

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
November 14, 2013

Members (Alternates) Present

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles	City of Richmond
Timothy M. Davey	Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Daniel A. Gecker, Secretary.....	Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover	Henrico County
Kathy C. Graziano.....	City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley.....	Chesterfield County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle.....	Chesterfield County
Bonnie-Leigh Jones.....	Henrico County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Chairman	Hanover County
Kelli Le Duc (A).....	New Kent County
Lynn McAteer	City of Richmond
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
Charles R. Samuels.....	City of Richmond
Randall R. Silber (A).....	Henrico County
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County

Members Absent

L. Ray Ashworth	City of Richmond
Karin Carmack	Powhatan County
David A. Kaechele	Henrico County
Tyrone E. Nelson.....	Henrico County
Faye O. Prichard.....	Town of Ashland
Frank J. Thornton	Henrico County
Carson Tucker	Powhatan County
Arthur S. Warren	Chesterfield County
David Williams, Treasurer	Powhatan County

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Tyee Davenport Office of Sen. Tim Kaine
Joanne Simmelink Chesterfield County

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Associate Planner
Anne Darby Senior Planner
Billy Gammel Associate Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Barbara Jacocks Principal Planner
Jin Lee Senior Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director, Urban Transportation
Barbara Nelson Principal Planner
Kathy Robins Senior Planner
Greta Ryan Senior Planner
Jackie Stewart Director, Planning
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 November 14, 2013 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:10 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. There were no requests to change the agenda, and the agenda was accepted as presented.

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 the Executive Committee completed Old Business related to the Executive Director's performance evaluation and took other items under advisement during this morning's meeting.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought members' attention to the 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 highlight a couple of projects staff has been working on. In Charles City County, a project to update the county's 911 address system has been completed. RRPDC staff (Leigh Medford) played a key role this project by improving the accuracy of the address system.

Staff is also working with Charles City County by participating in a telecommunications planning project. The lack of telecommunications in the county is impacting economic development as well as education. Staff assisted the county with an application for a state planning grant to help determine how the infrastructure can be improved. Staff is also sitting on a planning committee to help identify infrastructure needs.

The City of Richmond is in line for assistance with the rotating Technical Assistance project. Staff is developing a corridor plan for Midlothian Turnpike, from Chippenham Parkway to Belt Boulevard. Mr. Crum said there has been a significant public works project to revamp the street scape in that area – sidewalks, pedestrian crosswalks, bus pull offs, etc. Mr. Crum said it will be interesting to watch how this investment will generate economic growth along the corridor.

Mr. Crum said the first meeting of a Logistics Roundtable was held earlier in the month here at the agency. The Roundtable was formed by Dr. Eugene Trani and includes about 25 representatives from various logistics companies within the Region. The Roundtable will work toward determining how the Region can leverage the Region's location and the Port of Richmond as economic drivers for the entire Region. Mr. Crum said a lot of time was spent discussing the Port and what it will take to encourage businesses to move more cargo through the Port. The MPO has played a significant role in making improvements at the Port of Richmond which is, in turn, increasing barge traffic.

F. Environmental and Intergovernmental Reviews

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

Mr. Crum reported that only one review was completed during the past month – modification to a Virginia water protection permit for a residential subdivision located on Old Hundred Road in Chesterfield County.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- A. Approval of Minutes – October 10, 2013
- B. Approval of September Financial Report
- C. Memorandum of Understanding Between the Town of Ashland and RRPDC for an Additional Assessment for Planning Assistance to Update the Town Parks and Recreation Master Plan

There was no request to have any of the items 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

There was no Old Business to bring before the Board.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Introduction of Dr. Edward “Ted” Raspiller, President, John Tyler Community College

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said it was a pleasure to welcome Dr. Gary Rhodes, President of Reynolds Community College, and Dr. Edward “Ted” Raspiller, the new president of John Tyler Community College, to today’s meeting. She noted that Dr. Rhodes will provide an introduction of Dr. Raspiller to members. Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she is an advocate for the community college system and the benefits these colleges can bring to the residents of the Region.

Dr. Rhodes thanked members for the opportunity to be before the Board today. He thanked members for all of the work they do around the Region. He said he would also like to endorse the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) report, which will be discussed later this morning. Dr. Rhodes said the report is very thorough and comprehensive. He thanked Mr. Crum, Ms. Jacocks, and other RRPDC staff who have worked on this project. He said the report is a great roadmap to where the Region is headed.

Dr. Rhodes said that he has just begun his twelfth year as president of Reynolds, which makes him the most senior in tenure of the higher education presidents in the Region – community college and four year schools. Dr. Rhodes indicated that one out of every four workers in the Richmond Region has taken at least one class at Reynolds Community College. One out of every three health care workers has taken a class at Reynolds. Dr. Rhodes said he and Dr. Raspiller are working with the same survey firm to add data from John Tyler Community College to see how those numbers will change. He said the investment made with local funds into community colleges has one of the best returns that can be imagined.

Dr. Rhodes noted that Dr. Raspiller's bio information is in the agenda packet. He previously worked in Virginia at Old Dominion University, as head of the Leadership Program. He took his first presidency in Texas before returning to Virginia to become president of John Tyler. Dr. Rhodes said Dr. Raspiller has shown a passion for shaping the community. Dr. Raspiller will be engaged and at the table, which is important for the Region.

Dr. Raspiller thanked members for the opportunity to introduce himself to everyone. He noted that Mr. Crum visited with him on the John Tyler campus a few weeks ago to discuss the current plans and the CEDS report that RRPDC staff have been working on. Dr. Raspiller said he's been in community college work since 1989. He said the focus of community colleges is teaching. He said he believes the work of community colleges is to serve the community. Community colleges are an economic engine for the communities they serve. Businesses used to base decisions on where to locate on natural resources. Now they base these decisions on human resources and knowledge resources. Two-thirds of jobs require skills beyond high school, and this is the job of community colleges for those who are seeking new jobs or reentering the workforce.

Dr. Raspiller said he thinks this is an exciting time for the Richmond Region, and he's just as excited to be in the Region. He said the future of community colleges is the future of the community. The future of the community is about a quality workforce.

Dr. Raspiller thanked members again for allowing him the opportunity to speak with them today. He said he welcomes the chance to serve in the Region.

Dr. Rhodes asked Dr. Raspiller to briefly touch on their shared work with the Community College Workforce Alliance (CCWA). Dr. Raspiller said when he began his career in the community college system, he taught Work Place Literacy. He said this gave him an understanding that manufacturing was moving toward the use of more robotics. This showed him the fact that workers did not have the math skills to use the robotics systems.

John Tyler and Reynolds have merged to form the CCWA. This entity delivers workforce training throughout the Region. The partnership offers specialized training without having to worry about conflicting programs at either school.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek thanked Dr. Rhodes and Dr. Raspiller for their time and comments.

B. RRPDC 2014 Legislative Agenda

Mr. Crum asked members to turn to Tab 6 in the agenda. Mr. Crum said RRPDC has developed an aggressive legislative agenda since the 2009 General Assembly session. He said he believes that every so often time should be taken to evaluate a program to see how it's progressing and how it can be improved. Staff has been in touch with the jurisdictions' legislative liaisons and members of the RRPDC Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees (LSJC) to determine the future direction of the RRPDC legislative program. Based on the conversations with these people, three points have been developed with regard to how the RRPDC legislative program fits into the Region.

First, RRPDC staff is here to support the efforts of the local jurisdictions by working on their behalf. Legislative positions of the RRPDC will not be as detailed as those of the local jurisdictions. There will be key issues that have a common thread that impact all nine of the jurisdictions. This is where the RRPDC fits in.

Second, the RRPDC legislative agenda will consist of a list of guiding principles that can be agreed to by the Region's jurisdictions. This is important for members of the General Assembly to know where there is agreement on guiding principles as everyone heads into the General Assembly session.

Third, RRPDC recognizes the dilemma of RRPDC staff providing input on specific bills during the General Assembly session. Things happen very quickly during the session. It's challenging enough for legislative liaisons to connect with their own elected officials, let alone when dealing with nine jurisdictions.

The decision was made that moving forward, RRPDC will not take positions on specific bills during the General Assembly session. When contacted for input by members of the General Assembly, RRPDC staff will share the guiding principles and refer specific questions to the legislative liaisons at the local level.

Mr. Gates will review legislative position statements and request input as he moves through the document.

Mr. Gates drew members' attention to the pages of legislative positions in the agenda book. He said he will review each of the areas and request that members voice any concerns related to what is being proposed.

The first section is Government Reform, with two sub-sections – Governing Locally and Local Taxes and Funding Mechanisms. There are general statements in support or opposition to governing locally that are important to the Region as well as thoughts on how taxes and funding mechanisms impact the Region. He asked if there were any comments on this section.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Gecker asked if there was a specific reason machinery and tools (M&T) and the Business/Professional/Occupational License (BPOL) taxes were not included in the statement.

Mr. Gates said the feeling was there would be opportunities that other sources of income would be sought. The broad statement was meant to be a catchall. He asked if members wanted to specify M&T and BPOL.

Mr. Gecker said these two sources are continually under attack, and he felt that members should go on record saying these should not be eliminated. He said he didn't understand why the word *piecemeal* was used. Mr. Gecker asked if members really opposed the elimination of any local funding source.

Mr. Gates noted that in the past, conversation has been that some jurisdictions recognize the problems with BPOL and M&T and were willing to discuss these; the discussion should also include an equal opportunity to update these to prevent the loss of funding.

Mr. Gecker asked what problems had been noted with M&T. He said he was not aware of any problems. He said he has heard the discussion with BPOL – gross versus net – but he had not heard of any issues regarding M&T. Mr. Gates said previous discussions note M&T is based on an antebellum look at the economy and infrastructure. The taxation is not set up for a 21st century way of doing business or for 21st century technology. Mr. Gates said the discussion should take place on how to replace these two sources of income.

Mr. Agelasto suggested the statement should say new tools are needed to create sources of income for the localities.

Mr. Holland said he agreed with the next statement referring to equal taxing authority for counties, towns, and cities. He said the counties need to be enhanced with their taxing authority.

Mr. C. Peterson said he remembered last year some changes were made to a piece of legislation that caused some issues, which precipitated the move toward more general statements. He said he feels that if the agenda is too general, there is no legislative agenda at all to deliver to the legislators. He said there needs to be more of a balance to the agenda.

Mr. Glover said he agreed with Mr. C. Peterson. He said he's not sure why something that's not broken should be fixed. He said more specifics need to be included.

Ms. Jaeckle also agreed that if there are no specifics, no one will understand what is being talked about.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if the consensus is that wording be added to indicate “We oppose attempts to eliminate existing local funding sources such as BPOL and M&T without replacing them with realistic and implementable tools that enable localities to generate equal or greater funds.”

Ms. O’Bannon said she didn’t believe an offer to replace a tax with something else should be included.

Mr. Glover said those taxes represent a considerable amount of funding for Henrico County that will be replaced by the tax payer instead of the business professional or machinery and tools. He said now it appears to be well balanced.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there was consensus to drop the last part of the statement. Mr. Gates asked if the statement should read “We oppose any attempts to eliminate existing local funding sources such as Machinery and Tools and Business/Professional/Occupational License taxes.”

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she and RRPDC staff will take notes that will be incorporated into another document to be presented during the December meeting.

Mr. Gates said the next section, Land Use, has two subsections – Growth Management Tools and Public Infrastructure Investment. He asked if there were any comments on either of these subsections.

Mr. Gecker asked for examples of what is listed under the section “We support local growth management tools that:....” Mr. Gates said there have been issues with each of the bullet points that follow the statement. For example, the last bullet point, *only require development to contribute its fair share for infrastructure improvements*, was a concern that developers would be asked to pay more than their fair share compared with what they are adding to the burden. If cash proffers that were excessive and punitive were instituted, then developers are being asked to pay for infrastructure in areas that are not impacted by their development.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there was actual legislation that would have brought about such an excessive cash proffer or if there is a risk that such legislation may be brought forward. Mr. Gates said there was a statement in a previous legislative agenda about cash proffers. The statement was rolled back as there was concern about supporting impact fees versus cash proffers or if both should be supported. Now the statement establishes guidelines for whatever is instituted.

Mr. Glover asked who decided on this statement. Mr. Gates said the statement is the same as what was included in last year’s legislative agenda and similar to what was included two years ago. The statement was developed by the LSJC and then the full Board would have approved it.

Mr. Gecker asked if these statements were meant to ask legislators for specific legislation. Mr. Gates said the statements indicate that RRPDC is not going to take positions on specific bills and is not asking legislators for any bills. The statements are more defensive so that when a legislator comes to RRPDC to ask for input on a bill, staff will point out the statements included in the agenda. The guiding principles are intended to be broad and all encompassing so when a bill is dropped, RRPDC can refer to the statements to see if the bill falls into line with the statements.

Mr. Gecker asked if a legislator drops a bill to change the proffer system and impact fees, would that fit into the proposed guidelines. Mr. Gates said the details of the bill would need to be studied. The RRPDC would not take a position for or against a bill, but would support a tool that lived up to the five bullet points.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek suggested that the bullet points may be a little too vague and may not need to be included. She said the entire impact fee and proffer question is covered under the next statement.

Mr. Silber said he did not see the need for that section – lines 31-43. Mr. Gates asked if members wanted to delete that statement. Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she thought it would add confusion to the legislative process. Consensus of the members was to delete lines 31-43.

Mr. Agelasto asked if it is helpful to bring to the table information gathered while talking with other groups that are planning to ask for specific legislation that may be of regional interest. He offered an example being presented by a realtors group. Mr. Gates said the LSJC directed staff to be less specific in the legislative agenda. If there is a specific bill that a locality feels is important, it can be brought to the table for discussion and support. The idea for this year's agenda was to be broadly vague.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said the legislative program for this year is a different path than what has been done previously. There's a balance between the guiding principles and taking a position on a specific bill that may be important to one jurisdiction but not the others. She asked members to keep that in mind and that specificity will be included when it makes sense, such as with M&T and BPOL.

Ms. Graziano added that if a stand is taken on a specific bill and it changes as it goes through the legislature, it's very difficult to contact everyone to ask if the support should continue or be withdrawn.

Mr. Pollard noted that he did not see any reference to legislative issues from other regions that RRPDC could support as well, such as transportation, to help move them forward.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that would be difficult to support legislation from other regions when the RRPDC is trying to walk a fine line within its own region with regard to what to support. RRPDC has shown understanding and appreciation of the difficulty in balancing regional needs. She said she didn't know how such support could be

quantified. She invited Mr. Pollard to provide an example that could be reviewed by members.

Mr. Holland agreed that lines 31-43 should be stricken.

Mr. C. Peterson asked about the statement in support of local government authority to apply zoning laws and comprehensive plans. Mr. Gates said this came from Hanover County referring to a law limiting the county's ability to impose any regulation on assisted living centers with less than eight patients. The concern was why this had been pulled out of the zoning umbrella. The state legislature should not be allowed to cherry-pick specific businesses to be exempt or non-exempt from zoning. Zoning is a local issue and should be left to local jurisdictions.

Ms. O'Bannon noted one bill from a previous General Assembly that exempted any wine tasting facility from having to go through zoning codes. She said she agreed with this statement.

Mr. C. Peterson said he would like more clarification on the statement so that no one else would pose the same question he did. He said he would trust staff to develop a statement with more clarity.

Mr. Gecker said he was unaware that the Board decided to step away from a more specific legislative agenda as determined by the LSJC. One of the large achievements of the Board several years ago was the coming together on a regional legislative agenda. He said now it seems this is being watered down. Mr. Gecker said he appreciates Ms. Graziano's concern as stated earlier about it being difficult to make changes late in the day. Mr. Gecker said he did not understand why a discussion was taking place on the current agenda when, as stated by Mr. C. Peterson, it can be difficult to understand what the statement is saying. If members can't understand the statements, then it seems a lot of time is being taken up for no result.

Mr. Gecker pointed out the statement "We support comprehensive evaluation of local tax authority..." He asked if that was an invitation for a new study of taxation by the localities. He asked if this is what the Board really wanted to do. Mr. Gecker said he did not understand why the Board would ask for a comprehensive evaluation of local tax authority. The result would be negative and it would be likely that the localities would get less instead of more by asking someone to look at what they are doing now.

Mr. Gates asked if the discussion could be broken down into two parts – the general direction of the legislative program and the specifics of what is stated in lines 15-25.

Mr. Gates said the legislative program has changed each year as staff goes through a learning process in determining the RRPDC's role in legislative advocacy. After last year, there was significant concern based on the quickly changing atmosphere during the legislative session that it was impossible to gather the Region's elected officials to develop an opinion on specific bills after the bills change. At times an opinion must be

determined in minutes. The LSJC discussed the feasibility of conference calls and emails to collect feedback from the elected officials. There is a problem when RRPDC votes to support a specific bill and then that bill changes as it moves through the legislative process. It is difficult to get a consensus from the local legislative liaisons and elected officials when a short turnaround time is in place. The LSJC members, specifically those staff members on the committees, said it was a cumbersome responsibility to manage this type of situation.

The primary reason to have a regional legislative agenda is to support the RRPDC members. The program had gotten to the point that there was concern the regional position was obstructing the process with regard to the localities. The issue became how to create an agenda that is less specific without being tied down to specific positions. Legislators do not like to hear one thing from a regional body and a different opinion from a locality. Many times a locality will need to change its position based on changes to the bill or concessions being made to other bills.

Mr. Gates said the idea is that if there is ever a specific opinion of one locality that needs to be brought to the table, then the entire Board can act on that one issue. This will happen only at the request of the locality.

Mr. Gecker said what he just heard is that staff from the four large jurisdictions want RRPDC staff to stay out of their way. Instead of saying the Board has been successful in getting nine jurisdictions to come up with a plan which may not be completely agreeable to each locality, the Board will now back down as the individual locality's position trumps the Region's. The result will be that members will retreat back into their own jurisdictions and water down the agenda to the point that it's not meaningful.

Mr. Gecker said if this is the decision made by the Board, then he will agree with it even though he does not like it. He said he didn't think this was a decision that should be made based essentially on local legislative services staff and subcommittees of the RRPDC Board. He said he questions whether the Board really supports a lot of what is included in the current document as it is written. Mr. Gecker cited a few examples from the proposed document. He said under the Government Reform section, the only statement he agreed with is lines 20-21. Mr. Gecker asked if the RRPDC was now at a point where no specific positions will be taken because the positions may conflict with a locality's desires.

Mr. Agelasto said he sees the merits of what is being proposed. He said perhaps each jurisdiction could come to the RRPDC Board with their primary legislative issues to see if any of the issues have a regional appeal.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that is how the RRPDC agenda used to be developed. Mr. Gates said during the summer of each year, RRPDC staff asks the local legislative staffs for suggestions on items to include in the regional legislative agenda. He said last year no feedback was received from any of the jurisdictions. However, most times, the

localities would not come to the RRPDC staff until a bill was dropped in January, at which time it was too late to reach a regional consensus on the bill.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if members wanted to go with the idea of using guiding principles or being specific on issues.

Mr. Glover said he agrees with Mr. Gecker in that the proposed document is too general.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if both the Large and Small Jurisdictions agreed on the current guiding principles approach. Mr. Gates said the Large Jurisdictions did agree on the guiding principles approach. The Small Jurisdictions agreed with reluctant disappointment.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek pointed out that the LSJC are comprised of the same members who are now sitting around this table. She said she's confused as to how the body went from consensus at the Large Jurisdictions Committee meeting and reluctant consensus from the Small Jurisdictions Committee to the disarray now being displayed.

Ms. Graziano said there were problems during last year's General Assembly session with RRPDC supporting a bill which a couple of localities did not support. She said if the agenda is to become specific, there needs to be a policy in place that if a bill is supported by a majority of jurisdictions, even if a couple of jurisdictions change position as the bill changes, the original RRPDC position moves forward. There will be changes to a bill that will affect each locality differently. She said this discussion should be held before next year's agenda is developed.

Mr. Crum said RRPDC staff will work at the direction of the Board on how to shape the legislative agenda. He said he agrees that more conversations should be held. He suggested that for this year, perhaps the agenda should be condensed to a few statements instead of a few pages. Mr. Crum said he heard strong support for lines 10-11 under Government Reform. There was also support for lines 20-21 under that same section. Mr. Crum said unless a statement says something meaningful, it will not be included. He said it may be better to have 10 lines of very specific language instead of two pages of filler. He said perhaps there are strong statements under each section that can be pulled out for this year and more discussion can be held on the RRPDC's legislative program before next year's agenda is developed.

Mr. K. Peterson said the legislative agenda is the RRPDC's opportunity to make a big "ask" of the General Assembly. He said if the focus is on asking for outcomes without getting tied up in the "hows," that might be the best path to take. As an example, last year the outcome from transportation that was desired was that the state should fill the potholes and fix the dramatically underfunded system. How this is accomplished is the responsibility of the legislature. There was agreement that there was a problem and the RRPDC asked for it to be fixed. Mr. K. Peterson said the problem begins when the RRPDC begins to focus on the "how."

Mr. K. Peterson said the general statements being proposed this year don't ask for anything. A specific outcome is needed.

Mr. C. Peterson said the lines that were struck, 31-43 under Land Use, are still useful as guidance to RRPDC staff when they are dealing with legislators.

Mr. Holland suggested that lines 20-21 under Government Reform should be kept.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she thinks specific lines should be pulled out as strong position statements under each section and the remaining lines can be used for guidance by staff. She suggested pulling the following lines as focus statements:

Government Reform:

lines 20-21

lines 10-11 as rewritten

lines 5-6 as rewritten

Land Use

lines 49-51

Mr. Baliles suggested that lines 49-51 be reworded as the localities already have this authority. He offered *We OPPOSE the state's attempts to change local government authority to apply zoning laws and comprehensive plans to all private residences and private businesses.*

Mr. Gates said he agreed that the statement will be more forceful if changed from one of support to one of opposition. He said last year there were many statements in opposition of issues that were changed to be more positive and still come to the same conclusion.

Mr. Gates said that unless an issue is included in the guiding principles, then RRPDC staff cannot offer input on it. Mr. Gates said he would like to have that protection. He would not want to try to interpret any statement on behalf of members. The statement received from all nine localities was that no action be taken by staff unless there is 100 percent certainty. Staff needs to ensure that what's being done is what the Board wants accomplished.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said she believed Mr. C. Peterson was referring to the process followed by Hanover County. Specific statements are pulled to be the "asks" from the county. There is also a broader, more general document of statements that could or could not be supported by the county with regard to other legislation that may be proposed.

Mr. Gates said this is how the RRPDC agenda has been developed in previous years.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek suggested that this year's agenda be developed in the same manner. Specific lines can be pulled from the current proposed document as "asks" and

the remaining statements can be listed as policy statements. Members can review the document again in December.

Mr. Fabricant asked for clarification on the statement Mr. Gates made about receiving no input from local legislative staffs this year. Mr. Gates said there was no input last year. He said this year's process was different because it had been determined that there would be no specific "asks" for legislative bills.

Mr. Fabricant suggested that next year, each jurisdiction should provide input. The input could then be combined and included in a legislative agenda. As in previous years, a member from each jurisdiction could then bring that issue forward.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that opportunity had been offered through the LSJC. She asked if the document had been circulated to the local legislative staffs. It was noted that the document was provided to key legislative staff members.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said that in the interest of time, she would suggest that members look at the remaining sections and pull out any statements that can be used as "asks" for this year's agenda.

Mr. Gecker said he felt there needed to be a statement with regard to a regional transportation authority under Transportation.

Mr. Fabricant noted that under Land Use – Public Infrastructure and Investment, perhaps an "ask" of the General Assembly could be for additional incentives for those who make improvements to blighted areas.

Mr. Gates said incentivizing typically means money, and there would be a question of what will be eliminated in order to provide the funding. Chairman Kelly-Wiecek suggested something could be crafted to include in the statement section of the agenda to address those types of incentives.

Ms. Graziano said she thought incentives could also be tools that are available. Legislation to give localities more tools to go after blight would be an option.

Ms. O'Bannon said she didn't know what other tools could be provided that the localities don't already have.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said the four items already identified from page 1 will be used. She asked members to look at statements under the sections on page 2.

Mr. Gecker said under Water Quality, he was not sure the localities are in a position to support those points. He would recommend striking the entire section as the regulations were going to happen whether the localities wanted them or not.

Ms. O'Bannon said lines 48-51 could be rewritten as a statement in opposition to strip the localities authority to address the impacts.

Mr. Gecker said he would support removing lines 46-47. Ms. O'Bannon noted that the restoration is trying to be accomplished without quantifiable goals and she would recommend keeping that statement. She said the goals are only quantifiable if a locality needs a waste water permit.

Mr. Gates said the statements are not isolated but are lifted up by the other statements. The idea is to support the restoration, but currently there are vague goals.

Mr. Davey said funding sources are missing.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Mr. Gates if he could reword lines 46-47 to include a reference to funding sources to accomplish the goals.

Ms. Jaeckle noted this is a specific unfunded mandate.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there was any part of the Water Quality section that was not needed. She said she would add that the goals should be based on researched scientific foundations.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that there is legislation that will be brought forward which deals with each of the bullet points under the Natural Resource Protection section of Environment.

Under Rail, Mr. Gecker said he did not see a reason to support rail from Richmond to Raleigh. He said he believes the high speed rail from Richmond to Washington, DC is what the Region should be interested in supporting. He said Main Street Station should be mandated as the line terminus. Because of the previous investments this Board has made in Main Street Station, Mr. Gecker said he believed the Board should go on record in support of the station.

Ms. O'Bannon said some companies are researching shuttle buses between Staples Mill Station and Main Street Station because that operation is less expensive.

Mr. Glover asked if this refers to improvements from Acca Yard to Centrailia for passenger trains. If so, he said there are several crossings and exchanges that will need to be dealt with before high speed rail can be completed. Mr. Glover said he did not know how funding for this work will be found.

Ms. Jaeckle added that she felt the Richmond to Washington was the most beneficial portion of the route to the Region.

Mr. Glover said he did not know how high speed rail can come to Main Street Station without improvements to Acca Yard and Centrailia.

Ms. Graziano said what's wanted is city-to-city transportation, and it's understood that this won't happen right away.

Mr. Gates said that the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) is trying to combine the routes to make the project all encompassing. He said what the statement is saying is that the Richmond to Washington leg of the project should be first, followed by the other two.

Ms. Jaeckle said the statement should be specific to the Richmond to Washington route. If the other two routes are in the statement, that will provide a reason for DRPT to focus on the other routes first. She added that the other routes would not be viable without the Richmond to Washington route.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek recommended that under the Passenger Rail section of Transportation, lines 10-11 be pulled and language should be added to emphasize the Richmond to Washington route. The rest of the statement can be in the policy statement section.

Mr. Davey said he would like to see the reference to Main Street Station in the statement. He said private business would support that addition.

Mr. Elswick asked if the cost to add Main Street Station to the route was known. Mr. Gecker said the cost had already been determined. He said the approximate cost was \$500 million and if trains were not stored at Main Street Station, the cost came down to \$300 million.

Mr. Gates said those numbers are based on studies by DRPT. The original figure was \$600 million, which included \$60 million for a new station and \$20 million for parking trains.

Mr. Elswick asked about the cost if the line terminated at Staples Mill. Mr. Gates responded that some of the improvements would benefit Staples Mill. If improvements are limited to the line between Acca Yard and Centrailia, the costs are significantly lower. The \$600 million amount was the amount asked for as part of the federal stimulus application submitted by the state. To get to Main Street Station, the cost was about \$400 million, which is a high-side figure.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked for a show of hands from those who wanted to include Main Street Station in the statement. The count in favor was 16. The count for those opposed to including Main Street Station was two (2). Mr. Glover abstained from the vote.

Mr. Gates noted that DRPT has backed away from a station at Parham Road.

Mr. Glover said he wasn't in opposition to Main Street Station, but he was concerned about the costs.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Mr. Gates to reword the statement to specify from Richmond to Washington with Main Street Station as the terminus.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked if there was anything else in the proposed document that should be pulled out as an “ask” statement. There were no other items brought forward. The revised document will be brought back to members for their review during the December meeting.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Mr. Gecker if he would like to speak to the issue of a transportation authority that he brought up earlier.

Mr. Gecker said a regional transportation authority has been discussed for a while, and now it’s not mentioned in the legislative agenda. He asked if this was intentional.

Mr. Gates indicated that the RRPDC has not taken a position on a regional transportation authority since 2008.

Ms. Graziano said there is legislation coming before the General Assembly this year on this issue. She said the City of Richmond has not taken a position on the issue. She said she would like to hold off until each locality determines whether or not they will support such an authority. She said she hopes that the City of Richmond will have a position on this prior to the December RRPDC meeting.

Ms. O’Bannon said Henrico County has not taken a position on the issue. Chairman Kelly-Wiecek indicated Hanover County has not discussed a transportation authority.

Mr. Holland asked if this issue has come before the MPO for discussion.

Mr. Crum said the topic is not scheduled to come before the MPO. Mr. Gates added that the MPO has not discussed becoming a regional transportation authority. The only option that has been presented is a bill from Del. Manoli Loupassi which will make the Richmond Metropolitan Authority (RMA) into a regional transportation authority. If RRPDC wants to take a position on a transportation authority, Mr. Gates said he would recommend indicating the RMA as that entity or another agency.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek said 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.

C. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Update

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked Ms. Jacocks to present this information.

Ms. Jacocks said copies of the document are being distributed to members. This is the same document that has been circulated in draft form since August. The document has been reviewed by the CEDS Strategy Committee. All of the local economic development

staffs are represented on this committee, in addition to members of the private sector, community colleges, and workforce providers among others.

During the December 12, RRPDC Board meeting, members will be asked to approve the CEDS report for submission to the Economic Development Administration (EDA) on December 14.

Ms. Jacocks asked members to review the document with their economic development staffs and to provide feedback through the local staffs or RRPDC staff before November 20. All feedback will be incorporated into a final document which will be presented to members during the December meeting for consideration and action.

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek asked members to let staff know whether or not they have any comment. She asked if there was a penalty if the document was not submitted to EDA on December 14.

Ms. Jacocks noted that an extension has already been provided to allow consistency with the rollout of the Capital Region Collaborative's action plan. She said the CEDS team has been able to work with many various groups in the community to discuss logistics, workforce development, anti-poverty issues, etc. She said this interaction has been a real benefit. During the development process, Ms. Jacocks indicated the Strategy Committee relied on existing resources so as not to duplicate any efforts. She noted the document will remain fluid as there are many things that will change going forward. Having an approved CEDS document in place will allow the Region to apply for federal grant funding.

Mr. Davey added that he was a member of the Strategy Committee and read various other CEDS reports during the process. He said he felt the document before everyone was the best he'd ever seen. He said he would encourage members to adhere to the request from Ms. Jacocks to provide feedback by November 20. He said he would recommend that revisions be kept to a minimum as the document is very detailed and thorough. He said the document can always be changed after it has received approval.

Ms. O'Bannon said she agreed with Mr. Davey's assessment of the document. She said Henrico County staff has asked for time to review the document.

Ms. Jacocks said staff will be glad to answer any questions.

Ms. O'Bannon made a motion that a final CEDS document be presented to members during the December 12 meeting for consideration and action. Mr. Glover seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no additional business to bring before the Board.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Kelly-Wiecek adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:55 a.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Angela Kelly-Wiecek
Chairman