

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting

April 12, May 10, 2012 (as corrected by Board 6/14/12)

Members/Alternates Present

Thomas M. Branin (M)County of Henrico
Douglas G. Conner (M).....City of Richmond
Douglas Dunlap (A)City of Richmond
Steve A. Elswick (M)County of Chesterfield
Allyson Finchum (A)..... County of Charles City
Daniel A. Gecker (M).....County of Chesterfield
Kathy C. Graziano (M).....City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M).....County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M).....County of Chesterfield
David A. Kaechele (M)County of Henrico
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Treasurer (M).....County of Hanover
Floyd H. Miles (M) County of Charles City
John H. Mitchell (M).....County of Henrico
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M).....County of Henrico
C. Harold Padgett (M)County of Hanover
Ken Peterson, Secretary (M)County of Goochland
W. Canova Peterson (M)County of Hanover
Edward W. Pollard (M) County of New Kent
Faye O. Prichard, Vice Chairman (M)Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M)City of Richmond
Carson Tucker (M)County of Powhatan
Arthur S. Warren (M).....County of Chesterfield
David Williams (M)County of Powhatan

Members Absent

L. Ray Ashworth (M)City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M).....County of Powhatan
James H. Burrell, Chairman (M) County of New Kent
James Crews (M).....County of Goochland
Even Fabricant (M)County of Hanover
Richard W. Glover (M)County of Henrico
James M. Holland (M).....County of Chesterfield
E. Martin Jewell (M)City of Richmond
Lynn McAteer (M)City of Richmond
Tyrone E. Nelson (M)County of Henrico
Millard D. Stith (M)County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M).....County of Henrico

Others Present

Manuel AlvarezCounty of Goochland
John Amos.....RRPDC Legal Council
Thelma Bland-Watson.....Senior Connections
Jan HatcherPartnership for Smarter Growth
Allen IbaughData Transfer Solutions
Kirsten Koehn.....Data Transfer Solutions
Amanda Linebury.....Neighborhood Resource Center
Sara LinkGreater Richmond and Petersburg United Way
Zack Mayo.....County of Chesterfield
Anna McRay.....County of Henrico

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. Evans.....Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal.....Associate Planner
John FoggSenior Planner
Billy GammelAssociate Planner
Chuck GatesCommunications Coordinator
Sophie Guhl.....Intern
Barbara Jacocks.....Principal Planner
Jin LeeSenior Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director of Urban Transportation
Kathy Robins.....Senior Planner
Matt Smith.....Intern
Jackie S. Stewart.....Director of Planning
Sarah Stewart.....Senior Planner
Peter M. Sweetland..... Finance and Contracts Administrator
Lee Yolton.....Principal Planner

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Prichard called the regularly scheduled May 10, 2012 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. Vice Chairman Prichard reported that Chairman Burrell could not be in attendance today due to a death in his family. She 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 to the Order of Business

Vice 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

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

D. Chairman's Report

Vice Chairman Prichard said that she would not have a report on behalf of the Chairman.

E. 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 that within the past couple of weeks, RRPDC staff coordinated a meeting at the Port of Richmond with most of the Region's economic development directors. The meeting was called to provide a presentation from the Virginia Port Authority (VPA) on their efforts to expand activity at the Port of Richmond.

As of July 1, 2011, the VPA manages and operates the Port of Richmond. The VPA has a lease with the City of Richmond, which owns the Port of Richmond. The amount of freight coming into the Port has doubled since July. Plans are underway to increase the schedule of barges arriving at the Port from two to three times per week. With the increased barge traffic, there will be increased economic development opportunities around the Port.

Mr. Crum noted that RAMPO provided the initial funding to begin the barge service that moves freight from the port at Hampton Roads up the James River to the Port of Richmond.

The meeting was held to let all of the Region's economic development offices be aware of the increased opportunity at the Port so they can begin to include the Port in their recruitment efforts. As an example, there were three people from Chesterfield County's economic development office in attendance, and Henrico County's Economic Development Department was also represented.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that she has heard from truckers who have said they appreciate the fact that they do not have to fight traffic in the Hampton Roads area to pick up freight. They can transport more goods from the Port of Richmond. They can spend less time on the road and more time at home with their families.

Mr. Crum reported that staff has been providing support to the Mayor's Anti Poverty Commission. Staff has been asked to provide a region-wide analysis of the relationship between areas served by GRTC and areas where jobs are located within the Richmond Region.

Work is also continuing on the regional economic development strategy. A meeting was hosted here at the RRPDC with about 30 representatives from the Region's jurisdictions. These input meetings are being held to gather information on what types of infrastructure upgrades are needed in the Region to create an environment that is conducive to economic growth and job creation.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

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

A. Approval of Minutes – April 12, 2012

B. Approval of March Financial Report

Vice Chairman Prichard 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 Mr. Williams and seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

III. OLD BUSINESS

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

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Richmond Region Age Wave Plan Update

Mr. Crum introduced Thelma Bland-Watson (Capital Area Agency on Aging, Senior Connections) and Ms. Sara Link (Greater Richmond and Petersburg United Way – Older Adults Initiative). They will provide information on the regional Age Wave Plan.

Ms. Bland-Watson thanked members for the opportunity to speak with them today. Since the Commission Board was given an overview of the effort last year, Ms. Bland-Watson said great progress has been made.

Senior Connections has joined with the United Way to find ways to take advantage of the programs that are already in existence for older adults in the Region. The two agencies began looking to see how these programs will need to be adjusted for the future.

An executive summary for the Age Wave Plan was distributed. This Plan will be distributed to the public on May 24.

Ms. Bland-Watson noted that this process has been underway for the past three years. It was guided by three key principles:

1. Older adults will be viewed as resources in the community, not just service recipients.
2. The plan will build on the region's unique assets and other regional collaborative efforts in Greater Richmond.
3. Age Wave preparedness is critical for individuals as well as families in the Greater Richmond region; the plan will foster multi-generational opportunities.

By the year 2030, twice as many older adults as there are today will be living in the Greater Richmond region, surpassing the number of school age children by 25 percent. This is a significant challenge to the business and social service communities.

It is projected that the percentage of adults over the age of 60 years will increase most in Goochland and New Kent Counties.

There were three phases of planning:

1. Awareness Raising and Visioning (2009-2010)
2. Drafting the Age Wave Plan (2010-2012)
3. Implementation and Evaluation (2012-ongoing)

Ms. Bland-Watson thanked Mr. Crum for the assistance of RRPDC staff during the first two phases of the Plan.

The Leadership Committee was comprised of members of various communities: government, academic, non-profit, business, and philanthropic foundations.

Ms. Link continued with the presentation providing additional information on each of the communities that participated in the development of the Plan. These all fall under the United Way's Ready Communities designation:

1. Engaged: lifelong learning and civic engagement
2. Livable: affordable housing and home modification; mobility and transportation; physical infrastructure; public safety and disaster planning
3. Stable: business investment; workforce entry and retention; financial security and stability
4. Well: wellness, prevention, and chronic disease management; access and coordination; caregiver and skilled health professionals; long-term care resources

Ms. Link said the most important aspect will be to get the information out to the public and to build awareness.

There are various ways members of the community can assist and become involved in the process. Through Connect Richmond there is a listserv that can be accessed to provide additional information on resources. There are over 600 members on this listserv to provide information on opportunities to the community. The United Way website also has a link for input.

As the demographics shift, it will be important to remember that what impacts older adults will also impact the younger generation.

Mr. Crum asked what local governments can do specifically to be prepared for the Age Wave.

Ms. Bland-Watson indicated that livable communities will be key, as well as improvements in transportation. The plan reflects on making the communities livable for all ages. Examples are curb cuts that can be used for strollers and wheelchairs, universal housing designs that can grow with an individual, infrastructure that can support people as they age, and recognizing that the older adults should be used as a resource. Local governments will be called on to help find resources for all aspects of life, such as social services and health care.

Ms. Link added that this is an opportunity to create advocacy for the Age Wave. There should be policy-based change.

Mr. Warren complimented Ms. Bland-Watson on her work in this area. He said it is important to let seniors know about all the resources that are already available to them and about ways that they can give back to their communities. Mr. Warren said, for example, seniors in Chesterfield County have been actively involved in volunteering to remove illegal signs around the county. He said there are many programs and ways for seniors to become involved in the community.

Mr. Pollard asked if there are plans to address the fact that many seniors are taken advantage of by outside organizations and even family members. Ms. Bland-Watson said programs are in place now to address these issues. She said it will be important to raise awareness of these programs. She thanked Ms. Jackie Stewart (RRPDC) for

her assistance in setting up town hall meetings to meet with senior citizens and their caregivers to discuss the concerns and issues they face.

Ms. O'Bannon added that she has held various such meetings with Ms. Bland-Watson and her staff and has found that afternoon meetings work best. She said caregivers usually attend with the older adults.

B. Rail Mapping Project Contract

Mr. Crum said Anna McRay, Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator for Henrico County, will be assisting with this presentation. He said the Board will be asked to authorize staff to proceed with the rail mapping project. This will assist emergency management staffs in the Region to know about critical infrastructure that exists along railroad corridors in the UASI region. The project is being sponsored by the Central Virginia Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI). All of the funds for this project will come from the UASI program; no RRPDC funds will be used.

Mr. Crum reminded members that in March 2011, the Board was presented with this project request. Currently there is not a good data base of critical infrastructure for emergency managers and first responders to use when there are incidents along the rail corridors. If an incident does occur, things such as water sources and ingress and egress points are not known.

Ms. McRay said local emergency managers are very concerned about the potential for rail disasters. She said rail marker locations do not match up with mile markers in the 911 system. This project will take rail mile markers and sync them to 911 mile markers. Areas of one half mile on either side of the rail corridors will be mapped.

Ms. McRay brought members' attention to the information contained in the contract document on page 7 under Tab 4. These are the types of resources that will be mapped. Once this information is gathered, it will assist not only regional emergency management personnel but also first responders. By knowing where critical infrastructure and rail crossings are located, response time will be shortened considerably.

Mr. Crum said the Board authorized RRPDC staff to act as the fiduciary agent for this project. Part of the responsibilities included working with members of the UASI Urban Area Work Group (UAWG) to develop a scope of work for the project and to put out requests for proposals to solicit a vendor which could do the type of mapping work that will be required in order to develop the data base.

About 10-12 proposals were received and were thoroughly reviewed by Mr. Crum, the RRPDC Principal Emergency Management Planner, and members of the UAWG. The review team has unanimously agreed on a vendor – Data Transfer Solutions – and it is being recommended that RRPDC enter into a contract on behalf of the Central Virginia UASI with Data Transfer Solutions (DTS). The contract amount is

\$148,160.00, and, again, this funding comes from UASI. RRPDC will manage the invoices and work with the consultant to make certain the project stays on schedule.

Mr. Crum introduced the Project Manager from DTS, Mr. Allen Ibaugh. Mr. Ibaugh said DTS appreciates being considered for this project and noted that it is the type of work DTS does routinely. DTS is headquartered in Orlando, Florida, with ten local offices across the country. The local office in Richmond is partnered with Louis Berger Group. DTS is a geographic information systems (GIS) and mapping company. This project will incorporate mapping railway crossings, security, critical infrastructure, utilities, etc. An initial review of existing GIS data will be made and then field crews will be sent out to map the missing data. DTS has all of the resources needed to do a comprehensive mapping of the rail corridors, whether by land or air.

Mr. Crum said the contract is included in the agenda book. It is being requested that the Executive Director be authorized to enter into a contract with Data Transfer Solutions to complete the rail mapping project as directed by the Central Virginia UASI.

Vice Chairman Prichard asked if there were any questions. Mr. Kaechele asked if there are limits to the area being mapped.

Ms. McRay said areas within on-half mile on either side of the rail line will be mapped and that all 20 UASI localities will be able to access the information. Each individual locality will have its own GIS information. All localities will have access to all of the data once it is completed.

Vice Chairman Prichard asked if Ashland will be included. Ms. McRay said Ashland is included in the mapping project.

Mr. Warren asked if there will be security safeguards built into the project so that the information will not be broadly distributed. Mr. Ibaugh said DTS has worked with private rail companies previously and has been able to limit access to the public. This will be done through Memorandums of Understanding with the rail companies.

Mr. Williams asked if the information would be available for FOIA requests. Ms. McRay said there is a section in the FOIA code that addresses this issue. She will find out the specific section of the code and provide it to staff.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked who would receive the deliverables. Ms. McRay said all participating localities will receive a copy of the final documents. These will be given to each of the emergency management departments to distribute within the localities as needed.

Mr. Ibaugh said the raw GIS data will also be provided for use in other projects.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the data will be in a format that can be updated by the locality if needed. Ms. McRay said that will be part of the ongoing gap analysis as new infrastructure is installed.

Mr. Tucker asked if the localities will be able to add hazardous waste and materials sites to the data or if this will be incorporated in the hazardous material storage facilities aspect. Ms. McRay said the localities can add that information and a lot of it will be pulled from other documents.

Mr. Ibaugh said that will be among other things that will be picked up such as natural gas lines and any population fluctuations that take place at certain times. All aspects of hazardous materials will be mapped if they are in the rail corridor.

Mr. Padgett said he would like to ask Mr. Amos about the sentence on page 3 of the contract, under paragraph 7 Controlling Law. Mr. Amos said the sentence is not correct. Mr. Ibaugh said this can be changed easily to read as counsel advises. Mr. Amos noted this is a one year agreement. Mr. Crum also verified that Mr. Amos did review the document.

Mr. Warren made a motion to approve the recommendation of staff as presented, that the Executive Director be authorized to act as the fiduciary agent on behalf of the Central Virginia Urban Area Security Initiative to enter into a contract with Data Transfer Solutions to complete the railroad mapping project as directed by the Central Virginia Urban Area Security Initiative. The motion was seconded by Mr. C. Peterson. There was no further discussion and the motion was carried unanimously.

C. Presentation of FY 12 Budget and FY 13 Budget and Work Program

Mr. Crum said he will be asking for approval of the FY 13 budget at the end of his presentation. The budget was given preliminary approval by the Board in December.

Mr. Crum reminded members that the agency operates on a fiscal year that runs from July 1 through June 30. The current budget year is fiscal year 2012 and will conclude on June 30, 2012. On July 1, 2012, the new fiscal year 2013 will begin and will end on June 30, 2013.

Budget updates are presented to members during the course of the year. The current fiscal year's budget was approved in May, 2011. A mid-year review was provided in December. A final review is being provided in May because all grant revenues and expenses through April are known. As an example, under expenditures from July through February, operating costs were reduced by \$17,800 from what was presented during the December meeting. This reduction has been accomplished by various cost cutting measures and efficiencies that staff has been able to achieve. Out of state travel, for example, has been reduced, as have costs related to professional development.

On June 30, it is estimated that \$57,400 will be used from the undesignated fund balance for operating expenses. The undesignated fund balance on June 30, 2012, is expected to be about \$212,610. The RRPDC Board established a long-standing policy that a designated fund balance of \$1 million will remain intact. About 70 percent of revenue received by the agency is grant funding. This means that the agency must incur the cost for tasks and projects up front and then submit invoices to the appropriate state or federal agency for reimbursement. The \$1 million designated fund balance allows the agency to maintain cash flow while waiting for reimbursements. On June 30, 2012, the total fund balance is expected to be approximately \$1,212,610.

Mr. Crum provided a chart that showed cash flow over the course of a fiscal year. Member contributions are received by the end of each July, which makes the cash flow balance highest in August. This is spent down as costs are incurred and invoices are submitted at the end of each quarter. The chart illustrates the ebb and flow of funds as they are spent and reimbursements are received. The designated fund balance of \$1 million helps the agency meet its financial needs until reimbursements are received.

For fiscal year 2013, Mr. Crum said he would like to review the proposed work program to illustrate what the jurisdictions will receive for their investments. By working with each of the division managers, staff time for each of the work tasks has already been estimated to estimate the amount of revenue that will be received from grant programs. About 70 percent of the work tasks done by the agency are funded through grants.

The work program for 2013 will include the following:

- Capital Region Collaborative: This is a joint effort between the RRPDC and the Greater Richmond Chamber to drive progress around seven priority areas that have been identified in the Region. A lot of work will be done around these priorities over the next year to move them forward. Job Creation and Workforce Preparation will be the top priorities.
 - Job Creation
 - Workforce Preparation
 - Social Stability and Awareness
 - Cultural, Arts, History, and Entertainment
 - James River
 - Healthy Community
 - Regional Transportation
- Regional Legislative Agenda: Mr. Gates will begin reaching out to legislative liaisons to begin work on next year's legislative agenda. Legislative priorities will need to be identified going into September for the next General Assembly session.
- Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees
- Regional Support and Coordination

- Richmond's Future: This is Dr. Eugene Trani's "think tank." Mr. Crum indicated he sits on this board.
- Regional Electric Vehicle Initiative: A presentation on this effort, to develop a strategic plan to prepare the Region's electric infrastructure for the introduction of electric vehicles into the community, will be given during an upcoming meeting. The effort is being led by the RRPDC.
- Strategic Transportation Initiatives for Richmond (STIR)
- GRTC Downtown Transfer Center Steering Committee: Mr. Crum indicated he sits on this board which is assisting the City of Richmond to identify a location for the new GRTC Transfer Center.
- Mayor's Anti-Poverty Commission (Richmond): The agency is providing staff support for this effort, and Mr. Crum said he is a member of this commission.
- Age Wave Planning: A presentation will be made on this effort during today's Commission Board meeting. RRPDC staff provides support to this effort.
- Smart Beginnings Program
- UASI Emergency Management Planning Program: This program is housed at the RRPDC and provides emergency management planning services to the Region's jurisdictions as well as to localities in the UASI region.
- Regional Affordable Housing
- Richmond Region Energy Alliance: The Board has authorized staff support of this effort.
- Virginia Association of PDCs
- Virginia Association of MPOs
- Regional Economic Development Strategy (CEDS): The RRPDC recently hosted a meeting that included representation from each of the jurisdictions' economic development departments to work on a regional strategy for economic development.
- Regional Land Use Inventory: Information on this task will be presented to members of the Board over the course of the next few meetings beginning in July. This will provide information on regional land use that will be helpful with local planning efforts.
- Chesapeake Bay / Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)
- Rural Transportation Planning Program
 - Route 5 / Capital Trail in progress with Charles City County
 - Goochland project for FY 2013 to be determined
- Intergovernmental Reviews
- Henrico County Technical Assistance Project – finalize
 - Industrial Zoning Classifications
- Hanover County Technical Assistance Project – to be determined; each of the four large jurisdictions are offered assistance each year on a rotating basis.

Work tasks to be undertaken by the Urban Transportation Division on behalf of the MPO will include:

- 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) – finalize major 18-month work effort. Within the next few months, public hearings will be held on this effort to receive input. Staff has worked to determine the most strategic locations for these hearings from Chester to the City of Richmond to the northern area of the Region.
- Travel Demand Modeling Program: Staff will be working on “what if” scenarios to match land use with transportation options to meet the needs identified.
- Congestion Management System
- Transportation Improvement Program
 - RSTP and CMAQ Allocations
- Staff support –
 - MPO Board
 - Technical Advisory Committee
 - Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
 - Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee
- Intermodal Planning: This includes work done with the Port of Richmond to encourage use of the Port to become a key economic driver for the Region. Support has been provided by the MPO financially as well as with planning assistance.
 - Freight Movement (James River Barge Project)
- Air Quality Plan and Program Activities
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Regional Priority Projects: Staff will continue to work to develop priorities on behalf of the MPO. The fact that the Region can agree on these projects has provided funds to the Region that might have gone to other areas of the state.
- Route 5 Corridor Study: Staff is working with Henrico County and the City of Richmond to identify the best plans for this area which should be finalized by the fall.
- I-95 Vision Plan and Tolling Study: Information still has not been provided on potential locations for tolling facilities on I-95. This application is due to the federal government by August. The MPO will be facilitating the distribution of this information to the localities so the impacts of the project can be fully understood.
- I-95 / I-64 Overlay Study: Information will be presented on this study during today’s MPO meeting.
- Route 288 / Route 360 Interchange Study: Staff has been invited to participate in this study.

Mr. Crum noted that there has been concern throughout the Region about the current economic times. The agency has had to eliminate several positions based on management decisions for cost savings or because grant funding has ended. The positions that have been eliminated are:

- IT Manager (2009): It is more cost effective to outsource these services.
- Planning Technician (2009)

- Senior Planner – Emergency Management (2011): The planner in this position opted to accept another job in Prince William County because funding for the Emergency Management Program will last only through June 2013.
- Principal Planner – Emergency Management (May 2012): Mr. Crum said this planner was responsible for leading the efforts of the RRPDC's Emergency Management Program. As the funds for this program will end in June 2013, this planner accepted the position of Director of Emergency Management for the town of Hilton Head, SC.
- Principal Planner – GIS Manager (2011): These duties have been spread to other staff members to realize cost savings.
- Senior Planner – Electric Vehicles (September 2012): The planner in this position is doing excellent work on a regional plan to prepare electric infrastructure for electric vehicles. Funding for this position will last only through September of this year.

Mr. Crum indicated that the fiscal year 2013 budget addresses the following:

- 5 percent VRS employee contribution with salary offset effective July 1, 2012: The budget being presented will implement the full five percent contribution at one time.
- 5.72 percent salary offset to maintain current take home pay for staff: Mr. Crum noted that during last month's Executive Committee meeting, he indicated that the legislation also calls for the employer to provide a five percent salary offset to make up for the five percent employee contribution. The increase of five percent to salary results in higher payroll taxes for the employees. This will result in about a \$200 decrease in take home pay for each employee. Last month the Executive Committee authorized the agency to provide a salary offset that will keep the employees whole. This percentage comes to 5.72 percent. Five percent will go to VRS and the 0.72 percent will cover the increased payroll tax. Staff has checked with the other jurisdictions and this offset amount is similar to what the jurisdictions will use.
- Electric Vehicle Planner position ends in September with the elimination of grant funds.
- Upgrade Part-Time Position to Full-Time in the Urban Transportation Planning Division: No requests for additional staff will be made for the upcoming fiscal year. There is a part-time employee who has been working in the Urban Transportation Planning Division for several years. Mr. Crum said he would like to upgrade this position to full-time status. The position will be fully funded by urban transportation planning dollars (PL and Section 5303) and will be assigned to the Travel Demand Model Program.

Mr. Crum indicated that the salary adjustments noted are offsets only to compensate for the VRS contributions. There are no cost of living or merit adjustments for staff in this budget; there will be no bonuses for staff. The only salary adjustment for staff since 2008 has been a two percent merit increase that happened last July. Mr. Crum also noted that while some state agencies and localities have provided employees with

bonuses, the RRPDC staff has not been given any bonuses during that time. During today's Executive Committee meeting, concern was expressed that if some type of compensation adjustment is not made soon, the agency will begin to lose some of its staff. This will need to be addressed at some point.

For fiscal year 2013, revenue sources are anticipated to be as follows:

Urban Transportation	54.9%
Local Member Dues	23.3%
Emergency Management	9.5%
State Appropriation	4.3%
Economic Development	2.3%
Rural Transportation	2.2%
Environmental	1.1%
Sublease and Miscellaneous	1.1%

Mr. Crum provided information on the amount of membership dues that will be paid by each jurisdiction for FY 13. Dues are 60 cents per capita. The breakdown of this is that about 55 cents goes to support the RRPDC and 5 cents supports work done on behalf of the MPO. The actual breakdown is more along the lines of 48 cents to the PDC and 12 cents to the MPO after the local match is taken into account. The per capita dues rate was established in 1992 and has not changed since that time. This is one of the lowest per capita rates of the 21 PDCs in the state. Mr. Crum said dues amounts vary among the jurisdictions based on population.

Operating expenses are dominated by personnel costs. About 78 percent of expenses go toward personnel and 11 percent goes toward rent.

Personnel	78.3%
Rent	11.7%
IT Operations	3.3%
Training/Travel/Organization Dues	1.8%
Legal, Audit, Insurance	1.2%
All Other	3.7%

The budget for FY 13 will have an operating budget of about \$2,624,300. It is projected that on June 30, 2012, the undesignated fund balance will be about \$212,610. Staff anticipates that \$24,500 will be added to the undesignated fund balance through cost savings and efficiencies. This will bring the undesignated fund balance to approximately \$237,110 on June 30, 2013. The designated fund balance will remain at \$1 million, giving a total fund balance on June 30, 2013 of approximately \$1,237,110.

The budget process calls for a request that the budget be approved today. A mid-year review will be provided to the Executive Committee in November and to the full Commission Board in December.

Mr. Crum noted that today the Executive Committee took action to recommend the budgets and work program to the full Commission Board for approval.

Vice Chairman Prichard asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Padgett noted that on the dues listing, Ashland has a line item. He said it seems that the population numbers for Hanover County also include the Town of Ashland. Mr. Padgett asked if this was double counted or if this was convention.

Mr. Crum asked Ms. Evans to respond to this question. Ms. Evans said there are member dues from Ashland and member dues from Hanover County that also includes Ashland's population. She said about 15 years ago there was a question from Hanover County about why this was the case. Ms. Evans said she could not remember the answer given at that time but she will research the issue to see how it was addressed. She said as to the second half of the question regarding whether has this been the convention, it has been the convention.

Vice Chairman Prichard said she did not think it was fair for Hanover County to pay for what is already being covered by the Town of Ashland.

Mr. Crum said the dues amount for Ashland can be subtracted from the amount for Hanover County. He said if this is what the Board would like to have done, the motion to approve the budget can include that stipulation.

Mr. Gecker asked if the research could be done to provide an answer before a vote is taken.

Vice Chairman Prichard said this would need to be taken up at the next meeting. Mr. Gecker said there is a history and he would like to understand why this has been the case.

Mr. C. Peterson suggested that the budget could be approved with the stipulation that no double payment should be made by any of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the rent shown for the agency is debt service, income, or expense. Mr. Crum said rent is referenced in two places. The agency receives sublease income from Leadership Metro Richmond for the space they lease from the agency. On the expense side, the amount listed is the amount paid for the agency's office space. Mr. Kaechele said he thought the agency was purchasing the space. Mr. Crum said the agency entered into a ten year lease for this space prior to his becoming Executive Director. He said renting versus owning is an issue he believes should be discussed with the Board.

Mr. K. Peterson asked how many full time employees are housed at the RRPDC. Mr. Crum said there are 24 full time employees plus some part time interns.

Ms. Jaeckle said she did not believe a vote should be taken on the budget until the reason for the Ashland/Hanover County dues payments is resolved. She said there may be a technical reason for this double charge and she does not think a vote should be taken until this is resolved.

Vice Chairman Prichard said if Ashland is counted in Hanover's population, Hanover County would have more representation on the Board than they do at this time. She suggested that the vote be taken with the stipulation that this issue be taken up at the next meeting.

Mr. Crum said if the Board wishes to approve the budget as presented, he will contact Mr. Harris and Mr. Hartgrove, and along with Ms. Evans, an answer will be researched and provided to members at the June meeting.

Mr. C. Peterson asked if the motion to approve would include the stipulation that the amounts be adjusted. Vice Chairman Prichard said the budget will be approved as it has been presented and adjusted later if needed.

Ms. Graziano made a motion that the final FY 12 budget and the FY 13 budget and work program be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Amos noted that the beginning sentence in paragraph seven of the contract with Data Transfer Solutions is very awkward. He said unless there is an objection, he will work with the contract administrators to correct the sentence by removing the verbiage in the first line down to the comma. The first sentence in the paragraph will then read "The rights and obligations of the Parties hereto, and any claims or disputes relating thereto shall be governed, interpreted, construed and enforced pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia."

There were no objections to this correction.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There was no other business to come before the Board and Vice Chairman Prichard adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:25 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Faye O. Prichard
Vice Chairman