

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**July 12, 2007**

**Members/Alternates Present**

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  
Richard W. Glover (M) ..... County of Henrico  
John C. Grier (M) ..... City of Richmond  
Michael L. Holmes (M), Vice Chairman ..... County of Charles City  
David A. Kaechele (M) ..... County of Henrico  
R. M. “Dickie” King, Jr. (M), Chairman ..... County of Chesterfield  
Beverley C. Lacy (M) ..... City of Richmond  
William J. Pantele (M), Treasurer ..... City of Richmond  
Faye O. Prichard (M) ..... Town of Ashland  
George K. Roarty (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Robert R. Setliff (M) ..... County of Hanover  
Donald D. Sowder (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Frank J. Thornton (M) ..... County of Henrico  
Stran L. Trout (M) ..... County of New Kent  
David T. Williams (M) ..... County of Powhatan

**Members Absent**

Thomas M. Branin (M) ..... County of Henrico  
James B. Donati (M), Secretary ..... County of Henrico  
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M) ..... County of Hanover  
Kathy C. Graziano (M) ..... City of Richmond  
Jerilynn T. “Jeri” Grigsby (M) ..... County of Henrico  
Frank M. Hartz (M) ..... County of Goochland  
Russell E. Holland (M) ..... County of Powhatan  
Renny B. Humphrey (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Sherman W. Litton (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Delores L. McQuinn (M) ..... City of Richmond  
Kelly E. Miller (M) ..... County of Chesterfield  
Elizabeth W. Moorhouse (M) ..... County of Hanover  
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) ..... County of Henrico  
Ellen F. Robertson (M) ..... City of Richmond  
Brenda L. “Sam” Snyder (M) ..... County of New Kent  
Arthur S. Warren (M) ..... County of Chesterfield

**Others Present**

John Amos ..... RRPDC Legal Counsel

**Staff Present**

Jo A. Evans ..... Interim Executive Director  
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary  
Daniel N. Lysy ..... Director of Transportation  
Barbara Nelson..... Principal Planner  
Jackie S. Stewart ..... Director of Planning/IS  
Peter M. Sweetland ..... Finance and Contracts Administrator  
Patricia A. Villa ..... Communications Coordinator  
Lee Yolton ..... Principal Planner

**Call to Order**

Vice Chairman King called the regularly scheduled July 12, 2007 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:20 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. At this time Vice Chairman King led the Commission in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Vice Chairman King thanked Mr. Butler for asking during his tenure as Chairman that the pledge be included on all Commission agendas

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

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

Ms. Evans certified that a quorum of 17 members/alternates was present.

**B. Installation of RRPDC Officers for FY 08**

Vice Chairman King noted that Chairman Holland could not attend today’s meeting because he is in Alabama with family to be with his seriously ill mother-in-law. In the absence of Chairman Holland, the oath of office for incoming offices will administered by Ms. Evans.

Chairman: R.M. “Dickie” King, Jr. Chesterfield County  
Vice Chairman: Michael L. Holmes Charles City County  
Treasurer: William J. Pantele City of Richmond

Following the installation of FY 08 officers, Ms. Evans stated that Mr. Donati (Henrico County), incoming Secretary, will be contacted and asked to come into the RRPDC offices within the next week to take his oath of office.

### **C. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business**

Chairman King asked if there were any changes or additions to the order of business. No changes or additions were requested.

### **D. Open Public Comment Period**

Chairman King asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment. As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, Chairman King closed the public comment period.

### **E. Approval of Minutes – May 10, 2007 Meeting**

Chairman King presented minutes of the RRPDC meeting held on May 10, 2007 on behalf of Mr. Donati. On motion made by Mr. Butler and seconded by Mr. Setliff, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

### **F. Approval of April/May 2007 Financial Reports**

Mr. Pantele presented the financial reports for April and May 2007. On motion made by Mr. Pantele and seconded by Mr. Holmes, the April and May 2007 financial reports were unanimously approved as presented and accepted for audit.

### **G. Chairman's Report**

Chairman King thanked Mr. Holland for doing a commendable job during his tenure as Chairman over the past year. Chairman King stated it is his intention to continue the practice of providing a written Chairman's Report as instituted by Mr. Holland. Should any members have questions or concerns regarding any item in the agenda books, please contact Chairman King prior to the upcoming meeting to allow time for him to gather information that may be required to answer the questions. This will also minimize the time spent in meetings.

Chairman King said he would like to make a statement and asked that members try to understand his intention. He stated that he has learned a lot over the past three and a half years about RRPDC and the MPO by attending meetings and listening to other members. He is now in the position of Chairman because he was asked to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Barber's departure. Chairman King stated he would like to serve in a fair and effective manner. He will seek advice from members with more experience on the Commission.

Over the past three and a half years, Chairman King has observed discussions regarding the future direction of the Commission. The RRPDC executive director has retired. Some members thought he did a good job; others did not. Chairman King understands that staff considered Mr. Fisher to be an excellent executive director. Until the future direction of the Commission can be determined and

what members expect the Commission to accomplish can be ascertained, nothing will be done to begin the executive director search. Chairman King stated that unless this issue can be put to rest, he will not serve out his six-month term as Chairman. It has been his choice not to seek reelection to his seat on the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors, so his term as Commission Chairman will end in six months. He commended the elected officials who serve on the Commission for the good work they've done in their own districts.

Chairman King stated he has seen Mr. Gordon, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Holland, as Commission chairmen, and Mr. Pantele as chairman of the Personnel and Operating Policies Committee, work over the past three and a half years to resolve the issue of the Commission's future direction. There is still no consensus on what this should be. Chairman King pointed out that unless the four larger jurisdictions can agree on the course of action, nothing will be accomplished. He would like representatives from the four larger jurisdictions (Counties of Chesterfield, Hanover, and Henrico and the City of Richmond) to meet and discuss the issue. Once they reach an agreement, the result would be brought back to the full Commission for discussion.

Chairman King indicated he does not want it to seem that he is excluding anyone from the discussions. At some point, there needs to be a decision as to whether the Commission will give direction to staff on what must be done. He stated that he does not know enough about the inner workings of the Commission to do this on his own. He will be glad to assist the other members in determining this. Chairman King has read in minutes [Personnel and Operating Policies Committee meeting, March 8, 2007] that his county administrator viewed some of the issues as being territorial in nature. Chairman King stated this is true, and he has been part of the problem. He said he feels that there must be something that the entire Commission can agree on to be the Commission's future direction.

Chairman King said he does not want to make this a political issue. He has heard and participated in previous discussions that perhaps the RRPDC should be dissolved. He stated this is his own opinion and not that of anyone else. It is his understanding that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) must be in existence due to the use of federal funds. Chairman King stated that while he knows staff would not want to hear this, he would offer that if RRPDC does not serve any purpose, then it should not exist. However, in conversations with his counterparts, he has learned there are many reasons for RRPDC to exist. Over the next few months, he would encourage everyone to agree on what is it that RRPDC should be doing. If there is nothing for the Commission to do, then the members should state this in writing.

Chairman King said that he understands he has been a part of the problem because of wanting to protect his territory, just as other members want to protect their territories. Before money is spent to hire a new executive director, Chairman King said he wants the Commission members to be able to agree on what the

purpose and direction of the agency should be. Once that is determined, then a firm should be brought in to help with the search. If the four larger jurisdictions cannot determine what the focus of the Commission should be, then perhaps a facilitator should be brought in to help do this. Chairman King said that in truth, he feels the agency cannot be dissolved because he believes it would send the wrong message to the public. He also feels that members do care about what happens in neighboring jurisdictions. The problem seems to be that no one can agree on what the focus should be.

Chairman King stated again that he is not prepared to serve his six-month tenure if members are not willing to resolve the issue. He would appreciate the help and advice of members in getting this done.

Chairman King then updated members of the Commission on how the office relocation had progressed. He said the move was completed, and there were still some items that need attention, such as the wallpaper in the hall outside of the board room. The contractor has promised the work will be finished by the end of next week. In September, the Executive Committee will meet in the smaller meeting room adjacent to the board room. An official open house will be held following the September meetings. If anyone would like to tour the space following today's meeting, staff will be happy to take members through the suite. Chairman King stated that he does not know how the space will work out, but he does know it seems as if it will. Staff appears to be happy with the transition.

All operating systems and other equipment were moved without any problems and are all fully operational.

In conjunction with Mr. Holland, appointments were made to the Secondary Roads Maintenance Fund Committee. Members of this committee will meet and their report will be given at an upcoming meeting.

With regard to the search for a new executive director, this relates back to Chairman King's statements about addressing the future direction of the Commission. Until membership on the Personnel and Operating Policies Committee is finalized, any further discussion will be deferred until the September meeting. Chairman King said he would like this to move forward at the September meeting.

The Personnel and Operating Policies Committee has been chaired by Mr. Pantele, and the committee has met several times over the past six months to discuss the search process and needs of the Commission. Chairman King feels that Mr. Pantele has worked as hard as the previous chairmen in trying to set the direction of the Commission. Chairman King may elect to change the chairmanship of this committee, but only after he has met with other members for feedback. This will not reflect one way or the other on any of the committee members. Six firms were identified that could assist in the search for a new

executive director. There may be a special meeting of the Commission called to discuss only the executive director search and future direction of the Commission. Chairman King asked Ms. Evans to help him set up a meeting with members of the larger jurisdictions to begin discussions on this issue.

The Chairman reported that appointments to Standing Committees will be made during the September meeting. These committees are the Executive Committee, the Audit Committee, the Personnel and Operating Policies Committee, and the Charter and Bylaws Committee.

Chairman King informed the Commission that Ms. O'Bannon had contacted him with information on a grant being awarded by the Department of Homeland Security. She will be unable to attend today's meeting due to a prior commitment with the National Association of Counties conference which is being held this week. The grant amount will be between \$16 - \$20 million. More details will be available to the jurisdictions next week. The grant will be awarded based on the following criteria:

- regionalism and local governments setting their own priorities
- communications such as E-911 systems
- interoperability of emergency communications
- some type of tie-in with 700 MHz radio systems
- urban areas working with rural areas

Chairman King has asked staff to communicate with Ms. O'Bannon to make sure that all jurisdictions receive the grant information as there is a short turn-around time to make the application. A final decision will be made by the governor by the end of September.

Typically the August RRPDC Executive Committee and Commission meetings are cancelled. If there is no urgent business to come before the Commission in August, a motion to cancel the meeting would be appropriate. Mr. Holmes moved that the August Commission meeting be cancelled; the motion was seconded by Mr. Sowder. The motion was carried unanimously.

The August MPO Executive Committee and full MPO meetings will need to be held on August 9 to address an item that was deferred from the June meetings.

Chairman King thanked members for the opportunity to serve as Chairman and encouraged members to contact him with any questions. He stated this is truly a humbling position, and he would encourage everyone to work together to set the future direction of the Commission.

## **H. Interim Executive Director's Report for June 2007**

Ms. Evans 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.

On behalf of all staff, Ms. Evans thanked members of the Commission for their support in the office relocation. Staff anticipates that by the September meeting, everything will be in place. RRPDC was at the old location for seventeen years, finally outgrowing the space. Ms. Evans anticipates the agency will be at this new location for many years past the current ten-year lease. There is room to grow and accomplish whatever the Commission would like for staff to undertake.

Ms. Evans reported that a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request was made of staff on the day the relocation was taking place. Information on the Regional Mass Transit Study (RMTS) has been requested by a local law firm. The RMTS is being undertaken by RRPDC staff on behalf of the MPO. The Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation also received an identical request. Mr. Lysy is working with Mr. Amos to make sure the request is fulfilled in a timely and accurate manner, following all FOIA guidelines.

Mr. Trout has brought a work product for the members to see. Part of this product was completed by RRPDC staff. Mr. Trout distributed copies of a Charles City County/New Kent County map that was begun in 2006. Both counties worked in cooperation with PDC staff to finalize the map, which cost about 8.5¢ each to produce. These will be placed at the Information Center on I-64 as well as other public buildings such as banks and restaurants in the counties. In addition to being good publicity for the counties, Mr. Trout reported that local residents are using the maps to find restaurants. There is historical information included on the maps as well, such as the Washington-Rochambeau Route, the John Smith Trail, and the J.E.B. Stuart ride during the Civil War. Mr. Trout thanked Ms. Stewart and her staff for their help in working with county staff to produce the map. He suggested that perhaps PDC staff could work with other counties to produce a map relating Civil War battles in anticipation of the upcoming 150th anniversary of the Civil War.

Mr. Amos added that with regard to the FOIA request, there was not a lot of information to pass along to the requestor, a Richmond law firm. The firm has been invited to come to the agency to look at what is available. There is no clear understanding as to exactly what information is being sought. Staff is cooperating with the request.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no Old Business to discuss.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

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

#### **B. Resolution of Appreciation for Paul Fisher**

Chairman King brought to the Commission's attention a resolution of appreciation for the outgoing Chairman included in the agenda book under Tab 5. He asked members to take a look at this resolution in addition to a second resolution of appreciation for Paul Fisher under Tab 6. The Chairman suggested that one motion to approve both resolutions would be in order. Should the resolutions be approved, both Mr. Holland and Mr. Fisher would be presented with the resolutions during the September meeting.

On motion made by Mr. Sowder and seconded by Ms. Prichard, the resolutions were approved as printed. Copies will be filed with these minutes.

### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **A. Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports.

#### **B. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

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

Included for the Commission's information was a copy of a letter appointing members to the Secondary Roads Maintenance Fund Study Committee.

At this time, Chairman King recognized Mr. Glover, who thanked Chairman King for his opening remarks on the future direction of the Commission. Mr. Glover asked if, prior to the jurisdictions meeting to discuss the future direction of the Commission, PDC staff could provide a list of projects undertaken over the past five years, including outcomes, and projects staff is working on currently. In addition, staff could include any projects staff feels would be appropriate for the Commission to undertake. Mr. Glover stated he felt this would be a good place to start – to know what had been done, what is currently being done, and what the staff sees as possible projects. Staff are the professionals and should be called upon to provide this information.

Chairman King stated that he had learned just today that staff does more than he realized. He also stated he agreed with Mr. Glover's suggestion. Mr. Glover stated

he felt that the PDC has done more than members realize. Many of the projects done by staff are never seen by the members. If staff could present these in a way members could understand the in-depth work that goes in to the projects it would be helpful. Mr. Glover said he knows staff has a GIS area and that street names are handled by staff. He would like a record of what has been done so going forward, it will be known that projects are accomplished.

Chairman King said he thought this would be a good idea, because it would allow kudos to be given to staff. He asked Ms. Evans if this could be done prior to any meeting with jurisdictions. Chairman King stated he would still like to move forward to set up a meeting with the larger jurisdictions, and he did not mean to exclude anyone from the discussion. He feels that the larger jurisdictions should meet first. The issue is how to begin to resolve the process. Chairman King said he felt Mr. Glover's suggestion was a very good one. The truth is that the group needs to know the successes and failures to allow the group to know how to begin.

Chairman King recognized Ms. Prichard who said she commended Chairman King for what he was trying to accomplish. She stated that she does have a concern with beginning the discussion of what RRPDC is all about without including the smaller jurisdictions. Ms. Prichard said she does believe the Chairman's idea is correct, that a smaller group would be a good way to begin, but the smaller jurisdictions do play a large part in what happens. If they do not have a voice in the beginning, she does not see how they will have an equal voice going forward.

Chairman King said her point was well taken. He asked if Ms. Prichard would acknowledge that he could have called such a meeting without her knowledge. Ms. Prichard agreed. Chairman King continued by saying that he wanted to be truthful about asking for the meeting and in no way would the discussions of the four larger jurisdiction not be brought before the full Commission. He would like the larger jurisdictions to tell him what would or would not be tolerated relating to agency functions. There are some big issues to discuss that can be viewed as territorial. Chairman King said he would defer to Mr. Amos for an opinion on whether this meeting of just the larger jurisdictions could take place. If this is not possible, some other method will be identified.

Mr. Glover said he understands the point Ms. Prichard was making, and he knows that the Chairman does not mean to exclude anyone. Mr. Glover said there are different wishes and desires that each jurisdiction would like to see fulfilled. He suggested that two committees be formed – one with the larger jurisdictions and one with the smaller jurisdictions. Staff could support both. After both groups meet, then the Chairman would have input from both to bring back to the full Commission for discussion.

Chairman King stated that he held the more experienced members of the Commission, such as Mr. Butler, in high esteem. As such, the last thing he would want to do is hurt Mr. Butler in some way by excluding the smaller jurisdictions from

the discussion. Ultimately no decision would be made without a vote by the full Commission. Chairman King said his motive is to have the meeting in order to begin a dialogue. He knows the jurisdictions meet outside of the Commission and perhaps he could get together with people during one of those meetings.

Mr. Amos said he believes such a meeting would violate the spirit of the Act (by which the Commission was created) and Bylaws to have a meeting that is segregated by the largest versus the smallest.

Mr. Glover said in dealing with the MPO, there are segregated issues – urban, those that will be urbanized, and those that are rural. He does not want to do anything exclusionary; however, he thinks members with like interests should meet. Mr. Glover does not see he has anything in common with a smaller jurisdiction such as Charles City. Henrico does not have some of the same issues as the smaller jurisdictions. He believes the major jurisdictions have a different vision for the future in their jurisdictions.

Mr. Amos said he agrees, but that's the reason for a regional commission. Mr. Glover continued by saying he didn't believe the Chairman was attempting to split the Commission into two different groups. Chairman King said his intent is to find out if there is a way to have the meetings as he would like.

Mr. Glover said he would like the Chairman to appoint two committees, both to discuss the future of RRPDC. The Chairman should choose the members for both. Chairman King asked Ms. Prichard if she would be agreeable to this. Ms. Prichard said as long as the committees had an equal voice she would have no problem with the appointment of two committees. Chairman King said the motive is to assist Mr. Pantele, Mr. Butler, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Gordon in finding some resolution to the issue. His motive is to get on with business.

Chairman King asked if there was any further discussion. He does not want to undermine the agency in any way. He recognized Ms. Cheeley who asked who would be on the ad-hoc committees and what would they accomplish.

Chairman King said he would like to appoint someone like Mr. Butler to head up one committee and perhaps Mr. Glover to chair the committee for the larger jurisdictions. Ultimately, if at some point, a way is not found for the larger jurisdictions to accomplish what they see as needed, the smaller jurisdictions will be hurt. The organization should be doing things everyone wants. There are many different interests and not all of them are competing. There is some common ground to be found that will benefit the entire region.

Ms. Cheeley said that in Hanover, there are differences in each of the magisterial districts. There is typically a representative from each of those districts present when something needs to be discussed. Mr. Glover said Henrico does not have that diversity.

Mr. Amos suggested that he believes this should not be set up as a special meeting called by the chair. He believes the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, can appoint committees to take on any assignment the Chairman would like. Mr. Amos said he thought this was the route the Chairman should take. If the Chairman feels there should be a committee made up of only representatives from the smaller localities to discuss an issue, then that would be the way to proceed. Chairman King asked for clarification, and Mr. Amos said it would be a special committee that would report back to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Glover said he did not agree with this. He believes the Executive Committee has been set up over the past four or five years as the governing body of the PDC, and that was not the intent. Every jurisdiction should have a say in what is decided. Chairman King is attempting to bring about a thought process and not division. He does not want to leave out any jurisdiction. There needs to be some dialogue. At some time, the two groups could meet as a whole and then come back to the entire Commission. Mr. Glover said he does not think the intent should be “separate but equal.”

Mr. Amos said the whole idea is regional cooperation. Everyone must work together toward a common goal; everyone agrees with this. If the Chairman wants to hear from the larger localities, the best way to do this is not to call a special meeting, but to set a special committee as indicated in the Bylaws: “The Chairman may from time to time establish such special committees as he deems desirable and shall appoint members....” This must be done with the concurrence of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Glover asked who said the Executive Committee must be involved. Mr. Amos stated this was in the Bylaws, and Mr. Glover asked for it to be read. Mr. Amos continued, “The Chairman may from time to time establish such special committees as he deems desirable and shall appoint members thereto with the concurrence of the Executive Committee. An example of such as committee would be the Nominating Committee.”

Mr. Sowder asked if he could offer another proposal. He stated he is probably one of the newest members on the Commission board, and he does not know a lot about what the Commission does. He accepts responsibility for not taking time to learn about the purpose of the Commission and what it is supposed to do. He would suggest that staff meet with members to educate members on what the agency does. Chairman King stated this has been done in the past on numerous occasions. Mr. Sowder said this meeting could be held with the entire group and then the committees could meet afterward. He further stated it would be helpful for him to know what projects had been done in the past, which ones were significant and not significant, and what applies to both small and larger jurisdictions. He said this should be a starting point for the smaller committees.

Chairman King replied that in his original proposal, he has asked for Ms. Evans to gather that information together to provide to the jurisdictions. This information would also be provided to both committees. His intent is that this could be done in an expedient manner. If the members cannot agree on anything, then the least the board can do is agree on that – that the members can't agree on anything – and let staff know that regional cooperation is not happening. He feels that there is something the group can agree on, and even after all of the work done previously, the Commission is still right back at the same point.

Mr. Glover asked how many jurisdictions participated in building and supporting monetarily the Richmond Convention Center. How many are paying operating costs today? How many participate in the regional environmental issue of recycling? Originally fourteen localities participated; Mr. Kaechele was chairman of that environmental committee. Are they all still participating? This is why he asked for Ms. Evans to provide a list of what the agency has accomplished. Mr. Glover continued with other examples of regional cooperation and stated all localities can participate if they would like to participate. Forty-one localities use the Richmond airport, but not all of those help fund the airport. Mr. Glover stated his point is that the group needs to know how RRPDC has been successful in order to know how to plan for the future. Staff can then know what is expected of them.

Chairman King recognized Mr. Pantele. Mr. Pantele stated that the regional planning legislation is open-ended to provide a mechanism for regional governments to come together with any project. He suggested that the word “planning” may not have been the best word to use. It is really whatever the vision of everyone in the room wants it to be. He has attended a retreat where this was discussed. In addition, there was a full day spent looking at the Commission's accomplishments, which were recorded and distributed to members at least on two occasions. Twice he has invited members to send their thoughts and comments to him, and he has not received any comments. He will send it out as many times as it takes. Is there something that can be done better, more economically? Mr. Pantele said he does not see the problem as a big jurisdiction versus small jurisdiction issue. He thinks it is a matter of collectively developing a vision of what the group would like to see happen and think about how the group can accomplish that. He further stated he felt the group had been respectful of one another and perhaps too respectful. The group needs to follow through on the last retreat the group had with Dr. Chandler. He asked if Dr. Chandler needs to be invited back to review what has been discussed previously. Mr. Pantele said he believes Chairman King is right to suggest there should be two or three things the group can agree to work on going forward.

Mr. Butler commented that he thought this was the right avenue to take. Every planning district goes through some type of exercise to change their direction. All of the localities should support regional efforts. He said he had challenged his county's planning department to come up with ideas the county can work on and got back a list of twelve ideas. This is what needs to be done by Commission members. Ideas should be sought from the jurisdictional staffs by each Commission member, such as

talking with the town manager, county administrator, city manager, etc. Then these can be brought back to the Commission for discussion. The larger jurisdictions should have their own meeting as should the smaller jurisdictions. Then a meeting should be held together to discuss these. The local staffs know the problems that need to be addressed regionally.

Chairman King said the issues need to be narrowed down. The motive is that it should be determined what the Commission members can work on together. He asked Mr. Amos for his input.

Mr. Amos read the first two sentences of the Virginia Code that established the PDC.

It is the purpose of the planning district commission to encourage and facilitate local government cooperation and state local cooperation in addressing on a regional basis problems greater than local significance. This cooperation resulting from this Chapter is intended to facilitate the recognition and analysis of regional opportunities and to take account of regional influences on planning and implementing public policy and services.

Chairman King said there are two words that he would like to emphasize from what Mr. Amos read – cooperation and regional. There has to be something the Commission can cooperate on regionally.

Mr. Setliff said he thought this was the best way to continue in finding a common goal. He would suggest that all elected officials from the jurisdictions be included on the committees. Chairman King said he would clarify that this would be only to show the differences in each jurisdiction, not to exclude anyone. Mr. Setliff agreed. Mr. Glover said he agreed with this as well. Mr. Setliff said this issue needs to be resolved so a new executive director can be hired.

Chairman King said he would appoint two committees and will contact those he would like to serve on the committees. He again stated that he is not willing to give his time to this organization unless members can agree to find something to agree on or to disagree going forward. He hopes that in six months the issue can be resolved.

Mr. Amos said he will work with the Chairman to appoint the committees, and the goal given to the committees would be to address issues of each group that they feel are regional issues and to identify these issues and resources and solutions to address them.

Mr. Kaechele said the definition of regional does not have to include all nine jurisdictions; Mr. Amos agreed. Mr. Kaechele asked who would represent the jurisdictions. Chairman King said he would support any suggestion that will get the group going in the direction needed to resolve the issue. Mr. Kaechele said he believed including the CAOs and CEOs would be helpful. Chairman King asked if

these individuals had ever met to discuss these issues. Mr. Glover said these individuals typically meet monthly.

Chairman King said he would appreciate everyone's cooperation in getting this issue resolved or a new chairman will need to be appointed.

Mr. Butler said he would like to make a motion that the Executive Committee endorse those appointed to these two committees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pantele.

Mr. Amos suggested that the Commission meeting be adjourned and the Executive Committee be reconvened to address this motion.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, on motion duly made by Mr. Kaechele and seconded by Mr. Trout, Chairman King adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:40 p.m.

---

Jo A. Evans  
Interim Executive Director

---

R.M. "Dickie" King, Jr.  
Chairman