

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
DECEMBER 11, 2003**

**Members/Alternates Present**

Angela L. LaCombe (M), Chairman..... Town of Ashland  
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M), Vice Chairman..... County of Hanover  
Roy J. Harrison, Jr. (M), Treasurer..... County of Powhatan  
Malvern R. Butler (M), Secretary..... County of Goochland  
Richard W. Ayers (M) ..... County of Powhatan  
Gentry Bell (M) ..... County of Henrico  
W. R. Britton , Jr. (A) ..... County of Charles City  
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico  
Russell J. Gulley (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Harvey L. Hinson (A) ..... County of Henrico  
Michael L. Holmes (M) ..... County of Charles City  
E. Ray Jernigan (M)..... County of Henrico  
David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico  
Joseph T. Lacy, Jr. (M)..... County of Goochland  
Kelly E. Miller (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Rebecca M. Ringley (M) ..... County of New Kent  
George K. Roarty (M)..... County of Chesterfield  
James T. Taylor (A)..... County of Goochland

**Members Absent**

Edward B. Barber (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Mark S. Daniel (M)..... County of New Kent  
John G. Dankos, Jr. (M)..... County of Hanover  
James B. Donati (M)..... County of Henrico  
Renny B. Humphrey (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
William Russell Jones, III (M) ..... City of Richmond  
John L. McHale, III (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Delores L. McQuinn (M)..... City of Richmond  
Patricia S. O'Bannon (M) ..... County of Henrico  
William J. Pantele (M)..... City of Richmond  
Robert R. Setliff (M)..... County of Hanover  
Frank J. Thornton (M) ..... County of Henrico  
J. T. "Jack" Ward (M)..... County of Hanover  
Arthur S. Warren (M) ..... County of Chesterfield

**Others Present**

John R. Amos.....RRPDC Legal Counsel (Amos & Amos PLLC)  
Floyd H. Miles, Sr. .... Virginia House of Delegates  
Glenn Larson ..... County of Chesterfield  
Stran Trout .....County of New Kent  
John Trivellin..... County of Hanover

**Staff Present**

Paul E. Fisher .....Executive Director  
Katherine E. Barrett ..... Executive Secretary  
Jo A. Evans ..... Assistant Executive Director  
Daniel N. Lysy.....Director of Transportation  
Jackie S. Stewart.....Director of Planning & Information Systems  
Peter M. Sweetland .....Finance and Contracts Administrator  
Patricia A. Villa ..... Communications Coordinator

**Call to Order**

Chairman Angela LaCombe called the regularly scheduled December 11, 2003 meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. in the RRPDC conference room.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

**A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum**

Mr. Fisher certified that a majority of the voting members/alternates (15) were present to constitute a quorum.

**A. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business**

There were no requests for additions or changes in the order of business.

**B. Approval of Minutes of October 9, 2003 RRPDC Meeting**

Mr. Butler presented the minutes of the October 9, 2003 meeting. There being no corrections or additions, on motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Hinson, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the October 9, 2003 meeting.

**C. Open Public Comment Period**

There were no requests to address the Commission at this time and Chairman LaCombe closed the public comment period.

**D. Approval of September 2003 Financial Report**

Mr. Harrison presented the financial report for September 2003. There being no corrections, on motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Ms. Ringley, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously accepted for audit the financial report for September 2003.

**E. Approval of October 2003 Financial Report**

Mr. Harrison presented the financial report for October 2003. There being no corrections, on motion of Ms. Ringley, seconded by Mr. Butler, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously accepted for audit the financial report for October 2003.

**F. Chairman's Report**

Ms. LaCombe reported that from time to time the structures and operations of other PDCs have been discussed by members of the Commission. Chairman LaCombe noted that she and Mr. Gordon, RRPDC Vice Chairman, have not had the opportunity that some members have had to go to another PDC and observe their meetings. On November 19, 2003, the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Executive Director attended the Hampton Roads PDC Executive Committee, MPO and Chief Administrative Officials meetings. It was not a full Commission meeting, but their Executive Committee met at 10:30 a.m. followed by the completely separate non-public CAO meeting at lunch time. The Hampton Roads PDC Executive Committee meets eight months of the year and the full Commission meets quarterly. A majority of the Executive Committee are Chief Administrative Officials. The MPO representatives from the local governments are the same as on the PDC. The CAOs from all 16 jurisdictions meet monthly following the PDC/MPO meetings. The Hampton Roads PDC agenda on November 19 included:

1. Memorandum of Understanding among the jurisdictions pertaining to maintaining the weapons of mass destruction/metropolitan medical response system
2. Hurricane Isabel de-brief and follow-up actions
3. Holiday policy
4. Using unallocated funds to pay for a major study of possibly placing tolls on existing tunnels

Chairman LaCombe also reported that she attended the following meetings:

1. Opening ceremony of Main Street Station on December 5
2. Welcome remarks at GIS Conference on October 27

3. Welcome remarks at Capital Region Caucus meeting at RRPDC office on December 8

Chairman LaCombe then thanked Ms. Ringley and Mr. Harrison for their support while a member of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission.

#### **G. Executive Director's Report for October and November 2003**

In addition to the written report, Mr. Fisher reported on the following items:

At the request of Commissioner Art Warren (Chesterfield County), the Executive Director attended a public meeting in the Clover Hill District and, as a member of a panel with three Chesterfield County staff, gave a presentation on the RRPDC and Regional Growth Issues.

Also, at the request of Chesterfield County's Planning Director, the Executive Director taught one session of his undergraduate "Introduction to Planning" class at Virginia Commonwealth University.

On December 5, 2003, staff facilitated a meeting of the local jurisdiction planning directors, hosted by Hanover County.

The Executive Director met with Chesterfield County's Planning Director to initiate planning for the Third Annual Regional Planning Commissioner's Forum which will be hosted by Chesterfield in early spring 2004.

The PDC served as host of the Capital Region Caucus meeting on Monday night, December 8, 2003.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. VAPDC GIS Conference Report**

Mr. Fisher reported that on October 27 and 28, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission hosted the 14th Annual Virginia GIS Conference. The two day event was held in the Greater Richmond Convention Center. There were approximately 450 in attendance including 47 vendors. The presentation tracks were: Data Application and Development; Public Works, Field GIS; Software Development; Transportation and Local Government; Public Safety; Education; and Historic Resources. Rooms were hosted by Hampton Roads, Crater, Middle Peninsula, Thomas Jefferson and the Richmond Regional Planning District Commissions. Audio visual equipment was provided by Woolpert LLC, and Thomas Jefferson and Crater Planning District Commissions. Moderators for the presentation tracks and the evening reception were provided by the Virginia

Association for Mapping and Land Information System (VAMLIS) and their corporate supporters.

The conference generated a net profit of about \$11,000 for the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions. Photographs of the conference as well as a list of attendees can be found on the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission web site at [www.richmondregional.org](http://www.richmondregional.org).

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Appointment of Nominating Committee to Recommend Replacement for Vacant Office of Treasurer**

Chairman LaCombe appointed the following members to serve on the Nominating Committee to recommend a replacement to fill the RRPDC Treasurer's office:

John Gordon, Hanover County  
Edward Barber, Chesterfield County  
Michael Holmes, Charles City County

#### **B. Cancellation of January 2004 RRPDC Meeting**

Mr. Fisher stated that almost all RRPDC Commissioner's terms expire December 31, 2003. A letter has been sent to the Chief Administrative Officer of each jurisdiction that has Commissioners with terms expiring at the end of December, advising them of each RRPDC Commissioner's status. As a result, County Boards and the City of Richmond will be making appointments to the RRPDC in December or January, and the Commission may not be advised of these appointments until close to or after the January Commission meeting.

On motion of Ms. Ringley, seconded by Mr. Ayers, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved cancellation of the January Commission and Executive Committee meetings.

#### **C. Proposed Amendments to the Rural Transportation Planning Work Program**

Mr. Fisher requested Commission approval to amend the FY 2004 Rural Transportation Planning Work Program and adopt a resolution to include the following.

##### Sub-Task E.

Alter: New Kent County Barhamsville Village Plan

Justification: In the last fiscal year, PDC staff worked with New Kent County staff to develop a village vision for the Providence Forge Village as part of the Rural Transportation Planning Work Program. New Kent County was pleased with the results of this planning effort, and wants to continue this effort by focusing on the Providence Forge Village. During this fiscal year the planning efforts will focus on Providence Forge, but staff will continue to gather information and current conditions inventory data for Barhamsville and begin the planning phase in FY05.

Sub-Task D.

Delete: Rural Roadway Entrance Assessment

Justification: At the request of the previous Powhatan County Planning Director, PDC staff would have examined how multiple entrances in proximity to each other affect the carrying capacity of rural roads in the Richmond region. This information has already been reported on through access management reports prepared for the rural localities of the region in FY00 and specifically for Goochland County in FY01 and Powhatan County in FY00.

Replace with: New Kent County Providence Forge Village Plan Phase II

Justification: New Kent County sees the need to further the village plan completed in FY03 by drafting a second phase plan that allows for specific recommendations and implementation strategies to improve transportation and economic development with the Providence Forge Village. Providence Forge has recently undergone dramatic economic change with businesses leaving the area. The County wants to revitalize this area and is in hopes that recommendations from the previous plan will continue and lead to implementation during FY04. Meetings with community and business leaders in the Providence Forge village have yielded additional interest in the design of infrastructure improvements within the village, specifically focusing on the intersection of Routes 60 and 155. The county has asked PDC staff to help with this effort and lead additional community meetings and a resulting committee.

On motion of Ms. Ringley, seconded by Mr. Ayers, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, Federal Highway Planning and Research (HPR) funds are being made available by the Virginia Department of Transportation for transportation planning in rural localities; and,

**WHEREAS**, the purpose of the HPR funds shall be to provide transportation planning assistance in the counties of Charles City, Goochland, New Kent and Powhatan; and,

**WHEREAS**, the HPR funded planning activities will be administered in accordance with the provisions of 23 CFR Part 420, Highway Planning and Research Program Administration; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission formally accepts the responsibility to administer the HPR funds for rural transportation planning; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Commission directs its staff to administer the HPR funds, and to provide transportation planning assistance to each of the four named counties; and,

**WHEREAS**, PDC staff met with New Kent County staff to discuss needed changes to the work program for FY 2004; and,

**WHEREAS**, New Kent County agreed to the amendments and requested they be submitted to appropriate bodies for approval; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission has reviewed the proposed amendments to the work program previously approved by the Virginia Department of Transportation

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Commission approves the amendments and authorizes the Executive Director to submit the amendments to the Virginia Department of Transportation for approval.

**D. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)/Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) All Hazard Mitigation Planning**

Mr. Fisher stated that the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) is providing grants to prepare pre-disaster mitigation plans, and they prefer that these plans be done on a regional basis. They are giving priority for funding to regional projects. In order for localities to continue to be eligible to receive post disaster FEMA funds these pre-disaster hazard mitigation plans have to be developed or underway to be developed by November 2004. A few weeks ago, a letter was sent to all of the chief administrative officials advising them of this requirement and asking them to send a representative to meet to decide whether or not the localities in the Richmond region wanted to pursue this as a regional application or if some wanted to pursue this as an individual locality application for these grant funds. Six of the jurisdictions attended that meeting and those localities decided to present a regional application. They submitted a pre-application by December 2<sup>nd</sup> indicating the intent of the region to apply for the grant. There will be a follow-up meeting with representatives from all of the jurisdictions to prepare the detailed application which must be submitted by the

end of January. Based on the input from all the jurisdictions, it appears that all the localities do want to pursue this grant and conduct the project as a regional project.

Mr. Fisher requested that the Commission adopt the resolution, as presented, authorizing the Executive Director to apply for the grant in the amount of \$123,500 to conduct the regional plan. Mr. Fisher stated that there is a 25 percent matching requirement. The State has advised that they will provide 20 percent of the 25 percent match. The remainder of the match necessary for the grant will primarily come from the amount of staff time from the localities that will be involved in putting the Plan together.

Discussion followed. Mr. Glover commented that Henrico County has declared an emergency. Mr. Glover asked whether there is any conflict if a jurisdiction had adopted an emergency position? What would you do with the Plan?

Mr. Fisher said that he could not answer that question today. We have until January 30<sup>th</sup> to submit the application and we will be meeting with all nine of the jurisdictions to put the application together that will actually detail what may be needed differently in each of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Glover said, in other words, there is absolutely no way that this will be a conflict with the larger jurisdictions and their position with FEMA. Henrico County worked very closely with FEMA doing this. It cost them around \$11 million in cleanup and probably did with other jurisdictions too. Mr. Glover said he's not against it, but he wants to have a better feel for what it will do and who you will do it for.

Mr. Roarty stated that in terms of that program, the focus is to try to mitigate some of the hazards and that could include a variety of strategies. But until every locality can assess their own situation and possibly some of the opportunities it could be incorporated into plan as a possible regional plan.

Mr. Glover asked how does the position the jurisdiction might take with FEMA and the things they have in their plan – suppose it conflicts with the PDC Plan?

Mr. Britton responded that this allows you to receive money when you declare a state of emergency.

Mr. Glover stated that Henrico County declared a state of emergency and received money. He stated that he wants to make sure this does not conflict with a plan that we were to adopt as a region with any localities position with FEMA. If we give them two different positions – one for the region and one for the locality – does that put us in jeopardy?

Paul Fisher assured Mr. Glover that the regional plan the Commission develops will be what the jurisdiction wants. The Department of Emergency Management staff met with staff and indicated this will not interfere in anyway with hurricane Isabel disaster funding that FEMA is providing or any disaster that would occur after November 2004. If this plan is not done then certain relief grant programs would not be eligible to your locality. Mr. Fisher stated that is what is motivating him to make sure the locality remains eligible for this fund.

Mr. Glover asked even if the locality complied with FEMA, would it still depend on the region to comply also? Mr. Fisher responded that it would depend on either the locality or the region complying with this November 2004 deadline. Mr. Glover asked who takes precedence. Mr. Fisher stated that each locality is free to apply for its own grant to develop its own plan. Mr. Glover asked if there is a conflict if the region applies for the funds and the jurisdiction also applies for the funds. Mr. Fisher responded that if the Commission applies for funds and Henrico wants to apply for it individually, then the Commission would delete Henrico from our application.

Mr. Gulley asked if the Regional Plan would come before the Commission for approval. Mr. Fisher said yes, and it would have to be approved by each local government.

Following general discussion, on motion of Mr. Glover, seconded by Mr. Ayers, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management has promulgated a request for proposals to regional planning agencies and local governments to develop hazard mitigation plans; and

**WHEREAS**, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission is an eligible entity; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have clearly stated their intent to fund primarily regional plans with only left over grant funds available to individual localities; and

**WHEREAS**, currently none of the localities in the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission have a hazard mitigation plan, and unless each locality develops and adopts its own hazard mitigation plan or participated in a regional plan before November 1, 2004, these local governments will not be eligible for FEMA hazard mitigation funding after that date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission will involve the public in this process through press releases, community meetings, and mailings, as needed, and will coordinate these planning efforts with the localities participating in this plan, and with state and federal agencies; and

**WHEREAS**, the localities participating in this plan will be asked to provide the basic community data needed for the community inventories and vulnerability assessments; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed plan will assist these localities with developing mitigation strategies and projects designed to address the hazards both independently and in conjunction with other solutions; and

**WHEREAS**, staff from the region's local governments have met and generally agree that a region-wide approach for developing hazard mitigation plan is in their best interest.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission authorizes the executive director to apply for a grant in the amount of \$123,500 (\$130,000 less \$6,500 [five percent] local in-kind match) from the Virginia Department of Emergency Management for the purpose of developing, gaining FEMA approval for, and adopting an all-hazards mitigation plan that meets the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000.

**E. Approval of Revised FY 04 Budget and Work Program**

Mr. Fisher stated that in December of each year revisions to the current fiscal year's budget and work program are prepared and presented for Board review and approval. These revisions are incorporated into the budget and work program last reviewed by the Board in May and are based on four months of actual activity.

Ms. Jo Evans, Assistant Executive Director, gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the changes recommended for the FY 04 budget update.

Ms. Evans noted that the estimate for operating revenues and expenditures has been reduced \$75,700 from what was anticipated last May. On the revenue side three additions to revenue – \$1,200 in the state appropriation, \$16,300 in Section 5303 funds for urban transportation planning, and \$28,800 in revenue from the VAPDC's 2003 GIS conference which was organized, staffed, and hosted by the Richmond Regional PDC – are netted against a \$122,000 reduction in the amount of undesignated funds anticipated to be needed to balance the agency's budget in the current year. The current estimate of undesignated funds needed in FY 04 is \$44,400.

The most significant revision to expenditures is in the personnel category that has been reduced by \$81,200 as a result of three vacant positions. The budget assumes that all positions will be filled as of January 1, 2004. Minor adjustments have been made to other expenditure categories primarily to reflect reimbursable expenses associated with the 2003 GIS conference.

Following general discussion, on motion of Mr. Ayers, seconded by Ms. Ringley, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the revised FY 04 RRPDC Budget and Work Program.

**F. Approval of Preliminary FY 05 Budget and Work Program**

Ms. Jo Evans stated again that in December of each year a preliminary budget and work program for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 are prepared and presented for Board review and action.

At this stage the budget is based primarily on the assumption of level funding supplemented by funds from the agency's undesignated fund balance. Specific information on state and federal funding amounts will become available over the next few months and will be incorporated into the budget presented for review and adoption by the Board in May. Further revisions to the FY 05 budget may also be made next December and the following May.

On the revenue side for operations, the state appropriation is held flat at the current year amount pending the outcome of the upcoming legislative session. An estimate of population for 2003 has been developed by staff and serves as the basis for the \$7,700 increase in member dues. A preliminary estimate of PL revenues for urban transportation planning has been included and shows a \$20,300 increase from the current year but is more than offset by a \$61,900 reduction in PL funds available from prior years. In the absence of any firm information on the federal allocation of 5303 funding to this region, an assumption of flat funding at the FY 04 base amount is included in the preliminary budget along with a \$16,300 decrease in 5303 funds from prior years. The preliminary budget also shows a \$28,800 reduction from the elimination of the one-time realization of revenue in FY 04 from the 2003 GIS conference. That revenue provided reimbursement for staff time and other miscellaneous expenses associated with planning, hosting and staffing the conference that was held October 27 – 28, 2003, in Richmond. Given the current estimates of revenues and expenditures, a carryover from FY 04 of \$218,300 in undesignated funds is necessary to balance the preliminary FY 05 budget.

The primary change in total operating expenditures from FY 04 to FY 05 is in the personnel category. The FY 05 budget assumes full staffing of all 20 funded full-time positions and includes up to a 4.6 percent merit increase effective July 1,

2004. Typically the Commission has provided for a 2 percent cost-of-living and 4.6 percent average merit increase for staff. In FY 04, the budget provided for a 3 percent across the board salary adjustment. The FY 05 preliminary budget provides a partial return to standard practice by including up to a 4.6 percent increase based on merit. This recommendation will be reviewed and revised as necessary when the FY 05 budget is presented to the Board in May. Other changes to expenditure items reflect the elimination of one-time expenses associated with the 2003 GIS conference, minor changes to program requirements, and estimated or fixed cost inflation factors. On net, total operating expenditures are expected to increase by \$139,300 in FY 05 over the revised FY 04 budget.

The per capita dues rate remains unchanged from that established in FY 92 - \$0.60 with \$0.55 designated as a General Dues Assessment and \$0.05 identified as the Additional MPO Assessment. The Additional MPO Assessment was established to provide the agency match funds required by the federal PL and 5303 grant programs. Federal funds account for 80 percent of the total grant budget, the state provides 10 percent, and the agency is responsible for matching 10 percent. For the past decade the \$0.05 per capita assessment has typically provided less than half of the funds required for the agency 10 percent match, and other agency funds have been used to make up the difference. With continued cutbacks or flat funding at the state and federal levels, the ability to use other sources of revenue to provide the match is hindered as is the ability of the agency to provide planning and program administration services to its member governments. For example, the Principal Planner position in the Planning and Information Services Division has been kept vacant for the past two years to help balance the budget. The agency work program is predicated on filling this vacancy so that the region's and member governments' planning needs may be met. Providing technical assistance to local planning efforts such as comprehensive plans and industrial zoning standards, coordination of emergency response planning, developing and maintaining the regional geographic information system, hosting the annual Regional Planning Commissioner's Forum and Regional Planning Director's Meetings, assisting with local CDBG applications and program implementation, updating the region's Solid Waste Management Plan, and preparing a Regional Open Space Inventory represent examples of the programs and services to be provided in FY 05.

In FYs 04 and 05, the recommended budgets provide for the use of funds from the undesignated fund balance to sustain the agency's provision of services to its member governments. While this is a short-term solution, it is not a viable funding option for the longer-term. It is suggested that the Commission start thinking about a change in the member dues funding structure in order to bring into parity the requirements of grant match funds and the assessment that was implemented to provide that match so that the agency's other funding sources

may be directed to the provision of planning and program administration services for which they were intended.

Chairman LaCombe asked if there was any discussion. Mr. Miller asked why the 3 percent was increased. Mr. Fisher stated that he was concerned about presenting a balanced budget and also making this agency's salary increases as consistent as we could with what the local governments were able to do. Last year the Commission approved a 3 percent across-the-board for budgetary reasons to avoid going very far into the fund balance to balance the budget. On behalf of staff this year he decided to start out looking at the feasibility of at least building back in the merit part of the Pay plan.

Mr. Glover asked if this is a 4.6 percent plus a 2 percent increase? Mr. Fisher said no, only a 4.6 percent is what this budget is assuming. Mr. Glover asked when will this take effect? Ms. Evans said July 1.

Mr. Glover asked if the Commission would vote on this again in May. He said he could not see voting to give the employees of the region any greater increase than the surrounding localities. He said it is a very tight budget year coming up. Mr. Glover suggested that the Commission put in a 3 percent and then take another look at it in May and if it's there then that is different.

Mr. Ayers asked if it were possible for someone to get the 2 percent and not the 4.6 percent merit? Mr. Fisher stated not on what is proposed for this year.

Mr. Ayers said he understood what was being proposed, but he was asking to consider going back to what is in the personnel plan as the pay scale for the Commission employees.

Mr. Ayers commented that the Commission would look at this again in May and would know what the financial situation is at that time. Does the budget assume everybody gets the 4.6 percent increase? Ms. Evans said each employee would be eligible for up to a 4.6 percent merit increase based on their evaluation.

Mr. Glover said he could not vote for a one third greater salary increase than the employees of Henrico County.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the Executive Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the preliminary budget? Mr. Fisher said yes. The Executive Committee reviews the Budget and Work Program and makes the recommendations to the full commission. The Executive Committee reviewed the Budget and Work Program this morning and recommended it for approval by the Commission.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the staff would look at what the jurisdictions are recommending annually and try to be in line with it. Mr. Fisher said yes, and that is what the staff did last year.

Chairman LaCombe stated that the Executive Committee's recommendation today was to recommend this budget but included that a study will take place looking at the dues structure within the next year.

Mr. Butler stated that the Executive Committee also included in the motion to study the income and expenses of the Commission for the next five years. The Commission has never had a Plan. Every year we come in and start spending the fund balance—next thing you know we are not going to have any funds.

Mr. Butler noted that the rent budget increased in FY 04 and shows an increase again in FY 05—will the rent increase every year? Ms. Evans said yes as that was in the Lease. The Commission signed a six or seven year lease with the landlord and it had that annual cost escalation factor in it.

Mr. Kaechele said he would only approve this if staff and the Executive Committee indicate that the merit increases will not exceed the jurisdictions in the final budget.

Mr. Ayers asked if the membership dues study would be finalized by the time the Commission votes on the final budget in May. Mr. Fisher indicated that he could complete the study by May.

Mr. Ayers said if it is not and we go with this budget—does that mean there will be more money taken out of the unallocated fund to balance the budget? Mr. Fisher said that was correct.

Mr. Ayers stated that the Commission should have a report on membership dues when the decision is made on the final budget. Mr. Fisher said he agreed, and may need to increase dues or decrease services depending on what direction this Commission wants to go.

Mr. Ayers said that according to Ms. Evans report, services have already been reduced.

Following further discussion, Ms. Ringley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Harrison, to approve the preliminary FY 05 Budget and Work Program with the stipulation that the PDC initiate a study of the member per capita dues, prepare a five year budget forecast projection, and consideration of individual jurisdiction salary increases.

Ayes: LaCombe, Holmes, Gordon, Ringley, Ayers, Harrison.

Nays: Gulley, Miller, Roarty, Butler, Lacy, Bell, Jernigan, Kaechele, Hinson.

Chairman LaCombe stated the motion failed.

Following further discussion, on motion of Ms. Ringley, seconded by Mr. Kaechele, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the preliminary FY 05 Budget and Work Program, with the stipulation that the staff initiate a study of the member per capita dues, prepare a five year budget forecast projection, reduce staff salary increases to three percent across the board cost of living with the stipulation that the PDC salary increases will not exceed the jurisdictions salary increases in the final budget.

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Announcements**

There were no announcements at this time.

**B. Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports at this time.

**C. For Your Information**

Mr. Fisher noted informational material was provided in the agenda.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

---

Paul E. Fisher  
Executive Director

---

Angela L. LaCombe  
Chairman