. Walker stated that a “Get In Touch” form has also been added to the
website. She noted that one of the strategic plan items was to make it easier for
customers to get in touch with ACSA staff. She stated that when customers filled
out the form, it would automatically email the staff. Mr. Armstrong asked if there
was a member of the staff dedicated to responding to those emails. Ms. Walker
responded that the IT department was responsible for responding to the emails and they all checked it several times throughout the day. She mentioned that they forwarded emails to the appropriate department as opposed to having them sent directly from the customer because there was a lot of spam that came through the website.

Ms. Walker stated that the website had a new map feature called “Where’s My Meter?” which was a fan favorite so far. She stated that when an address is typed into the box, for example the ACSA’s address, it gives an idea of the meter location for that address. She noted that when a user clicks on the meter symbol on the map, it gives the last reading date and consumption. She mentioned that this feature was specifically helpful for customers that suspect they have a leak because they can look at the prior month’s reading and compare it to the current month. Mr. Tolbert asked what the symbol for the meter was. Ms. Walker replied that the symbol was the letter “m” with a circle around it. Mr. Tolbert stated that it looked very tiny to him. Ms. Walker stated that one could zoom in on the map if necessary. Mr. Tolbert stated that the customer would first have to be able to locate the meter in order to zoom in. He asked if the same symbol that is used on some maps could be used for the meter location.

Mr. O’Connell stated that the same symbol that is used in the GIS system is the one used on the website. Mr. O’Connell stated that he felt it was difficult to see because of the location of the building, but that it should be more prominent with another address. Mr. Lynn added that the particular meter they were looking at is located in the basement of the building, which is another reason why it did not show up well. Ms. Walker stated that the IT staff would look into making the meter symbol more prominent. She stated that the GIS Coordinator developed the application so she was not familiar with its full capabilities. Ms. Swanson asked about those customers behind master meters. Ms. Walker replied that the master meter would show along with all of the service addresses associated with that meter.

Ms. Walker stated that the new Capital Improvement Project (CIP) map was also a popular feature on the website. She stated that it displays projects by district and clicking on an individual project would display the project manager,
the proposed budget, a description of the project, and the areas affected by the
project. She stated that there was also a page dedicated to the Board of
Directors. She noted that there was a link on the page to access each board
packet or individual items digitally.

Ms. Walker stated that Google Analytics now allows the IT staff to track
how many visitors the website receives each day, as well as the most frequently
visited pages on the website. She mentioned that most customers visiting the site
were using e-Pay to pay their bill. She noted that the analytics tool also details
the average length of each visit to the website, as well as new versus returning
visitors. She mentioned that it breaks down visitors by city as well. Ms. Swanson
asked if the staff found it interesting that so many people outside of the ACSA’s
service area were visiting the website. Ms. Walker replied yes, and stated that it
was especially interesting to get people from other countries visiting the site.

Mr. Roberts asked why people not in the jurisdictional area would be
visiting the website. Mr. O’Connell replied that there are some properties that
Google would consider not in the area that actually are. Ms. Walker added that
another reason could be that Google Analytics pulls the city information through
the internet service provider who could have the incorrect information. Mr. Tolbert
asked if the information from Google Analytics was available to anyone or just
the ACSA staff. Ms. Walker replied that it was only available to the ACSA staff.
Mr. Bowling asked if it was possible to find out the individual email address of a
person visiting the website. Ms. Walker replied no. She stated that they could
determine what browser they are using, but not the email address.

Ms. Walker stated that the website was a work in progress. She stated
that if the Board wanted to see anything on the site changed, updated, or added,
to let the staff know. She mentioned that there would be new content coming
soon and the goal was to keep the site fresh and relevant. She stated that she
personally wanted to thank Gary O’Connell for supporting the IT department,
Travis Marrs for supporting her throughout the process, Justin Ray for his work
on the maps, and Danielle Trent for her help with editing the content. Ms.
Sulzberger stated that she wanted to compliment Ms. Walker. She stated that
she accessed the website from two different devices and found it to be very user friendly and easy to navigate, which was a big improvement.

9. Water Quality Presentation (Recording Time: 10:46:05 a.m.)

Mr. O’Connell stated that Mr. Brown would discuss water quality and lead testing, in response to the current water issue in Flint, Michigan and specific questions from the Board. Mr. Brown stated that he wanted to thank Mr. O’Connell for maintaining regular presentations on water quality as water is the number one product the ACSA is delivering to its customers. He stated that he would move through the first half of the Power Point presentation (Attached as Pages____) rather quickly, as most of the Board was familiar with it and that the second half would go over lead testing.

Mr. Brown stated that there were around 400,000 tests done per year on South Rivanna treated water before it is even released from the plant. He stated that many of the parameters are tested continuously, with values being logged every 15 minutes, every day of the year. He noted that tests were done on various things including raw, settled, and finished pH, raw, settled, and finished turbidity, filtered turbidity at multiple filters, settled and finished chlorine, and finished fluoride. He stated that on finished water, testing for an array of metals, minerals and inorganics, and volatile organic compounds occurred annually. He noted that testing for pesticides, herbicides, and radioisotopes is done a little less frequently.

Mr. Brown stated that there was also significant testing that took place once the water was in the ACSA’s system. He stated that many things needed to be monitored between the water leaving South Rivanna and entering the customer’s tap. He stated that coliform bacteria are a general indication of the sanitary conditions of the water supply and the testing for it follows the 1990 EPA Total Coliform Rule. He stated that in the Urban system, there were currently 70 samples taken per month, which is based on the estimated population served. He mentioned that samples are collected by RWSA staff from 23 sites. He mentioned that of the 840 samples taken in 2014 and 2015, there was one positive coliform sample each year, and none in 2013. He noted that those
results were a testament to the quality of the collection by RWSA personnel. He
added that each tap has to be sterilized before collection, and it takes much skill
and care to properly collect a sample.

Mr. Tolbert asked how many of the 23 sample sites were in Albemarle
County and how many were in the City of Charlottesville. Mr. Brown replied that
all 23 were in the ACSA’s jurisdictional area. He noted that the City, in turn, has
to collect 50 samples per month, based on their estimated population as well.
Ms. Swanson asked if the testing for coliform bacteria was rapid testing, as
opposed to older methods. Mr. Brown replied that testing was done in the RWSA
lab, with results yielded in 24 hours. He mentioned that there are multiple
methods now that are much quicker than the older methods such as agar plating.
Ms. Swanson asked if the test was a DNA or RNA type of test and how presence
of bacteria was determined. Dr. Gullick replied that it was not a DNA or RNA test.
He stated that they used the Colisure method, which is a standard, certified
method. He mentioned that there are faster methods available but they are not
certified. He added that it would be bad to get a false negative on a test, but that
they did not want a false positive either. Mr. Brown stated that with the method
used, if bacteria are present and there is growth, the metabolism will result in a
color change. He stated that in the case of the few positive test results recorded,
repeat sampling at the site was performed as well as upstream and downstream
of the site, all of which were negative.

Mr. Kittrell asked where the samples were taken in the system. Mr. Brown
replied that they were scattered with the intent to be in every pressure band
within the system, but that they would be changing as of April 1, 2016 as part of
the EPA Revised Total Coliform Rule (RTCR). He stated that the Virginia
Department of Health (VDH) approved them to be scattered throughout the
distribution system. He noted that there had been some clustering of sample
sites that needed to be addressed and an attempt is being made to have more
sample sites within the neighborhoods and subdivisions as opposed to the main
distribution lines.

Mr. Brown stated that the ACSA is working closely with RWSA to finalize
the Bacteriological Sample Siting Plans to deliver to the VDH. He stated that the
plans called for 20 sampling sites, four times a month, with nine of the sites being new. He stated that four of the nine new sites would involve sampling stations positioned in key neighborhoods including Ashcroft, Key West, Redfields, and Ivy Oaks. He stated that the RTCR places a greater focus on assessing sanitary defects when there are total coliform exceedances and follow-up corrective action. He mentioned that the sampling stations would consist of a device approximately the size of a fire hydrant with a brass fixture that can be sterilized like any other tap. He noted that four would be installed in the Urban area and one in Crozet by ACSA maintenance staff in the next few weeks. Mr. Tolbert asked if the sampling stations would be green like the one in the picture. Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Tolbert stated that since they are about the size of a fire hydrant, they should not be red or yellow so as to distinguish them from fire hydrants.

Mr. Brown stated that the reason for the sampling stations was to get into the neighborhoods were the ACSA customers are and where there are few or no commercial facilities. He stated that ACSA staff was looking to avoid using households to take samples as they did not typically ask to enter a customer’s private residence. He noted that this meant using an outside tap and there are multiple problems associated with that such as not being able to access the tap, sterilizing the tap, or contamination from rainwater.

Ms. Swanson asked if there had ever been an effort to connect a sampling station to a fire hydrant. Mr. Brown replied that coliform samples can be collected from a hydrant. He stated that David Tungate, Water Manager at RWSA, indicated that his previous employer regularly collected samples from fire hydrants. He noted that they could be disinfected but, in his opinion, that presented an even greater challenge. He stated that the purchase of the sampling stations would be well worth the money spent as opposed to attempting to collect a sterile sample from a fire hydrant.

Mr. Brown stated that the ACSA had probably not made more improvement in any area of testing than that of residual chlorine testing. He stated that in the past two years, thanks to the efforts of Rich Gullick and Alex Morrison with the ACSA, there has been greater data accuracy based on longer
flush times within a commercial facility, greater testing frequency, better
coverage throughout the system, better knowledge of seasonal variations, and
better knowledge of variations within the same season. He noted that chlorine
was tested regularly at the same sites used for coliform bacteria testing and
issues with chlorine in Crozet and Scottsville, as well as a few Urban areas, have
been addressed. He mentioned that chlorine data was now being added to the
GIS system with any hydrant visit and automatic flushers have been used at six
locations.

Mr. Brown stated that disinfection by-products are chemicals that can form
when there is an interaction between the added disinfectant, chlorine, and the
organic carbon in the source water. He noted that these chemicals were the
primary stimulus for the Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) upgrade at the
treatment plants. He mentioned that there is a direct correlation between some
disinfection by-products and water age. He stated that there were currently eight
testing sites, with many of those sites located at the fringes of the ACSA system,
and that testing was done on a quarterly basis. He added that the staff tracked
what is called a locational running annual average, and that all sites are in
compliance.

Mr. Brown stated that with regards to lead and copper testing, the Lead
and Copper Rule, which is a mandate for the ACSA, states that its purpose is to
protect public health by minimizing lead and copper levels primarily through
reducing water corrosivity. He stated that the rule is very extensive, calling for
testing in homes and buildings, installing corrosion control treatment at the
plants, regular testing of other water quality parameters at the plant and in the
distribution system, replacing lead service lines, and public education. He noted
that test results go to the owner of the site where the sample is collected and
every customer can get information about lead in the annual water quality report.

Mr. Brown stated that the Lead and Copper Rule varies from other
aspects of water quality in that it established what is called an Action Level (AL)
for lead and copper. He noted that an AL is not the same as the maximum
contaminant level set for all other parameters. He stated that there is an AL of
15 ppb for lead and 1.3 ppm for copper. He mentioned that for each round of
testing, the action levels cannot be exceeded by 90% of the sample sites. He stated that this meant 10% of the sample sites could exceed these AL’s and still be in compliance.

Mr. Brown stated that the Lead and Copper Rule was also unlike any other drinking water provision in that the supplier is responsible for the quality of water that flows through plumbing out of its control. He stated that “first-draw” water samples are collected by the resident, not trained water supply personnel. He noted that there had been several revisions to the rule in the last 25 years, with the most recent one being in 2007. He added that water suppliers must obtain approval from the VDH prior to adding a new water source or altering a process such as treatment.

Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Kittrell had asked about the sample site selection process earlier in his presentation. He stated that in Virginia, there is a tier system. He stated that Tier 1 includes single family residences that have lead service lines, lead pipes, or copper pipes installed between January 1983 and April 1986. He stated that Tier 2 was the same as Tier 1 except it involved multi-family residences. He mentioned that Tier 3 includes single family residences with copper pipes installed in 1982 or earlier. He noted that there were no institutions including schools in the three tiers, and that a water supplier is to continue using the same sites unless the copper or lead pipes have been removed.

Mr. Kittrell asked if the same 30 sites have been used for lead and copper testing over the years. Mr. Brown replied yes and stated that using the same sites was a VDH requirement. He stated that many of the sampling sites go back to the 1990’s and early 2000’s. He mentioned that every time a sample has to be taken, the current homeowner has to be contacted. He stated that if there has been a change in the homeowner, they may or may not wish to participate. He noted that, in some cases, the ACSA has been turned down by continued participation by the same homeowner. He stated that the other key issue was whether or not there had been any significant changes in the plumbing.

Mr. Tolbert asked what the original selection of the sampling sites was based upon. Mr. Brown stated that it was long before his time at the ACSA.
stated that the tier system was used, and the intent was to include as many of
the representative neighborhoods as possible. He noted that in some cases there
are two or three sample sites within the same subdivision. Mr. Tolbert stated that
it would be interesting to see a map of the distribution of the sample sites. Mr.
Kittrell stated that he would question how well the ACSA knows its system given
that the same sites have been sampled for over 25 years. Mr. Brown replied that
the VDH requires that the sampling sites remain the same. Mr. Kittrell stated that
additional samples could be taken outside of the required sampling sites.

Mr. Brown next went over the logistics of lead and copper testing. He
stated that the sampler gets a one liter sample bottle with detailed instructions.
He stated that the water should sit unused in the plumbing for at least six hours
according to VDH guidelines. The sampler would then collect a “first-draw”
sample, which would result in the potential highest concentration of lead and
copper. He stated that the sampler would record the date and time of last water
use and the date and time of the sample collection and leave the sample outside
for the ACSA to collect. He noted that the sample is then sent to the RWSA lab,
which is state-certified to test for lead and copper. He mentioned that an area of
variability with the testing is that the customer is asked to collect the sample, and
they could make mistakes that would yield false results such as using the
bathroom in the middle of the night.

Mr. Brown stated that as Mr. Kittrell mentioned earlier, 30 samples were
required for the Urban area, with 20 being taken in Crozet, 10 in Scottsville, and
5 in Red Hill. He stated that all of the required sampling numbers were reduced
by half based on historically low results. He stated that triennial collection began
in 2001 and since that time, there have been 290 samples collected from all
ACSA systems with no sample being greater than 15 ppb for lead.

Mr. Bowling asked if he was correct in stating that the sample sites were
originally picked because they were areas known to have lead and copper pipes.
Mr. Brown replied yes. Mr. Bowling stated that the ACSA did not have control
over a customer’s personal service line. Mr. Brown concurred and stated that the
ACSA’s control was only up to the meter. Mr. Lynn stated that over the years,
the ACSA staff has replaced the lead gooseneck fittings in the system and they
were confident that there were not any left between the water main and the
copper setter. He stated that the last known water line that contained lead
packing was in Crozet, but that the Jarmans Gap Road Project eliminated that.
He mentioned that there was one area that may still contain lead, which is a
section of water line next to Buckingham Circle that the ACSA staff cannot
access.

Mr. Brown stated that if 1 out of 20 tests is over the threshold, that means
that 19 out of 20 are not, indicating that there is not a system-wide issue with
corrosion. He stated that the ACSA staff did not have knowledge of the
customer’s private plumbing past the meter but, with no sample being over 15
ppb since 2001, corrosion control, distribution line composition, and water quality
at the meter were clearly very good. He mentioned that even those homes that
still had lead and copper pipes were not showing any significant release of lead
from the internal plumbing.

Mr. Kittrell asked about the copper testing results. Mr. Brown replied that
there had been a couple of copper exceedances. He stated that at one house in
Red Hill, a first sampling barely exceeded the 1.3 ppm copper limit. He stated
that a corrosion inhibitor was added to the water treatment and continued testing
has shown decreased copper levels each of the five times testing was performed
since 2009. He mentioned that the second time testing was done, he performed
a “first-draw” test and another test after a two minute flush. He noted that the
copper levels came down 75% to 85% for both lead and copper after the two
minute flush.

Mr. Brown stated that not only had the lead test results not been over 15
ppb since 2001, 95% of the samples from the last round of testing were less than
the lab reporting limit of about 2.5 ppb. He mentioned that the lab was confident
that anything over 2.5 ppb was a real number in terms of lead content. Mr. Kittrell
asked if the same percentage of samples were below the lab reporting limit going
back to 2001 when the sampling first began. Mr. Brown replied that Dr. Gullick
prepared a detailed report of all numbers, including the City, and it was along the
lines of more than half of the samples were found to be under the reporting limit.
Mr. Kittrell asked if the Board could receive a copy of that report. Mr. Brown replied yes.

Mr. Tolbert referred back to the customer in Red Hill whose copper levels decreased after flushing for two minutes. He asked what happened if that customer’s neighbor, who was likely to have the same issue, did not flush their water every day before using it because they were not aware that there was an issue. Mr. Brown replied that in Red Hill there were eight private residences and an elementary school. He stated that one sample from each house and two from the school are taken during testing, so the ACSA is aware of the lead and copper levels of each customer in Red Hill. Mr. Tolbert asked if the ACSA notified every house or just those with an issue. Mr. Brown replied that there has not been a need to notify as there has not been a household over the threshold since 2001. He reminded the Board that up to 10% of the samples could be over the threshold and the ACSA would still be in compliance.

Mr. Brown stated that due to the issues in Flint, Michigan, his guess was that there would be some changes to the Lead and Copper Rule, such as a more detailed assessment of all customers, a greater emphasis on the ACSA to remove any remaining lead in the distribution system, a greater number and frequency of samples collected, possible sample collecting by the water supplier as opposed to the customer, and a lowering of the Action Level because there is no safe lead level determined for pregnant women and young children.

Mr. Tolbert asked how much the lead and copper tests cost. Mr. Brown replied that a private lab will charge anywhere from $18 to $50 for lead and copper combined. Mr. Tolbert stated that if the ACSA wanted to double the number of sampling sites, it was not a big cost. Mr. O’Connell stated that it would be an issue of labor more so than the cost of the test. Mr. Tolbert stated that the homeowner would be collecting the sample and the ACSA staff would pick up the samples. Mr. O’Connell stated that when doing something like that, it was good to think about what changes the regulators may be making. He stated that he has a meeting with a representative from the VDH tomorrow, and their focus was on the City as it was an older system. Mr. Tolbert stated that he understood nothing should be done until the changes were made, but he felt that it would be
better for the system if there was some random testing in addition to the original 30 sites.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was some type of filter that could be bought for drinking water. Mr. Brown replied yes. He stated that the Brita and Pur water filters can be effective for lead. Mr. Kittrell stated that he did not think there was any problem with the quality of the water in the ACSA distribution system. He stated that his focus was not on the regulations, but rather ensuring that there continued to be good, safe drinking water for ACSA customers. He stated that he was thinking about additional sampling that could be done, whether it is random or in a stratified random manner where specific areas are looked at, such as Buckingham Circle. Mr. Lynn stated that he wanted to make a clarification with regards to Buckingham Circle. He stated that all water lines have been replaced in that area. He stated that the water line that he referred to earlier in the meeting is located adjacent to the entrance to Buckingham Circle, but is not connected to Buckingham Circle.

Mr. Kittrell stated that the issue in Flint, Michigan was not an isolated situation because it happened in Washington, D.C. He stated that he wanted to make sure that there was good, quality water in the older neighborhoods and homes, as well as other places too. Mr. O'Connell stated that the ACSA wanted to be in a position that it can back up its claims of safe water with solid information. Mr. Kittrell added that most customers do not know that they should flush the water from the system before they use it, and perhaps some type of educational program for them would be helpful.

Ms. Swanson stated that as the materials that go into the water system are improved and there is a standardization of materials, the ACSA should not have to worry about the newer developments because the materials they are using should be lead free. Mr. Gorham stated that some brass fixtures still contained a small amount of lead. He stated that after January 1, 2014, those were no longer allowed to be installed.

10. Update on the Vulnerability Assessment (Emergency Planning) Project
(Recording Time: 11:38:20 a.m.)
Mr. Lynn stated that he wanted to give the Board a quick update on the status of the Vulnerability Assessment Project. He stated that five proposals were received for the project from Tectonics, O’Brien & Gere, WRA/Baker, ABS Consulting, and Launch Consulting. He stated that on January 6, 2016, representatives from the ACSA, RWSA, City of Charlottesville, and UVA met at the ACSA Operations Center and interviewed three of the consulting firms. He stated that, through a unanimous decision, Launch Consulting was chosen.

Mr. Lynn stated that each entity will develop their own individual scope of work with Launch Consulting as each will have different criteria and items that are important to them. He stated that Linda Warren, the CEO of Launch Consulting, is a local resident and a customer of the ACSA. He mentioned that she has a personal interest in the integrity of the water system as it provides water for her and her family. Mr. O’Connell added that Ms. Warren had also done some work with the ACSA on the strategic plan.

Mr. Lynn stated that on February 10, 2016, he met with Ms. Warren to discuss a draft for the ACSA’s scope of work. He stated that he has spoken with the Albemarle County Police Department, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue, Kirby Felts, the Emergency Management Coordinator, and the local health department. He mentioned that the ACSA would be utilizing them in the project to get their perspective and to provide additional insight. He stated that he was not sure about the City’s plan, but that RWSA is looking into having a discussion with the local police and fire department as well. Mr. Lynn stated that this project is an opportunity for all entities involved to communicate more.

11. Items Not on the Agenda (Recording Time: 11:42:28 a.m.)

Mr. O’Connell stated that the staff reviewed all the job descriptions as a result of a Board request to make some changes to the years of experience sections. He stated that the staff found a few other areas that needed to be changed and those changes were made as well.

12. Executive Session (Recording Time: Due to Executive Session, no recording was conducted during this time period.)
Ms. Trent read a Resolution to enter into Executive Session pursuant to Virginia Code §2.2-3711 A (7) to consult with legal counsel and staff regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice (Attached as Page ____).

Mr. Kittrell moved to approve the Resolution as presented to the Board, seconded by Mr. Tolbert. The Chair asked for a roll-call vote: Ms. Swanson, aye; Mr. Armstrong, aye; Mr. Roberts, aye; Mr. Tolbert, aye; Ms. Sulzberger, aye; Mr. Kittrell, aye.

The Board of Directors came back into regular session. Ms. Shifflett read into record a Resolution stating that only matters so previously stated and exempted from open discussion in regular session were discussed in Executive Session (Attached as Page _____).

Mr. Tolbert moved to approve the Resolution as presented to the Board, seconded by Ms. Sulzberger. The Chair asked for a roll-call vote: Ms. Swanson, aye; Mr. Armstrong, aye; Mr. Roberts, aye; Mr. Tolbert, aye; Ms. Sulzberger, aye; Mr. Kittrell, aye.

13. Adjourn (Recording Time: 12:27:38 a.m.)

There being no further business, Mr. Tolbert moved that the meeting be adjourned, seconded by Mr. Armstrong. All members voted aye.

Gary B. O'Connell, Secretary-Treasurer