

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
OCTOBER 14, 2004**

Members/Alternates Present

John E. Gordon, Jr. (M), ChairmanCounty of Hanover
Malvern R. Butler (M), Vice Chairman.....County of Goochland
Russell E. Holland (M), Treasurer.....County of Powhatan
Edward B. Barber (M), SecretaryCounty of Chesterfield
Gentry Bell (M).....County of Henrico
Amy M. Cheeley (M).....County of Hanover
Richard W. Glover (M).....County of Henrico
Frank M. Hartz (M).....County of Goochland
Harvey L. Hinson (A)County of Henrico
Michael L. Holmes (M)County of Charles City
David A. Kaechele (M).....County of Henrico
R. M. “Dickie” King, Jr. (M)County of Chesterfield
Angela L. LaCombe (M).....Town of Ashland
Sherman W. Litton (M).....County of Chesterfield
Kelly E. Miller (M).....County of Chesterfield
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M)County of Henrico
George K. Roarty (M).....County of Chesterfield
Millard D. “Pete” Stith (A)County of Chesterfield
Stran L. Trout (M).....County of New Kent
Lisa D. Ware (M).....County of Henrico
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Members Absent

Richard W. Ayers (M)County of Powhatan
Mark S. Daniel (M).....County of New Kent
James B. Donati (M).....County of Henrico
John C. Grier (M).....City of Richmond
Renny B. Humphrey (M)County of Chesterfield
Robert B. Jones, Jr. (M).....City of Richmond
William Russell Jones, III (M).....City of Richmond
Delores L. McQuinn (M)City of Richmond
Elizabeth W. Moorhouse (M)County of Hanover
William J. Pantele (M).....City of Richmond
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Frank J. Thornton (M).....County of Henrico

Others Present

John R. Amos.....RRPDC Legal Counsel (Amos & Amos PLLC)
Michael Aukamp.....Dunham & Aukamp, PLC
Jeff Baker..... VCU Graduate Student

Staff Present

Paul E. Fisher..... Executive Director
Katherine E. Barrett..... Executive Secretary
Jo A. Evans..... Assistant Executive Director
Daniel N. Lysy.....Director of Planning
Jackie S. Stewart..... Director of Planning and Information Systems
Peter M. Sweetland..... Finance and Contracts Administrator
Patricia S. Villa..... Communications Coordinator

Call to Order

Chairman John Gordon called the regularly scheduled October 14, 2004 meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. in the RRPDC conference room.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Mr. Fisher certified that a majority of the voting members/alternates were present to constitute a quorum.

B. Request for Additions or Changes in Order of Business

There were no requests for additions or changes in the order of business.

C. Open Public Comment Period

There were no requests to address the Commission at this time and Chairman Gordon closed the public comment period.

D. Approval of Minutes of September 9, 2004 RRPDC Meeting

Mr. Barber presented the minutes of the September 9 meeting. There being no corrections, on motion of Mr. Barber, seconded by Mr. Holland, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the September 9, 2004 meeting.

E. Approval of August 2004 Financial Report

Mr. Holland presented the financial report for August 2004. There being no corrections, on motion of Mr. Holland, seconded by Mr. Barber, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously accepted for audit the financial report for August 2004.

F. Chairman's Report

Chairman Gordon reported that the RRPDC/MPO Work Session was very successful and a positive process. He thanked everyone for their commitment.

G. Executive Director's Report for September 2004

Mr. Fisher presented the written status report, a copy having been included in the agenda. Mr. Fisher also announced that Mrs. Katherine Barrett, RRPDC Executive Secretary, has submitted her letter of retirement effective December 31, 2004. He stated that Mrs. Barrett has been with the Commission since 1968, she is taking with her a tremendous amount of institutional memory, and she will be a huge loss to him and the rest of the staff members.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Consensus Report on RRPDC and MPO Special Work Session

Chairman Gordon stated that the RRPDC and MPO Executive Committees met on August 19, 2004 and, by consensus, agreed that a special work session of the full Commission and MPO should be held to review the following initiatives: 1) organization changes, 2) relationship with the Chamber of Commerce and other entities on transportation issues, 3) dues restructuring, and 4) legislative agenda. Chairman Gordon also proposed that the Commission review and perhaps revise its Mission Statement.

The Special Work Session was held on September 23, 2004 at the Greater Richmond Convention Center with 35 people in attendance. Chairman Gordon felt it was a successful work session. There was some direction received from the Commission on certain items on the agenda. The Executive Committee met earlier today and made recommendations on each issue.

Chairman Gordon then asked Mr. Fisher to briefly discuss the consensus reached on each initiative.

Mission Statement

Mr. Fisher stated that Chairman Gordon proposed, at the August 19, 2004 RRPDC and MPO Executive Committee meetings, that the RRPDC review its mission statement and consider adopting a new statement. Two potential statements were considered at the work session and the following is the consensus reached:

“To strengthen the quality of life throughout the Richmond region by serving as a regional forum of member local governments to address issues of regional significance, providing technical assistance to localities, and promoting and enhancing the collective consensus on the economic, transportation, social, environmental, and demographic interests of the region.”

Mr. Gordon stated that the Executive Committee unanimously recommended the Mission Statement to the full Commission as presented.

On motion of Ms. LaCombe, seconded by Mr. Barber, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously adopted the Mission Statement as recommended.

Organization Changes

Chairman Gordon reported that the special work session of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission and Metropolitan Planning Organization was held on September 23, 2004, and information was presented related to proposed organization changes. The two major changes considered were 1) engaging the Chief Administrative Officials (CAO) as members of the Commission, and 2) empowering the Executive Committee to conduct business eight months of the year with the full Commission meeting quarterly.

The consensus from the work session was to make the following recommendations to the Executive Committee and Commission:

- Option 1. Establish the planning district’s nine CAOs as a separate group with a Chairman and vice-Chairman with one representing a larger jurisdiction and one a smaller locality. RRPDC staff will provide administrative support to the group which will address issues that are of interest to the Commission and relevant to its mission. Two meetings will be scheduled within the next six months with the potential to expand to three or four meetings per year. Meeting outcomes will be conveyed to the Commission.

Option 2. Assemble the nine CAOs in the planning district as a technical advisory committee of the RRPDC similar to the model used by the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization for technical review and input by local staff. In regularly scheduled meetings the CAOs would review regional planning issues that are slated to come before the Commission and provide a technical assessment of those issues to the Commissioners for their consideration.

Leave unchanged the existing meeting calendar and roles and responsibilities.

Chairman Gordon stated that the Executive Committee, at its meeting earlier today, recommended a third option for Commission endorsement as follows:

Option 3. The Chairman, at his discretion, may call a meeting of the nine Chief Administrative Officials to discuss issues of regional significance.

Mr. Miller stated that he did not have a problem with option 3, but would it also be available to any member of the Commission who wanted to make a request?

Mr. Gordon stated that the Executive Committee did not get into a detailed discussion of that potential. However, he felt that if this is approved, he would interpret it as if members of the Commission had a desire to bring the group together they would work through the Chairman to make it happen.

Mr. Glover asked if the four larger jurisdictions are still meeting on a regular basis.

Mr. Gordon said they are not.

Mr. Glover said it was his understanding that they were meeting. When there is an issue that they need to discuss, they also bring in the chairmen and any of the outlying jurisdictions that want to participate.

Ms. LaCombe said that is not true. Smaller jurisdictions are not invited. Ms. LaCombe said she did not believe any of the smaller localities are even aware or even notified of when those meetings occur, let alone invited, or what the topic of discussion is should they have any issues that relate.

Mr. Gordon said he is Chairman of the Hanover Board of Supervisors and he did not believe he had met at all this year and he has been available. He said he has served as Chairman three times and did not recall any jurisdictions represented outside of the big four.

Mr. Glover recommended that the Commission defer this until it is determined whether there is a duplication of efforts. He said he did not have a problem with this if there is no one meeting. It has been very effective in the past.

Mr. Stith stated that in years past the CAOs met regularly. Now, they meet on an issue by issue basis. Any of the administrative officers can call folks together for issues. The structure is there. Whether or not they set a regular or quarterly meeting or a semi-annual meeting, he did not think that exists. The process is there to come together.

Mr. Hinson said that was his understanding as well. He did not know if anything formalized through this body would change that.

Ms. LaCombe stated that there are nine jurisdictions here and five of them are never included in those meetings. They are not invited and they are not made aware of the meetings. Ashland's chief administrative officer doesn't know when the meetings are and he doesn't get to discuss those. Ashland has regional issues that are of concern to the town as much as they are to the larger localities. Such as, the example she used in the Executive Committee meeting today regarding the hurricane. Ashland did not get air time to let their citizens know if water was safe to drink in any of the outlying areas, including for the most part Hanover County. The CAO's were asked to come together and discuss that and come up with a better way to broadcast during emergency situations so that everybody in all the outlying areas of the region knew whether their water was safe to drink, if there was going to be a trash pick up, etc.. That is one instance where we called the CAOs, or their designee, to discuss that issue with all nine jurisdictions, not just four. That was successful and then it got assigned to the four localities. They have never gotten back to the small localities again. Maybe some of the small localities can chime in but we are not invited to those meetings. That statement was made at the work session. Ashland's CAO has never been invited to those meetings. Ms. LaCombe said even though Ashland is small in population they are a major interstate interchange and have a lot going for the region that they need to be involved in.

Mr. Glover said he did not disagree if they want to be included in the meetings—he has no problem with that. He felt if we are going to duplicate an effort we ought to duplicate it within the body that already exists. He does not have a problem going back and telling his Chairman or

county manager that they should include the smaller jurisdictions in their meetings. He was under the impression that they did some time ago and maybe they have gotten away from it. However, Mr. Glover stated that he would like to have 30 days to visit it and make sure there is no duplication of efforts. He thinks it is a great idea but should not duplicate it just because they want to be in charge.

Mr. Barber stated that the Executive Committee discussed the bullet points as well as other things. What the Executive Committee is recommending is actually an authority that the Chairman currently holds. The Chairman can call on outside groups to get together to make a recommendation. The spirit of it was because this topic was on the table they didn't necessarily want the Chairman to go forward and call the committee of administrators together on some type of issue. What they wanted to do is put it in front of the full Commission. It is an authority that the Chairman currently has based on our bylaws

Mr. Glover stated that the smaller jurisdictions ought to be made a part of the agenda. It was his understanding that invitations were made to those people and they were made through the PDC to notify everybody that they were having a meeting if they wanted to participate. Each one of the four jurisdictions funded the luncheon. If there is a desire to go to nine jurisdictions to fund luncheons, that would be great.

Mr. Trout echoed what Mrs. LaCombe said about not being involved. New Kent County has not been invited. There are some issues that are of regional importance where the Chairman of the PDC may want to call a meeting of this group to cover some issues that are perhaps not considered directly by some of the larger jurisdictions. If anything happens in a disaster mode the twenty some miles of interstate in New Kent County and the equal amount in Goochland County are going to be the ones that are crowded. If Richmond and the jurisdictions around here make a decision to either evacuate or accept evacuees from somewhere else, there are tremendous issues that would be involved. The executive committee was really backing up an authority that the Chairman already has to call meetings in cases where he feels it is necessary.

Mr. Glover stated that he thought the Chairman also has the authority to call other outlying organizations to participate and to study and make recommendations to the CAO's. Mr. Glover said he did not have a problem with any suggestions, but he wants 30 days to review it.

Mr. Holland elaborated on Mr. Miller's comment. He felt that all the elected officials that sit on this Commission should get written notification of the time, place and agenda for the meetings. He felt the notification procedure ought to be tied in as part of this discussion. Mr. Holland

supported Mr. Glover's request for 30 day deferral because he would like to know what's going on—let's get some lessons learned and he supported the expansion that is all inclusive because it is important they have an ongoing dialogue. He did not think you could separate the CAO's from the elected officials on this Commission and get meaningful results.

Mr. Stith stated that historically when the big four was organizing he did not think it was ever intended to be anything but the big four because of the close geographical location of the four jurisdictions. He did not think it was ever meant to be exclusive. It was just that the outlying counties at that time when they first initiated the process felt that they didn't have any commonalities. If there is a piece of legislation that New Kent or Powhatan wanted the support of Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover or City of Richmond, they would come and make a presentation. It was designed for only the four jurisdictions that make up the Richmond region. He felt that the Chesterfield County Administrator would want to look at this as well.

Mr. Butler stated that when there are regional problems it should come to this Commission. We are the elected officials and we should discuss them here. We do have regional problems. Mr. Butler felt that the Commission should put on the agenda each month the pressing issues of the region, discuss them, and if there is a need to bring the CAOs in, then bring them in to discuss the issues further.

Mr. Kaechele stated that one of the key issues is who should be at the table when there is a subject matter. A lot of the meetings of the so called big four have been about The Diamond—who wants to contribute to refurbish the ball diamond; the Arts Foundation—who wants to put tax money into that, or the Religious Freedom Center. These are subject matters we have discussed in those groups. If you are talking about a hotel tax or a regional tax, we would welcome participation. Even Hanover, he did not believe, contributes to the ball diamond but they have been at the meetings. That is the key issue—what is the subject matter and who needs to be in that meeting.

Chairman Gordon said that was the intent of pursuing the third option. At this point, his purpose as chair is to bring them together and get their feelings on whether there is benefit to establishing some frequency of the team coming together.

Mr. Glover stated that any time you bring in a new item thirty minutes before a meeting, he is going to ask for time to review. He felt that his citizens, his jurisdiction, as well as other jurisdictions, deserve the time to understand what is being requested.

Mr. Barber then made a motion to defer this item for 30 days to allow the three options to be put on paper and then bring back the proposal at the November meeting. Mr. Miller seconded the motion.

Prior to a vote on the motion, Mr. Miller asked for clarification on the motion. Chairman Gordon stated that the option on the table is that the Chairman would have the discretion to invite the CAOs to a meeting to discuss matters of mutual interest.

Mr. Miller said he thought the Chairman already had that authority.

Chairman Gordon agreed that the Chairman does have that authority already. What the Chairman was looking for, and encouraging some action on this item, is an indication of support. The Chairman does not like to have a party and no one shows up.

Mr. Warren stated that he serves on the Richmond Airport Commission and New Kent County was invited to one of their meetings to see if they were interested in joining. Of course, the three localities have contributed, through membership, several hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Kaechele serves as Chairman of the Greater Richmond Partnership this year and they invited Goochland County to attend their meeting as a regional body. They were interested in having them join and the annual dues are \$400,000 a year. That is available to Ashland or any locality that would like to join the Greater Richmond Partnership.

Chairman Gordon then called for a vote on Mr. Barber's motion to defer this item until the November meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Dues Restructuring

Mr. Fisher reported that information was presented related to the long-term funding structure of the agency. The two recommendations reviewed at the work session were 1) set a floor of \$1,000,000 for the fund balance with any amounts in excess of that floor to be available for expenditure by the Commission, and 2) address the revenue shortfalls projected for FY 06 through FY 09 by using the fund balance and increasing per capita member dues.

The consensus from the Work Session was to make the following recommendations to the Executive Committee:

- 1.) Establish \$1,000,000 as the minimum amount to be held in the fund balance.

- 2.) Leave unchanged the current dues rate, and use the fund balance in excess of \$1,000,000 to address revenue shortfalls as they occur. It was recognized that a significant increase in dues may be necessary by or before the end of the long-term forecast horizon (FY 09). The consensus recommendation includes leaving intact the twenty existing funded staff positions and existing levels of service, at minimum. The long-term financial outlook of the Commission is to be reevaluated every two years.

The Executive Committee, at its meeting earlier today, recommended the dues restructuring as presented.

On motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Mr. Holland, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved the recommendation of the Executive Committee as presented.

Legislative Strategy

Mr. Fisher stated that the region's legislative liaisons met over the course of the past month for the purpose of developing a PowerPoint presentation, highlighting three major questions to be addressed at the work session:

1. Does the PDC want a legislative strategy with guiding policy statements to direct the Commission throughout the General Assembly session, this year and in future years?
2. If so, how could the Commission be successful in executing the strategy, making the region a better place?
3. What are some of the basic issues/topics on which the region could focus that would benefit the region?

It was decided that having a legislative program is, in fact, a desirable goal and that staff should move forward with development of a program.

The group determined that in order for the legislative program to be successful, commitment from individual members on particular issues would be necessary in order to address the time-sensitive negotiation and amendments which occur during the legislative process. In addition, it would be important that the Commission limit the policy statements to three or four items, in order to be effective, and that RRPDC staff would lead representation of the Commission's agenda with support from the localities' liaisons.

The final question, which spoke to issues and concerns that the Commission could focus on as a region, resulted in a number of possible

suggestions, such as emergency services, transportation funding, telecommunication taxes, and the personal property tax.

Ms. Villa stated that the region's legislative liaisons will work on developing some key legislative guiding principals which will be brought to the November 18 planning district Commission meeting for discussion and approval. If approved, this will be incorporated into a formal legislative packet and included in the formal Capital Region Caucus presentation which is delivered to the area's legislators by the region's legislative liaisons in December. Mr. Fisher also stated that Chairman Gordon had talked about a potential committee as well.

The Executive Committee, at its meeting earlier today, recommended the legislative strategy as presented.

Chairman Gordon stated that there has been some consideration of the chair establishing a committee to assist with this process, and more importantly, to support the adopted agenda at the general assembly. That is still being considered at this time but the issue before the Commission is whether to adopt the process as recommended out of the special work session. The executive committee did in fact discuss this item also and endorsed it this morning.

Mr. Miller asked how this is going to work. Who is going to make the decision as to who is going to have the items that will be in the legislative package? How is this Commission going to interact with that?

Mr. Fisher responded that the Commission will decide what's in the legislative agenda as has always been the case based on input from the localities. The staff here will work with the legislative liaisons from each of the jurisdictions and will identify three to five issues of regional significance that will be brought to this Commission at your November meeting for your endorsement or rejection. It will not interfere in anyway whatsoever with the jurisdiction's individual legislative process.

Mr. Miller questioned if there are several members that have legislative items that his delegation or county didn't agree with or it could be the other way around—how do we deal with it?

Chairman Gordon stated that each individual jurisdiction will have their own legislative agenda and no action on the part of this group interferes with the current process.

Ms. LaCombe noted that we are looking for a consensus of the regional issues that we can all agree on and that is what we will go forward with on a regional basis.

Chairman Gordon stated that we are anticipating three to five items maximum and we are looking for items that have unanimous agreement on for all practical purposes.

Mr. Hinson said it would have to be unanimous, otherwise, we stand the chance of sending a mixed message. Mr. Hinson said the system works fine the way it is. If there is an issue that we come to a meeting about and we all agree that the PDC should pass a resolution or take a stand on it or have our Chairman write a letter on it, such as manufacturing housing, it would work very effectively. Sometimes our legislators get too many messages and they are getting them from too many different sources and that becomes upsetting to them. Each locality has its own programs. When you add another layer to that you stand a chance at upsetting something that works very fine.

Mr. Holmes stated that it definitely is an important factor for the entire region to know as much as possible about what is going on within the region. This would give us an opportunity for some of those issues that may have regional significance that are being proposed by one or two localities for the rest of the region to be aware of what is happening.

Chairman Gordon pointed out that this is an activity that is currently occurring ,but it is occurring at the liaison level. What this action will do will bring this body into the process.

Mr. Glover stated that this has been done in the past. Every year we have a legislative program that the PDC staff brings to this body and we make comments on it. I think it has been very effective. Let's not duplicate everything that is being done.

Ms. LaCombe suggested calling liaisons together and plan for them to do a presentation for the Commission at its November meeting and then continue this discussion after we see what they have come up with.

Mr. Miller said he could not understand why any jurisdiction that sits at this table who has a legislative concern that they can't come to this Commission and ask this Commission to support them or see if it is of interest at a regional level and then go forward. He could not understand why we would need this intermediate level or whatever it is we are attempting to do.

Mr. Hartz stated that we have to be receptive to the other counties. If they differ with us then they differ with us. He felt this is the perfect place to air the differences and try to come up with some sort of consensus on how we can deal with the issues.

Mr. Barber stated that if the Work Session produced a question about legislative strategy, then it must have been an issue. This recommendation came from the Work Session based on someone's concern or input. It looks as though we are looking at doing this in a stronger fashion.

Chairman Gordon stated that it was his intent to clarify what is the Region. His desire is to make this a more effective organization and to be more effective in lobbying the General Assembly. He said what bothers him about this organization is potential. How far are we, in his opinion, from reaching our potential as an organization on regional initiatives? Chairman Gordon stated his objective is to help lead this organization to become a more effective regional organization so the Richmond region can achieve its potential. It is not going to happen as long as we are here to protect our individual interest only.

Mr. Fisher stated that the key difference is that legislative issues of importance to the region have been presented to the Commission for information purposes but this body has never adopted that as a regional legislative agenda.

Chairman Gordon stated that the Commission has not discussed it in detail. We have not participated in carrying that agenda to the General Assembly.

Ms. LaCombe made a motion that the Commission charge Ms. Patricia Villa with coming up with legislative information that she normally does before General Assembly and present it to us in November for us to look at for which items we have a consensus on in carrying forward.

Gordon: I'm not sure that a motion is necessary for us to do what you suggested.

Mr. Butler stated that he would like to know what Ms. Villa is going to carry down to the General Assembly. He felt that everybody here should. Ms. Villa should bring it to this Commission and if we don't like something in there then we can agree to take it off.

Mr. Glover stated that back a few years ago Commission members used to meet with General Assembly members of this region, but we couldn't get enough people from this body to attend to make it effective. We were making it possible for all the people here to meet with our legislators. If you want to do these things you've got to be there.

Mr. Hartz felt that Mr. Glover's suggestion was an excellent one. If we want to take something to our representative we ought to have everybody that is a member of this Commission there—as close as you can go to

making it mandatory. We can say here is our legislative agenda. What do we do that is near as important as that?

Chairman Gordon stated that is exactly what he was trying to accomplish here.

Ms. LaCombe then withdrew her motion.

Ms. LaCombe suggested that when we host the Capital Regional Caucus that the Chairman could say the Planning District Commission has met and here are some of the key issues.

Ms. Villa stated that part of the problem at the General Assembly is that many of the General Assembly members do not view the Richmond Region as a united front. They see nine jurisdictions looking out for themselves.

Following further discussion, Mr. Barber made a motion to direct staff to make the legislative presentation at the Commission's November 18, 2004 meeting, and at that time take up our legislative strategy. Mr. Miller seconded the motion.

Mr. Miller asked for clarification on the motion. He said he seconded the motion but on the understanding that staff is going to come here on the November 18th, if this motion passed, and present a package of proposed legislative items that has been previously discussed with the liaisons of the various jurisdictions that are at this table.

Ms. Villa responded that anyone who has a liaison is invited to the meeting and that she will contact the other jurisdictions as well.

Mr. Miller asked if anything would prevent Ms. LaCombe from calling Ms. Villa and saying they don't have a liaison but there are some issues they would like to be considered.

Chairman Gordon stated that whether this motion passes or fails staff is going to do that same thing because that is what they've always done.

Mr. Butler asked if the legislative packet would be included in the November agenda mailout. Mr. Fisher said yes.

Mr. Hinson stated that if the strategy here is that there is more strength in the PDC's position than the local government standing alone, then why isn't it more strength in a VACO or VML position when we are all on the same page. The General Assembly delegation receives so many different

pieces of paper and programs and positions and it is difficult for their staff to sort all of this out. The strongest position that has been a part of this group for any local government position is when you have an issue you feel very strongly about and you focus on that issue. In Henrico we used to send a laundry list. We would ask all of our agencies to give us an idea of what they wanted to see in the legislative program and we would produce a document. We would go through that and it would always come down to what is the most critical issue and why shouldn't we be focusing our effort on that one or two pieces of legislation that we sorely need and that is the direction our program is in now. It seems that we are about to water down our efforts by doing something different than what has worked in the past.

Mr. Miller stated that it looks like the Chairman has the prerogative to direct the staff to bring the legislative agenda without the necessity of this motion.

Mr. Barber stated that if this Commission is of consensus that the Chairman can direct Ms. Villa to come to the November meeting and on our agenda will be the legislative presentation and the opportunity to formalize how we take that agenda poll, then he would withdraw his motion.

Chairman Gordon stated that Mr. Barber's motion has been withdrawn. Chairman Gordon directed Ms. Villa to make a legislative presentation at the November Commission meeting as planned.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. FY 05 RRPDC/Department of Housing and Community Development Contract

Mr. Fisher stated that each year planning districts and Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (VDHCD) enter into a contract that provides state funding pursuant to the provision of certain items as required by the Regional Cooperation Act. Requirements include a report on regional planning activities; information on board membership, finances and work program; copies of reports produced during the year; and a status report on the region's strategic plan development and implementation.

State funds to be provided for FY 05 total \$165,277 which is a decrease of \$18,364, or 10.0 percent, from the FY 04 funding level of \$183,641.

For the third consecutive year VDHCD will distribute funds monthly rather than annually upon receipt of the executed contract and annual report.

This item was originally on the September 9, 2004, board agenda, but action to approve the contract was not taken as the contract had not yet been made available by DHCD.

Mr. Fisher reported that the Executive Committee recommended approval at its meeting earlier today.

On motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Ms. LaCombe, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously approved for signature the Commonwealth of Virginia Financial Assistance Contract Number 115-04.

B. Presentation and Acceptance of FY 04 Audit

Mr. Butler, Chairman of the Audit Committee, reported that the committee met at 11:00 a.m. today to review and discuss the audit prepared by Michael D. Aukamp, CPA, of Dunham and Aukamp. Mr. Butler noted a change on page 8 of the audit in the revenue column under GIS conference to include \$50,158 in the “variance favorable” column.

The Audit Committee and Executive Committee recommended approval.

On motion of Mr. Butler, seconded by Ms. LaCombe, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission unanimously accepted the audit as amended.

C. Legislative Update – VML Conference

Ms. Patricia Villa, RRPDC Communications Coordinator, reported that she attended the Virginia Municipal League Annual Conference held in Alexandria, Virginia October 3 – 5, 2004. VML finalized their legislative program and categorized their priorities into three different headings, as follows:

1. Advocacy of State Investment
 - a. Transportation
 - b. Education
2. Advocacy of Local Revenue
 - a. Solid Waste Surcharge
 - b. Flush Tax
3. Local Land Use Authority

IV. **OTHER BUSINESS**

A. **Announcements**

There were no announcements at this time.

B. **Committee Reports**

There were no committee reports at this time.

C. **For Your Information**

Mr. Fisher noted an informational item included in the agenda.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Gordon adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Paul E. Fisher
Executive Director

John E. Gordon, Jr.
Chairman

