

**Planning and Coordination Council Quarterly Meeting**  
**May 21, 2009; 2:00 p.m.**  
**Room 241, Albemarle County Office Building at McIntire Road**

**Council Members in Attendance:** Ken Boyd, David Norris, Gary O'Connell, Dennis Rooker, Leonard Sandridge, Colette Sheehy, Bob Tucker

**Also in Attendance:** Tom Foley, Bryan Elliott, Wayne Cilimberg, Bill Letteri, Ron White. Also at the meeting: League of Women Voters representative, Neighborhood Representatives, Members from the Public, Media Representatives

**1. Call to Order – Ken Boyd**

Mr. Boyd called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

**2. Approval of February 19, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

A motion to approve minutes of the February 19, 2009 meeting was made by Mr. Rooker and seconded by Mr. Tucker. Motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Boyd introduced Steve Williams, newly appointed Executive Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, to PACC.

**3. Presentation: Airport Master Plan – Barbara Hutchinson**

Ms. Hutchinson provided the following background information on the Airport. The Airport was initially planned by the City and the County in the 1940s with construction starting in the 1950s using funds from an FAA grant. Airport service began in 1955 with Piedmont Airlines. In 1960, the FAA issued a grant to construct the first terminal building as the Airport received a second airline, American Eagle. The runway was extended to 6,001 feet in 1966. In 1974, the air traffic control tower was added. In 1989, the existing terminal building construction started. The old terminal was renovated to serve as an aircraft rescue and firefighting station. In 1991, the new terminal was completed and in 2003, the current Master Plan update was completed. The Airport became an Airport Authority in 1983 when the City and County voted to create the Authority and deeded the Airport to the Authority. The City Manager and County Executive are two perpetual members of the Airport Authority Board. The Airport Authority Board is currently a political subdivision of the State and operates as an enterprise fund. Primary sources of revenue include parking, airline rates and charges, and the fees paid by rental cars. There is a residual airline agreement that pre-sets net income and, over the years, the FAA and the State have invested approximately \$65 million in the Airport. The Airport receives no funding from the community.

Mr. Rooker asked what a residual airline agreement with pre-set net income meant. Ms. Hutchinson explained that the Airport makes \$178,000 per year. When the terminal was built and the current parking lot system constructed, the Airport entered into an agreement whereby the airlines agreed to underwrite the Airport's debt service. The Airport sets the budget and the airlines' rates and charges cover all expenses each year including debt service. The Airport is permitted to increase rates and charges to collect the additional \$178,000 that goes into a reserve fund by which the Airport can purchase capital items that do not qualify for grant money. If there is any overage at the end of the fiscal year, that money is returned to the airlines. If there is a deficit, the airlines must make up the deficit and this is true until all debt service is paid off. There are approximately four more years of debt service.

Mr. Norris asked about the Airport's operating budget. Ms. Hutchinson said, including debt service, it is approximately \$4.2 million.

Ms. Hutchinson explained that the Airport has completed Phase I (2003-2007) of its Master Plan Projects including construction of the south runway safety area, which is vital to the future of the airport. A

conventional hangar has been constructed through a partnership with private industry. The Airport Development Environmental Assessment has been completed. Additional overflow parking has been added, and a new firefighting vehicle has been purchased. The Airport is currently in the process of relocating an improved electrical vault to the west side of the Airport and in the process of designing a snow removal equipment storage building that will be located on the west side of the Airport.

Phase II (2008-2012) of the Master Plan will include replacing the snow removal vehicle; construction of a multi-level parking deck; development of a new environmental assessment for the ten-year phase of the Master Plan, construction of a new maintenance hangar, relocation of the fuel farm and construction of the de-icing containment system.

Phase III will involve working with private industry to construct a general aviation apron which will provide parking for aircraft; however, a proposal from a private firm to initiate construction of a hangar on the west side has been received so that could pre-empt this project being in the ten-year period and potentially move it to the current period. Overlaying the runway is another project in the last ten year period along with installation of west side utilities and wetland mitigation. Constructing an access road and parking on the west side, relocating the weather observation system, and aircraft parking and terminal rehabilitation would also fall into Phase III. The baggage claims system is reaching its useful life and will have to be replaced at some point.

In 2003, the Master Plan was updated and the runway extension project effort was initiated. In 2004, the Master Plan was accepted by the FAA and the State, and was then adopted by the County as part of its Comprehensive Plan. A benefit cost analysis of the runway extension was provided to the FAA at that same time. The environmental assessment commenced in 2005 and included not only the runway extension, but also the west side access road, a snow removal building and construction of a new section of perimeter road. In January, 2008, after a series of public hearings, the DEQ approved the environmental assessment and the FAA issued a finding of no significant impact. At that same time, the State issued a new license that would allow for and recognize the runway extension. Due to some additional State funding that became available, the Airport put forth a project, Phase IA, related to wetlands mitigation, and that has been completed. This project relocated the Airport's internal gravel road and helped construct erosion and sediment control measures, which in turn, will reduce stormwater runoff by 50%.

In terms of the Master Plan, the preliminary engineering for the runway extension project has been completed and construction was to begin in December 2008; however, the fill required for that project, not only for the runway extension, but for the safety area that extends 1,000 feet from the end of the runway, is still an issue. The Airport is working on finalizing the new five year capital improvement plan with the FAA and the State which will primarily focus on the runway extension and relocation of the snow removal equipment building.

Mr. Rooker asked about the length of the runway extension and a completion date. Ms. Hutchinson said the FAA has approved an 800 foot extension, which will serve the Airport well into the future. If the FAA is able to free up additional federal aviation discretionary funds, it is hoped that, in the next three years, the extension could be finished and would be used for taking off, but couldn't be used for landing until the parallel taxi-way and the extended safety area is complete. Without any further funding from the FAA than what is currently available, it is projected to take five to six years or even more to complete. Ms. Hutchinson concluded that identifying onsite fill material will reduce the project estimate.

Mr. Boyd asked about taxi fares to/from the airport. Ms. Hutchinson said the Airport does not have the legal authority to regulate fares. The only way fares could be regulated would be if the County undertook that. The Airport does have the right to establish rules and regulations that taxis must follow. Signs are posted making passengers aware that the Airport cannot regulate fares and passengers are encouraged to inquire about fares prior to entering a taxi. Ms. Hutchinson said the Airport is currently investigating a "preferred provider" system whereby cab drivers would agree to establish rates that would be set for the contract term.

Mr. O'Connell asked about the service issue at the Airport. Ms. Hutchinson said, under the new "preferred provider" plan, there would be minimum times established that the Airport would have to be

served by the cab drivers receiving permits. She said the Airport recently issued a short renewal to the cab companies. In the meantime, the Airport is working with the Airport Commission to determine if a "preferred provider" system should be considered. In order to receive a permit, the fares have to be posted for a 12-month period which should eliminate the high fees. Cab drivers would also be required to post a schedule so that there are enough drivers at the Airport for Saturday and Sunday evenings as well.

Mr. Boyd asked about an ordinance which would establish fare regulations. Ms. Hutchinson said the Airport would like to try alternatives first, including procedures utilized at other state airports. If this effort deems not to be successful, the Airport would be interested in approaching the governing authorities to investigate other options.

Mr. Norris asked about public transportation to/from the Airport. Ms. Hutchinson said the Airport has, in the past, tried shuttle service, and that was not successful. The Airport remains very interested in what will come about with the Regional Transit Authority. She added that, based on other airports' experiences, most corporate and/or leisure travelers would not utilize a bus to the Airport since a bus would have to be modified to handle luggage, baby carriers, etc. Also, a bus would not be point-to-point.

Mr. O'Connell asked about parking revenues at the Airport. Ms. Hutchinson said parking is the Airport's main source of revenue. Last year, \$1.6 million was budgeted in parking revenue; \$1.4 million for this year. If passenger traffic is down 8-10% for a month, parking revenue goes down 20%. With all the new fees imposed by the airlines, people are being more creative in finding ways to save money, perhaps relying more on friends and/or family to bring them to the airport.

Mr. Boyd thanked Ms. Hutchinson for her report.

While waiting for the Solid Waste presentation to begin, Mr. Rooker suggested PACC discuss a recent rezoning request by the University's Real Estate Foundation as it relates to the Fontaine Research Park. Mr. Rooker said he invited David Benish to comment on the County's Comprehensive Plan regarding transportation features in that area to ensure that the alignment is properly preserved for the Fontaine connector, particularly as the properties develop and how the railroad track will be crossed.

Mr. Sandridge said that the University's commitment to the Fontaine connector road is to cover the cost of the road to the edge of their property. He added that the University does not intend to cover the cost of crossing the railroad track.

Mr. Rooker said the County's Comprehensive Plan includes language that would ensure transportation facilities in that area are not overwhelmed by the increase in square footage for the two rezonings that are contemplated. He suggested PACC defer discussion until the end of the meeting, at which time Mr. Benish will provide copies of that section of the Comprehensive Plan.

#### **4. Update: Rivanna Solid Waste Authority Strategic Plan – Tom Frederick**

Mr. Frederick said a number of months ago, a series of public meetings on recycling were held. There was strong sentiment at those meetings to increase recycling in the area. He pointed out that examples from other communities show if recycling were more convenient, more people would participate. One way in which convenience can be achieved is through more curbside recycling services. The City provides curbside service to all of its single family citizens now. In the County, recycling is left to private haulers. He added that single stream convenience would be a big step toward increasing recycling; however, single stream recycling requires more processing and there is more cost associated with that convenience. Better access to convenience centers in rural areas was another suggestion. A concept that has caught on nationwide in urban areas is a "pay as you throw" program whereby everyone receives trash collection and recycling services curbside. The cost of this service is based on how much trash is generated.

Mr. Norris asked about single streaming all household waste. Mr. Frederick said very advanced models have collection of three items (trash, recyclables and food waste). At almost 100% recovery, food waste is converted to compost, recyclable materials are graded, sorted and sent to recycling markets. The

remainder is burned in an incinerator which creates electricity. What is taken to the landfill is the ash generated from the incinerator.

Mr. Tucker said volume would be necessary to make single streaming work. Mr. Frederick agreed that volume is important to the economies-of-scale of a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) that processes recyclable material. He explained that incinerators do not work very well unless they are continuously fed, so it's important to determine how much volume is anticipated. Incinerators are expandable but if an incinerator is too big and can't be fed continuously, it becomes very inefficient.

Mr. Rooker asked about single bin trash. Mr. Frederick said a special type of MRF referred to colloquially as a "dirty MRF" includes a leachate collection system and can process all solid waste into three major categories. Trash is incinerated, food waste is composted, and recyclable material is further sorted for recycling markets. Because recyclable paper in this system is mixed with food waste in the single bin, the paper is usually of lower grade and does not generate the revenue in recycling markets that clean paper does.

Mr. O'Connell asked how the advanced model collection is different from the City's curbside collection. Mr. Frederick said the City is not separating food waste out at the present time. The City sells tags for trash bags which is similar to the "pay as you throw" service in the sense that those who throw out more trash pay more. Mr. Frederick said expanded curbside service offering more recycling at the curb is something the County could consider, which would improve recycling, but a proper and convenient transfer or processing facility is a prerequisite to serving those interests.

Mr. Frederick brought up the idea of a new transfer station. He said transfer stations provide a location where people can bring their own trash and recyclables, or where private haulers can bring their trash and recyclables and have them processed. There are a few MRFs nearby, all of which do receive single-stream recycling material from a transfer station. They all do the processing/sorting/separating out into the grades that then go to remanufacturing facilities.

Mr. Norris asked if a MRF is capable of taking household trash in addition to single stream recycling. Mr. Frederick said a "dirty MRF" can process trash. He added that it would be difficult to start up a publicly-owned MRF without some certainty of volume. Some communities have established flow control ordinances requiring all material generated within that jurisdictional boundary go to one facility. The volume must be sufficient to make the financing work.

Mr. Norris asked if there is a commitment to sustain a private MRF and how that works. Mr. Frederick said, in considering a contract with a private facility, some issues would include a determination on length of contract, at what price and how that price would float with the market. Another consideration would be if the private facility decides they want to exit the business at any given time and how the localities would respond.

Mr. Frederick said, from RSWA's perspective, changes will have to occur if the Authority is going to succeed. Private transfer stations make a return on their investment. Public transfer stations can also be sustainable economically if it is set up and operated so that its fees do not have the added burden of supporting free public programs. As an example, household hazard waste special collections is a free public service program that is very popular in this area. RSWA is the only agency in this area that is providing special household hazard waste collection events, yet, cost averages approximately \$40 to \$42 per car. If it becomes a fee-based program, he is concerned that participation would drop off.

Mr. Frederick said he sees two primary options for RSWA. RSWA could exit the business and trash collection would become the responsibility of the City and the County. The second option would be to build a modern transfer station to replace the existing operation, which is at the end of its useful life. The modern transfer station model that RSWA is suggesting would include the receipt of three types of waste: trash, single stream recycling, and construction/demolition debris. Trash would be compacted and transferred to a private landfill. Single stream would be transferred to a private MRF, and construction/demolition debris would be transferred to a private MRF receiving this type of material. The private haulers in this community would be more likely to offer greater recycling programs to their customers if there is a convenient place to receive single stream material. Under that same model,

RSWA would operate the transfer station on a business model, which means tipping fees would be charged and RSWA would not depend on government subsidies to operate.

Mr. O'Connell asked Mr. Frederick to share with PACC the free programs currently being offered. Mr. Frederick said RSWA currently offers the following free programs: household hazard waste program, McIntire Recycling Center, the paper sort facility, a paint exchange program, and other services at the Ivy Convenience Center, as well as the "Encore Shop" which provides an opportunity for re-use of material in good condition from the trash ("trash to reassure" similar to programs by non-profit groups such as Habitat for Humanity). Mr. Tucker asked if Rivanna would contract with a private entity to run free programs rather than running it themselves. Mr. Frederick said those programs could be operated directly by the Authority or they could be contracted and run by a private company. What is important is the revenue to operate free programs would come through local government and not depend on tipping fee revenue. Furthermore, local governments would not be obligated to agree to fund the free programs. Those unsupported, free programs would be terminated.

Mr. Frederick pointed out that the current transfer station is not sustainable. It is not an ideal operation under current conditions and it will never, in its current set up, be competitive. RSWA believes the nature of the infrastructure needs to be changed if they are to continue to provide transfer station operations. Mr. Frederick showed slides of the current transfer station and described how difficult it is to operate when it is raining or when the compactor breaks down. He then showed slides of a modern transfer station similar to what RSWA would recommend. The modern facility operates under roof, and with an operation that is enclosed, labor costs come down, providing overall efficiencies in operation and maintenance. Designed, developed and operated properly, a modern transfer station can be self-supporting. He said the best place for a modern transfer station in Albemarle County is the existing Ivy site because the site is already permitted and has been used for that purpose for a number of years.

Mr. Frederick said, in conclusion, the equipment currently operating at the transfer station is requiring a lot more lubrication, an indication that the equipment is getting close to significant failure. He said it is likely that RSWA may find it necessary to recommend the Ivy Transfer Station be permanently closed if some decisions are not made soon.

Mr. Rooker asked about options for people who are presently using the Ivy facility. Mr. Frederick said there are two private facilities in the region, both at Zion Crossroads, and a public facility in Greene County, however, that facility will only take waste from within Greene County.

Ms. Sheehy asked about the cost of a new transfer facility. Mr. Frederick said a facility that could handle 250 to 300 tons was estimated in 2008 to cost \$3.7 million, which includes professional services, financing costs, etc. He added that a facility that large is probably not necessary at the present time, however, it should be built with the idea that it is expandable if that becomes necessary.

Mr. Boyd said the best way to make it work would be if we have a commitment from the City, the County and the University. Mr. Rooker agreed. Mr. Frederick said, during the public meetings for the strategic plan, it was suggested by RSWA's consultant that if there were a commitment from all three entities for curbside single stream in the urban area, a public MRF could be a sustainable model. The consultants also stated that a public MRF could pay for itself and, when the market is good, could even generate a profit. Since those public meetings, Mr. Frederick pointed out that a private MRF has been constructed at Zion Crossroads, and accordingly, RSWA is not recommending a public MRF be constructed in the near term.

Mr. Rooker said the consultants stated if there was a commitment from the City, County and University through a single pick-up company or even divided regionally between the two, that a company could be engaged to provide curbside pick-up of trash and recyclables separated into two or three streams for less than is being paid by the typical county resident for pickup today. But it would require a regional decision to select one or two carriers to move forward with that idea.

Mr. Frederick said since the City already has its own operation through one contract, this discussion would be related primarily to the County. If there is interest from the County in moving toward a bid to

have a single hauler required to pick up all of the material in the urban area, then that could come into play.

Mr. Boyd said the County could require all haulers who pick-up in the County to provide curbside recycling, which seems like a model that would make sense for the transfer station.

Mr. O'Connell asked about the Authority's continuing efforts and cost of remediation at the Ivy Landfill. Mr. Frederick said the bio-remediation at the Ivy Landfill site is going very well. The Authority is under a legal obligation to continue to provide remediation for several more years. This year, the Authority spent over \$2 million due to the installation of a new leachate collection system. Next year, the cost drops to approximately \$600,000.

Mr. Boyd asked if there was interest in developing a proposal for a new transfer station. Mr. Rooker said it makes sense to look at that as an option. Mr. Boyd thanked Mr. Frederick for his report.

At the conclusion of the Solid Waste report, Mr. Rooker asked David Benish to speak to PACC on the County's Comprehensive Plan expectations for the additional development on Fontaine and the Granger Property.

Mr. Benish passed out copies of the land use plan profile for Neighborhood Six, the area which includes Fontaine Research Park. As part of the Southern Area B study, Mr. Benish said a number of recommendations were incorporated into the County's Comprehensive Plan. In short, those recommendations would ensure that the roads serving the area would operate at an adequate level to serve any expansion of the Fontaine Research Park (or development of the "Granger" property development) and that the Fontaine-Sunset Connector Road is provided for with the expansion of the Park.

Mr. Rooker said the Board of Supervisors recently learned that a rezoning application has been filed by the University. Since PACC only meets quarterly, he thought it might be helpful to get some determination on the expectations and timing factors as the Board evaluates the application.

Mr. Sandridge said the University is committed to constructing the road, which would be an extension of the Stribling Avenue connector, as it relates to Fontaine's property, to state specifications, but only to the edge of the property.

Mr. Benish added that one of the challenges for staff is to make sure that the alignment, either on Granger or Fontaine Research Park, is one that can be utilized as the other side of the property is developed.

Mr. Sandridge said the University understands the County's responsibility and wants to be very clear in what the University is committed to doing and is prepared to deliver. He added that it is a very difficult alignment and will most likely be a very costly alignment.

Mr. Tucker asked that any items for future PACC meetings be sent to him via e-mail.

There being no further business, Mr. Boyd adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Mullins