

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
MAY 13, 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  
 Edward B. Barber (M), Secretary.....County of Chesterfield  
 Richard W. Ayers (M).....County of Powhatan  
 Gentry Bell (M).....County of Henrico  
 W. R. Britton, Jr. (A).....County of Charles City  
 Mark S. Daniel (M).....County of New Kent  
 Richard W. Glover (M).....County of Henrico  
 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  
 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  
 William J. Pantele (M).....City of Richmond  
 Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover  
 Frank J. Thornton (M).....County of Henrico  
 Stran L. Trout (M).....County of New Kent  
 Lisa D. Ware (M).....County of Henrico

**Members Absent**

John G. Dankos, Jr. (M).....County of Hanover  
 James B. Donati, Jr. (M).....County of Henrico  
 John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond  
 Peter R. Grimm (M).....City of Richmond  
 Renny B. Humphrey (M).....County of Chesterfield  
 William Russell Jones, III (M).....City of Richmond  
 David A. Kaechele (M).....County of Henrico  
 Delores L. McQuinn (M).....City of Richmond  
 Patricia S. O’Bannon (M).....County of Henrico  
 George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield  
 Arthur S. Warren (M).....County of Chesterfield

**Others Present**

John R. Amos.....RRPDC Legal Counsel (Amos & Amos PLLC)  
Marc Amos.....Amos & Amos PLLC  
Ahmet Anday ..... Virginia Department of Transportation  
Tom Ballou ..... Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Amy Costello ..... Virginia Department of Transportation  
Douglas Landwehr ..... Virginia Department of Transportation  
Jim Sydnor ..... Virginia Department of Environmental Quality  
Carson Tucker..... Powhatan County Planning Commission  
David Williams ..... Powhatan County Planning Commission

**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 Administration  
Patricia A. Villa ..... Communications Coordinator

**Call to Order**

Chairman Angela LaCombe called the regularly scheduled May 13, 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 (21) 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 April 8, 2004 RRPDC Meeting**

Mr. Barber presented the minutes of the April 8, 2004 meeting. There being no corrections or additions, on motion of Mr. Barber, seconded by Mr. Holmes, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the April 8, 2004 meeting.

**E. Approval of March 2004 Financial Report**

Mr. Butler presented the financial report for March 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 March 2004.

**F. Chairman's Report**

There was no Chairman's report.

**G. Executive Director's Report for April 2004**

In addition to the written status report, Mr. Fisher reported that he participated in the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce InterCity Visit to Charlotte, North Carolina on April 29 – May 1, 2004.

Mr. John Amos, RRPDC Legal Counsel, introduced his partner and son, Marc Amos.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Yeas and Nays Report – A Summary of 2004 Legislation**

Mr. Fisher reported that the final legislative update, *The Yeas and Nays Report* was included in the agenda packet for information. The *Yeas and Nays Report* also included the voting record of each Capital Region Caucus member.

**B. 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 reported that this item pertains to the review of planning district boundaries being conducted by the Department of Housing and Community Development. Amelia County has expressed to the Department of Housing and Community Development a desire to become a member of this planning district commission. Staff has provided the Commission with detailed information over the past several months

regarding that request. At the April Executive Committee and Commission meetings staff was instructed to prepare a draft resolution to submit to the Department of Housing and Community Development indicating the desire of the Commission for Amelia not to join this planning district commission.

Mr. Fisher then discussed the two resolutions for consideration by the Commission. The first one followed the directive of the Executive Committee and Commission to indicate the opposition to Amelia County to join the RRPDC. Mr. Fisher stated that he took the liberty of drafting a second resolution which is somewhat softer in its tone and reads that the RRPDC continues to be satisfied with its current planning district boundaries and local government membership. The second resolution is somewhat softer and perhaps leaves a few more options available to the Commission in the future. Mr. Fisher pointed out a technical correction to both of the resolutions. In the first "whereas," second line, the words "Regional Cooperation Act of 1996" need to be stricken. He quoted that directly from a letter received from Department of Housing and Community Development but the cited Section 36-139.7 is not the Regional Cooperation Act.

Chairman LaCombe stated that the Executive Committee has discussed this issue and recommended unanimously that we go with the second resolution for a number of reasons.

Mr. Thornton asked Mr. Fisher to explain the rationale for what it is that Amelia County wants.

Mr. Fisher responded that Amelia County submitted a resolution to the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) citing a number of reasons why they thought it would be more appropriate for them to be in this planning district. Seventy percent of Amelia's workforce tends to work in the Richmond region. There is a lot of in-migration to the Richmond region to work for their residents. They feel that the growth that is occurring in Chesterfield County is getting closer to their boundaries and is leading to possible leap frog development of residential and commercial development into Amelia County. Amelia County feels that they would be in a better position to deal with that growth if they were sitting at this table and could talk to the elected leadership in Richmond area localities on a routine monthly basis. Mr. Fisher felt that there is certainly the shared water resource. The river that runs between Chesterfield and Amelia counties has potential for long term development as a regional water supply source for more than one community. Mr. Fisher stated that there certainly are areas of common interest that Amelia has expressed in their desire to join this planning district.

Mr. Miller felt a need to be looking beyond our urban areas and start looking closer to our southern neighbors as well, because they are going to receive a lot of the growth coming out of Richmond and Chesterfield. Mr. Miller believes Amelia County would be a good addition. He felt that they ought to be given the opportunity to purge the dues issue. Mr. Miller stated that he would unequivocally support them coming today. If that not be the will of this group then he would ask to defer this further so that the Commission might have the opportunity to talk to Amelia County directly. Mr. Miller believes they are good neighbors and they deserve and should be allowed to come into this Planning District Commission—they will prove to be a good addition. Mr. Miller stated he certainly was not prepared to support the resolutions. Mr. Miller requested that the Commission give that consideration and give them the opportunity to come in on probation or we could defer the matter.

Mr. Barber stated that Amelia County has been a good neighbor to Chesterfield County—maybe not to the other folks around this table in the region, as of yet. His personal issue has been they are not a member in good standing in their current planning district commission. That needs to be resolved. Chesterfield county administrator had some discussion with Amelia County officials and Mr. Barber did not know the result of that discussion. Mr. Barber did know that it has been communicated that they need to remove that hurdle (dues payment) and certainly Chesterfield and others would be willing to consider and welcome them as a member but that hurdle needs to be overcome. Mr. Barber stated he did not necessarily disagree with the resolution, but he did think that a deferral might be the right thing to do to give those discussions the opportunity to give us a conclusion. Mr. Barber suggested that the Commission could defer this to the next meeting and see if Amelia is willing to make themselves a member in good standing and therefore someone we might look to as a future member.

Chairman LaCombe stated that originally it was thought that the public hearing to be conducted by DHCD would be prior to the Commission's June meeting.

Mr. Fisher stated that he talked with Shea Hollifield with DHCD on Tuesday of this week. DHCD still has not set the date for the public input session. She said that Mike Chandler is still working with the communities in that planning district trying to resolve any of the issues they have within the planning district. DHCD wanted to wait until Mr. Chandler completed that work. Mr. Fisher further stated that he would hope that if this commission did defer action today to communicate to Amelia County the need to become whole with their current planning district, he would communicate that to DHCD and ask them to defer their public input session until Amelia County had time to take that action or not take that

action, and to give the Commission time at the June meeting to decide how to go forward.

Mr. Glover said he has tried to figure out how Amelia County could be detrimental to the RRPDC. He noted in the discussion in the book that should they decide to become a part of the MPO they would drain the resources there. With them not being an urban county, how would they drain resources from the MPO? Mr. Glover asked Mr. Fisher to give him some idea of why it would be detrimental to have them a part of RRPDC since they are critical to Chesterfield County. Mr. Glover said he would like to give both Chesterfield and Amelia every opportunity.

Mr. Fisher stated that staff was requested to put together both the advantages and disadvantages of Amelia joining RRPDC. From a staff perspective, the disadvantage is that the RRPDC has limited resources to provide services to the rural jurisdictions, and in large part the services we provide to the rural jurisdictions are subsidized by the dues of the larger jurisdictions. If the Commission added Amelia County that would add an additional rural county that the Commission would be providing those rural services. We do a lot of comprehensive plan development work, zoning ordinance reviews, and other special area planning projects for the smaller jurisdictions. It would dilute the amount of staff time available. Therefore, we consider that a potential disadvantage.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Dan Lysy to briefly state the implications to the MPO should they request to be a rural member of the MPO.

Mr. Lysy responded that with Amelia County joining the planning district commission it may also lead to their joining the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). That would be the decision of the Governor, with the concurrence of 75 percent of the local government's population and the central City, to add them as a voting member. With them as a voting member, the MPO would define a study area that would include that part of Amelia County that is either projected to be urbanized within the next 20 years, or that the MPO and Amelia County decides it should be included as a study area. A study area can include more than the area projected to be urbanized. Once they are a part of the MPO, that part of Amelia County that is in the MPO becomes eligible for regional surface transportation program funds which is one funding source that the MPO has lead on making decisions. They will not be eligible for congestion mitigation air quality funds because that is limited to the non-attainment area jurisdictions only. Regarding our planning activities, we would have to incorporate them on any special projects including long-range plan, congestion mitigation, congestion management system, and various other plans and studies. The PL funds received from the state would not increase—they would stay the same. Also, Federal Transit Administration

Section 5303 which are planning funds from the Federal Transit Administration would stay the same.

Mr. Glover said he could not see how it could be detrimental to this area. It could dilute some of the vote here. Amelia probably recognizes some of Chesterfield's needs. Chesterfield's needs and Henrico's needs are very much the same.

Mr. Butler stated that in talking to some of the other counties in the Piedmont Planning District Commission, a lot of those counties are unhappy too. He thinks it goes back to the needs of the county. Those people probably haven't paid the bill because they got nothing. Mr. Butler felt that Amelia County is willing to pay that bill regardless if the Commission considers them or not. Some of the adjoining counties have some of the same opinions that Amelia has. It's really not serving them. Amelia is getting a lot of growth and they need direction in planning.

Mr. Butler also said he did not think that Piedmont Planning District Commission had met the needs of the other counties. Sometimes we need to really do something for the people who are members. If we are all in a region maybe we need to reach out. One of these days, Cumberland County will be knocking on our door because they have water resources up there. It might be King William or Caroline County. The regions will change in years to come. Mr. Butler said he did not have a problem with Amelia County. They are going to have population growth and water that people need in the future. They also have a landfill that a lot of us already use.

Mr. Trout said he had some of the same types of concerns. But the overall concern seems to be what is happening to the planning district commission in that area and maybe the system in general around the state. He noticed from some of the newspaper articles that, in addition to Amelia County, Lunenburg and Charlotte counties are both looking in to getting out. The Piedmont Planning District could be substantially reduced and harmed by all of these people getting out. Perhaps it would be best to let Mr. Chandler take a shot at trying to correct some of the problems they have before it breaks up. If it is going to break up, to look at the state level basically to see what to do with all the counties down there, not just one at a time having them drop out.

Mr. Trout also stated that Amelia certainly has some of the same interests here, including New Kent. At the same time he was concerned about the overall Piedmont Planning District Commission and wants to give them the best chance to work out their problems and provide the services to the various jurisdictions. If that can't be done, and there is a decision to break

that up, then at that time we can bring in some jurisdiction here and to some other PDC's.

Chairman LaCombe said it sounds like people would like more time. We thought we needed to vote on this item this month with the public hearing process coming up. Chairman LaCombe asked what if the Commission recommends that the Executive Director write a letter saying the Commission would like to wait until the study is done and don't schedule the public hearing process until after RRPDC June meeting. Can we do that? Mr. Fisher agreed that a letter could be written.

Mr. Bell commented that the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Services will have the final say on this. Will DHCD be making any decisions regarding the boundaries of all the regions between now and the time the RRPDC has a chance to vote on the resolution and have our input?

Chairman LaCombe responded that what Mr. Fisher indicated was DHCD is waiting until Mike Chandler finishes his study and then they have to have a public input session before they make their decision. So the recommendation that Chairman LaCombe made was to write them a letter letting them know that the Commission would like to get further along in that process to see if some things could be rectified and ask them not to do that public meeting until after the June meeting.

Mr. Glover stated that the RRPDC, coupled with Northern Virginia and Tidewater, basically controls the vote in the State of Virginia. He said he could understand Amelia County, with their growth, wanting to be a part of a major PDC. Mr. Glover said he travels Route 360 quite frequently and he felt that Amelia County was feeling the impact of growth. They probably would want to move in this direction for the help that RRPDC could give them. Mr. Glover said he did not need any additional information, but if the Commission feels it is necessary, he would like to go ahead and take a vote.

Chairman LaCombe asked if there was suggested language for the final paragraph of the resolution?

Mr. Miller made a motion, seconded by Mr. Glover, to amend the second resolution to favorably admit Amelia County into the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission.

Discussion followed with Mr. Hartz stating it was his feeling that the RRPDC is giving them the green light to abandon the Piedmont Planning District. What if you vote to accept them before Mr. Chandler has already had a chance, if you will, to fix the problem. It may very well be with

some discussion and maybe some new staff they can pull this back together. Mr. Hartz said he would hate for this Commission to be the contributing factor in the demise of that planning district with a yes vote before they have even had a chance to fix it.

Mr. Fisher then stated that if it is the desire of the Commission to allow Amelia County to join this planning district, this Commission could remain silent right now and let the process run its course with Mike Chandler's work at Piedmont PDC. The Commission would lose nothing then in terms of the DHCD process, because you would not have had to take an option to oppose their joining this planning district and make that comment at their public input process. You could remain silent at this time, see what happens in their planning district, and then whenever DHCD holds its public input meeting, you could instruct staff at that time to endorse Amelia's joining this planning district.

Mr. Miller stated that Amelia has indicated their desire, for whatever their reason being, to eliminate or remove themselves from their present position with Piedmont PDC. They have asked RRPDC to admit them. I guess we could take the position to remain silent, but I feel an obligation to act today, but then I would certainly support the motion for deferral. We do have a motion on the table and we have a second.

Chairman LaCombe made a point of clarification stating that she did not believe that Amelia had actually contacted RRPDC to join RRPDC. Didn't they just go through DHCD and ask them to look at that? Mr. Fisher said that was technically correct.

Mr. Amos directed members to a copy of the resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors for Amelia County. It asks that the Virginia Department of Housing and Community allow Amelia County to actively participate in its review of the Commonwealth planning district boundaries. That's the request from the board of supervisors.

Chairman LaCombe said Amelia County has not come to this PDC and asked to be admitted. They sent a resolution to DHCD asking the boundaries be reviewed.

Mr. Miller said that's a fine point, too. The fact of the matter is the Commission would not be going through this exercise. The resolution we are asking is to DHCD to not consider favorably their request. We are obviously intricately involved. By the motion I requested we send to the DHCD that they favorably consider Amelia County becoming a member of RRPDC.

Chairman Lacombe asked if Mr. Miller is asking for a new resolution.

Chairman Lacombe commented that without the actual resolution in front of us, would Mr. Miller then entertain deferring this until the Commission could see the actual resolution? Mr. Miller said he would prefer to go ahead.

Mr. Miller stated at this point, whether or not the language can be worked out, he would like to go on record at this time and see where it takes us.

Mr. Gordon stated that he was having a little difficulty following the path. In October, he believed the Commission took the position basically to oppose Amelia County becoming a part of this commission. In March and April of this year, we have again discussed this matter and directed staff to draft a resolution of our position. Now, not only are we reversing that action, we are taking a pretty aggressive path in the opposite direction with this motion. Mr. Gordon stated that he sensed that some members of the commission have information that he did not have, because he did not understand that path that has led us to this point. At this point, Mr. Gordon stated he would have to oppose it and he certainly did not like doing that. Mr. Gordon said he could support a deferral so that he would have the opportunity to understand how the Commission ended up where we are today.

Mr. Miller then withdrew his motion.

Mr. Ayers then moved that the Commission adopt the second resolution that has the softer language but suggests that Amelia should not be part of the RRPDC based on the discussion held for the last six months.

Mr. Miller noted that the second to his motion had not been withdrawn.

Mr. Glover then withdrew his second to Mr. Miller's motion. Mr. Glover then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Setliff, to defer the matter until the June meeting.

Chairman Lacombe asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Barber then made an amendment to Mr. Glover's motion to direct staff to bring back a resolution that would welcome Amelia County to join the RRPDC. We would have both resolutions in front of us and then we could see the language.

Mr. Glover accepted the amendment.

Chairman Lacombe asked if the Commission was also asking DHCD to put off their public hearing and decision process until after the RRPDC's June meeting? Mr. Glover said yes, if necessary.

Chairman LaCombe called for a vote on the motion and amendment. The motion carried with Mr. Ayers voting no.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Approval of Recommendation of Audit Committee and FY 2004 through FY 2006 Audit Contract**

Mr. Butler reported that the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission Audit Committee met prior to the Executive Committee meeting April 8, 2004. They were presented with the results of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for audit services issued February 20, 2004. The RFP was advertised in *The Richmond Times-Dispatch* and mailed to nineteen (19) qualified audit firms. Three audit firms submitted responses to the RFP, they were: Witt, Mares & Company; Cherry, Bekeart & Holland; and Dunham & Aukamp. After presentation of the respondents, the Audit Committee unanimously recommended to the Executive Committee to retain Dunham & Aukamp as auditors for the Commission for the fiscal years 2004 through 2006. The Executive Committee concurred in that recommendation. Mr. Butler also noted that the contract with the audit firm was included in the agenda.

On motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Pantele, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the Audit Committee and Executive Committee recommendation to retain Dunham and Aukamp as auditors for fiscal years 2004 through 2006, and authorized the Executive Director to execute the contract as submitted.

#### **B. Richmond Nonattainment Area Designation for Ozone Air Quality Standards**

Mr. Dan Lysy, RRPDC Director of Transportation presented a written report noting that on April 15, 2004, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued its designation of areas in the U.S. that do not meet the Clean Air Act's (CAA) new 8-hour ozone air quality standard (see attached letter from EPA). Previously, the Richmond Area was a "maintenance" area for ozone air quality standards under the previous one-hour standard. EPA has been under court order to designate those areas in the U.S. that do not meet the new 8-hour standard (which was approved by EPA in 1997 and upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2001) by April 2004.

Jurisdictions within the Richmond Nonattainment Area for Ozone Air Quality Standards have been set as follows:

- County of Charles City
- County of Chesterfield
- City of Colonial Heights
- County of Hanover
- County of Henrico
- City of Hopewell
- City of Petersburg
- County of Prince George
- City of Richmond

Note that all of Charles City County is now included in the nonattainment area. Under previous designations, only a small portion of the county (near the current monitoring station at Shirley Plantation) was in the nonattainment and maintenance areas. Also note that EPA has now added the City of Petersburg and Prince George County to the nonattainment area.

It is staff's understanding that with nonattainment areas designation now set, work should now begin on the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP serves as the region's plan of action for attaining ozone air quality standards. The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ) is responsible for staffing this work. Major steps in the SIP development process include the following:

- Emissions Inventory – Identification of sources of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions. When relatively high levels of VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> are mixed together in the presence of heat and sunlight, these pollutants form ground level ozone. Ozone is harmful to human health and also damages property and plants.
- Emissions Budgets – VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions come from point sources (power and chemical plants, various manufacturing plants, etc.), area sources (lawnmowers, chain saws, barbecue grills, dry cleaners, asphalt paving and roofing, pesticides, vehicle refueling, residential and commercial fuel heating, incineration and burning, off-road vehicles, jets and airplanes, locomotives, marine vessels, etc.), mobile sources (cars, trucks, and buses), and biogenic sources. The SIP establishes emissions budgets by source (point, area, or mobile) which serve as targets to be reached by applying various control measures for emission reduction.

- Control Measures – Identifying specific actions and programs that will reduce VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. These measures identify the amount of projected (modeled) emissions reduction, the agency/jurisdiction responsible for implementation, and the schedule for its implementation.

Before work on the SIP can begin, the state must establish the CAA Section 174 Lead Planning Organization (LPO). Members on the LPO are appointed by the Governor and include local elected officials from each jurisdiction included in the nonattainment area, representatives from the state air quality planning agency (VDEQ) and state transportation planning agency (VDOT), and the metropolitan planning organizations (Richmond Area MPO and Tri-Cities Area MPO). The role of the LPO is established and defined in Section 174 of the CAA (see attached Section 7504, Planning Procedures from Title 42, Chapter 85, Subchapter I, Part D, subpart 1 of the U.S. Code). LPOs are charged as follows:

- Update as necessary or develop new planning procedures for development of the SIP.
- Determine which elements of the SIP “will be developed, adopted, and implemented (through means including enforcement) by the State and which by local governments or regional agencies, or any combination of local governments, regional agencies or the State.”
- Prepare the SIP in coordination with the MPO such that the MPO shall take into account requirements of the SIP (i.e., the MPO’s Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program must conform to the SIP by demonstrating that they are within the mobile source emissions budget as established by the SIP).

Mr. Lysy introduced Mr. Jim Sydnor and Mr. Tom Ballou of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

Following Mr. Sydnor’s introductory remarks, Mr. Tom Ballou gave a presentation covering the following items:

- 8-hour Ozone Standard
- Ozone Air Quality Status and Classification
- Consequences of Nonattainment:
  - Area Boundary
  - Requirements
  - Planning Process
  - Schedule

Chairman LaCombe thanked Mr. Sydnor and Mr. Ballou for their presentation and information.

**C. Approval of Final FY 04 RRPDC Budget**

At Mr. Glover's request, the Commission dispensed with the staff presentation on the FY 04 final budget.

There being no discussion, on motion of Mr. Glover, seconded by Mr. Setliff, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously adopted the final FY 04 RRPDC Budget.

**D. Approval of FY 05 Revised RRPDC Budget and Work Program**

At Mr. Glover's request, the Commission dispensed with the staff presentation on the FY 05 revised budget.

Mr. Glover made a motion to approve the FY 05 Budget as presented. Mr. Barber seconded the motion.

Chairman LaCombe then stated that the Executive Committee, at its meeting earlier today, voted to recommend approval of the FY 05 budget with an additional \$13,570 in the personnel column.

Mr. Glover amended his motion to approve the FY 05 Budget as written and bring the amendment back to the Commission at its June meeting pertaining to what the Executive Committee has recommended. Mr. Gordon seconded the motion. Motion carried. Mr. Butler requested that the benefits, such as social security, be added to the report so the members will know exactly what it will cost. Mr. Glover agreed.

**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**

There were no information items at this time.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman LaCombe adjourned the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

---

Paul E. Fisher  
Executive Director

---

Angela L. LaCombe  
Chairman