

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
December 8, 2011

Members/Alternates Present

Chris W. Archer (M).....County of Henrico
L. Ray Ashworth (M).....City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M)County of Powhatan
Willie L. Bennett (M)County of Henrico
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan
Timothy W. Cotman (M) County of Charles City
James D. Crews (M)County of Goochland
James B. Donati (M).....County of Henrico
Evan Fabricant (M).....County of Hanover
Daniel A. Gecker (M)County of Chesterfield
Richard W. Glover (M).....County of Henrico
John E. Gordon (M), Treasurer.....County of Hanover
Kathy C. Graziano (M)City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M)County of Chesterfield
James M. Holland (M)County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M)County of Chesterfield
David A. Kaechele (M).....County of Henrico
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), Vice Chairman.....Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Stran L. Trout (M), Chairman..... County of New Kent
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield
Deborah B. Winans (A)County of Hanover

Members Absent

Malvern R. “Rudy” Butler (M), Secretary.....County of Goochland
Douglas G. Conner (M)City of Richmond
Marleen K. Durfee (M)County of Chesterfield
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond
Lynn McAteer (M).....City of Richmond
Millard D. Stith (M).....County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M).....County of Henrico
Joseph B. Walton (M)County of Powhatan

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Robert L. Eanes.....Jefferson Davis Association
Tom JacobsonCounty of Chesterfield
Latisha Jenkins.....County of Chesterfield
Kelli Le Duc..... County of New Kent
Stenny McGee.....Jefferson Davis Association

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director
Jo A. EvansAssistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary
Sulabh AryalAssociate Planner
Anne DarbyAssociate Planner
Jacob Epstein Intern
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Billy Gammel.....Associate Planner
Barbara JacocksPrincipal Planner
Jin Lee.....Senior Planner
Barbara Nelson.....Principal Planner
Kathy Robins Senior Planner/UASI
Greta RyanData Analyst
Jackie Stewart Director, Planning
Sarah StewartSenior Planner
Peter Sweetland.....Finance and Contracts Manager

Call to Order

Chairman Trout called the regularly scheduled December 8, 2011 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. He then led 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 Trout asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. There were no requests to change the agenda, and the agenda was accepted as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Trout asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. He reminded speakers that their time is limited to three minutes. As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, the Chairman closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

Chairman Trout noted that today is his last meeting and the last meeting for several other members. He said he began serving on the Commission Board eight years ago at mid-year and is leaving at mid-year. Chairman Trout announced that there is a holiday reception for all members following adjournment of today's meeting and prior to the start of the MPO meeting.

Chairman Trout reminded members that during the October meeting, action was taken to cancel the February meeting and to meet in January instead. Due to the election results, there will be a need for the jurisdictions to appoint new members to serve on the Commission Board. Many of these appointments will not take place prior to the January 12 RRPDC meeting date.

During today's Executive Committee meeting, action was taken to cancel the January meeting and to move the February meeting date to Friday, February 17. The regular meeting date of February 9 is in conflict with the VML/VACo/VAPDC Legislative Day. Many of the elected officials will be involved in this event and as a result, will not be able to attend the RRPDC meetings.

Chairman Trout said he has enjoyed his time on the Commission Board. He said the expanded role of the RRPDC has allowed him to become involved in many other regional activities, and he has seen more regional cooperation between the jurisdictions develop.

E. Presentation of Resolutions of Appreciation to Outgoing Members

Mr. Crum asked the following members to join him and Ms. Prichard at the front of the room for recognition:

Tim Cotman, Charles City County
Marleen Durfee, Chesterfield County
Rudy Butler, Goochland County
John Gordon, Hanover County
Bob Setliff, Hanover County
Debbie Winans, Hanover County
Jim Donati, Henrico County

Stran Trout, New Kent County
Bob Cosby, Powhatan County
Joe Walton, Powhatan County

Mr. Crum asked Ms. Prichard to make the presentations.

Ms. Prichard said this is a bittersweet opportunity – bitter because the RRPDC is losing a lot of good colleagues who will be going on to do important work in other venues; and sweet because there is an opportunity to show appreciation for people who have done so much for the RRPDC and for the Region. She said the current Board bears no resemblance to the Board of four years ago with respect to what has been accomplished. She said thanks in part go to Dickie King, who is no longer a member of the RRPDC. Ms. Prichard said the Board has done a complete turnaround over the last four years. The regional cooperation that has been established over the last four years is amazing.

The list of RRPDC accomplishments is long, and at the top of the list is the collegiality and camaraderie that has been built between all nine of the RRPDC jurisdictions, in large part due to the members who are standing at the front of the room. Ms. Prichard noted that each of these persons has gone above and beyond the call of duty in the time they have dedicated to the RRPDC and the Region. She said all RRPDC members owe them a huge debt of appreciation.

Ms. Prichard said on behalf of herself and the RRPDC Executive Committee and Board, she thanked the outgoing members for the time and love that they have given to the jurisdictions and the RRPDC.

Members joined in a standing ovation in recognition of the outgoing members.

Ms. Prichard asked if any of the outgoing members would like to say anything to the Commission Board.

Mr. Cotman said the four years he has spent working with the RRPDC and MPO had been a real revelation for him that aided his work with his local government, especially in understanding how the local government fits in to what is going on around it. He said he will treasure the experience and getting to know everyone. He said he appreciates having the opportunity to be a member of the RRPDC.

Chairman Trout said he appreciated the recognition and thanked Ms. Prichard for her remarks.

F. 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 1, and details work being

advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. He said staff will be happy to address any questions on what is included in the report.

Mr. Crum said he would like to add his thanks on behalf of staff to all of the outgoing members for their work. He said they have been a large part of the RRPDC's success, and the seeds planted by these members will be followed up on as the RRPDC moves forward. He said staff is looking forward to working with the returning and incoming Commission members. Mr. Crum announced that staff will be organizing three orientation sessions for incoming members. He said the invitation to participate in the orientation sessions will be open to any member.

Mr. Crum reminded members that a discussion had taken place following recent natural disasters on what the RRPDC could do to help improve communications to the localities on how and where to access available services. Ms. Stewart has reached out to each of the localities, and tomorrow at noon, a meeting will be held at the WCVE studio to review the Memorandums of Understanding each of the localities has with WCVE to provide public service announcements during times of natural disasters. Representatives from each of the jurisdictions will be attending. A report on the meeting discussions will be provided during the next Commission Board meeting.

The RRPDC will hold its third annual Legislative Breakfast Reception on January 4. Invitations will be mailed tomorrow. The reception will begin at 7:30 a.m. at the Greater Richmond Convention Center. Current Commission members will be invited as these members helped to develop the 2012 agenda. All regional elected officials, including newly elected officials, will also be invited.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Trout said the Executive Committee has recommended approval of the items listed on the Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of Minutes – November 10, 2011 Meeting

B. Approval of the October 2011 Financial Report

Chairman Trout asked if anyone wished to have either of these items pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion.

As there were no requests for discussion on the items, on motion made by Ms. Prichard and seconded by Mr. Glover, the Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously as presented.

III. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to bring before the Commission members.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Review of Revised FY 12 Budget and Preliminary FY 13 Budget

Chairman Trout asked Mr. Crum to lead the discussion on this agenda item.

Mr. Crum said following his presentation, he will ask Commission members to take action to approve the revised FY 12 budget and the preliminary FY 13 budget. The RRPDC practice is to provide a mid-year review on how expenditures and revenues are tracking and to update the budget accordingly. A preview of the FY 13 budget will also be presented. Mr. Crum emphasized this is only a first draft of the FY 13 budget and that final approval will be asked for in May 2012. There are still several unknowns with regard to the FY 13 budget at the state level. Staff will monitor these unknowns as the year progresses. The new Commission Board will also have input into the FY 13 budget.

The RRPDC operates on a fiscal year that begins on July 1 and runs through June 30. This is currently fiscal year 2012.

At the end of FY 11, the auditor reported that the undesignated fund balance was about \$270,000. The designated fund balance remains at \$1 million. This gave the RRPDC a total fund balance at the beginning of FY 12 of about \$1,270,000.

Mr. Crum reviewed the cash flow of the RRPDC over the course of a year. The RRPDC operates on a reimbursement basis. About \$552,000 of the operating budget is received from the jurisdictions in the form of member dues, and about \$113,000 is received from the state appropriation. The remainder of the operating budget is received from various sources such as federal grants. This requires the RRPDC to complete work and then request reimbursement. Revenues ebb and flow depending on the reimbursement process. Mr. Crum said this points out the wisdom of having a designated fund balance of \$1 million to ensure there is money to cover operating costs while waiting for reimbursement.

The FY 12 budget was developed using the following:

- Reduction in membership dues: These are calculated at 60¢ per capita; this covers operation of both the RRPDC and MPO; membership dues were reduced to five percent below the FY 10 level to be sensitive to the economic conditions in the jurisdictions; dues have been stable at the 60¢ per capita level since 1992; any increase in the dues amounts has been as a result of population increases.
- Emergency Management Program phase-out: This has been a very successful program; the federal government is withdrawing funds as of June 2013; one of the three planners originally hired has already left and will not be replaced.
- All out of state travel has been eliminated: During today's RRPDC Executive Committee meeting, members recommended that the costs for the Executive

Director to attend the InterCity Visit be reinstated; this cost is approximately \$1,800.

Mr. Crum provided information on how much each jurisdiction contributes in membership dues, which totaled \$552,000 for FY 12. The larger jurisdictions pay more due to larger populations.

It is projected that approximately \$62,500 will be used from the undesignated fund balance during FY 12 to meet operating expenses. This will bring the total of the undesignated fund balance to about \$207,510 at the end of FY 12. The \$1 million designated fund balance remains intact giving a total fund balance of approximately \$1,207,510 at the end of FY 12.

Mr. Crum reviewed some cost containment measures taken by staff. Staff strives to deliver the best service possible to the jurisdictions in the most cost effective manner. Staff tries to anticipate situations instead of reacting to them.

Between 2009 and 2011, four positions have been eliminated at the RRPDC. Mr. Crum said three of the positions were occupied at the time of elimination. These positions were:

- IT Manager – 2009: It was determined to be more cost effective to outsource these responsibilities.
- Planning Technician – 2009
- Senior Planner-Emergency Management – 2011
- Principal Planner-GIS Manager – 2011: These tasks will be distributed to other staff members.

The FY 13 budget is being developed using the following assumptions:

- funding for Urban Transportation will remain flat; this source funds about 55 percent of operating costs
- local membership dues will be fully reinstated based on the per capita formula as recommended by the Executive Committee
- 2 percent salary increase (merit based) for employees effective July 1, 2012; Executive Committee members expressed concern about this increase as the local jurisdictions will in all likelihood not be able to offer their employees an increase
- no out of state travel is funded
- addition of one Senior Planner funded completely by Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds; this position is needed to develop the in-house travel demand modeling program; all costs – including salary and overhead – will be covered by the RSTP funds received

Mr. Glover asked if the RSTP funds being used were those that are in the MPO and are rolled over at the end of two years. Mr. Crum said these are not PL or Section 5303 funds, but RSTP funds.

Mr. Glover asked if the funds were MPO. Mr. Crum said they are MPO funds. Mr. Glover asked if these were the funds that are normally rolled over after two years. Mr. Crum said the RSTP funds are typically used to build road projects. Mr. Glover asked if they were federal funds. Mr. Crum indicated the funds are from the federal government.

Mr. Crum reviewed the following revenue streams:

Urban Transportation	54.8%
Local Member Dues	22.7%
Emergency Management	8.9%
State Appropriation	4.2%
Sublease, Misc., Fund Balance	3.6%
Economic Development	2.4%
Rural Transportation	2.1%
Environmental	1.3%

On June 30, 2013, it is projected that approximately \$66,500 will be used from the undesignated fund balance for operating expenses, leaving an undesignated fund balance of approximately \$141,000. The \$1 million designated fund balance will remain intact giving a total fund balance of approximately \$1,141,000 on June 30, 2012.

Mr. Crum provided more information on the addition of the senior planner to assist with the travel demand modeling program. As the RSTP funds will cover all expenses associated with the position, including salary, benefits, and all overhead, the fund balance will be positively impacted by approximately \$87,700. Mr. Crum said if there was not a functional need for this position, he would not propose it. VDOT has set aside these federal monies to fund the position for two years.

Mr. Crum indicated staff will need to monitor the following items over the next six months. He reminded members that a final review of the FY 13 budget will be presented in May 2012.

- State appropriations from the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD): Last year the RRPDC received approximately \$113,000; the budget sent to the Governor provides for an increase in funding to PDCs but staff is not going to anticipate additional funding; some General Assembly members believe that through efficiencies in regional cooperation, the funds are a good investment

- Virginia Retirement System (VRS) contributions have been budgeted to remain flat: Staff has received verbal information that the contribution may decrease; the contribution is determined by the average age of the employee base; the RRPDC has a young average age; Mr. Crum said a flat rate will be assumed until confirmation of the agency's contribution is received in writing
- 2 percent salary adjustment: This will be adjusted based on action taken in the jurisdictions
- Levels of Urban Transportation Funding will be monitored.

Mr. Crum said the budget process will include another review in May 2012. Because the RRPDC Board will be gaining several new members, Mr. Crum said he is recommending that the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees meet jointly in March to discuss the 2013 work program. The input received during this meeting will be brought to the full Commission Board in May 2012. At that time, the Commission Board will be asked for final approval of the FY 13 budget.

Based on RRPDC bylaws, staff is required to ask that the Commission endorse the FY 12 mid-year budget and to approve the preliminary FY 13 budget, with the understanding that final approval will be made in May 2012.

Mr. Glover asked if the budget combines RRPDC and MPO funds. Mr. Crum said the MPO budget is part of the RRPDC budget. Mr. Glover asked if the positions eliminated were RRPDC or MPO employees.

Mr. Crum said the IT manager provided support to both the RRPDC and MPO staffs. The GIS positions provided support to both staffs as well. Mr. Crum said there are transportation planners who support the MPO and other planners who support the RRPDC. All of the planners are employees of the RRPDC.

Mr. Glover asked if the work program mentioned would include MPO projects or RRPDC projects.

Mr. Crum said these would be both RRPDC and MPO projects. MPO work tasks are determined by the MPO with input from the MPO technical advisory committees.

Mr. Glover said before reimbursement can be made for MPO work, the projects must be identified.

Mr. Crum said the Unified Work Program (UWP) will be presented to the MPO Board in March by Mr. Crum and Mr. Lysy. The MPO is supported by the urban transportation planning division within the RRPDC. The MPO develops and approves all work tasks done by the planners on behalf of the MPO.

Mr. Glover asked if the undesignated fund balance includes MPO funds or RRPDC funds. Mr. Crum said technically the MPO does not have a bank

account. The funds come from the federal government and localities to the RRPDC and are used to reimburse work done by the RRPDC and MPO.

Mr. Glover asked if MPO and RRPDC funds were separated out in the agency's accounting. Mr. Crum said separate invoices are provided and MPO funds are monitored in terms of work activities.

Mr. Glover said he does not understand how funds that come from the localities and funds that are reimbursed for MPO work are kept separate. He said it concerns him that he cannot see the separation. Mr. Crum said the MPO is provided staff support by the RRPDC. Mr. Crum said he monitors the MPO work tasks. Mr. Crum said he will be glad to meet with Mr. Glover to review how funds are monitored.

Mr. Fabricant asked if the work done by the employees who have been laid off had been absorbed by other staff members. Mr. Crum said that was correct. Mr. Fabricant said several months ago there was a discussion of increasing staff salaries to accommodate the increase in work loads. He said there is about a \$38,000 reduction in expenses since the last time the budget was reviewed. Mr. Fabricant asked if it made sense to reward the staff who are taking on the extra work.

Mr. Glover said salary adjustments are not done during a mid-year review. Any salary increases approved are for the future. Mr. Fabricant said it is very expensive to bring in new staff to train them. He asked if this is something Mr. Crum has discussed with the Executive Committee.

Mr. Crum said salaries at the RRPDC are an issue. There are seven planners with masters degrees who make less than \$45,000 per year. He said he is concerned that the RRPDC is not competitive in the market. Mr. Crum said he feels the time will come when this will need to be addressed in order to maintain the current quality of staff.

Mr. Fabricant asked if Mr. Crum had considered taking that \$38,000 in savings to reward his current staff with a one percent increase between now and the end of the fiscal year or with some type of bonus. Mr. Crum said from a performance stand point, this does make good business sense. He said the concern is that this would move the undesignated fund balance closer to the \$1 million threshold.

Mr. Fabricant asked if staff performance is increased, would that mean there is a potential for staff to bring in more funding through more reimbursable work. Mr. Crum said that is a possibility. He feels he has reached the limit on what he can ask staff to do at the RRPDC's current levels. He said staff is doing as much as they can. He said he does feel that staff should be rewarded with additional compensation, but indicated that this is not possible without increased contributions from the jurisdictions.

Mr. Fabricant emphasized that it is very expensive to train a new employee.

Mr. Setliff asked if a salary review can be completed once the new Board is seated to see if an adjustment in salaries does need to be made. He said elected officials are facing their own budget constraints in their own localities. He said it is difficult for elected officials to justify a salary increase for RRPDC staff if a similar increase cannot be offered to the locality staffs.

Mr. Crum said he made a salary review proposal to the Board about sixteen months ago, and it was declined due to the cost of the survey. Mr. Setliff asked if the information could be obtained by Mr. Crum through the human resource staffs in each of the localities. Mr. Crum said he would be willing to expend the time if there is potential for the outcome to show the exercise is a good use of his time. Mr. Crum said in discussions with the Executive Committee, it has been determined this may not be a good use of his time, because the Board was not in a position to make salary adjustments at this time. Mr. Crum said if the Executive Committee or Board feels that now is the right time, he will be glad to expend the time to collect the information.

Mr. Glover said he did not think mid-year was the right time to do this type of study and perhaps it could be discussed for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Fabricant asked what increases have been offered in the localities over the last year. Mr. Glover indicated that over the last twenty-plus years, the RRPDC has given equal increases to its staff as the localities have given to their staffs as approved by the elected officials. Mr. Glover said perhaps the RRPDC salaries were started at a rate that is too low. He said to offer a salary adjustment just because there is a \$38,000 savings is not something he agrees with.

Mr. Fabricant said he is not saying an adjustment should be done just for that reason.

Chairman Trout said he felt this discussion should be continued once the new Board members are seated.

Mr. Fabricant said he would recommend that the InterCity Visit for FY 12 be reinstated at the approximate cost of \$1,800. He feels this is a valuable resource for Mr. Crum in order to foster better relationships with the other jurisdictions.

Ms. Jaeckle said she agreed that the InterCity Visit should be reinstated for Mr. Crum.

Mr. Kaechele asked if there is any fiscal impact to the FY 12 budget included in the mid-year review from what was approved in May 2011. Mr. Crum said staff has been able to keep the budget about where it was projected to be at this time.

There was no additional discussion, and on motion duly made and seconded, the Commission unanimously approved the FY 12 mid-year budget as presented, with the reinstatement of funds for the Executive Director to attend the InterCity Visit, and the preliminary FY 13 budget as presented.

B. Route 1 Corridor Study Update

Chairman Trout asked Mr. Crum to introduce this agenda item.

Mr. Crum introduced Ms. Jacocks and Mr. Gammel to provide this presentation. Mr. Crum reminded members that the agency provides technical assistance to one of the larger jurisdictions each year, on a rotating basis. This year assistance was provided to Chesterfield County to complete a revitalization study of the Route 1/Jefferson Davis Highway corridor. Mr. Crum noted that Mr. Gammel was the lead staff on this project.

Ms. Jacocks commented that the project was originally started last year with Ms. Jackie Stewart working with Mr. Gammel. Ms. Jacocks said staff was very pleased to provide assistance to Chesterfield County this year to take a detailed look at one of the central communities within the county and to provide information to assist with the county's revitalization effort. Ms. Jacocks noted that Mr. Gammel has been working on the project over the last sixteen months and will provide a brief presentation on the study's findings.

Mr. Gammel said Chesterfield County wanted to focus on one of the more mature areas of the county – Jefferson Davis Highway. He recognized Tom Jacobson and Latisha Jenkins, with Chesterfield County's Department of Economic Development, as well as Ms. Jaekle, who represents the Bermuda District on the Chesterfield County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Gammel also recognized Stenny McGhee and Robert Eanes, who are with the Jefferson Davis Association, for their assistance.

Mr. Gammel provided a map of the study area in context with the county. The area runs from Route 1 (Jefferson Davis Highway) to Chippenham Parkway (Route 150) on the north and to Route 288 on the south. Mr. Gammel also provided a list of past technical assistance projects and noted that next year's project will be for Henrico County and will take a look at industrial zoning within the county.

Mr. Gammel noted the main purpose of the study was to provide the county's Economic Development office with parcel specific data which can be used to attract development interests, with a goal of identifying where the economic opportunities exist within the study area.

The scope of work was completed in three parts:

- existing conditions: to assess the conditions of all non-residential buildings along the corridor and to catalogue and inventory all existing businesses
- perform a market analysis to identify demand
- identify 12 economic opportunity sites for infill development

Mr. Gammel noted that the study area is about 6.5 miles in length. He said there are two major employers in the study area – DuPont and the US Defense Supply Center. These were not incorporated into the study, but the employment was captured in the market analysis.

The results of the building conditions of about 308 non-residential buildings were provided – retail, office, and industrial. Of these buildings, the conditions observed showed 37 percent in good condition; 47 percent in fair condition; 14 percent in poor condition; and 2 percent in dilapidated condition. The methodology used was provided by the Dunbar Building Evaluation Criteria in cooperation with the Chesterfield County planning staff. Mr. Gammel provided examples of buildings in each of the conditions noted.

Occupancy status was based on visual inspections. Of the 308 buildings examined, 270 were occupied, 32 were vacant, and occupancy of six buildings could not be determined. The condition of 88 percent of the buildings was good to fair.

Mr. Gammel provided a list of businesses currently located in the study area. Of 247 total businesses, 30 classifications were noted.

light industrial	50
non-retail or non-office	29
used auto dealership	24
auto parts/tires	19
eat-in restaurants	14
mechanic shops	14
convenience stores	13
motel/hotel	11
banking/tax service	10
fast food	9
gas stations	9

Mr. Gammel presented a map that noted residential and non-residential zoning in the study area. In terms of zoning, it was determined that 82 percent of the 580 parcels are zoned either Community Business (C-3) or General Business (C-5). This implies some flexibility in future commercial development.

In the market analysis, the focus was on where there is unmet demand and where it would be plausible to sustain a retail anchor such as a drug store or grocery store. Two trade areas were identified. Trade Area 1 was a primary concentration

within the most dilapidated part of the corridor. The location of the area goes east to the James River, west to the CSX rail line, north to Chippenham Parkway, and south to Route 288. The area was drawn by census block data and based on physical or man-made constraints. Supportable densities in Trade Area 1 were identified as:

	Dollar Leakage	HH/Acres	Density Factor	Households
Existing Density	n/a	1.88	1	3,707
Support Grocery Store	25%	2.85 – 3.1	1.6	5,600 – 6,100
Support Drug Store	25%	3.6 – 3.9	2	7,100 – 7,600

Within Trade Area 2, there is already a retail anchor – a grocery store.

In both Trade Areas unmet demand included:

- specialty food stores
- major appliance stores
- footwear stores
- electronics stores
- medical office
- pet store/toy store
- beauty salon
- tobacco products store
- jeweler
- laundromat
- florist

In order to identify opportunity sites, the following criteria was used:

- real estate assessment values – building to land value ratio
 - looked for value < 1
 - indicates building value < land value
 - many are vacant parcels or structures in poor/dilapidated condition
 - attractive development potential – not as much value in building so acquisition cost may be minimal
- utility service – water and sewer
- site accessibility – based on existing road networks

Using these criteria, 12 opportunity sites were identified, ranging from lot sizes of 1.5 acres to 24 acres and located in an area that is isolated from the main community. Mr. Gammel showed an aerial photo of one potential site. Also included in parcel-specific data is information on the owner, utility services, location, and assessment data, among other information.

Mr. Gammel said all of this information can be used by the county as a tool to attract developers and others to assist in revitalization efforts along the corridor. He asked Mr. Jacobson and Ms. Jaeckle if they had any comments.

Mr. Jacobson said this was a very innovative study, and the county is very grateful for the detailed work done by RRPDC staff. This is in essence a reverse market analysis, which is not typically done. He said it was instrumental in

giving the county information on how many more residents are needed in the area to support the types of development the county would like to have along the corridor. He said the data base will become part of the county's effort for revitalization.

Ms. Jaeckle said she thought it was an excellent study because it was a good inventory of what is already located within the corridor. She said the data provided showed that the perception of the corridor is not accurate. Ms. Jaeckle said this will be a great tool to assist the county. She thanked staff for their work on the study.

Mr. Archer asked if any statistical data on the viability of shopping centers has been gathered. He said it seems that when new shopping centers are opened, another older shopping center begins to lose business.

Mr. Gammel said that each of the larger retail chains has its own team which preforms those types of studies before the retailer will decide whether or not to locate in a specific area. He said in the Jefferson Davis study, he used information from the Urban Land Institute that gave data on shopping centers, and this data was included in the model used for the Jefferson Davis study.

Mr. Kaechele asked if a traffic count on Route 1 had been completed and if the number of contact points with I-95 had been identified. Mr. Gammel said a traffic analysis was not part of this study. He said the county Department of Transportation was contacted when the opportunity sites were identified. Mr. Gammel pointed out on one of the maps where there was highway access. He said there is one I-95 access point at Willis Road and another further down. Mr. Gammel said this was taken into consideration as the opportunity sites were identified.

Mr. Glover asked how many businesses in the corridor would be considered impulse businesses and how many were destination sites. Mr. Gammel said on the list of niche businesses identified, most are destination sites.

Chairman Trout thanked Mr. Gammel for his presentation.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

B. Announcements

Mr. Crum again thanked members of the Board for their work over the past year and on behalf of staff, he wished everyone and their families a happy and safe holiday season. He invited members to enjoy the refreshments provided.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Trout adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:20 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Stran L. Trout
Chairman