

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**December 10, 2009**

**Members/Alternates Present**

Willie L. Bennett (M) ..... County of Henrico  
Malvern R. “Rudy” Butler (M).....County of Goochland  
Deborah B. Coates (A).....County of Hanover  
Douglas G. Conner (M) .....City of Richmond  
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan  
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. (M)..... County of Charles City  
James B. Donati (M), Vice Chairman..... County of Henrico  
Marleen K. Durfee (M).....County of Chesterfield  
Evan Fabricant (M).....County of Hanover  
Daniel A. Gecker (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico  
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M) .....County of Hanover  
Kathy C. Graziano (M), Chairman .....City of Richmond  
John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond  
Russell J. Gulley (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Dorothy Jaeckle (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond  
Bonnie-Leigh Jones (M) ..... County of Henrico  
David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico  
John F. Miniclier (A) ..... County of Charles City  
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) ..... County of Henrico  
C. Harold Padgett (M).....County of Hanover  
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... County of New Kent  
Faye O. Prichard (M), Secretary .....Town of Ashland  
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover  
Randall R. Silber (A) ..... County of Henrico  
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico  
Stran L. Trout (M), Treasurer ..... County of New Kent  
Joseph B. Walton (M) .....County of Powhatan  
Arthur S. Warren (M) .....County of Chesterfield

**Members Absent**

Karin Carmack (M).....County of Powhatan  
James M. Holland (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Courtney G. Hyers (M).....County of Goochland  
Beverley C. Lacy (M) .....City of Richmond  
George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield  
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond

**Others Present**

John R. Amos..... RRPDC Legal Counsel  
 Nora Amos .....Town of Ashland  
 John T. Benton .....Citizen, Chesterfield County  
 Rob Bradham ..... Greater Richmond Chamber  
 W. Denev Hurley ..... Branscome, Inc.  
 Glen Larson..... Chesterfield County  
 Dan Mason.....McDonough Bolyard Peck  
 Mike Schnurman.....Henrico County  
 Kirk Turner ..... Chesterfield County

**Staff Present**

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director  
 Jo A. Evans ..... Assistant Executive Director  
 Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary  
 Sulabh Aryal ..... Intern  
 Anne Darby .....Associate Planner  
 Chuck Gates ..... Communications Coordinator  
 Barbara Jacocks .....Principal Planner  
 Brian Koziol..... Intern  
 Daniel N. Lysy .....Director, Transportation  
 Barbara Nelson.....Principal Planner  
 Randy Selleck .....Senior Planner  
 Jackie S. Stewart ..... Director, Planning/IS  
 Sarah Stewart .....Senior Planner  
 Peter M. Sweetland ..... Finance and Contracts Administrator  
 Kathy Wright ..... Intern  
 Lee Yolton .....Principal Planner

**Call to Order**

Chairman Graziano called the regularly scheduled December 10, 2009 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. She then led the Commission members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

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

Mr. Crum certified that a quorum of members was present.

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

Chairman Graziano asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. As there were no additions or changes noted, the agenda was accepted as presented.

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

Chairman Graziano asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. She reminded speakers that their time is limited to three minutes.

Mr. John T. Benton, citizen of Chesterfield County, was recognized by Chairman Graziano.

Mr. Benton said he would like to address members of the Commission with regard to the proposed legislative agenda which will be discussed by the members later today. He noted he had missed the last few meetings but had been able to read the meeting minutes provided by staff to know what the Commission had been discussing during the meetings he had to miss.

Mr. Benton said he would compliment Board members on the actions they took on the legislative agenda to either support or oppose specific items. He said he felt members of the General Assembly needed to hear that type of stand on issues. Mr. Benton noted there are 25 items on the legislative agenda: 16 are supported; 6 are opposed; however there are three that used other action verbs – encourage, request, and believe. Mr. Benton suggested that those three points be reworded to show support for the item without changing the meaning of the topic. He said he had already spoken with Mr. Gates regarding this. Mr. Benton said by changing the wording, he felt this would be a more professional presentation.

With regard to the topic on 599 funding, Mr. Benton noted a more detailed reference should be made to the specific bill and not just the number of the bill. He said while members of the Commission understood the reference, not everyone else would without more detail. He said many other services can be affected by cuts in these funds, and he suggested that a more general statement be made instead of the reference to only law enforcement.

Mr. Benton said he was disappointed with the stand the Commission will be taking on transportation. He said this is really no position at all. He feels the Commission should put forth some positive suggestions to address the transportation problems in the Region.

Mr. Benton said the upcoming presentation that will be made on the Chesterfield County Comprehensive Plan will be made by who he considers to be two of the hardest working county employees. He said they are very diligent, hard-working,

and loyal employees of the county. He encouraged members to listen to the information that will be presented and to ask questions.

Mr. Benton thanked members of the Commission for their attention.

There were no other requests from the public to address the Commission, and the Chairman closed the public comment period.

#### **D. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Graziano said that a report will be given today on activities of the Small and Large Jurisdictions Committees. She also reported that the Capital Region Collaborative is moving forward with its agenda.

Chairman Graziano wished all members a merry Christmas and happy holidays.

#### **E. Approval of Minutes – November 12, 2009 Meeting**

Chairman Graziano asked Ms. Prichard to present minutes from the November 12, 2009 meeting. There being no discussion, on motion made by Ms. Prichard and seconded by Mr. Cotman, the minutes were approved as presented.

#### **F. Approval of October 2009 Financial Reports**

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Trout to present this item.

Mr. Trout stated the financial report is included in the agenda book under Tab 2. There being no discussion, on motion made by Mr. Trout and seconded by Mr. Donati, the October 2009 financial report was accepted for audit as presented.

#### **G. Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Crum brought the members' attention to the monthly staff activity report which is included in the agenda book under Tab 3.

Mr. Crum reported the staff status report is abbreviated this month but will be more detailed for the next agenda package.

With regard to the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC), Mr. Crum reported the CRC continues to meet monthly and has been meeting with nine focus groups to ask for input on what important regional priorities should be addressed by the CRC. Meetings will be set up with a faith-based group as well as with the Asian and Hispanic chambers of commerce. A draft report will be made to the public for input this coming spring.

Mr. Crum provided an update on the regional economic development strategy discussed with members during last month's Executive Committee meeting. The Executive Committee authorized Mr. Crum to collect information on opportunities for the RRPDC to take the lead in an effort to develop a regional economic development strategy. By having a CEDS in place, the Region's localities will be able to apply for federal economic development funding through EDA, which currently cannot be done because there is no regional CEDS in place. Many state PDCs have taken this role. The City of Richmond is currently involved in this process. The RRPDC will not hamper efforts underway in the city, but will broaden the effort to a more regional approach. Mr. Crum said he will continue to collect information on the opportunity and report back to the Commission in February.

A meeting will be held on December 15 with the Region's public utility deputy directors to help advance a regional infrastructure initiative.

The regional funding group, Regional Area Funding Team (RAFT), will provide its first report and recommendations to the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees in January.

## **II. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Jurisdictional Committees Reports**

Chairman Graziano asked Ms. Prichard to present a report from these committees.

Ms. Prichard reported that the committees met jointly on November 19 to participate as one of the CRC's focus groups. The committees developed a list of items they felt were imperative to moving the Region forward. Ms. Prichard noted the facilitator was the best she had ever worked with and felt that had influenced the participants' ability to identify the items. These were:

- functional regional transportation system
- better economic development
- early childhood education
- better civic engagement

Ms. Prichard noted the last point had been identified by Jay Stegmaier, Chesterfield County administrator. He had discussed how Chesterfield County took its proposed budget to the citizens for their input on which services and programs could be cut due to the downturn in economic conditions. There was a lot of discussion on how to bring citizens into the public process and have them take some responsibility.

The committees will meet again jointly on January 14 to continue discussions on the legislative agenda.

## B. Regional Legislative Agenda

Chairman Graziano noted this is the revised legislative agenda based on changes made by Commission members during last month's meeting.

Mr. Gates began his report by announcing the legislative reception will be held on Wednesday, January 6, beginning at 7:30 a.m. at the Richmond Convention Center. Formal invitations will be sent out next week. Breakfast will be served. All RRPDC and MPO Board members will be invited to attend in addition to other local elected officials.

The draft legislative agenda included in the agenda book today includes all changes that were made during last month's meeting. These changes are highlighted. Mr. Gates said he would like feedback on whether the revisions correctly reflected the direction he had been given.

Mr. Gulley noted that with regard to Funding Mandates, he felt it should read *unfunded* mandates. Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those who would agree to change the word *funded* to *unfunded* in that bullet point. Commission members agreed this should be done.

Mr. Gates noted that the revisions had been taken back to the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees (LSJC) for their review. The local legislative liaisons and some county administrators were also in attendance at the November meeting. Members of the LSJC discussed how the changes made by the Board affected the work completed by the LSJC in their prior work sessions. One concern was raised.

With regard to the Dillon Rule statement, the LSJC was concerned about the portion of the statement that read *...the impact of the Dillon Rule on....* Mr. Gates said LSJC members were concerned about the inclusion of a Dillon Rule statement. Those in attendance at the November LSJC meeting felt a Dillon Rule statement would diminish the RRPDC's credibility at the General Assembly. All agreed the Dillon Rule makes local governing difficult but felt the political climate was not right at this time to approach this issue.

A proposal was made by the LSJC to delete that phrase from the statement but no official vote was taken. The chairman had asked for each committee member to ask their localities for feedback on the statement and to be prepared to discuss that feedback during today's meeting. Mr. Gates noted elimination of the phrase would leave the statement as:

We SUPPORT a resolution directing the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to examine local government's ability to efficiently address local issues such as public safety, land use, and revenue.

Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those members who supported removal of the phrase ...*the impact of the Dillon Rule on*.... One member voted to remove the phrase.

Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those members who wanted to leave in the phrase. The majority of members indicated they would like to leave in the phrase.

Mr. Glover said he felt this is a broad statement. He asked what the Commission was asking the General Assembly to do with regard to the Dillon Rule. He asked what the statement is supposed to mean.

Chairman Graziano said she believed localities would like more flexibility in self-governing. The Dillon Rule impairs this flexibility.

Mr. Glover said he felt the RRPDC should discuss, at some point, what statements could be sent to the General Assembly to help them understand what about the Dillon Rule is prohibitive. He said he felt that the statement might infer that RRPDC was asking to have the Dillon Rule removed.

Chairman Graziano said the statement is asking the General Assembly to look at the impact the Dillon Rule has on local governments' ability to self-govern.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if Mr. Glover was saying the RRPDC should determine how the Dillon Rule impacts localities. Mr. Glover said the Commission should be able to tell General Assembly members how the Dillon Rules affects the localities. He said not all localities are affected in the same way.

Mr. Butler said he believes the Commission does not want to do away with the Dillon Rule but would like for counties to have equal taxing authority as cities and towns. Mr. Glover said he is not against the statement as it stands. He thinks a more specific list of ways the Dillon Rule affects localities should be developed for the General Assembly.

Chairman Graziano said she would recommend this issue could be studied by the Commission over the next year.

Mr. Gordon said he felt the Commission was asking for a JLARC study, which won't be completed within the General Assembly session this year. He also said he felt the word *efficiently* was the key to this statement. Mr. Gordon said many of the bills considered by the General Assembly are because of the Dillon Rule. He said he felt something might be found in a study of the Dillon Rule with respect to how the local and state governments can function more efficiently by relaxing some of the Dillon Rule.

Mr. Glover said he felt the Commission should be able to tell the General Assembly how to function more efficiently. Mr. Gordon said the Commission was asking the General Assembly to make a study and determine that for themselves.

Mr. Pollard said he feels the Dillon Rule has some merit, and he would not support changing the Dillon Rule completely.

Chairman Graziano said the statement is merely asking for a study. Mr. Pollard asked if any other PDCs are addressing this in their legislative agendas. Chairman Graziano said she was not aware of any.

Mr. Gates noted that each PDC has its own level of involvement in legislative affairs. At this time he is not aware of any that have a statement specifically on the Dillon Rule. When LSJC initially discussed the Dillon Rule, references were made to what the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) and the Virginia Municipal League (VML) are putting forth this year. During the LSJC discussions, county administrators and legislative liaisons in attendance felt addressing this would diminish the RRPDC's credibility because VML and VACo should be leading this charge; the broad statement is not a good choice but should be more specific; legislators tend to ignore any requests concerning the Dillon Rule.

Mr. Butler said he felt all that the Commission had been asking for was the ability to have equal taxing authority for all localities. VACo is requesting equal taxing authority.

Chairman Graziano reminded members they had just voted to leave the phrase in question in the statement. She said she felt the discussions had been good and would suggest the Commission move on with the other items.

Mr. Kaechele said the statement could be amended to improve the financial impact. He said taxation could be included in that final sentence. Mr. Gordon asked if the word *revenue* could include taxes.

Mr. Glover said out of the nine RRPDC member jurisdictions, only two have the ability to raise taxes as needed – Ashland and Richmond. He said all the localities want is the ability to do what towns and cities can do.

Chairman Graziano asked for a revote on which members would like to delete the highlighted phrase *...the impact of the Dillon Rule on...* to raise their hands. One member voted to delete. Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those members who wanted to retain the phrase. The show of hands indicated this is what the members desired to do. The statement will remain as printed:

We SUPPORT a resolution directing the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to examine the impact of the Dillon Rule on local government's ability to efficiently address local issues such as public safety, land use, and revenue.

Mr. Butler said he felt a motion was required to amend the statement. Ms. O'Bannon said she felt what Mr. Butler wanted was to add a statement saying that counties would like to have the same or equal taxing authority as towns and cities. Mr. Butler said he would move that counties would request that counties should have the same taxing authority as cities and towns. Mr. Walton seconded the motion.

Mr. Gecker asked if legal counsel could address the differences in taxing authority between cities and town and that of counties. Mr. Amos said he did not have that knowledge and would be reluctant to comment on that.

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Butler to repeat his motion. Mr. Butler said he would move that counties be given the same taxing authority as cities and towns. Mr. Walton seconded the motion.

Mr. Glover said Henrico County is prepared to support the portion of the legislative agenda referencing cash proffers and impact fees even though the county does not use these. He said he would hope the Commission members could support asking for equal taxing authority for all counties.

Mr. Gecker asked if Mr. Glover could tell him what differences there are in the taxing authority. Mr. Glover said meals taxes are one difference. Counties must have a referendum to raise these but cities and towns do not. Other taxes or fees include parking and traffic tickets as well as tobacco taxes.

Mr. Trout asked if counties want the same or equal taxing authority. Mr. Walton said he believed there were no differences that would cause a county to lose anything by asking for the same taxing authority.

Mr. Gordon asked if this statement would stand on its own or if it would be added to the second bullet point. Mr. Butler said it would be a third bullet point.

Chairman Graziano called for the question on the motion. The motion carried.

Mr. Crum asked if there was any objection if staff used the word *equal* instead of *same*. There was no objection.

Mr. Gordon noted that during the public comment period, Mr. Benton had brought up a point that Mr. Gordon considered worth consideration. He said the words *oppose* and *support* are used throughout the agenda. Mr. Gordon said he

felt that with some minor tweaking, the statements that do not use either of those words can be changed to be consistent with what is in the rest of the agenda.

Under Funding Mandates, the first bullet point could be changed to read *We SUPPORT that the Commonwealth fully fund...* In the same section, the third bullet point could read *We SUPPORT the thorough analysis and consideration of the impact....* Under Transportation, the statement could be changed to read *We SUPPORT the development of funding mechanisms by the Commonwealth to meet the current....*

Mr. Gordon said he would make this in the form of a motion. Ms. Prichard seconded the motion. Mr. Gates asked if staff could be given leeway to make the verbiage changes instead of taking time in the meeting to do so. Mr. Gordon said that was his intent. There was no further discussion on the motion and the motion carried.

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Gecker to present his proposed addition to the agenda.

Mr. Gecker said what he was going to propose had been missed during last month's discussions. Chairman Graziano noted it had been discussed during today's Executive Committee meeting and the Committee had endorsed bringing it to the full Commission for discussion.

Mr. Gecker said there is a proposal to change the federal historic tax credit rules to allow historic schools to receive tax credits even after they are rehabilitated to remain schools. Currently historic schools can be rehabilitated to be anything except a school. An article appeared in the *New York Times* written by former Richmond mayoral candidate Paul Goldman and former Senator George Allen supporting this concept. He said he and Chairman Graziano had discussed this previously and felt the Commission should take a position on the issue.

Mr. Butler said this is national legislation.

Chairman Graziano said it would be recommended that this issue be added to the legislative agenda for the General Assembly with hope that the General Assembly will put forth support to the federal government for this. She said during the next Commission meeting a resolution in support of this could be considered to send to the congressional delegation.

Mr. Butler said this bill is already in process and would recommend the resolution be considered at this time. Chairman Graziano said she agreed but would like to take up the issue of support for the item first.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the Commission would ask the General Assembly to support this issue. Chairman Graziano said the Commission would ask for General Assembly support.

Mr. Gates said if the Commission adopts this amendment to the legislative agenda, he can take care of presenting it to the General Assembly and to ask for their support in taking it to Virginia's congressional delegation.

Chairman Graziano said she would like to add it to the legislative package first and then discuss taking it to the congressional delegation.

Mr. Glover asked who would receive a copy of the legislative agenda. Mr. Gates said it would be given to any legislator whose district included any portion of the RRPDC member jurisdictions. Mr. Gates said he can also lobby any committee chairman at General Assembly who could put this issue forward.

Ms. Durfee said there are two issues – whether this should be added to the legislative agenda and whether the Commission will endorse this.

Chairman Graziano said there is a motion on the floor to add this to the legislative agenda. Mr. Walton seconded the motion. There was no further discussion and the motion to add the following language to the legislative agenda carried:

We SUPPORT changing federal law to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for the federal rehabilitation tax credit. Current federal law allows for tax credits when an historic school is rehabilitated and used by another user but not where the buildings are reused as public schools.

Ms. O'Bannon said there is a statement under Public Infrastructure Investment that says *We SUPPORT local government authority requiring new development to cover the costs of expanding public infrastructure through tools such as impact fees and cash proffers*. Ms. O'Bannon asked if meals tax could be added. Mr. Gates said he felt the previously adopted language under Governing Locally would cover this.

Mr. Crum said a motion would be requested to approve the legislative agenda as revised and presented. Mr. Butler made the motion which was seconded by Mr. Walton. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

Chairman Graziano recommended that staff be given the authority to draft a resolution to the US congressional delegation in support of the historical tax credits. Mr. Butler so moved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walton. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the legislative reception on January 6 would be held to review this legislative agenda with General Assembly members. Chairman Graziano said that was correct. Mr. Gates added that the meeting will begin with informal interaction among guests and a formal presentation will then be made on the legislative agenda. He said he would like for members of the Commission to make the presentations to the legislators, and he will be making contact with various Commission members to ask for their assistance. He said he would like one representative from each jurisdiction to make presentations. Mr. Gates said this is the first time such a presentation has been made in this way, and he thanked members for their patience and hard work to put this agenda together.

Mr. Gordon asked under which section the historical tax credit item will appear. Mr. Gates said he would recommend it be included under the Public Infrastructure section as a separate bullet point. He said if there is a federal section, everything else listed would be considered not a federal issue. Mr. Walton said he would recommend adding parentheses to show it is a federal law. Mr. Gates pointed out the language says it is a request to change a federal law.

Mr. Jewell said he thought this is a single line item in the IRS code and felt that should be noted. Mr. Gecker said it is more than a single line and would be difficult to explain with just a few words. Ms. Jaeckle said this can be brought to the attention of General Assembly members during the reception and they will know where to take it from there.

Mr. Gates noted the legislative agenda is to give him guidance as he lobbies both at the General Assembly and in Washington. If something comes up that is not covered in the agenda, he will bring it back to the Commission and ask for input.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Chesterfield Comprehensive Plan**

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Crum to introduce today's speaker.

Mr. Crum said he was pleased to introduce Kirk Turner, Director of Planning for Chesterfield County, and Glen Larson, who is the Assistant Director of Planning. They will discuss the Chesterfield County Comprehensive Plan process and give an update on the status of the plan.

Mr. Turner thanked members of the Board for the opportunity to address the Commission today.

**[At this time the recording mechanism failed to record. Minutes from this point forward are written from staff notes.]**

Mr. Turner noted that a new comprehensive plan was undertaken to:

- establish an overall future vision for the county
- educate the public and promote their involvement in the county's future
- guide the wise use of land and resources
- effectively coordinate land use and transportation planning efforts
- protect the environment and promote sustainability
- promote employment opportunities
- guide property owner and developer decisions
- effectively coordinate the location of public facilities
- promote the most cost effective use of tax dollars

The county was divided into smaller areas than the five board districts to gain more diverse input during public hearings. Mr. Turner said principal components included in the plan process were:

- background research and analysis
- issue reports
- public participation and visioning
- priorities and principles statement
- fiscal impact assessment
- plan elements (plan document)

Mr. Turner reviewed the roles of the key players – the public, the boards and commissions, the consultants, and county staff.

The plan was developed using a public participation and involvement program. This program included:

- schedule and procedures
- publicizing the process
- public information materials
- steering committee
- district public meetings
- board of supervisors, planning commission, and school board meetings
- public hearings

Mr. Turner noted that the Steering Committee determined what information was desired from each of the district meetings. Once feedback from the district meetings was received, the Steering Committee would process this for inclusion in the plan.

The county has developed a web site devoted to the comprehensive plan that includes information on:

- an overview of the plan and process
- schedule of how long the process will take

- guide for how citizens can participate
- frequently asked questions
- library for all documents produced in the process
- lists of teams and committees
- links for outside resources used in the process
- the current plan

Mr. Turner noted that the county anticipates a final comprehensive plan will be ready for adoption in November 2010.

Mr. Padgett asked how the public was involved. Mr. Turner said the public was asked to provide feedback on what they liked and didn't like about living in the county and what they would like to see the county do in the future. All of this feedback will be posted on the web site.

Mr. Padgett asked if the public was involved from the onset or if they were brought in after the process was started. Mr. Turner noted the public had been brought in from the beginning. Citizens were selected to represent specific segments of the county's population. Input was given to the consultants who produced a report to the Steering Committee.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if meetings were available on the web site. Mr. Turner indicated that the meetings had been recorded and the videos were posted on the web site. The county is working toward a social networking capability to involve younger citizens.

Mr. Fabricant asked if citizens had been involved first. Mr. Turner said the consultants worked with citizens to develop a list of ideas on what the plan should include.

Ms. Durfee said she felt citizens had been eager to participate. She thanked members of the RRPDC staff for their involvement in helping to facilitate the public hearings.

Chairman Graziano thanked Mr. Turner and Mr. Larsen for their presentation.

## **B. Revised FY 10 Budget and Draft FY 11 Budget and Work Program**

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Crum to introduce this item. She noted that Mr. Crum had presented this item to the Executive Committee earlier and the Committee had endorsed its presentation to the Commission.

Mr. Crum said he will present revisions to the current FY 10 budget and give an overview on the draft FY 11 budget and work program. After the presentations, he will ask for action to approve what has been presented. He noted that during this presentation to the Executive Committee last month, the Committee had made

recommendations on revisions which have been included in what will be presented to Commission members today.

Mr. Crum said the agency operates on a fiscal year that runs from July 1 through June 30. Any revisions made to the draft FY 11 budget today will be presented again to the Commission in May, at which time further revisions can be made prior to adoption for the FY 11, which will begin on July 1, 2010. Mr. Crum noted that all information was included in the agenda book for members' review.

Mr. Crum reported that when the FY 10 budget had been adopted, it was anticipated that the agency would have an undesignated fund balance of \$549,500 to begin FY 10. The actual undesignated fund balance following the annual audit was \$590,644, or \$73,000 above what had been approved. The undesignated fund balance was established by the board for staff to use as needed for agency operations. The designated fund balance was set at \$1 million; this remains unchanged. The designated fund balance is what is anticipated to be needed to pay final expenses should the agency cease operations.

Revisions to the FY 10 budget are:

- no annual cost of living or merit increase for staff
- elimination of funding for a wage survey; this will be done in-house by Mr. Crum
- out-of-state travel has been limited to
  - travel for the Executive Director and Chairman to the InterCity Visit
  - travel for the Planning and Transportation Division Directors to one conference

Mr. Crum noted that funds have been budgeted for some Executive Committee members to attend the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions conference to be held in Richmond in February.

Revenue reductions are:

- sub-lease revenue beginning in February at a reduced rate; Mr. Crum noted that he has indicated to the realtors that a reduced rate of \$10-\$12 per square foot will be entertained; the agency currently pays \$17 per square foot; there has been some interest in the space at the reduced rate; Mr. Crum hopes to be able to bring a proposal to the Board in February.
- state funding has been reduced by \$14,200

Revenue additions include:

- addition of \$111,500 from the UASI grant for additional emergency management planners including all overhead costs

- addition of \$5,300 in Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant as brought in through work done by the Regional Area Funding Team (grants warehouse)

Mr. Crum reported that it is anticipated staff will use \$106,300 of the undesignated fund balance in FY 10, which is down from the anticipated \$139,100 estimate given in May. At the end of FY 10, the total fund balances are anticipated to be approximately \$1,484,344, which is \$73,000 higher than the budget adopted in May 2009.

There were no questions regarding the FY 10 revised budget.

Mr. Crum noted the information on the FY 11 budget includes revisions made by the Executive Committee during last month's meeting. The FY 11 budget overview is:

- no salary or cost of living increases for staff
- addition of Senior Transportation planner to handle travel demand modeling (PL funds); this position was recommended by the Long Range Transportation Plan study group and the Transportation Advisory Committee in response to VDOT's announcement that it will no longer do this work
- addition of two UASI emergency management planners funded in total by the UASI grant; these are contract positions; if the funding is cut, the positions will be eliminated

Mr. Crum reviewed revenue sources:

- 54.9% from FHWA/FTA/VDOT (urban transportation)
- 21.2% from local member dues
- 10.4% from the UASI grant
- small percentages from other sources

Work program tasks that will be performed in FY 11 will include:

- continued work with the Capital Region Collaborative
- proactive legislative agenda
- continued work to support the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees
- regional infrastructure inventory
- other regional projects

Mr. Crum noted there will be new data collection programs that will include, among others:

- regional existing land use map
- regional vacant land inventory

- regional future land use map

He noted the agency is also working toward gaining 3-D simulation capabilities which will enhance presentations. Work will continue on the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan update, Route 5 multimodal corridor study, as well as support for all MPO committees and boards. Additionally, staff will continue its work on the James River Barge Project and begin work on a bicycle and pedestrian plan and in-house travel demand modeling.

Mr. Crum said it is anticipated \$68,900 will be used from the undesignated fund balance for a total fund balance at the end of FY 11 of approximately \$1,415,444.

Mr. Crum said that concluded his presentation and asked if there were questions.

Mr. Gecker said he is concerned about the agency carrying 40% over the required \$1 million fund balance. He asked if some of this could be drawn down in the form of dues rebates to the localities. He said he believed \$1 million was more than enough to cover six months' worth of operating expenses.

Mr. Crum said this is something the Executive Committee could discuss as a recommendation for a revision to the FY 11 budget.

Mr. Fabricant said he would be agreeable to using some of that overage to fund a minimal salary increase for staff. He said the cost to bring on and train new employees would be more than offering a minimal salary increase to ensure that the agency could keep the qualified and competent staff it currently has. Mr. Crum noted that the initial FY 11 budget recommendation had included a 3% salary increase for staff; however, Executive Committee members said this would not be appropriate as none of the localities are in a position to offer increases to their staffs.

Ms. Durfee asked when Mr. Crum would have the wage review completed. Mr. Crum said he planned to have this ready to present to the Executive Committee in April.

Mr. Kaechele asked how much revenue the sub-lease would bring in. Mr. Crum said the agency currently pays \$17 per square foot, and he did not believe the space would be rented for that rate.

Mr. Kaechele noted that if the fund balance is to be reduced, contributions from member localities would be cut in half. Mr. Crum said this option could be discussed by the Executive Committee. He would, however, ask that this be considered a one-time rebate so as not to establish any precedent going forward. Continued reduction in the undesignated fund balance would be problematic for the agency operations.

Chairman Graziano noted that as localities' funds are cut, they will need to interact more with RRPDC staff to take up the slack for work that needs to be done in the localities. Ms. O'Bannon said that as VDOT's budget continues to be cut, the RRPDC will begin to handle more of VDOT's tasks. She said the fund balance would need to be monitored to ensure the agency will be able to do the extra work. She said while she is not opposed to a one-time rebate to the localities, she thought it would be best to wait to see how the economy reacts.

There was no further discussion. On motion made by Ms. Durfee and seconded by Ms. O'Bannon, the revised FY 10 budget and draft FY 11 budget were approved as presented.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

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

There were no other committee reports.

##### **B. Announcements**

Chairman Graziano reminded members there would be no January meetings. She thanked members for their support and involvement over this past year and wished everyone happy holidays.

Mr. Gordon said he would like to offer his appreciation to Mr. Crum and the RRPDC staff for a very productive year. He said foundations have been put down for continued accomplishments in the future.

Ms. Durfee added her thanks to Mr. Crum for his work and many accomplishments. She said she believed the Executive Committee had made the right choice to bring Mr. Crum to the RRPDC.

Chairman Graziano also thanked Mr. Crum for his work over the past year.

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

There were no items included in this section.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Graziano adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:45 p.m.

---

Robert A. Crum, Jr.  
Executive Director

---

Kathy C. Graziano  
Chairman