

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
JUNE 10, 2004**

Members/Alternates Present

Angela L. LaCombe (M), Chairman.....Town of Ashland
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M), Vice Chairman.....County of Hanover
Malvern R. Butler (M), Treasurer.....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
John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond
Frank M. Hartz (M).....County of Goochland
Harvey Hinson (A)..... County of Henrico
Russell E. Holland (M)County of Powhatan
Michael L. Holmes (M) County of Charles City
Renny B. Humphrey (M) County of Chesterfield
David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico
R. M. “Dickie” King, Jr. (M).....County of Chesterfield
Sherman W. Litton (M).....County of Chesterfield
Kelly E. Miller (M).....County of Chesterfield
Elizabeth W. Moorhouse (M)County of Hanover
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) County of Henrico
William J. Pantele (M).....City of Richmond
George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Millard D. “Pete” Stith (A).....County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico
Stran L. Trout (M)..... County of New Kent
Lisa D. Ware (M)..... County of Henrico

Members Absent

Edward B. Barber (M), SecretaryCounty of Chesterfield
Mark S. Daniel (M)..... County of New Kent
John G. Dankos, Jr. (M).....County of Hanover
James B. Donati, Jr. (M)..... County of Henrico
Peter R. Grimm (M).....City of Richmond
William Russell Jones, III (M).....City of Richmond
Delores L. McQuinn (M) City of Richmond
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Others Present

John R. Amos.....RRPDC Legal Counsel (Amos & Amos PLLC)
Philip T. VannoorbeeckAmelia County Administrator

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 and Information Systems
Peter M. Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator
Patricia A. Villa Communications Coordinator

Call to Order

Chairman Angela LaCombe called the regularly scheduled June 10, 2004 meeting to order at 1:00 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 (23) were present to constitute a quorum.

B. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business

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

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 Minutes of May 13, 2004 RRPDC Meeting

There being no corrections or additions, on motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Miller, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission approved the minutes of the May 13, 2004 meeting. Ms. O'Bannon abstained.

E. Approval of April 2004 Financial Report

Mr. Butler presented the financial report for April 2004. There being no corrections, on motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Miller, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously accepted for audit the financial report for April 2004.

F. Chairman's Report

Chairman LaCombe expressed appreciation to the Commission for the privilege of serving as FY 2004 Chairman. She also noted that she looked forward to working with the new Chairman, John Gordon.

G. Executive Director's Report for May 2004

In addition to the written status report, Mr. Fisher stated that the Commission supported him last year in being a member of Leadership Metro Richmond (LMR) Class of 2004 and reported that he graduated last night. Mr. Fisher noted that it was a wonderful experience and he looks forward to engaging himself more into community activities as a result of the LMR opportunity.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution of the RRPDC Regarding the Review of Planning District Commission Boundaries Being Conducted by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development

Mr. Fisher stated that this item has been before the Commission since last October when we learned the Department of Housing and Community Development was conducting a review of PDC boundaries as a result of the year 2000 decennial census. At that time when we made you aware of it this commission instructed staff to communicate to DHCD that you were satisfied with the current boundaries and local membership of this planning district commission and we did that. Subsequent to that action we learned that Amelia County had sent a resolution to DHCD indicating a desire to join this planning district commission and since that time we have provided you with information about the merits and disadvantages, as well, of Amelia becoming a member. At a prior meeting you had staff prepare draft resolutions to be sent to the Department of Housing and Community Development indicating a continued desire for the PDC boundaries to stay the same. At your last meeting you instructed staff to prepare an alternative resolution which would support Amelia joining this planning district commission through a change in the boundaries. The two "resolved" statements at the end are, first of all, to support expanding the RRPDC boundary to add Amelia County and communicate that to the

Department of Housing and Community Development. The second “resolved” is that Amelia County membership would be contingent upon Amelia County becoming a signatory party to the RRPDC Charter and Bylaws and thereby agreeing to abide by those Charter and Bylaws.

Chairman LaCombe stated that the Executive Committee had a great deal of discussion on this again today. Initially, a member of the Executive Committee looked at the word supports in the second to last paragraph and suggested that instead of saying “supports” that it might say “does not oppose”. Then we got in a very lengthy discussion and the final recommendation of the Executive Committee was that we perhaps look at not doing a resolution of this sort at all but instead provide the Department of Housing and Community Development a summary of all these issues and concerns, positive and otherwise, of bringing them in and giving them some more information related to positives and negatives rather than just doing a resolution of support or not support. That was the final recommendation, but it was not unanimous.

Mr. Trout further discussed the Executive Committee’s action. This has been under study as we’ve heard by the Department of Housing and Community Development and also by Michael Chandler who has been assigned to work with that particular planning district commission. One of the concerns was that there were at least three counties who had expressed interest in moving out of that particular planning district commission. So if there is a concern that should we go along with this and should other PDC’s also take in some of the members that would basically destroy the effectiveness of that planning district commission. Since it is currently under study by the Department of Housing and Community Development and currently has some people who are going down and checking with those jurisdictions to see what can be done, it would be premature for us to say yes or no whether we want them or not. If the boundaries certainly are changed which would include Amelia County in the Richmond region, then at that point they would be entitled to membership in this PDC. It would be certainly inappropriate for us to say no we don’t want you if they are actually put into this PDC by the Department of Housing and Community Development. It would also be premature for us to invite them to membership if they are not going to be put in this PDC. At the current time, the best solution arrived at in the Executive Committee was to present the pros and cons with the information which was presented here to Department of Housing and Community Development so that they can have that to help them with their decision. Once that decision is made then we would go on and make our determination. That is the reason for the no opinion one way or the other and also the idea that we would present to them our analysis and what we determine to be the pros and cons of the change in membership.

Chairman LaCombe then introduced and welcomed Mr. Philip Vannoorbeeck, Amelia County Administrator.

Mr. Miller requested that Mr. Vannoorbeeck have an opportunity to address the Commission at this time.

Mr. Vannoorbeeck stated that he was sorry so many people had to go to so many extra meetings on their account. He certainly hoped they had not caused any undo consternation. He felt like they were simply complying with what DHCD asked them to do. Unfortunately the RRPDC members are the ones who have to make the tough decisions. Amelia County asked DHCD what they wanted them to do. He stated they have two reasons that they feel like besides what is in the resolution. One, they are in the Richmond region whether the resolution is adopted or whether the RRPDC takes action or not. We are no more or no less part of Richmond region and our residents are no more or no less a part of the Richmond region than other members in the RRPDC—Charles City, Goochland, and Powhatan counties. It's a fact that Amelia residents travel to Richmond to spend money, entertain themselves and work in the Richmond region. Amelia's transportation network is Richmond's transportation network. The majority of the people who live in Amelia County commute to Richmond to work everyday.

Mr. Vannoorbeeck said their intention is simply to do what DHCD asked. If you have satisfaction with your current situation, then great. If you do not adopt this resolution by a certain date and then see what happens, that is your choice. That's what they have done and that's what DHCD has asked them to do. Amelia County does not want to be a point of contention for RRPDC. They don't want the RRPDC to go broke trying to serve Amelia County. They don't want the RRPDC to have problems on account of Amelia County. However, he felt like Amelia County is a part of the Richmond region and Richmond region is a part of Amelia County. If anybody hasn't been to Amelia County recently it looks totally different than it used to. You get out across the Appomattox River, you can't tell when you leave Chesterfield and enter Amelia County. It is probably more populated on the Amelia side as Chesterfield has done things to reduce the growth on the Route 360 corridor. Amelia County is adding subdivisions constantly. Amelia County's agenda for next Wednesday night will include five or six public hearings for new subdivisions coming to Amelia. Land is fairly inexpensive in Amelia County and the regulatory climate is a whole lot easier to deal with than perhaps in Chesterfield and Powhatan counties. Mr. Vannoorbeeck said they are not asking RRPDC to make tough decisions. They are not asking RRPDC to hurt themselves or staff—we appreciate everything Mr. Fisher has done. Amelia County would just like to be included at the table. Amelia County has matured, changed, and they don't look like a diary farm or a tobacco farm. They are not just

raising timber in Amelia County. Mr. Vannoorbeeck said that Amelia County needs some of RRPDC's assistance because they do not want to have to re-invent the wheel and make the same mistakes that other communities may have had to make. He said they are not asking RRPDC to fracture lines. They are not asking RRPDC to have to count votes. They just would like the same consideration because they are Richmond region and would like DHCD to make their decision with a yea or a nay or a positive vote or a negative vote. When you look at the timing, he felt DHCD's decision would be made based on what the RRPDC thinks. If it is not a popular decision in this area then DHCD may be less likely to make the change. He felt that waiting until DHCD makes their decision for the endorsement, no offense to the Executive Committee, but the Commission should adopt the resolution now.

Chairman LaCombe clarified a couple of things. She stated that the RRPDC is not waiting for the DHCD to make a decision—the Executive Committee is saying instead of sending a resolution that just simply says support or not that we would give them the information that helped us make that decision. We do understand they have the final say so. Chairman LaCombe stated that if Amelia County is coming, then the RRPDC would certainly want to welcome them—nobody wants Amelia County to feel unwelcome. Some members of the Executive Committee felt like the Commission needed to get a little more background.

Ms. O'Bannon stated that one of the things that came up in Executive Committee discussion had to do with Amelia needing some planning done.

Mr. Vannoorbeeck stated that his first job in the public sector was Assistant County Manager in Blackstone, and if you don't know a little town that has no resources, go to Blackstone. This is a south side community without a lot of money. Everything we did in Blackstone we did it ourselves. We earned it. I was the inspector on utilities. I'd go out with the power crews when the power would go out. We made do with resources we had. In Amelia County over the past four years we do the same thing. We do everything in house. All my DHCD applications are prepared by staff. TEA-21 applications are prepared by staff because we are very good at it and it's less expensive. If Mr. Fisher's services for those are more economical than what we can do them, or he's got talent and skills that we don't possibly have that can bring something to those applications, yes we would ask for that assistance for fair compensation. Now, if the Farmville PDC is preparing a new application for Amelia County. Amelia County feels like they can do them better and save money. While the situation is being resolved, Amelia County does not want to get them obligated to anything that would force the board of

supervisors to have additional tough decisions because we have ourselves committed to a contract.

Ms. O'Bannon stated so you didn't contract because you didn't want that long-term obligation. Mr. Vannoorbeeck said in part, particularly the most recent one being the hazard mitigation planning.

Ms. O'Bannon asked Mr. Vannoorbeeck if he had talked to Mr. Chandler. Mr. Vannoorbeeck said he met with Mr. Chandler for two hours yesterday. Mr. Chandler expects to issue his report in July.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if he was pleased with what Mr. Chandler talked about. Mr. Vannoorbeeck stated that Mr. Chandler attended a PDC meeting last Thursday night in Farmville. Amelia County was not the center of attention. They were not the cause of the consternation between some of the other agencies there, but there is a lot of friction out there. Mr. Chandler was there to see it. He felt that Mr. Chandler has concerns about the fractious relationship between the people at the PDC. There are also some issues about satisfactory services. There are issues about the quality of the services being offered and the cost. It's less expensive for Amelia County to be a member of the Richmond PDC than it is for the Farmville PDC.

Ms. O'Bannon asked even if RRPDC raised its dues? Mr. Vannoorbeeck said yes. The dues in Richmond are less if the dues would have stayed the same in Farmville. They have a fund balance of over \$300,000. Small staff and a small agency but yet the dues went up. The board approved 4% raises for some staff last Thursday night. There is a disconnection. Amelia County is going to wait and see what happens. He felt Mr. Chandler had seen some of these types of things that are happening. Amelia County does not understand why the dues went up so much. Yet there is a significant fund balance in place.

Ms. O'Bannon said then there's no resolution with concerns of that particular PDC—has Mr. Chandler said anything? Mr. Vannoorbeeck said Mr. Chandler is interviewing.

Ms. O'Bannon said then you are not willing to wait until there is a resolution. Mr. Vannoorbeeck said he was at the RRPDC's mercy. He would like to see a favorable response to the resolution.

Ms. Humphrey then spoke in favor of the resolution. Ms. Humphrey stated that she represents the Matoaca District in Chesterfield County which is the geographical border to all of Amelia County. They share the Appomattox River corridor with Amelia County. They are the head waters to public water supply to some 2 million residents in the Richmond

Regional PDC and the Crater Regional PDC. Ms. Humphrey also serves as chairman of the Crater Planning District Commission and will be serving a second term as chairman pending next Wednesday's meeting. She noted that she had a perspective on how this has been discussed not only in the Richmond region but also in the Crater region. Frankly, when they looked at Crater region comprehensively where many of their rural or growing localities are headed in the next 25 to 50 years, Amelia fit during that time and during their growth spurt as they plan for highways and byways and regional cooperative venues. The Richmond region fit better for Amelia County than the Crater region. The Crater region stems from Route 10 in Chesterfield, picks up their industrial corridor, and runs all the way to the North Carolina line. Amelia County, being the head waters of a significant water body for the region in addition to Chesterfield's pursuit of the Powhite extension which is a piece of a loop road that benefits the entire region. Their employee base—John Tyler Community college, J. Sergeant Reynolds Community College, Amelia County's role in that planning, and their potential for the future, fit better with the Richmond region. She said she was not sure of the staff things that the Commission is talking about. The Crater region is discussing with Nottoway and some other localities where their future role is. They currently manage an economic development business center at Longwood University. There are other challenges in their current PDC that don't affect this body or Crater but there are some reviews of the regional scope of where everyone fits. Powhatan County certainly has the cooperative agreement with Chesterfield for public water in the next 25 years. Amelia is going to be a critical piece of that. They are going to be that reservoir from which our fresh drinking water will come.

Ms. Humphrey urged the RRPDC to accept Amelia as they stand in good standing and to send a positive message to the Department of Housing and Community Development that they are a part of the Richmond region. They have worked on this role for the last twelve years. Ms. Humphrey said she has maintained a relationship with the Amelia board because they do share roads and a rural corridor. As we plan for Chesterfield's western traffic patterns, that discussion includes Amelia's representation.

Mr. Kaechele asked, what have they said? Ms. Humphrey said as discussed it is a matter of where Nottoway fits in the next 25 years, where Amelia should fit in the next 25 years, where Longwood University should fit in the next 25 years. Amelia County clearly fits with what is happening in the Richmond region—the Powhite extension, the reservoir and public water supply for the Richmond region.

Mr. Kaechele asked if they have taken a position saying this. Ms. Humphrey stated that they have discussed it in terms of road projects and what's out there, such as high-speed rail connectors going through

Dinwiddie, and how that would possibly provide access for Nottoway. Nottoway is another county which is being evaluated where they fit, in the Crater Planning District versus Amelia fit in Richmond better.

Mr. Kaechele said he knew Ms. Humphrey's position, but does that represent the full Crater PDC position. Ms. Humphrey said, no, that's her position. However, serving as chairman they have talked about this at the dinner hour in that venue. They have not passed a resolution because frankly the biggest agenda item for Crater right now is the high-speed rail initiative and Fort Lee, and neither one is located specifically in Nottoway County. She is sure that in the next six months Nottoway County is going to come to Crater PDC with the same request that we help find a place for the next 25 years just as Amelia has come on to RRPDC. The urgency for this is, as the Powhite extension is planned, support for this road or no support for this road. Amelia is a critical piece of this road. This is their first highway to come that close since Route 360 was paved around the turn of the century.

In regard to Mr. Trout's earlier comments, Mr. Hartz asked if Amelia County was going to be one of several jurisdictions in the Piedmont PDC to express an interest in joining this PDC or another PDC. Mr. Trout stated it was his understanding there were two other counties considering leaving Piedmont—Charlotte County and Lunenburg County.

Chairman Lacombe then asked Mr. Fisher to summarize the advantages and disadvantages that he presented to the Commission a few months ago, including the implications for the MPO.

Mr. Fisher reported that in prior agenda materials we put together a list of advantages and disadvantages of Amelia coming in. Mr. Fisher stated Mr. Vannoorbeeck is very correct in indicating the primary reason Amelia would like to come here is the fact they do have a lot of areas of commonality with the Richmond region. Their workforce commutes about 70% to the Richmond region for work, and the common border with Powhatan and Chesterfield counties. First of all, the shared natural resource as Ms. Humphrey and Mr. Miller described, the Appomattox River. A long range water supply was planned in the early 1990's by this agency and it included in the long term a potential reservoir on that river. So that is very much an advantage in this area. Shared boundaries with Chesterfield and Powhatan Counties. They are already cooperating on many things on a regional basis and membership here would continue that positive momentum and cooperation with some of our member jurisdictions. And Mr. Butler, when this was discussed at the last meeting, mentioned the fact that there is a landfill in Amelia which serves Goochland and possibly other members of the Richmond region.

The disadvantages to the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission of having Amelia as a member, based on their population and our current dues rate of .60 per capita is that would bring in \$7,000-\$8,000 in the operating budget. It would be an additional jurisdiction requesting technical planning assistance for plans and ordinances. As you know, we have five smaller population jurisdictions in the planning district currently and we provide a great deal of assistance to them in preparing comprehensive plans, zoning and subdivision ordinances and other technical assistance of that nature. That work is subsidized in large part by the four larger population jurisdictions. All of the member jurisdictions pay .60 per capita for membership. Obviously, the jurisdictions with over 100,000 to 200,000 populations contribute a lot more to the operating budget than do the smaller jurisdictions. So an additional smaller jurisdiction would mean we would be requested to provide additional planning assistance without much in the way of revenue coming from that jurisdiction. The third point there relates to the transportation planning. We receive \$48,000 each year in rural transportation planning assistance for smaller counties in our jurisdictions. That would add a fifth small county to utilize funds from a fixed amount of \$48,000. Another potential disadvantage, and that would be much more out in the future which Ms. Humphrey talked about as the Powhite extension. At some point Amelia County likely would request to be a member of the Metropolitan Planning Organization. That would be an additional mouth to feed from the funds that the MPO receives. And the last point is one that Mr. Vannoorbeeck mentioned a couple of times when he's been here and that is the fact that Amelia has not paid a dues increase that was approved by the Piedmont Planning District Commission. PPDC'S Charter and Bylaws are the same as RRPDC. Once the Commission adopts a budget and the dues are raised it requires the members to pay that dues increase or they are in violation of the Charter and Bylaws. The dues amount in Piedmont was .60 per capita which is the same as RRPDC and went to .85 before the current fiscal year. We just briefed the Executive Committee on what's going to be a long term study over the next four or five months of the RRPDC's long-term fiscal outlook. We are looking at a dues increase here by the year 2009 to about .87 per capita to maintain the same current level of service. If we don't have the dues increase, then we will have to deplete the undesignated fund balance, reduce staffing and services or get real creative in other ways.

Mr. Vannoorbeeck asked to address the issue of Amelia County being in violation of the Charter and Bylaws. The Board of Supervisors made a decision during the budget process. They have to consider the schools, social services, and library. There is a lot of competing interest for it and it is difficult to justify increases for services that they are not using. We don't mind if we go to them and request a need to administer a grant for us then we'll pay you 10% or 8% or 7.5% or whatever the negotiated price is.

But when cutting school budgets and not renovating schools because of money, then those are the kinds of things that the Board of Supervisors has to sit back and weigh with everything else. The Board of Supervisors last year and this year instructed all departments to submit a flat budget. They did not increase contributions to any agency. Mr. Vannoorbeeck's recommendation had no increase for any of these types of agencies—Central Piedmont Action, Legal Aid Society of Virginia. Therefore, when the Board of Supervisors factored it in, they said we gave instructions for flat budgets and we are going to stick to it. We are not going to increase taxes this year. We don't anticipate increasing taxes until some of our debt services comes in for some school construction and we have done some renovation. We have a reassessment coming and we are going to try to bundle those. There was more than a callous disregard for the Bylaws and the Charter of the Piedmont Planning District. It was a conscientious decision made during a thoughtful budget process of what was right and what was wrong and how do we justify a 2% increase for teachers and then come back and raise the dues or raise fees for the commission that we potentially won't use.

Mr. Miller stated that the Commission has debated this issue several times and as stated last time he supported the application of Amelia County for the reasons they are adjacent neighbors. They do share a commonality with the Richmond region. They would not necessarily drain any resources beyond the RRPDC's ability to pay. They are good neighbors and they are a part of our region. We ought to be prepared to accept them, and he felt the RRPDC would profit from it. They would be a good addition.

Mr. Miller then made a motion to adopt the resolution supporting Amelia County's request to be included in the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission as proposed. Ms. Humphrey seconded the motion.

Chairman Lacombe asked if there was further discussion.

Ms. O'Bannon commented that the Executive Committee suggestion was to take a neutral stance because there seemed some concerns raised. Mr. Miller said he did not agree.

Ms. O'Bannon stated she wanted to let the Commission know that was the Executive Committee's decision. The Commission does not get to make this decision—it will be made by the Department of Housing and Community Development. Whether they say yes or no we have to accept it. Mr. Miller said he did not agree with that and his motion was to support the resolution.

Mr. Trout stated that he planned to vote against the resolution. He felt that this is not the appropriate time to take that kind of stand and should the Department of Housing and Community Development determine that the boundary lines be change, then he would like to be one of the ones in line to welcome them in. But at the same time he felt this was premature for RRPDC to take this action at this time.

Mr. Butler felt Amelia County would be good neighbors. They are close by, they are the water of the future, and also their landfill is huge and it takes Goochland's waste and maybe other counties as well. Mr. Butler said he supports the resolution.

Mr. Glover stated that he felt it was up to the elected officials in the Richmond region and those people that deal with the Richmond region more so than the Department of Housing and Community Development. He also said he had some concerns that any jurisdiction will not be ruled by the majority vote of its current PDC. If that means more dues then he did not know if that personal budget should be out of the picture to that degree. Therefore, he would say the first time that would happen he would be the first one to make the motion to send Amelia back to the Piedmont area. But at the same time he would say that Chesterfield has been a good member in good standing. He felt Chesterfield deserves to be honored in their request to bring their neighbor in. If the Department of Housing and Community Development disagrees then he would object to their disagreement. Mr. Glover noted that one of his constituents, and appointee to another Board, happens to be the head of the Department of Housing and Community Development. Mr. Glover stated his support for the resolution as presented.

Mr. Holland stated that Powhatan County is sort of like Chesterfield County in the fact that they do share common boundaries with Amelia County. It is very important for Powhatan and Amelia to work together. They have to work together for the future whether this motion is approved or not. Mr. Holland stated his support for the resolution.

Mr. Holmes then made an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Trout, to strike the word "supports" and insert the words "does not object to" in paragraph seven of the resolution.

Following further discussion, Chairman LaCombe called for a vote on the amended motion. By a voice vote, the amended motion failed.

Chairman LaCombe then called for a vote on the motion of Mr. Miller, seconded by Mrs. Humphrey, for the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission to adopt the following resolution supporting expanding the RRPDC boundary to add Amelia County:

WHEREAS, the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is required by Section 36-139.7 of the Code of Virginia, to conduct a review of planning district commission boundaries after each decennial census; and

WHEREAS, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) at its October 9, 2003 meeting directed staff to prepare and send a letter to DHCD indicating satisfaction with the current RRPDC boundary; and

WHEREAS, the Amelia County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on December 17, 2003 concerning “Amelia County’s Participation in Review of the Commonwealth’s Planning District Boundaries and an Interest in Becoming a Member of the Richmond Regional Planning District,” in which Amelia County described issues of common interest between Amelia County and RRPDC jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, Amelia County sent that resolution to the DHCD on December 23, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the DHCD has initiated a formal review of PDC boundaries and will be holding public input sessions to accept comment; and

WHEREAS, the RRPDC Executive Committee and Commission have discussed this issue at length over several months and have concluded that there are numerous areas of common interest between RRPDC member jurisdictions and Amelia County.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission supports expanding the RRPDC boundary to add Amelia County and that this conclusion be communicated to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development; and,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that should the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development expand the RRPDC boundary to include Amelia County, Amelia County membership is contingent upon Amelia County becoming a signatory party to the RRPDC Charter and Bylaws and thereby agreeing to abide by the Charter and Bylaws.

The motion carried by a vote of 15 Ayes and 7 Nays.

B. Approval of FY 05 Revised RRPDC Budget

Mr. Fisher reported that the Commission, at its May 13, 2004 meeting approved the FY 05 budget as presented along with direction that staff prepare a revised budget for an additional one percent salary increase in FY 05.

Mr. Fisher noted on the revenue and expenditure budget tables that a one percent increase in salaries would result in a \$12,700 change to the personnel line and to the bottom line of the operating budget. This amount would be drawn from the fund balance.

The rationale for providing an additional one percent for salaries reflects the Commission's desire to return in part to the merit-based component for salary increases. The Commission's pay policy calls for a two percent general wage adjustment and a merit increase of up to four point six percent depending on availability of funds. In FY 04 an across-the-board three percent wage adjustment was made to staff salaries. Performance evaluations were conducted in FY 04 even though the results were not linked to a change in salary.

For FY 05, the Board indicated an interest in allocating part of the salary increase to merit while leaving in place a general wage adjustment. The allocation of funds between a general adjustment versus a merit adjustment has no impact on the total budget as total salaries would be capped at a four percent average increase.

Mr. Fisher requested that the Board adopt the FY 2005 budget as revised to provide for a two percent general wage adjustment and an average merit increase of two percent in accordance with Commission policy and subject to availability of funds.

There being no discussion, on motion of Mr. Ayers, seconded by Mr. Holland, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously adopted the FY 2005 revised budget to include a two percent general wage adjustment and an average merit increase of two percent.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report of Nominating Committee and Election of RRPDC Officers for FY 05

Mr. Holmes reported that the Nominating Committee met and recommended the following slate of officers:

John E. Gordon, Jr., Chairman
Malvern R. Butler, Vice Chairman
Russell E. Holland, Treasurer
Edward B. Barber, Secretary

There being no additional nominations, the officers were elected as recommended by the Nominating Committee.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Announcements

Mr. Pantele invited members of the Commission to join a delegation to Arlington, Virginia by bus on June 16, 2004 to look at their transportation infrastructure.

B. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports at this time.

C. For Your Information

There were no information items at this time.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman LaCombe adjourned the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Paul E. Fisher
Executive Director

Angela L. LaCombe
Chairman