

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
December 12, 2013

Members (Alternates) Present

Manuel Alvarez (A).....	Goochland County
Daniel Arkin.....	City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles.....	City of Richmond
Karin Carmack.....	Powhatan County
Timothy M. Davey.....	Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick.....	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Daniel A. Gecker, Secretary.....	Chesterfield County
Kathy C. Graziano.....	City of Richmond
Edward L. “Ned” Henson (A).....	Town of Ashland
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle.....	Chesterfield County
Bonnie-Leigh Jones.....	Henrico County
David A. Kaechele.....	Henrico County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Chairman.....	Hanover County
Floyd H. Miles.....	Charles City County
John H. Mitchell.....	Henrico County
Patricia S. O’Bannon.....	Henrico County
C. Harold Padgett.....	Hanover County
Ken Peterson, Vice Chairman.....	Goochland County
W. Canova Peterson.....	Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard.....	New Kent County
Randall R. Silber (A).....	Henrico County
Carson Tucker.....	Powhatan County
David Williams, Treasurer.....	Powhatan County

Members Absent

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Richard W. Glover.....	Henrico County
Russell J. Gulley.....	Chesterfield County
Lynn McAteer.....	City of Richmond
Tyrone E. Nelson.....	Henrico County
Faye O. Prichard.....	Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels.....	City of Richmond
Frank J. Thornton.....	Henrico County
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County
Arthur S. Warren.....	Chesterfield County

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Jon Clary..... Henrico County
Tyee Davenport Office of Sen. Tim Kaine
Gloria Freye..... McGuire Woods
Charles Hartgrove..... Town of Ashland
Laura Kebede Richmond Times-Dispatch
Mike Schnurman Henrico County
Joanne Simmelink Chesterfield County
Myra Goodman Smith Leadership Metro Richmond
Tom Tokarz Henrico County
Andrea Wortzel Troutman Sanders

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Associate Planner
Tiffany Dubinsky Senior Planner
Billy Gammel Associate Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Barbara Jacocks Principal Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director, Urban Transportation
Barbara Nelson Principal Planner
Kathy Robins Senior Planner
Greta Ryan Senior Planner
Randy Selleck Principal Planner
Sarah Stewart Senior Planner
Peter M. Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator
Lee Yolton Principal Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek called the regularly scheduled December 12, 2013 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:05 a.m. in the RRPDC board room. 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

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. The Chairman recognized Mr. Crum.

Mr. Crum said the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (CVWMA) is requesting that the RRPDC Board defer discussion of Item IV.A. – Central Virginia Waste Management Authority Amendment to the Solid Waste Management Plan. Kim Hynes, Executive Director of CVWMA, is in attendance this morning. Mr. Crum invited Ms. Hynes to provide more information on the request.

Ms. Hynes thanked everyone for the opportunity to speak with them this morning. She said she would like to apologize for the inconvenience that this request has caused. Ms. Hynes reported that late last week, an error was discovered in the way CVWMA has been processing amendments. Technically, the CVWMA Board is supposed to hear the item and take action on any plan amendment before it is brought to the RRPDC and Crater PDC Boards for consideration.

Ms. Hynes said as a result of discovering the error, CVWMA is requesting that the plan amendment consideration be deferred by the RRPDC Board until such time as the CVWMA Board can consider it and take action.

Mr. Crum said staff would recommend that upon request of the CVMWA, the RRPDC defer consideration of the Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan amendment regarding the TEEL facility until action on the Plan amendment is first taken by the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority Board.

Mr. Gecker so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano.

Mr. Kaechele asked when the CVWMA Board would hear the Plan amendment. Ms. Hynes said this item will be on their January 24 meeting agenda.

There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

There were no other requests to change the agenda, and the agenda was accepted as amended.

C. Open Public Comment Period

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

D. Chairman's Report

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek reported that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, action was taken to cancel the January 9, 2014, RRPDC Executive Committee and full RRPDC Board meetings. She indicated this will provide time for local jurisdictions to make any required appointments to the RRPDC Board during organizational meetings held in January.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek also reported that the annual RRPDC Legislative Breakfast Reception will be held on Tuesday, January 7, at the Greater Richmond Convention Center. She said with the brevity of this year's Legislative Agenda, it is being recommended that time be taken to highlight some of the projects being undertaken by the RRPDC and the role of the RRPDC as the body which comes together to discuss items of regional interest.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek reported that the Executive Committee had also taken action to authorize an additional holiday on December 23, for RRPDC staff as set by the Governor for state employees. The RRPDC typically follows state holidays as approved by the Executive Committee. The RRPDC will be closed on Monday, December 23 through Wednesday, December 25, reopening on Thursday, December 26.

Mr. C. Peterson asked if the state and RRPDC offices would be closed on New Year's Eve. Mr. Crum said that at this time, the office would only be closed on New Year's Day.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought members' attention to a handout provided at each member's seat. Mr. Crum said staff recently received this email, which provides information on the Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership (IMCP). The U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) is looking to reward communities that demonstrate best practices in attracting and expanding manufacturing by using long-term planning that integrates target investments in workforce training, infrastructure, research, and other key assets.

Mr. Crum said the presentation that will be made later this morning on the CEDS provides a regionally coordinated strategy to address each of these areas. Additional information on the IMCP indicates communities would be recognized in areas of:

- workforce and training
- advanced research
- infrastructure and site development
- supply chain support
- export promotion
- capital access

Mr. Crum said that EDA will designate twelve manufacturing communities within the country. These communities will receive benefits such as:

- elevated consideration for federal dollars and assistance across ten department cabinets/agencies
- dedicated federal liaison at each agency to work with the communities

Regions are being encouraged to apply for this designation.

Mr. Crum said staff will need to do more research on the IMCP. He proposed that staff work with the Greater Richmond Partnership and the Greater Richmond Chamber, among others, and provide a report to the Board in February on whether this will be a good opportunity for the Region to pursue. The application for consideration is due in March.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Daniel Arkin, who is the new Citizen Representative from the City of Richmond. He replaces Mr. Ray Ashworth. She reported that Mr. Arkin once worked for RRPDC in the late 1970s/early 1980s. She welcomed Mr. Arkin to the RRPDC Board.

F. Environmental and Intergovernmental Reviews

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Mr. Crum to provide information on this item.

Mr. Crum reported that three reviews were received over the past month. Two involved Chesterfield County, both related to the Meadowville Technology Park – Parkway Extension Consistency Certification and a related Virginia Water Protection Permit. The third review was done for Powhatan County for a Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit.

Mr. Crum said RRPDC staff contacts partner agencies to ask for comments regarding each review and then compiles the comments to return to the appropriate reviewing agency.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said the Executive Committee recommended approval of the items listed on the Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of Minutes – November 14, 2013
- 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. Gecker, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Report

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Ms. Jacocks to provide information on this item.

Ms. Jacocks noted that there are some hard copies of the report available for members' use. Copies can be provided to members upon request after it has been approved.

Ms. Jacocks said a draft CEDS report has been available since August. Discussions have been held with the Strategy Committee, local economic development staffs, and other groups to work toward the final draft that is being presented today for consideration and final adoption. She said the final document, once approved by the Economic Development Administration (EDA), will provide regional opportunities to apply for federal grant funds for various programs. Through the Public Works Administration, funding will also be available for those types of projects. One of the strategies is to develop a list of project ideas for grants that can then be distributed to the localities and other groups to use as reference in determining their own projects.

Ms. Jacocks provided for members' information a list of those persons who had been involved in the CEDS process.

Ms. Jacocks reviewed the CEDS objectives:

- build on all available resources
- stimulate a regional discussion
- identify short and long term educational and training needs of existing population to move the Region forward
- position priority development sites with appropriate infrastructure to foster growth measured by employment retention and expansion

Information was also provided on the different areas covered in the CEDS document:

- executive summary
- framework and vision
- demographics
- regional economy
- distressed areas
- education
- workforce development
- community infrastructure
- focal areas and sites
- strategies and matrix

Ms. Jacocks reviewed the goal framework:

1. create best-in-class Pre-K – 12 public education system
2. expand productive workforce participation
3. focus capital investments on priority economic development opportunities
4. grow and retain jobs that advance the Region
5. expand regional choice in housing and transportation access to employment

Ms. Jacocks provided a brief look at three of the strategy concepts from the CEDS document:

1. Port of Richmond Logistics Strategy
2. RIC / White Oak Educational Collaborative Strategy
3. Regional Connectivity Strategy

Ms. Jacocks said that staff is asking for any additional comments on the document and consideration by the Board for adoption. She said this is an important first step, and there is a lot of work that still needs to be completed. With the submission of the CEDS to and approval by the EDA, the Region will be eligible to apply for grants. This will also provide opportunities for RRPDC and the localities to work with other regional partners such as the Greater Richmond Partnership and the Capital Region Collaborative.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek noted that members have had several opportunities to review and comment on the document.

Mr. C. Peterson said he was pleased to see the emphasis on workforce development. He said during the InterCity visit to Denver, it was noted that Denver's education system ranks very low nationwide, and they depend on recruiting a workforce that has been trained in other states.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek thanked Ms. Jacocks for her presentation. She asked if there was a motion to approve the CEDS resolution as included in the agenda book under Tab 5, which will allow the document to be submitted to EDA for review and approval. Mr. C. Peterson so moved, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. RRPDC 2014 Legislative Agenda

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek reminded members that the draft legislative agenda was sent to members prior to today's meeting with a request for any significant comments to be submitted before today's meeting. She said the goal of today's discussion is to reach a consensus on the legislative agenda and to move forward. The agenda was vetted by the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees, and a thorough discussion was held on the agenda during the November Board meeting. She said she believed a consensus was reached during that meeting on how to move forward with the agenda.

Mr. Gates reported that following the November meeting, staff had created a draft agenda taking into consideration all of the comments provided by members. This draft was

reviewed by staff and Chairman Kelly-Wiecek and refined further. Mr. Gates said he believes the draft document provided for review today is a reflection of what members requested.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek reminded members that during last month's meeting, it was determined that there would be a small number of "asks" to include as Legislative Positions. These do not comment on specific legislation. More general Supporting Guidance statements follow the Positions.

Ms. O'Bannon said she objected to the Supporting Guidance section. She said she believes these statements are not needed to bring before the legislators. She said at times legislators may use such statements to frame legislation.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said the position taken in previous years was to support or oppose specific legislation. The supporting guidance statements were developed based on input from the Jurisdictions Committees.

Ms. O'Bannon said broadcast emails work very well for specific legislation. She said the Supporting Guidance statements are good to have but she would not direct these to the legislators. She said when specific legislation is presented, then broadcast emails can be used to provide additional information.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that the Supporting Guidance section can't be used by staff unless the Board approves it. She said she has no objection to splitting this into two documents. However, she said she believed the intent was to call out specific "asks" and then to provide guiding statements for staff's use.

Mr. Fabricant said during last month's meeting, it was noted that at times, a decision is needed on specific legislation within a matter of hours. He said not everyone may receive an email in time to respond.

Mr. Gates said this document is not necessarily something that will be printed out and given to legislators. The guiding statements will be for staff's use to determine whether staff should engage on the issues. He said if the Supporting Guidance is removed, staff would not be able to engage on any related issues.

Mr. C. Peterson said he believed only the Legislative Positions would be provided to legislators and the Supporting Guidance would be for staff's use during the General Assembly session.

Ms. O'Bannon said she thought this document would be made into a brochure to be distributed.

Mr. Gates said that is not necessarily the route that will be taken. He said the vote today is to guide staff with regard to legislation until the Board takes any additional action.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the Supporting Guidance would be on a separate paper.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said what will be provided to the legislators will be the Legislative Positions. The Supporting Guidance will be used by RRPDC staff as the General Assembly session moves forward.

Ms. O'Bannon indicated she believed some of the statements were redundant.

Mr. Gates said staff will engage on legislative issues as the Board directs.

Mr. Gecker said that given the fact there are no hot issues before the General Assembly this year that are known at this time, he would make a motion that the Legislative Positions be adopted as presented and that staff use the Supporting Guidance as appropriate as the session advances. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she believed the motion meets the spirit of the intent. She said ideally members should move forward with everyone in agreement.

Mr. Padgett said that the November minutes indicated that a discussion would be held today on the regional transportation authority proposal.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she thought this would be discussed as a separate item and not in conjunction with the legislative agenda.

Mr. Williams said based on the minutes (page 17), Mr. Gecker raised the question of the regional transportation authority issue during the November meeting. It is indicated that members would report back during today's meeting on the position of their localities with regard to a regional transportation authority.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek read the referenced portion of the November minutes: "...this will be incorporated into the discussion at the December meeting and if any of the localities have made a decision on the issue, that information can be shared in December." She said Hanover County has not discussed the issue of a regional transportation authority.

Ms. Graziano said the City of Richmond has not discussed this issue. Ms. O'Bannon said Henrico County has not discussed the issue.

Mr. Williams said according to the local newspaper, Delegate Loupassi has developed a bill to move toward establishing a regional transportation authority. If the bill has been dropped, Mr. Williams asked if the localities have discussed a regional transportation authority.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that she believed the current RRPDC legislative agenda was not to take a position on specific legislation in advance of the General Assembly – any legislative bill. She said a bill is submitted and changes are then made to the bill that

may not be supported by the regional group. RRPDC is trying to find a positive gray area between taking positions on specific legislation and providing guidance. The localities have not discussed whether to support a regional transportation authority. She said she didn't think this should be added to the Legislative Positions because none of the jurisdictions have formed a position on the issue.

Ms. O'Bannon said Delegate Loupassi has not introduced a bill at this time. The bill he has been considering will only include the City of Richmond and the Counties of Henrico and Chesterfield. She said RRPDC is a regional body, and the localities have not discussed the issue because there is no bill.

Ms. Graziano said the bill only affects three localities and is not a regional item. She said this is a specific piece of legislation. It is very difficult to have a regional body support a specific bill because it will change as it moves forward. It is very difficult to reach out to everyone during the General Assembly session to receive input on changes and whether or not the bill can be supported with any changes.

Mr. Williams said that even though the bill will only affect three jurisdictions, it is being framed as a regional transportation authority for the entire Region. He said he believes the discussion should be held on whether a regional transportation authority is wanted by the jurisdictions. He said the discussion can take place at the local level, but at some point, this regional body will need to have the discussion.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked the Chesterfield County members if they had any comments.

Mr. Gecker said the concept of a regional transportation authority was promoted heavily by RRPDC a few years ago. He said the idea that a predecessor to this group didn't support the concept as a whole, even though it would have involved a subset of the jurisdictions, is wrong factually. He said the RRPDC may not support the idea today as a group, but did previously.

Mr. Gecker said this year's legislative agenda has been watered down based on input from the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees and not by the actual Board. He said this is not the year to go back to specifics since no consensus on issues has been generated. He said a more specific legislative agenda needs to be discussed for next year.

With regard to the RMA bill, although it may only impact three jurisdictions initially, Mr. Gecker said it is of regional significance. He said at some point, it will need to be decided if the Region is going to take positions only if each jurisdiction agrees or if the majority of the jurisdictions agree. He said the decision needs to be made as to whether this is a true regional body, if it is a voice with independent policy as a Region, or a mouthpiece of the individual constituent entities if everyone agrees. Mr. Gecker said this discussion needs to be held at a different time.

For today, Mr. Gecker said it does not make sense to hold up the approval of the legislative agenda since none of the jurisdictions has locally discussed the regional transportation authority issue. He thanked Mr. Williams for bringing the issue up because it is an important issue moving forward.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she is hearing that there is no broad-based consensus to add this to the legislative agenda.

Mr. Williams said he brought the issue up only in response to Mr. Padgett's question and what was written in the minutes. Mr. Williams said he agreed that nothing will be decided today. At some point, however, the discussion needs to be held. He said the impact of the Governor's Transportation Bill creates a different situation from what was brought forward previously. Mr. Williams said he would encourage all members to have the discussion on the Transportation Bill with their governing bodies. He said the question will be what the regional transportation authority should look like for this Region.

Mr. Kaechele said Henrico County's legislative agenda this year is very similar to the proposed RRPDC agenda.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek thanked members for their discussion and asked for a vote on the motion to approve the RRPDC 2014 Legislative Agenda as presented by staff. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (CVWMA) Amendment to Solid Waste Management Plan

Item deferred per previous action.

B. FY 14 Revised Budget and FY 15 Draft Budget

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Mr. Crum to provide his presentation on the budgets.

Mr. Crum said he is providing this information per the RRPDC Bylaws, which require a mid-year review in December of the current fiscal year's budget and a preliminary look at the next fiscal year's budget. The Bylaws also require that the Board take action on the budgets at this time. Mr. Crum said a final look at the FY 15 budget will be provided in May, at which time the Board will be asked to approve the budget.

Detailed budget information is included under Tab 8. The fiscal years run from July 1 through June 30. The current fiscal year, FY 14, will end on June 30, 2014, and FY 15 will begin on July 1, 2014.

For FY 14, items that are impacting the budget include:

- final reimbursement for the CEDS grant from the Economic Development Administration (EDA)
- Richmond Food Policy implementation – special assessment in the amount of \$25,000 for assistance from a PDC staff member; this work is beyond the expectations of the normal member contributions
- second installment of grant funding for the Regional Community Indicators project
- Town of Ashland Park Plan – special assessment for \$10,000

Mr. Crum said the indirect rate (overhead costs) is a method of recovering expenses that are not directly generated by a grant program. The rate calculated in the prior year's audit is used for current year cost recovery. Mr. Crum provided examples of items that can be charged to the indirect rate. In addition to every dollar charged for salary in the grant program, additional charges can be made for indirect costs.

Mr. Crum said the indirect rate has gone down because more grant funds have been brought into the agency. The most recent audit has brought the indirect rate down from a high of 123 percent in FY 07, to 72 percent in FY 13. For every dollar charged to a grant program this year, another 72 cents can be charged for indirect costs.

In the current fiscal year, not all grant funds can be billed and balances will be pushed into FY 15. The benefits rate has gone from 35 percent to 27 percent, and the indirect rate has fallen from 94 percent to 72 percent. One way to impact this is to bring in additional staff. Staff forecasts that the indirect rate will go up next year. As a result, additional staff will not be brought in. Instead, some of the grant funds will be pushed into FY 15.

In FY 14, monies from the fund balance will be used to meet operating costs. In FY 15, it is anticipated that funds will be added back into the fund balance.

For June 30, 2013, staff projected a fund balance of \$1.28 million. After the audit, the balance was actually \$1.36 million due to cost containment and other cost cutting efforts. An addition of \$74,812 was put into the fund balance.

Because of the change in the indirect rate, this year about \$151,200 will be used from the fund balance to meet operating costs. The total fund balance at the end of the fiscal year, on June 30, 2014, is expected to be \$1,209,489.

In FY 15, there are a lot of unknowns. Impacts that are known at this time include the final year of dues credit to Hanover County (\$6,900), and it is anticipated that the indirect and benefits rates will rebalance. Grant programs will be lost, which will cause the rates to increase. Mr. Crum indicated there is a proposal before the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) to increase funding for PDCs. However, it is unknown if the proposal will be approved.

Revenue streams in FY 15 are expected to be:

Urban Transportation	58.5%
Local Member Dues	24.4%
State Appropriation	4.5%
Emergency Management	4.0%
Community Indicators	3.0%
Rural Transportation	2.3%
Sublease, Misc., Fund Balance	1.2%
Environmental	1.2%

Mr. Crum provided a preliminary look at member dues for FY 15. These are based on population at a rate of 60 cents per capita. Total revenues from all of the jurisdictions will total about \$617,035 in FY 15. Staff provides the dues projections to local staffs for use in their budget planning process. As more refined population numbers are received, staff works with the local staffs to update these in the spring.

Operating costs for FY 15 are expected to be:

Personnel	78.2%
Rent	12.9%
All Other	3.4%
IT Operations	2.3%
Training/Travel/Org. Dues	1.6%
Legal, Audit, Insurance	1.4%

Staff was able to negotiate a refund of about \$30,000 from the landlord to forego new carpet and painting in FY 14. Mr. Crum said he appreciates direction from the Board to realize this refund.

The initial budget for FY 15 indicates that about \$45,200 will be added back to the fund balance at the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Crum said staff is pursuing additional revenue streams that cannot be put into the budget at this time. It is anticipated that the total fund balance at the end of FY 15 will be approximately \$1,254,699.

Mr. Crum reminded members that in 2007, the agency undertook some financial projections that indicated by 2009, the fund balance would be below \$1 million. Due to the conservative fiscal management and cost containment efforts by staff, the fund balance will remain above \$1 million in FY 15.

Mr. Crum said at this time, some of the revenue unknowns include the proposal before DHCD (\$25,000) and the possibility of a DHCD grant (\$10,000). There are several foundations that have expressed interest in funding assistance for the Regional Indicators Project. Mr. Crum said he hopes to be able to bring more specific information on these funding sources to members before the start of FY 15.

The FY 15 budget will be presented again in May for final approval. The RRPDC Bylaws do require approval of the mid-year revisions and the initial upcoming fiscal year budgets in December.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there were any questions. Mr. Gecker made a motion that the revised FY 14 budget and the draft FY 15 budget be approved as presented by Mr. Crum. Ms. Graziano seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Holland said that with the addition of funds to the fund balance in FY 15, he would recommend that more funds be allocated for staff training.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

VAPDC Winter Conference

Mr. Crum reported that the Winter Conference will be held on February 6-7 in Richmond. The first day coincides with VML/VACo Legislative Day, which many members attend. VAPDC shares this event with VML/VACo. An evening session will be held, and it is anticipated the keynote speaker will be the chancellor for the state's community colleges. On February 7, there will be a number of speakers from various state agencies.

Mr. Crum said that if any member is interested in attending to please contact Ms. Fry. Ms. Fry indicated that as soon as an agenda is finalized for the conference, it will be distributed to members.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There was no additional business to bring before the Board. Chairman Kelly-Wiecek wished members a happy holiday season and adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Angela Kelly-Wiecek
Chairman