

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
September 14, 2006**

**Members/Alternates Present**

Chris W. Archer (M)..... County of Henrico  
 Terri C. Beirne (M).....County of Chesterfield  
 W.R. Britton, Jr. (A) ..... County of Charles City  
 Malvern R. Butler (M) .....County of Goochland  
 Amy M. Cheeley (M).....County of Hanover  
 Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan  
 John E. Gordon, Jr. (M) .....County of Hanover  
 Kathy C. Graziano (M) .....City of Richmond  
 John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond  
 Jerilynn T. Grigsby (M) ..... County of Henrico  
 Frank M. Hartz (M).....County of Goochland  
 Harvey L. Hinson (A) ..... County of Henrico  
 Russell E. Holland (M), Chairman .....County of Powhatan  
 Michael L. Holmes (M), Treasurer ..... County of Charles City  
 R. M. “Dickie” King, Jr. (M), Vice Chairman.....County of Chesterfield  
 Sherman W. Litton (M).....County of Chesterfield  
 W.C. Martin (A).....Town of Ashland  
 Eugene A. Mason (M).....City of Richmond  
 Kelly E. Miller (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
 Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) ..... County of Henrico  
 William J. Pantele (M), Secretary.....City of Richmond  
 Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover  
 Brenda L. “Sam” Snyder (M) ..... County of New Kent  
 Stran L. Trout (M).....County of New Kent  
 Arthur S. Warren (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
 David T. Williams (M) .....County of Powhatan

**Members Absent**

James B. Donati (M)..... County of Henrico  
 Thomas W. Evelyn (M) ..... County of New Kent  
 Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico  
 Renny B. Humphrey (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
 William Russell Jones, III (M).....City of Richmond  
 David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico  
 Elizabeth W. Moorhouse (M) .....County of Hanover  
 Faye O. Prichard (M) .....Town of Ashland  
 George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield  
 Ellen F. Robertson (M) .....City of Richmond  
 Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico

**Others Present**

John Amos ..... RRPDC Legal Counsel  
Mark Douglas..... Thalhimer/Cushman & Wakefield  
Bernard Harris..... CVWMA  
George Homewood ..... County of New Kent  
Kim Hynes ..... CVWMA

**Staff Present**

Paul E. Fisher ..... Executive Director  
Jo A. Evans ..... Assistant Executive Director  
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary  
Daniel N. Lysy ..... Director of Transportation  
Archita Rajbhandary ..... Associate Planner  
Jackie S. Stewart ..... Director of Planning/IT  
Peter M. Sweetland ..... Finance and Contracts Administrator  
Patricia A. Villa ..... Communications Coordinator

**Call to Order**

Chairman Holland called the regularly scheduled September 14, 2006 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:20 p.m. in the RRPDC conference room.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

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

Mr. Fisher certified that a quorum of 26 members/alternates was present.

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

Chairman Holland asked if there were any changes or additions to the order of business. He stated one item during the Executive Committee had taken an extra amount of time to discuss, and the person who would be entertaining questions for that portion of the Commission meeting would need to leave for another meeting. With that in mind, discussion for new office space, Item II D, will be moved up on the agenda. The Open Comment period (Item I C) will be moved to the end of the agenda.

At this time, Chairman Holland led the Commission in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Chairman Holland recognized Mr. Miller, who introduced a new member to the Commission from Chesterfield County, Ms. Terri C. Beirne. Mr. Trout then introduced a new Commission member from New Kent County, Ms. Sam Snyder.

Chairman Holland noted a new member from the Town of Ashland had also been appointed, Ms. Faye O. Prichard, who was not in attendance. He also welcomed Mr. W.C. Martin, who has been appointed as the alternate voting member for the Town of Ashland, and who was in attendance due to Ms. Prichard's absence.

**D. Approval of Minutes – July 13, 2006 Meeting**

Mr. Pantele presented the minutes of the RRPDC meeting held on July 13, 2006. On motion made by Mr. Pantele and seconded by Mr. Butler, the minutes were approved as presented.

**F. Approval of June/July 2006 Financial Reports**

Mr. Holmes presented the financial reports for June and July 2006. On motion made by Mr. Setliff and seconded by Mr. King, the June and July 2006 financial reports were unanimously approved as presented and accepted for audit.

**G. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Holland noted that his written report had been included in the agenda package. He stated he would like to continue work begun by Mr. Butler in his role as chairman last year, and Chairman Holland would solicit comments and suggestions from the members as they think appropriate.

**H. Executive Director's Report for June/July 2006**

Mr. Fisher presented the written staff status report, a copy having been included in the agenda, and urged the Commission members to read the report which details activities staff has undertaken in each of the localities over the past month.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

**D. Office Space Proposal**

Chairman Holland recognized Mr. Pantele, who had chaired the Office Space Sub-Committee, and asked Mr. Pantele to report on the committee's proposal.

Mr. Pantele stated the current lease is set to expire in May, 2007. The current space has been deemed inadequate to meet future space needs, and the sound system in the conference room is impaired by the HVAC equipment. The committee was charged to find new space. Even though the charter requires the offices to be located within the limits of the City of Richmond, the committee had been advised to consider all available buildings within the local member jurisdictions. Included in the agenda packet was a listing of all buildings that had been identified. Mr. Mark Douglas, of Thalhimer, Cushman & Wakefield, had been retained to help with the search. Properties were eliminated based on needs

of the Commission: adequate, free parking; accessible via public transportation; limited adverse effect in travel time to staff and members. Properties meeting these requirements were viewed, and a proposal for Stony Point I was being offered for consideration.

This office park is located near the intersection of Huguenot Road and Forest Hill Avenue. The proposal is \$16.50 per square foot, ten (10) year lease with a 3% escalator, no pass-through expenses, and a desirable location. The space is approximately 16,000 square feet, comparing to 8,700 square feet in the current location. This will add about \$105,000 to the annual rent costs per year over what is currently being paid.

The Executive Committee had extensive discussion on the proposal and had voted to recommend the proposal to the full Commission for its consideration and action.

Chairman Holland asked Mr. Douglas for any additional comments. Mr. Douglas indicated the search had been exhaustive, beginning with 48 properties. Stony Point I is \$2.00 per square foot below what had been anticipated.

Chairman Holland recognized Mr. Butler. Mr. Butler indicated just to move out of the current location would cost about \$55,000.00. Space will almost be doubled, and his concern is whether a doubling of space is actually needed. During the Executive Committee meeting, Mr. Butler had made a motion that a new proposal be presented for 13,000 square feet at the Stony Point I site. The motion failed. His other concern is whether the future direction of the Commission will warrant the additional space. Mr. Butler suggested an additional 4,000 square feet would be adequate. He further stated that the sound system could be corrected with the proper equipment. Mr. Butler stated he voted against the 16,000 square foot proposal. He questioned whether the additional expense for office space would result in additional services to the localities at additional costs. Mr. Butler also questioned some of the services currently being provided. He made a motion that Mr. Douglas should renegotiate for 13,000 square feet at the same cost per square foot. In order to open the motion for discussion, it was seconded by Mr. Litton.

The Chairman recognized Mr. Pantele, who indicated he appreciated the concerns stated by Mr. Butler. He asked members to consider two points. The proposed lease is for ten (10) years and that changes in each jurisdiction over the past ten years should be taken into consideration. Commercial real estate does not offer short-term leases. Long-term interests should be considered. While there is some risk with the proposed costs, the reduction in space may not fit into the space being considered. There are structural limitations that need to be considered. The proposal for Stony Point I is not the same proposal that was being considered earlier in the summer. Stony Point II was taken off the table with the withdrawal of CVWMA from lease negotiations.

Mr. Miller asked if there was a minimum amount of space that had to be taken at the proposed location. Mr. Douglas stated the needs of RRPDC had been given to a professional space planner, who had overlaid those needs with the space available at Stony Point I. The planner determined 16,000 square feet would be the amount of space needed. Mr. Miller asked if there was a rate differential based on the number of square feet taken. Mr. Douglas stated that is usually not the way rates are determined. Rates are based on how the space is configured. Currently there is another tenant in the space (Make a Wish Foundation) that wants to be let out of their lease. The landlord may not want to redraw the space to fit new requirements and may not release the current tenant from its lease. Mr. Miller asked for the justification in doubling the current square footage.

Mr. Fisher responded there are several factors. It is anticipated, over the ten-year period, additional staff will need to be hired to perform the work load that should increase as the jurisdictions grow and expand. Currently there is a need for two additional staff positions to offer opportunities for promotion within the organization. Mr. Miller stated that additional square footage was being added without knowing if the space would be required. He also asked if there would be funds to cover the additional costs. Mr. Fisher stated currently there is a reserve of about \$1.8 million. He reminded the members that a long-term budget analysis was made at the request of the members to determine when a dues increase would need to be made. The Commission directed staff to draw down this surplus until there was a serious need to increase dues. That would mean that in the short term, funds are available to cover the additional costs.

Mr. Miller asked if a dues increase would be required to pay for the additional rent. Mr. Fisher replied that if the reserve fund is exhausted and services continue to be provided at the current level, all revenue options would need to be reviewed. He also stated that square footage per staff member for offices is being reduced. Additional space is being added in conference room area. Population within the jurisdictions will increase over the ten-year period, and membership in the organization is based on population. Thus, there will be additional commissioners sitting on the board. A smaller conference room was also added to accommodate other meeting needs. Storage space is being added to bring in records currently being stored in an off-site rented space in accordance with records storage laws. Additional production space is being added for GIS functions and other reports being produced for localities.

Mr. Litton asked how much of the space will be for actual office space. Mr. Fisher referred to the chart on page 5 of the proposal which indicates current space for employees is at 54%, and in the new office space, that amount is reduced to 38.6%. Mr. Litton asked for the current staff levels, which at this time are 20 full time and 4 interns. It is anticipated over ten years to add four additional employees. The space being proposed could accommodate four additional employees.

Ms. Evans added that also on page 5, there is a chart showing the amount of actual square feet currently being used for office space (3,733) and the proposed office space square footage (4,299). The remaining 12,000 square feet will be taken up by conference rooms, production areas, hallways/restrooms, and dedicated space for computer equipment, which is not available in the current location.

Mr. Warren stated he would not be able to vote for expanding into 16,000 square feet based on what he has heard so far during the meeting.

Ms. Grigsby asked for clarification on space requirements for CVWMA and if the 16,000 square feet had included CVWMA. Chairman Holland indicated the 16,000 square feet was a result of needs expressed only for RRPDC after CVWMA was removed from consideration. The space is required to correct current space deficiencies. The Stony Point I space is not being held for RRPDC at the quoted rate. If another client expresses interest, they will be given a chance to make an offer on the space.

Mr. Trout stated he understood that the price being offered is valid through September 15, which is something to keep in mind. The conference room location is based on structural constraints. Reducing the square footage could result in cutting down the size of the large conference room. This was one of the reasons the Executive Committee determined it would best to continue forward with the proposal.

Mr. Butler stated that should the Commission grow to 40 commissioners, he doubted it would be a workable number. Northern Virginia PDC recently reorganized to cut down the size of its membership. He reiterated the sound system, which he understands has been the biggest complaint about the current conference room, could be addressed with the proper vendor. He feels the current system was inexpensive and would not be functional in new space.

Mr. Miller asked for the motion to be restated. Mr. Butler clarified his motion to be that Mr. Douglas should return to the property owners to renegotiate for 13,000 square feet at the \$16.50 per square foot cost. Ms. Cheeley asked if the conference room as shown on the plan could be moved. Ms. Evans stated that structural support columns on the other side of the space prohibited the conference room from being moved to that side.

Mr. Douglas reported the difference in pricing between Stony Point I and II is in the fact that existing walls, frames, etc., can be reused in Stony Point I, while in Stony Point II, some rebuilding would need to take place.

Mr. Gordon stated it seems the only concern he's hearing is the size of the square footage. If a needs analysis had been done and identified this size as being what

was required, then why, at this stage, was size being brought out as the only concern.

Mr. King asked if the Commission had ever been advised that the space being considered would be 16,000 square feet. Ms. Evans replied that when CVWMA was included in the space search, it was reported to the Commission that a total of 24,000 square feet was being sought, with 3/5 of that for RRPDC and 2/5 for CVWMA. Mr. King summarized that based on what he heard regarding needs for office space, production area, and meeting rooms, that would be an additional 4,500 square feet, which would make Mr. Butler's recommendation of 13,000 square feet in line with what was needed.

Mr. Setliff asked if Mr. Butler's motion was to have Mr. Douglas make a counter offer for 13,000 square feet or to see if there was other space available in the market. Mr. Butler indicated staff would not need to reassess their needs. Mr. Butler said the proposal before the Commission in July was based on CVWMA moving with RRPDC. There was no meeting in August, and information was only now being brought before the Commission with a request for action without time for consideration. Mr. Butler asked what would happen if some jurisdictions determined they did not want to belong to RRPDC. The additional space would not be needed.

Mr. Setliff asked if the space needed, including CVWMA, had been set at 24,000 square feet. Ms. Evans indicated the space requirements had been determined to be 20,000 square feet; however, the entire second floor at Stony Point II was 24,000 square feet. Mr. Setliff said if that was correct, then RRPDC would need only 14,000 square feet, based on RRPDC using only 3/5 of the 24,000 square feet. Ms. Evans replied that the proposal added hallways, restrooms, etc., which is what brought the number up to 16,000. She was unclear as to whether the landlord would take off 1,000 square feet if it was not accessible to another tenant. This is something Mr. Douglas will have to address with the landlord.

Ms. Graziano asked for clarification on her understanding that if the square footage is reduced at Stony Point I, the size of the conference room may not be able to be increased due to the configuration of the space. Mr. Douglas stated the issue is whether the current tenant in space needed for the conference room (Make a Wish) will be allowed out of their lease if the space is given to RRPDC. If RRPDC wants only half of that space, the current tenant may not be allowed out of their lease and may not be able to function in only half the space they currently occupy. Ms. Evans stated again that the building is not symmetrical, so the space planner will need to redraw plans to see how the required needs will fit into the reduced space. If more reconstruction will be required, the rate may go up. This process will take up to two weeks for the planner to redraw the space and for the landlord to review it. Mr. Douglas indicated this will incur additional fees as well.

Ms. Cheeley asked if the deal for Stony Point I falls through, would there be other space available. Mr. Douglas stated the space in Stony Point II would be available but at an additional \$2.00 per square foot. Mr. Douglas offered that space at \$16.50 per square foot will be difficult to find.

Chairman Holland reminded the members that the office location is required by the charter to be located within the city limits of Richmond, and it must be accessible via public transportation due to MPO requirements for federal funding.

Mr. Douglas stated that when less space was required with the withdrawal of CVWMA, the space at Stony Point I was identified.

Mr. Butler asked why Make a Wish wanted to relocate. Mr. Douglas stated the organization wanted to downsize and move to a west end location. Currently the organization uses about 4,500 square feet. Mr. Butler stated he hoped to realize a savings of approximately \$45,000.00 per year with the space reduction to 13,000 square feet. Mr. Douglas stated the owner will pay about \$2,000.00 to redraw plans, which the owner will do if the sale is certain.

Mr. Hinson commended the sub-committee on the work they had done. He stated that he did not recall information being brought to the members on how space would be used by RRPDC. The plan being brought before the Commission today seemed to be very different than what was presented in July. Mr. Hinson asked when it would be prudent to build instead of renting. He stated it would be best if the members could have time to consider the proposal and alternatives. Mr. Douglas indicated the urgency was in the fact that the market is very active at this point, and there are other organizations competing for the same type of space. Mr. Douglas indicated that excess space could be sub-let, however, any profit would go to the landlord.

Mr. Holland stated his concern was that most of the information had been previously sent out to members. He asked Mr. Douglas how much time was available for members to read through the information again and to have all questions answered. Mr. Douglas said he would guess that within the next 30 days, there is a 70% chance the space could be leased. Redrawing the plan will be contingent on whether the landlord will allow Make a Wish to split their space and if Make a Wish can operate in half the space they currently have. If the space does lease, the other option is Stony Point II, which is \$18.50 per square foot.

Mr. Setliff asked if the current lease can be extended for one year, or could RRPDC offer a down payment to hold the Stony Point location. Ms. O'Bannon asked if she had understood the motion offered in Executive Committee to be that the current proposal be held until a proposal for 13,000 square feet could be drawn up for comparison. Chairman Holland stated that was the motion, but it had been defeated. She asked if this could be done and then the Executive

Committee could meet again in a week. Mr. Amos stated that meeting notification requirements in the bylaws would not allow this.

Mr. Mason indicated his reading of the material provided had seemed positive, but with discussion, he was having some doubts as to whether the Commission should move ahead with the proposal.

Mr. Butler stated his understanding during the July meeting was that a special meeting of the Executive Committee would be called prior to the September meeting so information could be reviewed and discussed, and he was disappointed that no information had been provided until now. Mr. Setliff commented that he had received an email requesting feedback on a tour, but he had not received any subsequent information. Mr. Butler stated no notice of a special meeting had been sent out. He suggested that a counter offer for 13,000 square feet should be given to the landlord and should the offer be turned down, RRPDC could stay in its current location with renovations and upgrades to the sound system. Ms. Evans stated that the current landlord had not offered an option for lease renewal other than to go on a month-to-month basis at 200% of the current rent.

Mr. Pantele stated he will oppose the motion. He stated a lot of work had been done to find new office space. The amount of space required has been before the Commission since the process began. Dates for a special meeting had been reserved in August if the meeting was needed. The meeting was not held as there was no new information to present, and documents were circulated regarding this. The issue is how the space will be used, which cannot be ascertained by such a large body. Staff was asked to determine their space needs and limitations in the current location. Needs for larger production, GIS, and conference rooms were identified, in addition to four (4) offices for potential growth over ten years. Mr. Pantele stated that while the Commission can wait to see if smaller space at a lower cost will open up, that cannot be predicted. As there is a need now to address the issue, and space is available to meet needs as determined by staff and the sub-committee, he would oppose the motion on the floor and vote to move forward with the proposal as presented.

Mr. Butler stated that he did not believe the full Commission had ever been made aware of the space needs.

Chairman Holland ended discussion and called for a vote on the pending motion. Ms. O'Bannon asked if the motion (previously seconded by Mr. Litton) could be repeated. Mr. Butler stated he would move that Mr. Douglas return to the potential landlord with a request to lease 13,000 +/- 50 square feet at the Stony Point I site. Ms. O'Bannon asked if this was the same location that was previously agreed to, and Mr. Butler indicated his only concern was the amount of space and not the location. As the voice vote was too close to call, Chairman Holland asked for a show of hands. Those voting in favor of the motion totaled 16; those opposed to the motion totaled 8. The motion carried.

Ms. Grigsby asked if the Koger Center had been considered as a possible location. Ms. O'Bannon explained that the charter requires offices to be located within the city limits of Richmond. Locating outside Richmond city limits would require a change to the charter.

**A. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation and Plaque to Outgoing Chairman**

Chairman Holland asked Mr. Butler to come forward to receive a resolution of appreciation for his service as Chairman of the Commission during fiscal year 2006. A copy of the resolution will be filed with these minutes. Mr. Butler was also presented with a plaque commemorating his service.

**B. Appointment of Standing Committees**

Chairman Holland noted the list of Standing Committee appointments had been included in the agenda packet for the Commission's information. He thanked those members who agreed to serve on these committees. A copy of the list will be filed with these minutes.

**C. Resolution on Energy Independence**

Chairman Holland noted that during the July meeting, Mr. Butler had proposed that the Commission adopt a resolution to send to the regional Congressional delegation urging them to accelerate efforts to decrease the nation's dependence on foreign oil. Mr. Fisher reported a resolution was drafted by staff and was included in the agenda packet for the Commission's review. Since publication of the resolution, circumstances regarding gasoline prices had changed, and staff suggested minor changes in the wording of the resolution.

A revised copy of the resolution was distributed, and Mr. Fisher asked Ms. Villa to review the changes. In the first paragraph, it was suggested that the reference to July 2006 be eliminated, referring only to the year 2006, and the addition of the second paragraph to indicate that prices would more than likely rise again in the future. Mr. Amos pointed out that oil production has increased recently and suggested this be noted in the sixth paragraph. Mr. Butler agreed that in the sixth paragraph, the parenthetical phrase "while excess production has declined" be removed, and he moved the resolution be accepted as amended. The motion was duly seconded.

Chairman Holland called for a vote, and the resolution was carried as amended. A copy of the amended resolution will be filed with these minutes. Mr. Holmes asked if the resolution would be sent to all Virginia legislators, at both the national and state levels. Consensus was this should be the course of action. Staff will distribute the resolution as directed.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Resolution of Appreciation for Outgoing Members**

Chairman Holland brought to the attention of the Commission resolutions thanking Ms. Angela LaCombe and Mr. Thomas Evelyn for their service to the Commission. On motion duly made and seconded, the resolutions were approved as presented, and copies will be filed with these minutes.

#### **B. Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to Submit a Virginia Division of Legislative Services Grant Application**

Mr. Fisher indicated that for the last several years, RRPDC has applied for this grant which would fund public service announcements dedicated to reducing the amount of pollutants entering the region's streams and water bodies. On motion made by Mr. Butler and seconded by Ms. O'Bannon, the resolution was carried, and a copy will be filed with these minutes.

#### **C. FY 07 RRPDC / Department of Housing and Community Development Contract**

Mr. Fisher reported this is the annual contract that provides state funding pursuant to the provisions of certain items as required by the Regional Cooperation Act. The funding would be in the amount of \$165,277.00. On motion duly made and seconded, the Commission authorized Mr. Fisher to execute the contract.

#### **D. Resolution to Amend ICMA 457 Deferred Compensation Plan to Permit Loans**

Mr. Fisher stated that several employees had requested this item be brought to the Commission for its action. Funds for this plan are contributed solely by employees, and loans could be drawn only on an employee's individual account. Involvement by RRPDC would be limited to signing and mailing the application, setting up a recurring payroll deduction, and transmitting the loan repayment to ICMA with the routine monthly contributions. Costs to RRPDC would be negligible. On motion duly made and seconded, the resolution to amend the 457 deferred compensation plan with ICMA to include a provision to permit loans by employees against their individual accounts was carried. A copy will be filed with these minutes.

#### **E. Amendments to the Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan**

Mr. Fisher introduced Ms. Kim Hynes, newly appointed executive director of Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (CVWMA), replacing Mr. John Mitchell who retired in August. Chairman Holland invited Ms. Hynes to make a few comments.

Ms. Hynes thanked the members of the Commission for their warm welcome and stated she looked forward to working with everyone.

Mr. Fisher also indicated Ms. Hynes is participating as a member of the 2007 Leadership Metro Richmond class, for which he is acting as a team facilitator.

Mr. Fisher presented for the Commission's review an amendment to the Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan to include the proposed Skinquarter Land, LLC Construction/Demolition/Debris Landfill in Chesterfield County. The Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors has approved a provisional use permit. On motion made by Mr. King and seconded by Ms. O'Bannon, the amendment was approved as presented, and a copy will be filed with these minutes.

## **I. Administration**

### **C. Open Public Comment Period**

As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, Chairman Holland closed the public comment period.

## **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

### **B. Committee Reports**

#### Emergency Broadcast Communications

Ms. O'Bannon gave a brief update on the Emergency Broadcast Communications Sub-Committee. She reported that some jurisdictions are still working on approving a Memorandum of Understanding with WCVE radio. She encouraged members to work with their respective boards of supervisors to have these issues worked out soon. Chairman Holland thanked Ms. O'Bannon for her work on this committee.

### **C. For Your Information**

Items included for the Commission's information:

1. Letter from Gwen Sarsfield thanking Mr. Fisher for his help with the Leadership Metro Richmond 2006 class.
2. Letter from Dawn Godwin, Acting Program Manager, Park Planning and Special Studies with the U.S. Department of the Interior, thanking the

Commission members for the resolution asking that the study of the Captain John Smith water trail be made a priority.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Holland asked for a motion to adjourn. Such a motion was duly made and seconded, and the meeting adjourned at approximately 2:40 p.m.

---

Paul E. Fisher  
Executive Director

---

Russell E. Holland  
Chairman