

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
October 11, 2007

Members/Alternates Present

Malvern R. Butler (M) County of Goochland
Amy M. Cheeley (M)..... County of Hanover
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M) County of Hanover
Kathy C. Graziano (M) City of Richmond
John C. Grier (M)..... City of Richmond
Jerilynn T. “Jeri” Grigsby (M)..... County of Henrico
Harvey L. Hinson (A) County of Henrico
Russell E. Holland (M) County of Powhatan
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
Kelly E. Miller (M) County of Chesterfield
Elizabeth W. Moorhouse (M) County of Hanover
William J. Pantele (M), Treasurer..... City of Richmond
Faye O. Prichard (M) Town of Ashland
Robert R. Setliff (M)..... County of Hanover
Donald D. Sowder (M) County of Chesterfield
Millard D. “Pete” Stith, Jr.(A) 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
Robert R. Cosby (M)..... County of Powhatan
James B. Donati (M), Secretary County of Henrico
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico
Courtney Hyers (M)..... County of Goochland
Renny B. Humphrey (M) County of Chesterfield
Beverley C. Lacy (M) City of Richmond
Sherman W. Litton (M)..... County of Chesterfield
Delores L. McQuinn (M) City of Richmond
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) County of Henrico
George K. Roarty (M)..... County of Chesterfield
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
Michael Aukamp..... Dunham, Aukamp, and Rhodes, PLC
John Anzivino Springsted Incorporated
W. Deney Hurley Branscome, Inc.
J. Parker Mills Branscome, Inc.

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

Chairman King called the regularly scheduled October 11, 2007 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:35 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. At this time Chairman King asked Mr. Miller to lead the Commission in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I. ADMINISTRATION

Chairman King thanked members for their patience in waiting until the Executive Committee had finished its meeting; it was not the intention of Committee members to take as long as they had to conclude business.

A. Certification by Commission Interim Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Ms. Evans stated that a quorum of members was present.

B. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business

Chairman King asked if there were any changes in the order of business. Mr. Butler asked if the representative from Springsted and the auditor could be moved up on the agenda due to the potential for a long meeting. Chairman King stated he would move the presentation by Springsted to the second item under Old Business as this had been discussed at a previous meeting, and the audit report would stay as the first item under New Business.

C. 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.

D. Approval of Minutes – September 13, 2007 Meeting

Chairman King presented minutes of the RRPDC meeting held on September 13, 2007 on behalf of Mr. Donati, who was not in attendance. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Butler. Mr. Hinson asked that a correction be made to the minutes before a vote was taken. He stated it was a minor correction, but on page 8, in the second paragraph, he would like for his job title to be corrected to read Deputy County Manager for Community Development. Chairman King stated this would be done. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pantele, and the minutes were unanimously approved as corrected. Mr. Holland abstained from the vote as he was not in attendance at that meeting.

E. Approval of August Financial Reports

Chairman King asked Mr. Pantele to present the financial reports for August 2007. Mr. Pantele called the members' attention to the report under Tab 2. Mr. Pantele moved that the report be accepted; Mr. Butler seconded the motion. There being no questions, the August 2007 financial reports were unanimously approved as presented and accepted for audit.

F. Chairman's Report

Chairman King noted his written report was under Tab 3 of the agenda book. The Open House held at the RRPDC offices on October 3 went very well.

The Ad-Hoc Committees will present reports. One reason the Executive Committee had met so long today was because there are some exciting things going on, and Chairman King hopes this will carry forward into today's Commission meeting.

A report will be given by the Personnel and Operating Policies Committee regarding the search for a new executive director. A representative from the proposed search firm is in attendance to answer any questions.

G. Interim Executive Director's Report for August/September 2007

Ms. Evans stated the report of staff activities over the past two months is in the agenda book under Tab 4. She encouraged members to read the report for details of work being done by staff on behalf of each jurisdiction.

Ms. Evans noted she had been asked to talk about the Chickahominy River Recreational Access study. She asked Ms. Stewart to offer a few details on this study.

Ms. Stewart remarked this study was prepared by staff as part of the work program under the Virginia Coastal Program. Staff has identified existing resources and facilities in the Chickahominy watershed, working with local government staffs. Staff made recommendations for future growth of recreational planning. The report has been sent out for comments, which will be reviewed and incorporated into a final report. Mr. Holmes asked if there was a timeline for completion. Ms. Stewart noted that the report was anticipated to be finalized by the end of October or the first part of November. Once it has been completed, it can be presented to the Commission if members so desire.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Presentation of Resolution of Appreciation and Plaque to RRPDC Outgoing Member, Frank M. Hartz

Chairman King noted that the resolution, as approved by the Commission during its September meeting, was included in the agenda book under Tab 5. As Mr. Hartz was not in attendance today, Chairman King said he would like the record to reflect his thanks to Mr. Hartz on behalf of the Commission for his service. The resolution will be forwarded to Mr. Hartz.

B. Report of Personnel and Operating Policies Committee (item moved from Other Business, Item A.2.)

Chairman King asked Mr. Pantele to present the report from this committee.

Mr. Pantele reported he and the committee's vice chair, Ms. Prichard, along with staff, had worked on the issue of identifying a firm to conduct the search for a new executive director. Firms that had been asked to submit proposals were SouthEast Regional Directors Institute (SERDI), The Hawkins Company, The Mercer Group, and Springsted Incorporated. Fees of each group were considered, and a review of search evaluations/references was made. In consultation with Ms. Prichard, it was their recommendation that Springsted be hired to conduct the search. The fees were competitive, and the overall presentation and experience of Springsted drew them to make this recommendation.

The Personnel and Operating Policies Committee is recommending that Springsted be hired as the search firm, at a cost of \$15,500.00, with out of pocket expenses not to exceed \$3,500.00. Out of pocket costs exceeding that amount will need to have prior written approval. A draft contract was distributed for members to review. Mr. Amos has also reviewed the contract and made recommendations which have been incorporated in the draft contract.

A representative from Springsted, John Anzivino, is present should any member have questions. Chairman King stated he had worked with Mr. Anzivino during Chesterfield County's recent search for a new county administrator. Chairman King asked Mr. Miller if he, in his role as chairman of the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors, had any comments. Mr. Miller said he was very much in favor of the proposed contract. Having worked closely with Mr. Anzivino, Mr. Miller found the group did everything they said they would do, the work was done on time, and the group was very professional. A very comprehensive report was offered at the conclusion of the search.

Mr. Pantele asked Mr. Anzivino if he had any comments. Mr. Anzivino indicated he is senior vice president for Springsted's mid-Atlantic operations. The company is based in Minnesota, and the mid-Atlantic operations division has been based in Richmond for the past two years. The company has been in business for over 50 years. Offices are located from Virginia Beach to California. The mid-Atlantic office currently has a staff of about ten persons. Mr. Anzivino listed some of the organizations for which Springsted has provided services, including many other planning district organizations such as the George Washington PDC and the Accomack/Northampton PDC. Mr. Anzivino stated that after having sat through today's Executive Committee meeting, he can understand the importance of this hire. Each search is customized to the individual organization. Should the contract be finalized today, the group would like to speak with each Commission member to get their perspective on what the executive director should be able to accomplish. Interim reports will be given to the Commission during the process. Mr. Anzivino anticipates the process will take four to five months, and the search will be nationwide.

Mr. Kaechele asked how many applicants could be anticipated. Mr. Anzivino stated this varies by organization, but he thought perhaps there would be 25-50 applicants.

Mr. Setliff asked if he had understood that Springsted had conducted the executive search for the Fredericksburg area PDC. Mr. Anzivino stated that was correct. Mr. Setliff asked members if they thought the agency was ready to go forward with this search. Mr. Pantele indicated he believes the Commission is ready, as will be demonstrated later in today's meeting. Mr. Pantele asked Mr. Anzivino if he thought the agency was ready after listening to the discussion during the Executive Committee meeting. Mr. Anzivino stated he believed there are some challenges that will need to be discussed, and he sees that some strong leadership may be needed to help bridge the gap.

Mr. Butler moved that the contract be accepted as presented; Ms. Graziano seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Anzivino thanked the Commission members for their confidence and stated his team will be working first with members of the Personnel and Operating Policies Committee.

Chairman King stated that he believes it is for the common good of the agency that this step has been taken. He appreciated the question asked by Mr. Setliff. Chairman King said he believes following today's meeting the Commission will be as good as it will be for a long time to come. The two Ad-Hoc Committees had done a good job.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Presentation and Acceptance of FY 07 Audit Report

Chairman King asked Mr. Gordon, chairman of the Audit Committee, to make this presentation.

Mr. Gordon stated this is the annual audit report. The auditor, Mr. Aukamp, will be making the same brief presentation he had given to the Audit Committee and to the Executive Committee. Following Mr. Aukamp's presentation, Mr. Gordon will make a recommendation to Commission members.

Mr. Aukamp said staff should be commended for keeping the books in such good order, which makes the audit go quickly and smoothly, with no surprises. Mr. Aukamp stated that the Commission had received an unqualified opinion, which is the highest rating that can be given. The audit was conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted by the U.S.; standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and *Specifications for Audits of Authorities, Boards, and Commissions*, issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts of the Commonwealth of Virginia. He further stated there are no changes in procedures to recommend. The Commission is in compliance with all regulations.

Chairman King asked how the Commission was situated with regard to the reserve on hand. Mr. Aukamp stated he feels the organization is in a strong financial position. He knows that there has been a conscious effort to spend down some of the reserve; there is currently \$1.7 million in reserve, with \$1.4 million of that in cash. Typically it is recommended that there be four to five months' worth of cash on hand for general operating expenses. The Commission is in a strong position in this regard.

Mr. Sowder asked if there was a management letter provided to offer suggestions to improve procedures. Mr. Aukamp said a management letter can be issued separately along with the audit if there is something the audit shows can be improved. It does not affect the audit. There was nothing found during this audit

that warranted a management letter. Controls are adequate as defined and operating as expected.

Mr. Butler remarked that during the Executive Committee meeting, there had been some discussion regarding funds for the MPO. He asked Mr. Gordon to comment on this discussion.

Mr. Gordon stated that there had been discussion during the Audit Committee meeting and the Executive Committee meeting on comments made previously regarding possible “co-mingling” of PDC and MPO funds. The audit team was asked specifically to look at this to make sure the organization is following the correct procedures. Mr. Gordon stated that nothing was found that would be inappropriate in how the organization handles its funds. RRPDC operates in much the same fashion as other PDCs that are also MPOs.

Mr. Miller asked about internal audit controls. Mr. Aukamp stated that the effectiveness of internal audit controls are not incorporated in his report as part of the audit but would be addressed in a management letter if concerns had been raised during the audit. Mr. Miller asked if there were deficiencies, would the audit team note these. Mr. Aukamp stated that during the audit, limited testing of the system is done. Risk factors can be identified through these tests and noted in a management letter. Over the years, the audit has shown the agency has strong controls and segregation of staff duties.

Mr. Gordon stated that the Audit Committee had recommended acceptance of the report to the Executive Committee which, in turn, accepted the report as presented. Mr. Gordon offered a motion that the audit report be accepted by the Commission as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thornton, and the motion was carried unanimously.

Chairman King stated that as the Commission moves forward in the hiring process, now would be a good time to address any procedural concerns.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A.1. Committee Reports, Ad-Hoc Jurisdictional Committees

Chairman King indicated that the charge to these committees had been to determine the future direction of the Commission. Because he is not running for elected office this year, Chairman King determined he could speak his mind on how he felt regarding a comment made by the former Chesterfield County administrator in minutes of a meeting during which the future direction of the Commission was being discussed. The comment had been recorded in the minutes that part of the problem was territorial. This prompted Chairman King to speak with other people who agreed this was a problem.

As a member of the Chesterfield Board of Supervisors, Chairman King said he could speak on issues regarding that county. There are many times the county is accused of not participating regionally. This is not true, but it brought to mind that the Commission has nine jurisdictions that could work together to set the vision for the region instead of allowing this to be done by other business leaders. While he means no disrespect to these other people, it doesn't make sense that these business leaders should be setting the regional vision when members of the Commission represent the people living in the region.

This had led Chairman King to appoint ad-hoc committees to meet with their peers. As has been noted previously, there was some concern regarding the set-up of these committees, in having one comprised of members of small jurisdictions and the other with members of the large jurisdictions.

Chairman King stated he wanted to have the members agree on some common goals prior to the end of his chairmanship in December. If this could not be done, then he would resign his chairmanship prior to December. He said he knew that no one would care if he did resign, but it opened the door for him to state that it was not the executive director's fault for any failures of the Commission; it was the Commission's fault for not giving better direction to the executive director.

The ad-hoc committees met, and what was determined was that this organization does have worth even if no one agreed on how it was run. What Chairman King asked was that these committees come up with something everyone can agree on. It's not about what the organization is today, but what can be accomplished in the future. If the members can't agree on something for the common good of the region, then they will never agree on anything.

Chairman King asked Ms. Prichard, as chairman of the Small Jurisdictions Committee, to make her report.

Ms. Prichard thanked all of the committee members, especially Mr. Williams and the Powhatan County staff, for giving such good feedback as the committee met. The committee met once and most follow-up work was done electronically. The committee identified two areas of concern. One was what could the PDC do. The list on the handout is lengthy. This list was narrowed to some priorities that were basic to what the smaller jurisdictions felt they needed from the PDC. Those priorities, which are in no particular order, are starred and include:

- assistance with identifying grant opportunities and with writing grant proposals
- PDC as a center for continuing education for localities to include such topics as teleconferences, GIS, and web design
- hosting a Manager/CAOs/CEOs and Chairs/Mayors meeting

- help with specific planning issues such as ordinance preparation and review (to include a possible bank of ordinances that localities might use as templates); and impact fees for development
- assistance with VDOT issues: host a regional transportation model at the PDC (Fredericksburg model)
- assistance in achieving interoperability of local systems to include: emergency systems; disaster planning; delivery of public safety services; EMS
- GIS
- become a regional data system for information
- long term planning for water needs and wastewater

This list was followed by information on how the PDC could accomplish these goals, by having a specific business plan that identified how the PDC can accomplish the goals as they are set out. This would allow a forecast of how the goals would be accomplished and accountability for meeting the goals. The committee was very pleased with the interaction it had with Mr. Gordon.

Chairman King said that he would need to leave shortly in order to speak at the opening of a new safety facility in Chesterfield County. He noted that he was disappointed that he had to leave as he has been looking forward to this discussion. He has asked the Vice Chairman, Mr. Holmes, to chair the remainder of the meeting and for staff to fill him in on the outcome of the discussions. Chairman King thanked everyone for their hard work in this effort. He encouraged the members to come to an agreement on how to go forward; he also thanked the previous chairmen for setting the groundwork for Chairman King to build on.

Mr. Pantele asked if he could state for the benefit of the full Commission comments he had made to the members of the Executive Committee. Mr. Pantele stated he felt there had been some tremendous progress made. Everyone who participated on these committees had worked very hard. When Chairman King made the suggestion to establish these two committees, Mr. Pantele thought this was a very bold and potentially risky move. When this was first proposed, Mr. Pantele thought this could divide the Commission and result in accusations that the large jurisdictions were patronizing the small jurisdictions. He wanted to offer his personal thanks to Chairman King for making the kind of commitment to get this work started.

Chairman King thanked Mr. Pantele for his comments and indicated that at this time, he had to leave the meeting.

Vice Chairman Holmes asked Mr. Gordon for his report from the Large Jurisdictions Committee.

Mr. Gordon added that he was not in attendance at the meeting when the decision was made to set up the two committees. When he received the phone call to let him know this had happened, he said that was fine, but he would not participate. Then he was told he was appointed chairman of the Large Jurisdictions Committee. He was very concerned, but the results proved the wisdom Chairman King had in taking the Commission in this direction.

The Large Jurisdictions Committee met twice and communicated via email frequently. Attendance at the meetings was great and included CAOs as well as participation from Mayor Wilder's office. Everyone came to participate and to contribute on just about every issue. During the first meeting, the committee focused on issues and did not try to prioritize any of them. Some of these items are already being worked on as a team. The list of initial items included:

- proactive legislative action at state and federal levels
- regional infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, etc.) assessment and/or initiatives
- GIS regional initiatives
- workforce development
- workforce housing
- economic development
- illegal immigration impact (negative and positive) analysis
- regional transportation district
- increase visibility and effectiveness

During the second meeting, the momentum of the first meeting continued. The value of the PDC in its current form was acknowledged, particularly with technical assistance, much of which goes to the smaller jurisdictions. This technical assistance to the smaller jurisdictions benefits the entire region. The second acknowledgement is the facilitation of cooperation between jurisdictions that the PDC has brought to the table to give members the opportunity to work with one another and to get to know one another. This gives a background of knowledge that allows better cooperation in working outside the PDC.

Three priorities were determined during this second meeting:

- **proactive legislative action**
It will be beneficial for the Commission to speak as one voice in legislative matters. The individual legislative liaisons should be maintained, but there are areas of common interest that could be best brought forward by the PDC. This should not stop at the state level, but should continue to the federal level.
- **GIS regional initiatives**
The surface of this issue has only just been scratched. The potential benefit of this technology needs to be fully realized.
- **increase communication, visibility, and effectiveness**

This could be done by creating a regional vision to define the region. A public relations strategy should be developed to communicate what is done by the PDC. There should also be PDC-to-PDC communication at the member level. It was also the opinion of the Large Jurisdictions Committee that both jurisdictional committees should be maintained in some form. There is some value to continue these committees.

These recommendations were taken to the Executive Committee which came up with a recommendation to bring to the Commission.

Mr. Butler moved that the two committees be retained and bring future proposals to the board, including items that may not be on the initial lists. He noted that the Executive Committee meeting had been long, and members tried to come up with one or two items to bring to the Commission. Mr. Butler would like to propose the following be added to the list:

- assistance with identifying grant opportunities and with writing grant proposals
- regional infrastructure assessment, especially water issues
- workforce development and housing
- regional transportation issues
- proactive legislation action
- GIS regional initiatives
- increase visibility and effectiveness

Mr. Miller seconded the motion.

Mr. Williams said he agreed with much of what Mr. Butler has said. This is evidenced with what is happening between Powhatan and Chesterfield Counties with Rt. 288. Mr. Williams would like to add that the PDC host a transportation demand model to allow jurisdictions to have access to the information without having to contact VDOT. Mr. Butler said he agreed all of these issues would need to be addressed.

Vice Chairman Holmes asked that members address the chair to be recognized to speak. He further stated that these initiatives are very broad and that as Mr. Butler recommended, the two committees would need to be maintained in order to add to these items.

Mr. Gordon said he had chosen not to share the Executive Committee's recommendation. However, at this juncture, he felt it should be shared. Vice Chairman Holmes asked Mr. Gordon to do this.

Mr. Gordon stated there was a lot of discussion, and his opinion is that everyone is on board to move forward. The discussion seemed to center around establishing priorities. The Executive Committee accepted and is recommending

the following, which are not in any prioritized order. The Executive Committee recommends adoption of the proactive legislation action item, GIS regional initiatives, and maintaining the two jurisdictional committees to facilitate continued discussion of matters specific to each and to recommend additional priorities.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification on the last item. He asked what would happen to the remainder of the last bullet item, Increase Communications, Visibility, and Effectiveness, from the Large Jurisdictions Committee, if only the last part was taken out. Mr. Gordon said the items would be considered as additional priorities at a later time. He further stated it was important to note that while it seems the items are being taken only from the Large Jurisdictions Committee list, the Executive Committee agreed that many of the items on the list from the Small Jurisdictions Committee rolled in to those items from the Large Jurisdictions Committee. The Executive Committee voted to endorse this particular recommendation.

Vice Chairman Holmes recognized Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams said that in looking at the two committee reports, there are recommendations from the Small Jurisdictions Committee that cross over to those on the Large Jurisdictions Committee. He asked why all recommendations from both committees should not be included. Mr. Williams said he did not understand why the Executive Committee would not have done this.

Ms. Prichard stated that the intention of the Executive Committee was to identify a starting place. Everything could not be done at the same time, so in choosing two priorities to begin with and then having the two committees add other priorities made more sense than trying to do everything at once. Mr. Williams thanked Ms. Prichard for the clarification.

The Vice Chairman recognized Mr. Holland. Mr. Holland stated he would like to point out that in the Small Jurisdiction Committee's report, the items had not been prioritized as they had in the Large Jurisdictions Committee's report. In noting the comment made by Mr. Miller, Mr. Holland said it would be more important to him, Mr. Holland, in representing Powhatan County, to replace three of those bullets with wastewater treatment. However, he feels it is important to have the mechanisms set up to get started on something everyone can agree on and then let the two committees meet to discuss the remaining items and bring those back to the Commission at a later time. Mr. Holland said he would support the Executive Committee's recommendation, which takes the first and third items from the Large Jurisdictions Committee. The most important thing to him is to retain the two committees. Ms. Prichard and Mr. Gordon have done a fantastic job, and it is important to realize that in order to move forward, these two committees must be maintained. This bullet point needs to be pulled out as a blessing of the work that has been done and will be done by the two committees. Mr. Holland said he would support the Executive Committee's recommendation, because the issue has

been on the table without any agreement for a long time. Chairman King had asked that the Commission find at least two items the members can agree on. Mr. Holland said the Executive Committee identified three items: bullets one and three from the Large Jurisdictions Committee and to retain the two ad-hoc committees.

Vice Chairman Holmes recognized Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller said his comments were not about whether the items had come from the large jurisdictions or small jurisdictions. His view was that something should be identified that could be accomplished. One of the things to complement being proactive with legislation would be to elevate the presence of the Commission in the General Assembly with a public relations strategy. He said he didn't see that it would be difficult to set up someone within RRPDC to take up the responsibility of this issue. This would benefit the small jurisdictions and the large jurisdictions. In reading articles on regional cooperation in the newspapers, there is not any input from the Commission. He believes this would be something that can be done without a lot of expense. This is something that has been lacking over the years; the Commission has not had the high profile it should.

Vice Chairman Holmes asked if the motion on the floor could be clarified. There was a question of how many items had been included in Mr. Butler's motion. Mr. Butler said he believed it was six. Vice Chairman Holmes listed the items as

1. assisting in grant proposals
2. infrastructure
3. regional transportation
4. legislation
5. visibility
6. workforce development and housing
7. GIS

Mr. Setliff said he did not have a problem with listing additional initiatives as long as they were prioritized and the first one, two, or three were addressed initially. If all are taken on at the same time, the Commission will be in the same position as it has always been. There is nothing wrong with listing other things, but Mr. Setliff said he did not think any progress would be made in trying to do too many at the same time. If a legislative agenda is not set soon, it will be too late for this year. Hanover County is developing its legislative initiative at this time.

Vice Chairman Holmes said he felt there were enough choices on the table at this time. The motion on the floor could be voted up or down or the motion can be amended.

Mr. Gordon said he would like to offer a substitute motion. His reason for this is that he feels members should remember that if an item was not selected today,

that did not mean it is not a priority and that it will not be on the list at some point in the future. This is the reason for maintaining the two committees. To Mr. Setliff's point, the Commission needs a success story. If more is taken on than can be handled, there will be a failure and another setback cannot be handled at this time. Mr. Gordon emphasized that caution should be taken to select items that are valuable and beneficial, but more importantly, that are achievable. His substitute motion would be to include regional infrastructure assessment and initiatives; proactive legislative action; GIS regional initiatives; the complete list under communications, visibility, and effectiveness; and assist with grant opportunities and writing grant proposals. This would be his substitute motion along with maintaining the two ad-hoc committees.

Mr. Miller seconded this substitute motion. Following some discussion, it was asked if Mr. Gordon could restate his substitute motion.

Mr. Gordon recapped the motion: regional infrastructure assessment and initiatives; proactive legislative action; GIS regional initiatives; the complete list under communications, visibility, and effectiveness, changing the last line to add "to recommend additional priorities" ; and assist with grant opportunities and writing grant proposals. Many of the items on the Small Jurisdictions Committee report will roll into this list.

Vice Chairman Holmes stated the substitute motion on the floor takes precedent over the original motion by Mr. Butler. Vice Chairman Holmes asked if there was any discussion on the substitute motion.

Mr. Butler stated that the substitute motion included everything from his original motion except the workforce development and housing and regional transportation planning. He feels the transportation item should be left in as it is an important regional issue. With planning funding being cut recently by the governor, it is important to get transportation issues accomplished so that all funding is not lost. Mr. Gordon said he felt this would fall under the infrastructure item and the roll already played by the Commission.

Mr. Holland indicated he would like to see the bullet point on assistance with VDOT issues from the Small Jurisdictions Committee included. He continued that he would like the bullet point on maintaining the two ad-hoc committees pulled out to stand on its own. Mr. Gordon said this had been included. Mr. Holland said he agreed with Mr. Setliff in that the items should be prioritized. The recommendation from the Executive Committee would have provided a means to do this. It took two of the priorities from the Large Jurisdictions Committee and left the two committees to take time in a thoughtful and meaningful process to review reports from both committees and to report back to the Commission on additional priorities. Mr. Holland said he felt this is being rushed through and disagreements will continue because the Commission is not

following the recommendation from the Executive Committee. He encouraged members to endorse the recommendation from the Executive Committee.

Mr. Butler said he would withdraw his original motion and support the substitute motion made by Mr. Gordon.

Ms. Graziano said she was on the Large Jurisdictions Committee and has been a member of the Commission for two years. She feels that if more is taken on than can be done, the Commission will find itself in the same position it is in now. If a few items are selected now and the two committees are maintained, other items from the lists, such as grant proposals, can be included in the responsibilities given to a new executive director. A couple of simple steps should be taken now, and she would support the Executive Committee's recommendation in order to accomplish this.

Ms. Prichard said she agrees with Mr. Holland. If the Commission wants to have some big wins, only one thing at a time should be done, and it should be done extremely well, and then move on to another priority. There is nothing that says things can't be done quickly in order to move on to the next item. She supports the Executive Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Sowder said he would agree with what has been said by the last few speakers and with what Chairman King had so eloquently stated in the beginning. The purpose of the whole exercise is to find something everyone can agree on. A success story is needed. If more is bitten off than can be chewed, the Commission will be right back in the same place. He would think one or two items to focus on would bring a greater chance for success. Then other priorities can be added.

Mr. Amos asked for clarification on the motion on the floor. He said he understood Mr. Butler had withdrawn his original motion, and the substitute motion from Mr. Gordon was on the floor at this time. The Executive Committee recommendation has not been placed on the floor. Mr. Amos recommended action be taken on Mr. Gordon's substitute motion.

Mr. Miller said he cannot understand why a public relations strategy is not the number one priority.

Ms. Cheeley noted she had attended a workforce housing seminar, also attended by Mr. Butler, Mr. Grier, and Ms. Graziano. Those at the seminar were looking for help from RRPDC, but they did not know what RRPDC could do for them. She believes Mr. Miller is right in stating that RRPDC must be promoted.

At this time, Vice Chairman Holmes noted that as several members had left the meeting, a quorum was no longer in attendance.

Mr. Williams asked what could be done to allow those remaining in the meeting to come to an agreement on a recommendation to bring to the next Commission meeting that would allow things to move forward without a lot of other motions being made. He suggested that the reports from the two committees not be used at the next meeting, only a recommendation drawn from those lists.

Mr. Miller asked if a non-binding vote could be taken on Mr. Gordon's motion.

Mr. Holland said he appreciated Mr. Miller's comment. As a member of the Small Jurisdictions Committee, Mr. Holland said he felt what had been lacking today was a joint resolution from both committees to be presented at today's meeting. He would recommend that both groups meet again to come up with a joint resolution to present at the next meeting. He feels that if Ms. Prichard and Mr. Gordon could present a resolution they can stand behind, this would facilitate moving forward.

Mr. Gordon stated he no longer has any interest in participating in this activity beyond this point. He will keep his seat on the Commission until his term ends and then he will become involved with a body that is about making things happen. He appreciates what Mr. Holland is saying, but Mr. Gordon is not interested.

Mr. Grier stated he has heard the concerns about biting off more than can be handled. He has also heard the enthusiasm about getting a win. He would suggest a plug-and-play opportunity that would need to be acted on prior to December 5, to participate in a regional visioning effort that is not affiliated with the Chamber or the other local power brokers. This has been in the works for a couple of years. The participants in this group have noted that RRPDC is not involved. Now it seems there is a willingness by members to embrace this sort of regional visioning without being territorial. He asked if this is the type of thing members would be interested in.

Mr. Setliff said he thought a consensus needed to be reached today so it can be brought back to the next meeting, and things can move forward. It is now too late to develop a legislative agenda.

Mr. Miller said the Commission has got to move past this sort of behavior. Things are right back where they have been all along. Until everyone can understand that everyone can't have all that they want, nothing will move forward. There must be cooperation to move forward on what can be done.

Mr. Hinson asked if there can be a call for the question. Vice Chairman Holmes said this can be done, but the vote will not be binding.

Ms. Prichard said before this is done, she would like to note that hard things are hard to do. Not everyone has gotten what they wanted, but she thought everyone would have agreed on a place to start, whether everyone was happy with the

details or not. She feels that the Commission has been hijacked. She asked that Mr. Gordon step back in to his role because the Commission is really close to a starting point. It's time for everyone else to say what is happening is not acceptable. If everyone wants to participate, that's fine, but otherwise, don't prevent everyone else from accomplishing something.

Mr. Hinson stated that he is very disappointed. Tremendous progress was made by both committees. Both groups were working on an agenda and priorities were brought to today's meeting. He thought this was one of the most positive things he has seen happen at the PDC in over forty years. The one thing needed at the PDC is good news. The PDC needs to have the media here. Until others can see this regional body as a group of elected and appointed officials who represent the region and who are all on the same page in support of each other and the priorities the PDC should be focused on, until that happens, the PDC will always be recognized as an ineffective group, not doing much, without any media coverage because they feel the agendas don't have anything on them. There was an opportunity today to put that in the past and move forward and have the right message out there about the Commission. If it is not done by this body, it will not happen. As Chairman King said, someone else will set the agenda for the region if this body does not do it. Mr. Hinson is disappointed and hopes Mr. Gordon will reconsider. Mr. Gordon has done a great job in leading one half of this effort; Ms. Prichard has done a great job in leading the other. He would hope they could meet and bring back one recommendation, even if a special meeting needs to be called. Everyone should be brought back and not let things end the way they have today.

Mr. Kaechele asked if discussion was on Mr. Gordon's recommendation versus that from the Executive Committee. He said he felt that Mr. Gordon's recommendation should be accepted, giving priority to the top three items and leaving the other two for later.

Mr. Holland asked if there was anything on either list that should be removed. He said he didn't see anything on either list that should not be there. The committees should continue to work on prioritizing the items.

Mr. Miller called for the question on Mr. Gordon's motion.

Ms. Graziano asked if a vote was taken on Mr. Gordon's motion if that would preclude any action on the recommendation from the Executive Committee. Mr. Amos said there is no other motion on the floor. The vote will not be binding. Vice Chairman Holmes noted that Mr. Gordon's motion does include the recommendations of the Executive Committee.

Vice Chairman Holmes asked for a show of hands on the motion as presented by Mr. Gordon. All 16 members in attendance voted to endorse Mr. Gordon's motion at the next meeting of the Commission.

Vice Chairman Holmes stated he had made the motion in the Executive Committee in order to establish a starting place. He does not think Mr. Gordon's motion is unreasonable. If there are too many items on the list, this can be adjusted with time. He thinks this is a good starting point. It needs to be determined if legislative items can still be addressed at the November Commission meeting.

Mr. Trout asked if the Commission could instruct PDC staff to contact the jurisdictions to see how far along they are in developing a legislative agenda. Ms. Villa said this is done annually. She does not believe any of the localities have finalized their agendas at this time. Legislative liaisons are scheduled to meet on November 2 to look at all the legislative programs. A PowerPoint presentation will be made to present to the Capitol Region Caucus during the first week in December. Ms. Villa has been in touch with all the liaisons and none have finalized their programs. Ms. Villa said she also contacts all of the county administrators. Mr. Williams asked if she could also contact him; she indicated she would. Mr. Trout said because of elections in November, he understands legislation cannot be introduced until the week after elections. There is no pre-filing this year.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Vice Chairman Holmes adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:20 p.m.

Jo A. Evans
Interim Executive Director

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

Michael L. Holmes
Vice Chairman