

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
November 12, 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
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan
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
Kathy C. Graziano (M), ChairmanCity of Richmond
John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M).....County of Chesterfield
James M. Holland (M).....County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M).....County of Chesterfield
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
Faye O. Prichard (M), SecretaryTown of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Randall R. Silber (A) County of Henrico
Millard D. Stith (A).....County of Chesterfield
Stran L. Trout (M), Treasurer County of New Kent
Joseph B. Walton (M)County of Powhatan

Members Absent

Karin Carmack (M).....County of Powhatan
Douglas G. Conner (M)City of Richmond
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. (M)..... County of Charles City
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M)County of Hanover
Courtney G. Hyers (M).....County of Goochland
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond
Beverley C. Lacy (M)City of Richmond
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... County of New Kent
George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Others Present

John R. Amos..... RRPDC Legal Counsel
Nora AmosTown of Ashland
Reed Amos..... Amos PLLC
Mary Ann Curtin.....County of Chesterfield
Michael Frede Caleb Acquisitions
Raymond Gill.....University of Richmond
George Homewood County of New Kent
Addison SadewaterUniversity of Richmond
Michael Schnurman County of Henrico
Jennifer M. WickerCity of Richmond

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Intern
Anne DarbyAssociate Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Brian Koziol..... Intern
Jin LeeSenior Planner
Daniel N. LysyDirector, Transportation
Greta Ryan Intern
Randy SelleckSenior Planner
Jackie S. Stewart Director, Planning/IS
Lee YoltonPrincipal Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Graziano called the regularly scheduled November 12, 2009 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:10 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. There were no requests from the public to address the Commission, and the Chairman closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

Chairman Graziano indicated she would not have a report this month.

E. Approval of Minutes – October 8, 2009 Meeting

Chairman Graziano asked Ms. Prichard to present minutes from the October 8, 2009 meeting. There being no discussion, on motion made by Ms. Prichard and seconded by Mr. Holland, the minutes were approved as presented.

F. Approval of September 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. Bennett, the September 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 that the Capital Region Collaborative Organizing Team (CRC) is beginning outreach to about seven organizations to receive input on regional priorities that should be addressed by the CRC. The CRC is working with a professional facilitator to help gather this feedback. These meetings will be completed by January and a report will be provided to the Commission early in the spring. A draft strategic plan will be developed to take to the community during the summer for public feedback.

The Regional Area Funding Team (RAFT – grants warehouse) continues to meet on a monthly basis. Each jurisdiction has a representative on this team. RAFT recently assisted the jurisdictions' staffs with applications for energy conservation block grants.

Work continues on the Socioeconomic Data Report. This report establishes baseline information in the community on employment and population through

detailed analysis. This information will be incorporated into the regional transportation model to predict transportation trips and to forecast future growth to the year 2035.

With regard to the UASI Emergency Management program that was previously approved by the Commission, the first position for a Principal Planner was advertised last month and applications are being reviewed. It is hoped that the position will be filled within the first three months of 2010.

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 October 15. One of the items on the agenda was the CRC and its efforts to reach out to other groups for input on regional priorities. The committees felt it was important for local governments to also provide input. The CRC facilitator will meet with the committees during a joint meeting on November 19.

There was also further discussion on the regional legislative agenda which will be presented to Commission members today. There are five topic groups: Environment, Governing Locally, Transportation, Growth, and Public Safety Funding. There is a general statement of principle under each section with detailed items listed under each one.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions – Coleman Speece, President

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

Mr. Crum indicated that the RRPDC is an active member of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions (VAPDC). He said this organization has been very helpful to him as a new PDC Executive Director. It provides a forum for sharing information and is trying to increase its visibility by connecting to the various PDCs around the state. Mr. Crum noted that Mr. Coleman Speece is a member of the Southside PDC and serves as president of VAPDC. Mr. Crum thanked Mr. Speece for taking time to make the drive, in adverse weather conditions, from South Boston to address the Commission today. Mr. Crum noted that Mr. Speece is attending meetings of all PDC boards across the state to offer updates on the VAPDC.

Mr. Speece thanked Commission members for the invitation to meet with them today. He thanked members for their support and encouraged them to become more active in the VAPDC. Mr. Speece noted that Mr. Crum is quickly becoming a valued leader in the state organization.

VAPDC is a small organization in terms of budget, but its activity level is high. Its board of directors and officers are a combination of executive directors and commissioners of the state's PDCs. The role of VAPDC is to disseminate information and to provide educational forums such as the summer and winter conferences. VAPDC also follows and attempts to influence political issues that are important to PDCs or regional planning in general.

VAPDC is celebrating its fortieth anniversary this year. During the winter conference, held this past January in Richmond, VAPDC honored former Governor Lynwood Holton, who signed the executive order that created PDCs.

Mr. Speece noted he has been a planning commissioner for about 10 years, but his association with regional planning spans 20 years. Regional PDCs have changed the faces of communities and towns across the state, especially in the smaller rural communities. As PDC commissioners, there is a responsibility to keep these planning efforts alive for the future. This is going to require special effort and dedication in the current tough economic times.

Mr. Speece encouraged all of the commissioners to attend the upcoming VAPDC winter conference and the summer conference next year. He said VAPDC needs the support of all commissioners. Mr. Speece noted that RRPDC is located in the portion of the state where things happen, which makes the support of RRPDC commissioners even more important. The winter conference will be held on February 17 in Richmond. Mr. Crum will do a session at this conference on the Capital Region Collaborative.

Mr. Speece thanked members of the Commission for their support and offered the assistance of VAPDC in anyway.

Mr. Crum noted he would circulate information on the winter conference agenda to members of the Commission. He said one of the items that VAPDC would like to include in its conferences is a session just for commissioners to share information and ideas. Mr. Speece said this would be to share successful practices. He said each PDC is different and much can be learned from sharing what common practices work best in each one.

Mr. Kaechele asked if any commissioner has voting rights or if voting rights were for members only. Mr. Speece said the board of directors votes on policy, but in the general meetings, all commissioners have voting rights.

Mr. Padgett asked how many PDCs are in the state. Mr. Speece said there are 21 PDCs. Of the 21, 19 are members of VAPDC. There were 20 members until the Commonwealth PDC left. Middle Peninsula PDC has not been a member for several years. There is a very active participation from VAPDC members.

Mr. Butler asked Mr. Crum if RRPDC had anyone on the VAPDC board. Mr. Crum replied not at this time. He also said most of the VAPDC board is comprised of PDC executive directors. Mr. Speece said the VAPDC is often viewed as an organization of executive directors. He said there is a disproportionate amount of work done by executive directors, which shows the need for more participation by commissioners.

Mr. Crum said he will provide more information on VAPDC opportunities to members of the Commission as they are identified. Mr. Speece said involvement from RRPDC commissioners in particular is needed due to the location of the RRPDC in Richmond.

Mr. Crum said during the winter conference, the VAPDC will host a legislative reception.

Chairman Graziano thanked Mr. Speece for his presentation.

B. Regional Legislative Agenda

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Crum to introduce this item.

Mr. Crum noted that Mr. Gates has been working with the Small and Large Jurisdictions Committees over the past two months to develop a proposed regional legislative agenda for the upcoming General Assembly session. He said Mr. Gates will review each item and ask for feedback from members.

Mr. Gates said he will present the 2010 legislative agenda as proposed by the Small and Large Jurisdictions Committees. He said the purpose for the agenda will be to establish a regional voice at the General Assembly on issues that are regional, planning issues, or common issues that impact all of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Gates noted the Commission will meet in early December and it is the hope of staff that the agenda can be finalized and ready to publish by mid-December, prior to the start of the General Assembly session in January. A date for a legislative reception has not been finalized. It has been agreed that the reception should be held after the Christmas holiday and prior to the start of the legislative session. Mr. Gates noted that three of the Region's legislative liaisons were in attendance today: Mary Ann Curtin, Chesterfield County; Jennifer Wicker, City of Richmond; Mike Schnurman, Henrico County. He noted their expertise, along with that of Ron Jordon (Richmond), Marilyn Blake (Hanover), and county

administrators, was very valuable in the development process with the jurisdictions committees.

Mr. Gates reviewed important legislative dates. He stated that if any of the Commission members would not be able to attend any of the pre-conference meetings, he will be glad to attend and report back on any developments. There will be a legislative liaison seminar hosted by VML/VACo in mid-December which Mr. Gates will attend.

Mr. Gates said today he would like to discuss the proposed agenda and receive feedback from members. The draft copy was included in the agenda book. There are five topics: Environment, Governing Locally, Transportation, Growth, and Public Safety. For each topic, there is a general policy statement, and some sub-topics are also included under each of the main topics. Mr. Gates said he would like to try to limit discussion to 10 minutes for each topic.

The first topic is **Environment**. There are five policy statements for the sub-topic of Stormwater Regulations. Chairman Graziano asked if there was any feedback on this topic.

Mr. Gates said to begin the discussion, he would like to introduce suggestions from Ms. Durfee. She addressed the first bullet point to delay implementation. Ms. Durfee contacted Mr. Gates to report that VACo is changing their policy statement regarding delaying implementation.

Ms. Durfee said during the VACo conference there were some speakers to address the stormwater regulations. VACo decided it was not in its best interest to use the word *delay* but to change the statement to read *support further evaluation and analysis*. Ms. Durfee said the RRPDC's first statement is to delay implementation. She would suggest that RRPDC mirror what is being put forward by VACo: *RRPDC supports a further evaluation of the Commonwealth's stormwater regulations...."*

Mr. Kaechele noted that Henrico County is going to put forward a statement to delay the implementation. Ms. Durfee said the same discussions were held during the VACo conference. They felt the word *delay* was not appropriate for them with regard to the position being taken by EPA and that VACo wanted to be in a better position to address whatever comes from EPA. Mr. Kaechele noted that implementation is set to begin on July 1.

Chairman Graziano asked if Mr. Kaechele would recommend leaving the wording as is. Mr. Kaechele said that was correct. Mr. Butler said Goochland County would also use the word *delay*.

It was the consensus of the members to leave the first bullet point as is.

Ms. Durfee said during the Small and Large Jurisdictions Committee meetings, there was discussion on the overuse of the word *oppose*. She said in looking at the other bullet points, she felt they could be turned around to say the same thing but in a positive way. On the fourth and fifth bullet points, they could be changed to read: (5th point) *We support stormwater regulation that incentivizes redevelopment or infill....*” Ms. Durfee said the only point that should maintain the word *oppose* would be third bullet point. The others could be more beneficial by sending the same message using the word *support*.

Ms. Graziano said she would like to take each point separately to determine the members’ wishes on wording.

Ms. Prichard said she would respectfully disagree. She feels RRPDC should say it opposes what it opposes.

Chairman Graziano asked for clarification on the first bullet point. She asked for a show of hands from members who would like to keep the wording as it stands. The majority of members agreed to leave the wording as is.

On the fourth bullet point, Ms. Durfee suggested *We support a generalized standard for all development that considers the size, location, or type of development within rural and urban areas*. She noted VACo determined all aspects should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Walton said he feels using the word *oppose* is the best route to take, but he would agree to change the fifth bullet point as suggested by Ms. Durfee.

Ms. Jaeckel said she feels the regulations are not meant to incentivize or de-incentivize redevelopment; this is just an unintended consequence of the regulations. She said she felt the bullet point should remain as it is.

Mr. Trout said the point is whether the RRPDC wants to say to do something good or to do something bad. He said RRPDC wants to say not to do something bad.

Mr. Gates said he would suggest: *We oppose stormwater regulations that have the unintended consequence of disincentivizing redevelopment or infill development opportunities*.

Chairman Graziano said she would like to go to the fourth bullet. She asked for a show of hands from those who want to leave the fourth bullet as printed. The members agreed to leave the fourth bullet point as is.

On the fifth bullet point, Ms. Durfee said her suggestion would be: *We support stormwater regulations that incentivize....*” Mr. Gates said he agreed there should be some statement that shows RRPDC acknowledges that the regulations

don't actually incentivize or disincentivize formally. He said he could use *unintended consequence* or *seem to cause*. There was a suggestion to use the word *hinder* in place of *disincentivize*.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if another sentence could be inserted to include *unintended consequences*. Mr. Gates pointed out that in the general statement above the Stormwater Regulations section, there was a bullet point using that phrase.

Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those who agreed to substitute the word *hinder* for the word *disincentivize*. Members agreed this change should be made. There were no other comments on this section.

In the next section, **Governing Locally**, discussion points included a general policy statement on local government autonomy. The sub-section on Regional Jails will be discussed by the Chairman.

Mr. Setliff asked if any discussion had taken place during the jurisdictions committees meetings on the elimination of the Dillon Rule. Mr. Gates reported that in last year's legislative agenda, a detailed section had been included on the Dillon Rule. He researched some of the legal treatises on this and reported them to the jurisdictions committees. Feedback from the legislative liaisons and county administrators in attendance was to strongly discourage that RRPDC take a position on the Dillon Rule at this time. They all agreed the Dillon Rule is an issue. Reasons for recommending that no position be taken were that there is no political climate currently to address this and that this would minimize the RRPDC's credibility by bringing up this issue. Mr. Gates suggested that if this is to be addressed, he would recommend it be done in collaboration with VACo and VML. He said he thinks this issue will take a lot more lobbying effort over several years and will require patrons of bills to address the concerns.

Mr. Setliff said Hanover County would take a position on this issue. Mr. Gates said this issue is too big to include only a broad statement saying RRPDC supports relaxation of the Dillon Rule. Mr. Setliff said he would like for localities to have complete autonomy. Chairman Graziano asked if Mr. Setliff was suggesting that the statement be changed to say the Dillon Rule should be eliminated. Mr. Setliff said that was correct.

Ms. Coats said she feels what is wanted regarding the Dillon Rule is to ask state legislators to initiate a study to see if the Dillon Rule is still effective in this day and time. She thought that could be more successful. She said asking to see if the Dillon Rule is still pertinent may further the cause more than asking for it to be eliminated.

Ms. Durfee said she could support asking for such a study.

Mr. Gates noted the study would be referred to the state Supreme Court. The reason for the Dillon Rule is because of decisions made by the Virginia Supreme Court. In order to move away from this Rule, the state legislature would be overturning a precedent set by the Court. He said a Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) study could be requested asking for the impact of the Dillon Rule on the localities. Virginia adheres more strictly to the Dillon Rule than any other state in the country.

Ms. Prichard said she agreed that the Dillon Rule should be eliminated but she wondered if the RRPDC legislative agenda was the place to begin this effort. She said she feels there are other priorities that need attention. If the Dillon Rule needs to be addressed, then there should be some collaboration with other PDCs and organizations such as VACo to obtain patron support.

Chairman Graziano asked if there should be a reference to the Dillon Rule in the policy statement. Mr. Setliff said Hanover County is recommending a study. He said the study would begin the process. Ms. Prichard said she would agree with asking for a study. Mr. Setliff said he would recommend a separate sentence to request a study on the Dillon Rule. Mr. Crum said staff would work with Hanover County to develop a similar statement.

Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands from those who wanted to add the request for a study on the impact of the Dillon Rule. The members agreed this should be added. Staff will develop verbiage for this that is consistent with what is being put forward by Hanover County.

Mr. Gecker said he was not sure this regional body meant to ask for complete autonomy with regard to land use. He said he felt it was ironic that a regional body would ask for local autonomy. He said he felt on regional issues, such as transportation, it would be more appropriate, but he didn't think one locality should veto another with regard to a regional land use issue. Chairman Graziano asked if there were other members who had similar issues with the first sentence under Governing Locally. There were no other members who shared this concern.

Mr. Gates noted the issues discussed during the development stage of this agenda were those of a regional nature, specifically regional such as high speed rail; issues that were planning in nature, such as stormwater regulations which are planning but don't impact the Region or require regional cooperation to oppose because it is a common issue; and those that don't have a planning emphasis or don't require regional cooperation but they can be included to have a unified voice.

With regard to Regional Jails, Mr. Gates said Chairman Graziano would address this. Chairman Graziano said she wanted to suggest a JLARC study to look at incentives from the state to localities if the localities participated in capital or

service agreements together. Mr. Gates said the specific proposal with regard to the agenda would be to remove or replace the paragraph on Regional Jails and replace it with the language on regional cooperation on all capital expenditures on facilities and the operation of such facilities. The resolution would direct ...*JLARC to examine the cost and benefits of the Commonwealth establishing incentives to localities for the joint construction of new capital facilities and the joint provisions of operating services.* This is a change from what the jurisdictions committees discussed because the direction was not clear at that time. This is on the proposed agendas for Chesterfield County and the City of Richmond.

Mr. Gecker said he thought it was for the joint use of facilities and not construction. Chairman Graziano said she thought it could be for either.

Ms. O'Bannon said Henrico County already cooperates with surrounding localities in such ventures.

Chairman Graziano said this would expand what is already in place, to offer incentives for such cooperation. Mr. Gates said this would endorse a resolution to ask JLARC to add this to their work plan. He said there is no financial impact to ask for this. If a locality builds a jail on its own, they could qualify for 25% funding from the state if the construction is approved by the Department of Corrections. If three or more localities cooperate, they could qualify to receive up to 50% of the cost. The suggestion is to ask JLARC to see if similar incentives could be applied to all regional capital facilities, both new and existing.

Ms. Durfee said the word *new* should be removed from the statement.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if the statement was asking to examine the cost and benefits of establishing incentives or the cost and benefits of construction. Mr. Gates said it is asking for a study on the potential cost savings statewide for regional collaboration on facilities.

Mr. Gates said he could draft language that will take out the word *new* and add *joint utilization*.

Mr. Kaechele said each locality could establish its own incentives but would need financial assistance from the state. Chairman Graziano said incentives could be financial or land. Mr. Holland said the incentives should not be limited to financial. Chairman Graziano asked if there was consensus on the concept.

Ms. Durfee made a motion that the language be kept as is with removal of the word *new*. Chairman Graziano called for the vote on the motion that would remove the word *new* and would call for the JLARC study on incentives for regional cooperation on use of facilities, and the motion was approved.

Mr. Walton asked if Mr. Gates would address the suggestion on filling local governing vacancies. Mr. Walton said with the recent vacancy on the Powhatan County Board of Supervisors, the county was subjected to the prevailing State Code for non-charter localities. The county found out that they would need to make an appointment for 13 months. The county felt it should be able to make an interim appointment until an election can be held. The state attorney general's office submitted an opinion on a similar situation regarding an appointed official that stated the appointed official does not have the same power as an elected official on specific issues in the state code and constitution. On some issues, a vote by the appointed official could be considered unconstitutional. Mr. Walton would like for RRPDC to support a generic position that non-charter localities should be able to hold an election as needed, at the county's cost. Delegate Athey will introduce legislation on this issue during this year's session. He introduced similar legislation last year but there were some issues in getting the bill processed because it was introduced late in the session. There would be an emergency implementation clause attached to the bill so that if passed, the county could hold a special election as soon as one could be organized.

Chairman Graziano asked if there were any comments on the proposal to include this request in the legislative agenda. Mr. Trout asked if this was the opinion that had been recently released by the state's attorney general. Mr. Gates said that was correct.

Chairman Graziano asked for a show of hands to support this addition. Members agreed this should be added.

Mr. Gates said the next topic would be **Transportation**. Mr. Gates reviewed each of the statements for the sub-topics.

Mr. Gates noted that under the sub-topic of Commonwealth Transportation Board, the jurisdictions committees had determined it would be in the best interest of the Region to ask for a third at-large seat to be filled from the Richmond Construction District. He said he felt it was too close to the start of the legislative session to write a bill and find a patron to put the bill forward. He said he would suggest that he would like to have the next year to research the issue and find support in the legislature for the bill. He also suggested it may have more traction to say the seat should represent the Richmond/Petersburg area. Mr. Gates said he has spoken with the legislative liaison at the Crater PDC who indicated they would be willing to work on such an issue.

Mr. Padgett said he believed in the first general statement, the word *vital* should be inserted to replace the word *encourage*. Chairman Graziano asked if there was anyone who opposed this change. There was no opposition, and staff will make the change.

As there were no other comments to make on this topic, Mr. Gates moved on to the section on **Growth**. He reviewed each of the general policy statements.

Ms. Durfee suggested the word *strengthening* should be added to the first general statement under Growth. Consensus was this should be done.

Ms. Durfee said she would like to bring up some discussion held during the VACo conference on impact fees and proffers. She said she would recommend adding a statement on adequate public facilities to the second bullet point under Public Infrastructure Investment. Mr. Gates said his suggestion was to add to the end of the second bullet point: *and adequate public facilities and ordinances*.

Mr. Gecker said he did not think that addition fit at the end of that sentence. He said he felt it should be a separate sentence. Chairman Graziano asked if there was anyone who was opposed to adding this language if it was made into a separate bullet point. There was no objection to this from the members.

Chairman Graziano asked if there were any other changes to make to this section. There were none.

Mr. Gates moved on to the last topic of **Public Safety Funding**. He reviewed each of the bullet points under this topic and asked for feedback. Chairman Graziano asked if there were any changes to be made to this section. There were none voiced.

Mr. Crum asked members to consider taking action on the legislative agenda as changed during today's meeting so that Mr. Gates can begin work to finalize the agenda and prepare it for publication and distribution.

Ms. Prichard made a motion that the legislative agenda as discussed and amended during the meeting be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Bannon. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

Mr. Trout asked if a draft could be sent out to members prior to publication. Mr. Gates said he will distribute a corrected draft copy and a clean copy to all members.

C. UASI Resolution

Chairman Graziano asked Mr. Crum to introduce this item.

Mr. Crum reminded members they had previously approved RRPDC participation in the UASI Emergency Management Planning Program. Action is needed to pass a resolution authorizing Mr. Crum to apply for the UASI grant funds and execute any actions necessary for obtaining this federal financial assistance.

Mr. Bennett moved that this resolution be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Prichard. There was no further discussion and the motion carried.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

B. Announcements

Mr. Gates reported that a legislative reception (breakfast) will be held prior to the start of this year's legislative session (January 13, 2010) for members of the Capital Region Caucus, area elected officials, and other planning organizations' staffs, among others. He asked members to contact him with suggestions on locations and dates.

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 2:40 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Kathy C. Graziano
Chairman