

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**December 13, 2012**

**Members/Alternates Present**

Manuel Alvarez (A)..... Goochland County  
Richard Ayers (M)..... Powhatan County  
Douglas G. Conner (M)..... City of Richmond  
Timothy M. Davey (M)..... Chesterfield County  
Steve A. Elswick (M)..... Chesterfield County  
Even Fabricant (M)..... Hanover County  
Daniel A. Gecker (M)..... Chesterfield County  
Kathy C. Graziano (M)..... City of Richmond  
Russell J. Gulley (M)..... Chesterfield County  
James M. Holland (M)..... Chesterfield County  
Dorothy Jaeckle (M)..... Chesterfield County  
David A. Kaechele (M)..... Henrico County  
Kelli Le Duc (A)..... New Kent County  
Lynn McAteer (M)..... City of Richmond  
Floyd H. Miles (M)..... Charles City County  
John H. Mitchell (M)..... Henrico County  
Tyrone E. Nelson (M)..... Henrico County  
Patricia S. O'Bannon (M)..... Henrico County  
C. Harold Padgett (M)..... Hanover County  
Ken Peterson, Treasurer (M)..... Goochland County  
W. Canova Peterson (M)..... Hanover County  
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... New Kent County  
Faye O. Prichard, Chairman (M)..... Town of Ashland  
Charles R. Samuels (M)..... City of Richmond  
Randall R. Silber (A)..... Henrico County  
C. Thomas Tiller (M)..... New Kent County  
Carson Tucker (M)..... Powhatan County  
Arthur S. Warren (M)..... Chesterfield County  
David Williams, Secretary (M)..... Powhatan County

**Members Absent**

L. Ray Ashworth (M)..... City of Richmond  
Thomas M. Branin (M)..... Henrico County  
Richard W. Glover (M)..... Henrico County  
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Vice Chairman (M)..... Hanover County  
E. Martin Jewell (M)..... City of Richmond  
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... Henrico County

**Others Present**

John Amos .....RRPDC Legal Council  
John Benton.....Citizen, Chesterfield County  
John Vithoukaskas.....Henrico County  
Jason Sawyer .....New Market Corridor Coalition

**Staff Present**

Robert A. Crum ..... Executive Director  
Jo A. Evans.....Assistant Executive Director  
Julie H. Fry ..... Executive Secretary  
Sulabh Aryal.....Associate Planner  
Chuck Gates ..... Communications Coordinator  
Barbara Jacocks.....Principal Planner  
Jin Lee ..... Senior Planner  
Daniel N. Lysy ..... Director of Urban Transportation  
Barbara Nelson .....Principal Planner  
Greta Ryan.....Senior Planner  
Jackie Stewart..... Director, Planning  
Peter M. Sweetland..... Finance and Contracts Administrator

---

**Call to Order**

Chairman Prichard called the regularly scheduled December 13, 2012 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. She then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Chairman Prichard noted that the microphones have been recalibrated and as a result, they will now pick up any sidebar conversations members may be having. She asked members to be aware of that fact if they wanted to speak offline.

**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 to the Order of Business**

Chairman Prichard 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 Prichard 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.

Chairman Prichard recognized Mr. Jason Sawyer.

Mr. Sawyer said he works with the Neighborhood Resource Center at the Greater Fulton Hill Civic Association. He said he wanted to read a letter to Mr. Crum and members of the RRPDC Board from the New Market Corridor Coalition. Mr. Sawyer distributed copies of the letters to members. A copy of the letter will be filed with these minutes.

Mr. Sawyer thanked Mr. Crum on behalf of the Coalition for his efforts to meet with members of the Coalition to discuss the Route 5 Multimodal Corridor Study. He said members of the Coalition appreciated the final decision to send the results of the study to the participating localities for their use.

Chairman Prichard thanked Mr. Sawyer for his comments, noting that the Board appreciates hearing from the Region's citizens.

As there were no other requests from the public to address the Commission, Chairman Prichard closed the public comment period.

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

Chairman Prichard reminded members to be sure to RSVP to attend the RRPDC Legislative Breakfast Reception, which will be held on Monday, January 7, at the Greater Richmond Convention Center. The event will begin at 8:00 a.m. She asked members to make contact with their legislators to encourage them to attend the event.

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

Mr. Crum brought 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 ask Ms. O'Bannon and Mr. Silber to introduce Mr. John Vithoukas, who will become the new Henrico County Manager in January.

Mr. Silber said Mr. Hazelett will retire on January 16. Mr. Vithoukas will assume the County Manager's position on January 17.

Mr. Vithoukias said he was glad to attend today's meeting and already knew some of the members. He said he is looking forward to working with everyone.

Members welcomed Mr. Vithoukias with a round of applause.

Ms. O'Bannon added that Mr. Vithoukias is a naturalized US citizen, having been born in Greece. She said he is the former Finance Director for Henrico County.

Mr. Elswick noted that Mr. Vithoukias had previously worked in the Chesterfield County Finance Department.

Mr. Crum reported that invitations to attend the Legislative Breakfast Reception were sent out earlier in the week to all members. He said last year 120 people attended and that number is expected to increase this year. Mr. Crum said some RRPDC Board members will be asked to present the 2013 Legislative Agenda during the meeting.

Mr. Crum asked that members make contact with their legislators to encourage their attendance at the breakfast. He said it will be important to have as many General Assembly members in attendance as possible.

Mr. Crum said Mr. Hazelett will be honored during the Legislative Breakfast for his service and leadership in the Richmond Region. Mr. Crum said Mr. Hazelett has always been willing to assist the RRPDC whenever possible.

Mr. Crum said during the MPO meeting this afternoon, the I-64 Environmental Impact Statement will be presented. He said he would encourage members to attend to hear the presentation if their schedules permit.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if a copy of the I-64 presentation could be forwarded to her as she is not able to attend the MPO meeting. Mr. Crum said staff will forward a copy to her.

Chairman Prichard noted that she failed to add an item to the agenda during that portion of today's meeting. She said during today's RRPDC Executive Committee meeting, there was discussion on changing the time of the RRPDC meetings. She said that, with no objections, this will be added to today's agenda as the first item under New Business.

## **II. CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- A. Approval of Minutes – November 8, 2012
- B. Approval of October Financial Report

There was no request to have either item removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion and on motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Williams, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

### **III. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. Adding Position Statements on Federal Environmental Mandates to the 2013 RRPDC Legislative Agenda**

Chairman Prichard asked Mr. Gates to make this presentation.

Mr. Gates directed members to Tab 4 in the agenda book. He said during last month's meeting, there was a request that a statement on unfunded mandates be added to the federal portion of the Legislative Agenda. Mr. Gates presented three recommended statements for members' consideration:

##### **Governing Locally**

###### Unfunded Mandates

We OPPOSE federal legislation and regulations that impose mandates upon local governments without providing adequate funding to implement required programs.

##### **Environment**

###### Resource Protection

We SUPPORT the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay through specific, quantifiable goals.

We OPPOSE water quality regulations and programs that solely regulate point sources of pollution without addressing the impact of non-point sources of pollution.

Mr. Gates said these statements were recommended to and approved by the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees during their November meeting, as well as the Environmental Technical Advisory Committee. The statements were also presented as an informational item to the RRPDC Executive Committee members during their meeting this morning.

Mr. Gates said members are being asked to approve these statements to be added to the Legislative Agenda.

Ms. O'Bannon said she would make the motion to add the three statements to the Legislative Agenda. She also noted it is important to support quantifiable goals with respect to the Chesapeake Bay. The cost to localities to make the required changes

will be very high. She said the regulations are onerous and if they are not met, the localities will be fined.

Mr. C. Peterson seconded Ms. O'Bannon's motion and stated that the goals for the Bay clean-up are being changed as quickly as they are identified, which makes it difficult for the localities to meet the goals.

Ms. Jaeckle said she thought the state should fund the regulations instead of requiring that the localities return 28 percent of the fees to the state.

Mr. Ayers said, with regard to the Resource Protection statement of opposition, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program solely addresses point sources of pollution. It sets obligations for dischargers and states which administer the program. The federal government sends funds to these programs for administration and to build new sewage treatment plants. He said he was not certain that the RRPDC should go on record to oppose such programs. He suggested that the statement be rewritten to say "We SUPPORT water quality regulations and programs that regulate both point sources and non-point sources of pollution." He said this may better position the RRPDC.

Chairman Prichard asked if this rewording should be considered a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor.

Mr. Gates said he would agree with Mr. Ayers' statement and thanked Mr. Ayers for his suggestion.

Chairman Prichard asked if the amendment to the motion was acceptable.

Ms. O'Bannon said point source pollution is being heavily regulated; however, rural localities are being required to fence land in order to keep cattle out of streams. She said the point of the statement should be that those required to get permits should not be the only ones who are fined.

Mr. Ayers said he agreed with Ms. O'Bannon and that Powhatan County would like to see more control and federal assistance to regulate non-point sources.

Chairman Prichard said Mr. Gates could rewrite the statement to reflect the intent. Mr. Gates said he would recommend the statement be rewritten as

We SUPPORT water quality regulations and programs that address the impacts of both point sources of pollution and non-point sources of pollution.

Mr. Gates reminded members that the Position Statements are intended to offer guidance as he lobbies on behalf of RRPDC during General Assembly.

Ms. O'Bannon and Mr. C. Peterson agreed to the amendment. There was no further discussion and the motion to approve the statements as amended to be included in the 2013 RRPDC Legislative Agenda carried unanimously.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A-1. Proposed Changes to RRPDC Meeting Times (new item added)**

Chairman Prichard reported that during this morning's RRPDC Executive Committee meeting, Mr. C. Peterson (MPO Executive Committee member) suggested that since the MPO is going to change the time of their meeting, the RRPDC should consider changing their meeting time as well. Chairman Prichard noted that the current meeting time breaks up the day in a way that can be non-productive for members with regard to their other activities and responsibilities.

It has been suggested that the RRPDC keep the same second Thursday meeting day and that the RRPDC Executive Committee begin its meeting at 8:00 a.m., followed immediately by the full RRPDC Board at around 8:45 a.m. She indicated that if the RRPDC chooses to make this change, the new meeting times would become effective with the March meeting. She asked if there was any discussion.

Following discussion, it was the consensus of members that the earlier meeting times would be preferable. Mr. C. Peterson made a motion that effective with the March 14, 2013, meeting date, the RRPDC Executive Committee meeting time will be changed to 8:00 a.m., followed by the RRPDC full Board meeting at approximately 8:45 a.m., after adjournment of the RRPDC Executive Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ayers. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

##### **A. Presentation of Revised FY 13 and Draft FY 14 Budgets**

Chairman Prichard asked Mr. Crum to make this presentation.

Mr. Crum said he will provide a status report on the current fiscal year budget and a preliminary look at the FY 14 budget, which will begin on July 1, 2013.

Mr. Crum said the Bylaws require that a mid-year review be provided to members in December.

The agency operates on a fiscal year that runs from July 1 through June 30. He said there are some unknowns with respect to the FY 14 budget, but he would offer a preliminary budget based on what is known at this time.

At the beginning of the current fiscal year on July 1, 2012, the total fund balance was \$1,234,477. Of that total fund balance, the designated fund balance was maintained at \$1 million per Board direction. He said it is important to remember that this is a

self-supporting agency and that cash flow must be maintained as most revenues are on a reimbursement basis from state and federal agencies. Invoices are submitted on a quarterly basis. Mr. Crum said by having the \$1 million designated fund balance, the agency is able to maintain cash flow and meet its financial obligations while waiting for reimbursements.

Factors impacting the mid-year review include:

- Reduction in Hanover County membership dues – The Board reviewed the overpayment of dues by Hanover County as a result of the population of Ashland being included with that of Hanover County. A compromise repayment plan was reached in the form of a dues credit in the amount of \$6,900 for three years.
- Return of \$32,000 from the landlord to the agency to forego mid-lease paint and carpet refreshing – Mr. Crum indicated that he has not been successful in having the rent rate lowered, but this refund was offered. This is revenue that was not anticipated for this fiscal year.
- Employee compensation – The five percent VRS contribution was instituted and employee salaries were adjusted by 5.72 percent to keep take home salaries level. This adjustment was made with Board approval and is consistent with what was done in several localities.
- UASI phase-out – This grant funded program is being phased out as federal funding will not be sustained.
- Electric vehicle program – This program will be completed in February and the grant funds will no longer be available. Agency staffing will be reduced by one planner as a result.

Mr. Crum said it is anticipated that at the end of FY 13, on June 30, 2013, funds will be able to be returned to the fund balance in the amount of \$37,500. This is due to careful management of expenses and the return of funds from the landlord. The total fund balance will be at about \$1,271,977 at the end of FY 13. Of this amount, approximately \$271,977 will be in the undesignated fund balance and the designated fund balance will be maintained at the \$1 million level.

Mr. Crum said FY 13 is tracking somewhat better than expected because of the ability to add back to the fund balance.

In FY 14, there will be some challenges. Details of both budgets are listed under Tab 5 in the Agenda book.

Mr. Crum reported that several grant-funded programs will be ending in FY 14. It is anticipated that Urban Transportation funding will remain flat. The FY 14 budget being presented today is a 5.6 percent reduction from the FY 13 budget. The agency is working with VDOT as adjustments are made to the allocation of transportation funds to urbanized areas. The second year of the Hanover County credit will take place.

As stated, five grant programs will end in FY 14. These are the Community Economic Development (CEDS) grant; the electric vehicle grant; grant funds for UASI; Chapel Island grant (a construction project being done in conjunction with the City of Richmond for the installation of a pedestrian trail system); and the rail road mapping grant.

Revenue sources for FY 14 are anticipated to be as follows:

Urban Transportation	56.0%
Local Member Dues	25.2%
Sublease, Misc., Fund Balance	6.3%
State Appropriation	4.7%
Emergency Management	4.2%
Rural Transportation	2.4%
Environmental	1.2%

Mr. Crum briefly reviewed each of the revenue sources.

Mr. Crum noted that membership dues have remained at the same rate since 1994 – 60 cents per person. Mr. Crum said this is one of the lowest per capita assessments of all PDCs in the state. He said it is lower than Crater PDC’s assessment rate as well as that of the George Washington Regional Council in Fredericksburg. There are a few RRPDC member jurisdictions which are also members of the Crater PDC.

Most of the agency funds come from Urban Transportation Planning Program funds. Mr. Crum said there is some uncertainty with regard to how these funds will track going into the new fiscal year.

Agency expenses will be broken down as follows:

Personnel	77.6%
Rent	13.1%
IT Operations	2.8%
All Other	4.0%
Legal, Audit, Insurance	1.3%
Training/Travel/Dues	1.2%

Mr. Crum indicated that Personnel and Rent comprise over 90 percent of operating costs. He said when he first arrived at the PDC, he eliminated the full time IT manager position. These services are now outsourced at a much lower rate. He said out of state travel has been curtailed, which impacts some training opportunities.

It is anticipated that in FY 14, about \$118,300 of the undesignated fund balance will be used to meet operating expenses. This will leave the undesignated fund balance at about \$153,677 at the end of FY 14. The designated fund balance will be maintained at \$1 million for a total anticipated fund balance on June 30, 2014, of \$1,153,677.

Mr. Crum said there will be a budget reduction from FY 13 to FY 14 of 5.6 percent.

In October, 2004, the Board took action to establish \$1 million as the minimum amount to be held in the fund balance. The Board left the dues rate unchanged and directed staff to use the fund balance amount over the \$1 million level to address revenue shortfalls as they occurred. At that time, the Board thought a significant dues increase would be needed by the end of FY 09.

Staff has been able to extend this time frame to FY 15. This has been accomplished by being pro-active in eliminating several positions since 2009. Mr. Crum indicated that the elimination of these positions with a full time staff complement of about 21 persons has been impactful.

Mr. Crum said he believes staff has been able to do more with less. The RRPDC has become more visible in the community. Mr. Crum said staff has largely completed this work without salary increases or bonuses since 2008. Staff has received one salary adjustment since 2008 and no bonuses. He said he is proud of staff for continuing to step up to do the work that has been accomplished.

Mr. Crum indicated that issues to monitor leading up to FY 14 include:

- state appropriations from DHCD; at this time, this funding source has been budgeted to be stable
- an application for a \$30,000 grant from DHCD has been submitted to assist with work for the Capital Region Collaborative
- allocation of Urban Transportation Planning Funds is still not known
- office infrastructure – updates to the outdated sound system have been made; the current sound system can be replaced for about \$30,000-\$40,000, so staff is trying to make repairs as possible; Board Room chairs also need to be replaced; IT options are being evaluated with regard to leasing versus purchasing of equipment
- staff compensation – staff has had one salary adjustment since 2008; staff has not received any bonuses; this will need to be addressed if the agency wants to maintain the current quality of staff; Mr. Crum will offer some suggestions that may include merit adjustments and/or bonuses; he said if upper level staff cannot have salary adjustments, Mr. Crum believes some adjustments should be made for lower level staff

The Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees will meet jointly in January to begin strategic planning discussions. Mr. Crum said he believes it is time to look at how the agency has done in meeting goals set by the Board several years ago. He said a self-critique needs to be undertaken. Mr. Crum said he would also like to determine what needs to be done in order to add value to the work completed for the jurisdictions. He will also ask for input on financial issues with respect to the FY 14 budget.

Mr. Crum said he requests Board endorsement of the mid-year FY 13 budget review and the preliminary FY 14 budget as required in the Bylaws. A final FY 14 budget

will be presented to the Board in May, 2013. The RRPDC Executive Committee will receive a review of the FY 14 budget in April.

Chairman Prichard asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Gulley asked why a vote needed to be taken on the FY 14 budget at this time when there are still some unknowns. Mr. Crum indicated that the Bylaws do say that the budget needs to be endorsed in December. Mr. Crum said a motion to endorse can include a caveat that final approval will not be made until May.

Mr. Gecker said during last month's Executive Committee meeting, he asked if staff could provide information on programs and associated costs. He said it may be that programs can be cut instead of raising dues. He said there may be an opportunity to prioritize some of the programs, such as the Capital Region Collaborative, which is not a core program of the agency. Mr. Gecker said the information will be useful in trying to determine where funds are being lost with regard to overhead.

Mr. Crum said this is what will be discussed with the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees and then with the Executive Committee and Board. He said at this time, about 70 percent of the agency's expenses are being covered by grant programs. As the grant programs end, the ratio will change as the agency moves into a new fiscal year. Mr. Crum said a list of programs and information on the portion of the programs that are reimbursable and what portion needs to be paid through the fund balance or jurisdiction/state will be provided to the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees and then to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Holland said he is concerned as well with the compensation issue in addition to the elimination of training. He said training is important to maintain quality staff.

Mr. C. Peterson asked for clarification on the next Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees meeting. Mr. Crum said the next meeting will be on January 25.

Mr. K. Peterson asked if any consideration has been given to impacts that may be felt with regard to the federal budget issues. Mr. Crum said the UASI and electric vehicle grants are federal monies, and these have been confirmed as being eliminated. The agency has a fairly good idea as to what funding will be received for Urban Transportation Planning and Public Transit Planning. The most concern is with state funding for PDCs and the impact that will be felt by the local governments. Mr. Crum said how the localities are recovering from the recent economic downturn impacts what can be done for the RRPDC. He said the fund balance has been maintained while giving the localities a five percent reduction in dues over two consecutive years.

Mr. Williams asked if other grants are being identified. Mr. Crum said staff is researching other grant opportunities. He said he does not want to depend on grant funding, however, due to the economy.

Mr. Fabricant asked if there are any staff members who are close to retirement and if so, would that have an impact on the agency. Mr. Crum said there are no employees who are at that point yet. He said it would be difficult not to replace a staff member if someone left at this time.

There was a question regarding whether the two budgets had to be voted on with one motion or if they could be separated out into two motions. Mr. Amos noted that the Bylaws state the annual budget should be approved in December prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. He said this has always been interpreted to mean that the upcoming fiscal year budget must be approved in December.

Mr. Crum said all of the local governments are asking for information on the agency's budget for their own budgeting process, understanding that a final budget will be approved in May.

Chairman Prichard said she would be agreeable to have two motions offered.

Ms. Graziano made a motion that the mid-year FY 13 budget review be accepted as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Bannon. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. O'Bannon made a motion that the preliminary FY 14 budget be approved as presented noting that the final budget approval will take place in May, 2013. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jaeckle. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Holland suggested that attention be given to staff training and development as the FY 14 budget process continues.

Ms. Jaeckle said she would recommend that the program costs information be provided to the full Board prior to the final approval of the FY 14 budget.

## **B. Transportation Funding Proposals**

Chairman Prichard asked Mr. Gates to provide this information.

Mr. Gates noted that he will be distributing sign-up sheets for members to indicate which of their local delegates and senators they would be willing to contact to invite to the RRPDC Legislative Breakfast Reception. He said he would like to increase the participation of the local legislators in the event.

Mr. Gates reminded members that during last month's meeting, the Board adopted a Legislative Priority to address the state's transportation funding crisis. He noted that in 2017, the state will run out of revenue for transportation funding. In 1986, the gas tax was set at 17.5 cents. Revenue from this gas tax has been decreased since that time due to the increased fuel efficiency of vehicles.

Mr. Gates provided information on the current state budget with regard to current statewide needs compared to revenue options. He then reviewed how the I-95 tolling proposal compares to transportation revenue needs over the next 25 years. Information was also provided on the amounts of revenue that would be generated from each transportation revenue option, including the I-95 toll, gas tax, state sales/use tax, vehicle registration, motor vehicle insurance, and motor vehicle rental tax.

Mr. Gates reviewed the transportation funding proposals being offered by Senator John Watkins, Governor McDonnell, and Senator Chap Peterson.

Senator Watkins' SB 717:

- impose wholesale gas tax
- eliminates tax exemptions
- offset with income tax reductions

Senator Chap Petersen's proposals (no bill at the current time):

- raise and index gas tax

Governor McDonnell's proposals (no bill at the current time):

- generate \$500 million annually for construction
- eliminate need to transfer from construction fund to maintenance fund

Information was also provided on how a gas tax functions and the impacts of a gas tax on citizens and the state. Mr. Gates indicated that Sen. Watkins' bill is thought to be fair and will limit the impact on citizens.

Mr. Kaechele asked for clarification on a sales tax versus a gas tax. Mr. Gates said the sales tax would be on motor fuels assessed on the dealer who purchases the gas.

Ms. McAteer asked how raising Virginia's gas tax would compare with the gas tax in neighboring states, such as North Carolina and Maryland. Mr. Gates said Virginia's gas tax is one of the lowest taxes on the east coast. Chairman Prichard added that Virginia currently ranks 43rd in the nation.

Mr. Holland asked if the funds the Governor borrowed from the House for transportation projects had been used. Mr. Gates said the funds had been put toward construction projects.

Mr. Gates said his presentation today was being provided to give members as much information as possible on the current transportation funding proposals so they will know how to answer questions from constituents. He said members should contact him if they need additional information.

Mr. Crum distributed information on how Virginia's gas tax compares to those states along the east coast.

### **C. Report from the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC)**

Mr. Crum said this report was released on Monday, December 10, and staff is still evaluating the information contained in the report. About two years ago, Chesterfield County and the RRPDC requested that JLARC study the costs and benefits of the Commonwealth of Virginia providing financial and other incentives to localities to encourage collaboration on facilities construction projects and other operating services. Mr. Crum said the idea behind the request was to see whether, if the state provided financial or other incentives, this would provide increased interest in collaboration on projects among the localities.

Mr. Crum brought members' attention to slide 4, which outlines the opportunities identified by JLARC for regional collaboration.

On slide 11, information was provided on ways the state has discouraged regional cooperation in previous years. On slide 21, interest in regional programs for special education is shown. Of the state's PDCs, the Richmond Region has the greatest interest in discussing regional cooperation with regard to special education. Mr. Crum said he did not know which school districts responded, but this may be an area the RRPDC could investigate.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if this is related to the Comprehensive Services Act. Mr. Crum said there was no detail provided in the report.

On slide 29, interest in statewide career and technical centers is shown. One of the state's five rural career and technical centers is in the Richmond Region and being used in cooperation by Charles City, New Kent, and King William Counties.

Slide 30 shows possible incentives that could be offered by the state.

Slides 33 and 34 give an example of regional cooperation to improve emergency communications. The example used is a joint effort between Hanover and King William Counties to share communication towers.

Mr. Crum said he was a bit disappointed by the lack of detail in the report, but staff will continue to evaluate the report and offer information on any opportunities to members.

## **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Committee Reports**

#### **1. Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees**

Chairman Prichard reported that during the November joint meeting, the committees discussed the 2013 Legislative Agenda and transportation funding. Mr. Crum added that a presentation was also provided by RRPDC member Mr. Tim Davey on the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) Reality Check. He asked Mr. Davey if he would like to provide more information.

Mr. Davey noted that Reality Check is a program offered by ULI on a national scale to bring to communities information on how to plan for future growth. He said a Game Day exercise will be held on May 14 at the Siegel Center. During Game Day, participants will look at the area's current conditions and stated goals and information from the Census Bureau on the expected population and jobs to be added over the next 25-30 years. The participants will need to determine where the growth should be directed for the long-term benefit of the region. Mr. Davey said the long-term goals from his perspective will be to create healthy, sustainable jobs and economic development. He said this information is being presented to the public and to local businesses for sponsorship opportunities. Mr. Davey indicated Mr. Crum has invited ULI to make a presentation to Board members, for their information, during the February meeting.

Chairman Prichard announced that the guest speaker will be Ed McMahon from ULI's Washington office.

### **B. Announcements**

1. Chairman Prichard reminded members that Local Government Day will be held on January 31. If anyone is interested in attending, there are registration forms on the back table.
2. RRPDC Agenda Packets are available electronically if members wish to receive them in that manner. Chairman Prichard asked if paper copies would be available at the meeting. Mr. Crum said copies could be made available at the meeting if members opt to receive the packet electronically.
3. Cancellation of January Meeting – Chairman Prichard announced that during today's Executive Committee meeting, members voted to cancel the January RRPDC Executive Committee and full Board meetings. The next meetings will be held in February.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

There was no other business to bring before the Board and Chairman Prichard adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:35 p.m.

---

Robert A. Crum, Jr.  
Executive Director

---

Faye O. Prichard  
Chairman