

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
April 14, 2011

Members/Alternates Present

Chris W. Archer (M)..... County of Henrico
L. Ray Ashworth (M).....City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M)County of Powhatan
Willie L. Bennett (M) County of Henrico
Malvern R. “Rudy” Butler (M).....County of Goochland
Douglas G. Conner (M)City of Richmond
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. (M)..... County of Charles City
James B. Donati (M), Chairman County of Henrico
Marleen K. Durfee (M).....County of Chesterfield
Evan Fabricant (M)County of Hanover
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M), SecretaryCounty of Hanover
James M. Holland (M)County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M)County of Chesterfield
David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico
Lynn McAteer (M).....City of Richmond
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) County of Henrico
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... County of New Kent
Faye O. Prichard (M), Treasurer.....Town of Ashland
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Randall R. Silber (A) County of Henrico
Millard D. Stith (M)County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico
Stran L. Trout (M), Vice Chairman County of New Kent
Joseph B. Walton (M)County of Powhatan
Deborah B. Winans (A)County of Hanover

Members Absent

James D. Crews (M)County of Goochland
Daniel A. Gecker (M)County of Chesterfield
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico
Kathy C. Graziano (M)City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M)County of Chesterfield
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond
C. Harold Padgett (M).....County of Hanover
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Others Present

Reed Amos..... RRPDC Legal Counsel
Kate Anderson Powhatan County
Nissa Dean Department of Conservation and Recreation
Leigh Dunn Goochland County
John Easter Greater Richmond Chamber
Bernie Harris..... CVWMA
George Homewood County of New Kent
Kim Hynes CVWMA
Sarah Huddle..... ProActPR
Adrienne Kotola..... James River Association
Chris McIntosh..... Office of Commonwealth Preparedness
Anthony Moore..... Department of Conservation and Recreation
Tad Phillips Republic Services
Shaun Reynolds Powhatan County

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Associate Planner
Anne Darby Senior Planner
Tom Dunn Principal Planner
Michelle Fults Principal Planner
Billy Gammel..... Associate Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Barbara Jacocks Principal Planner
Jin Lee Senior Planner
Travis Lindsay Senior Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director, Transportation
Leigh Medford Associate Planner
Kathy Robins Senior Planner
Greta Ryan Data Analyst
Jackie Stewart Director, Planning and Information Services
Sarah Stewart Senior Planner
Lee Yolton Principal Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Donati called the regularly scheduled April 14, 2011 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. He then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Chairman Donati noted that Mr. John Amos, RRPDC legal counsel, was unable to attend today’s meeting. Attending in his place is Reed Amos.

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 in Order of Business

Chairman Donati asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. There were no changes and the agenda was accepted as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Donati asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. He reminded speakers that their time is limited to three minutes. As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, the Chairman closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

Chairman Donati said while he did not have a formal report, he would like to offer some comments on the recent InterCity Visit to Austin, Texas. This is the annual fact-finding visit sponsored by the Greater Richmond Chamber. Chairman Donati reported that Mr. Crum and several other RRPDC members also attended, representing their various localities. He said the last time he visited Austin was in 1996 and many changes have occurred.

Chairman Donati said Austin is a very beautiful city and the people are very excited about the city being known as the Music Capital of the World. He said the music industry is heavily promoted. Austin City Limits has a new auditorium and production facility in the city.

Chairman Donati said that in general, Texas does not have any zoning laws. The tax rate is \$2.47 per \$100 of assessed value; however, there is no state income tax. Sales tax is also high. There are transportation problems. He said traffic is heavy in all directions all day long. The University of Texas is located in downtown Austin.

Chairman Donati asked if any of the others present who had attended would like to offer any comments.

Mr. Crum said the city has land use regulations, but the counties do not. Developers seem to be more interested in building in the city due to incentives and other innovative programs the city offers to bring in developers. He said the city is thriving. There are many challenges, but everyone at all levels promotes

all of the positive aspects of the area. Mr. Crum said the Richmond Region has many more amenities than Austin, but we do not promote those assets.

Ms. Durfee said she talked with two gentlemen from Austin during her travel, and they were very animated about all of the positive things going on in the city. She said they were very proud of the city and how everything connects with everything else. She said this was noticeable wherever the group visited. Traffic is heaviest going into the city. Ms. Durfee said she did not feel the residents there have a good understanding yet of how to meet the challenges even though they are close to coming to that realization. She said the same energy needs to be brought to the Richmond Region.

Mr. Thornton said when he was there in 1996 he noted that the electronics industry was represented by Motorola; Samsung is now the key industry. He said he thought the Richmond Region needs to brand itself and stick with it. Everyone needs to be more positive about the Richmond Region.

Mr. Fabricant asked how the population in Austin compares with Richmond. Chairman Donati said the metropolitan statistical area is about 1.7 million and Richmond's is about 1.2 million.

Ms. Jaeckle said the SportsBackers are trying to brand the Richmond Region as the most active community on the east coast.

Mr. Kaechele asked if there is any zoning process.

Mr. Setliff said there is a regional master plan. He said an old airport is being redeveloped to include housing, retail/commercial, and open space. He said there is an economic development planning department in the city government. The city owns land that they will lease to developers. He said the city also owns its own power company to generate revenue. Mr. Setliff said he felt the area was a bit more progressive than the Richmond area.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought the members' attention to the monthly staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 1 and details work being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. He said staff will be happy to address any questions on what is included in the report.

Mr. Crum reminded members of the panel discussion that will be held on June 16, 6:30 p.m. with the area's seven college and university presidents. This will be held at the Henrico Theatre. RRPDC is hosting the event in cooperation with the Greater Richmond Chamber, Greater Richmond Partnership, Leadership Metro Richmond, and the Capital Region Collaborative. The discussion will center

around how the colleges, universities, and community can better partner in economic development issues.

RRPDC transportation staff is setting up meetings with each of the localities to discuss the regional transportation priority projects. In addition to the presentation on the projects, feedback will be requested on how to proceed with the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Mr. Crum noted there is information in the Staff Status Report on efforts with the Greater Richmond Partnership to help with their regional cluster analysis, which identifies clusters in the economy that are opportunities to strengthen the regional economy. This will help in business recruitment efforts. The information will also be used in the development of the regional economic development strategy.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Donati said the Executive Committee has recommended approval of the items on the Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of Minutes – March 10, 2011 Meeting**
- B. Approval of the February 2011 Financial Report**
- C. Authorization to File and Execute FY 12 Federal and State Grant Applications and Agreements on Behalf of the RRPDC for the Richmond Area MPO's FY 12 Unified Work Program (Tab 4)**

Chairman Donati asked if anyone wished to have any of these items pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion.

As there were no requests for discussion, on motion made by Mr. Butler and seconded by Ms. Durfee, the Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously as presented.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees

Ms. Prichard said the meeting was moved to April 28, so there is no report. The committees will meet jointly to discuss the information that will be presented today on TMDLs.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Virginia Watershed Implement Plan (WIP) – Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL)

Chairman Donati asked Mr. Crum to introduce today's speaker.

Mr. Crum said in early March, RRPDC was contacted by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) to ask that an item be scheduled on the agenda to allow DCR staff to provide more information on the WIP and TMDLs. Mr. Anthony Moore, Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources with DCR, is here today to provide an overview of the programs and to offer additional information on implementation in the local governments. Mr. Crum said at the end of the presentation, he will recommend that this topic be referred to the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees for their review.

Mr. Moore thanked members of the Commission for the opportunity to meet with them today to discuss this program. He said part of his office's duties is to manage the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). These are the main two agencies that have jurisdiction over the WIP.

Mr. Moore provided the following information:

- 1980 Chesapeake Bay Commission created
- 1983 Chesapeake Bay Agreement with Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Washington DC signed
- 1987 Chesapeake Bay Agreement to include 40% nutrient reduction goal
- 1993 Amended Agreement to develop Tributary strategies
- 2000 Chesapeake Bay 2000 to meet water quality standards
- 2005 New Tributary strategies released
- Tributary strategies are in place currently and TMDLs are the new goals
- Nitrogen loads reduced by about 23% from 1985 to 2009; these are almost at the new TMDL levels; these are the most expensive to remove
- Phosphorus loads have been reduced but need to be reduced further to meet TMDLs
- EPA has issued guidelines on the maximum loads of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment that can be put into the Chesapeake Bay on a daily basis
- State has developed the WIP which was approved by the EPA; additional backstops could be imposed if the EPA did not approve the WIP
- Three phases: state to develop a plan; extend plan to local government level (2011); evaluate plans in 2017 to ensure 60% of practices are in place, with 100% in place by 2025

Mr. Moore noted that Virginia's priorities were developed to allow flexibility in implementation to ensure cost-effective practices are given priority. Additional priorities include:

- Implement ground water quality improvements
- recognize economic impact of TMDL (\$7-\$8 billion for Virginia's portion over the next 15 years) and need for federal funding and reductions from federal facilities
- developed to meet EPA deadlines and requirements

- reserve the right to modify the plan and adapt as necessary
- plan includes regulatory programs currently in place

Most current programs already in place have been included in the WIP and will assist in meeting the goals.

The WIP was submitted to EPA in November 2010 and accepted by the EPA in December 2010. The WIP as approved meets all targeted loads by 2017.

Mr. Moore indicated that the state wants to extend the nutrient credit exchange. In 2005, the Water Control Board issued a watershed general permit. There are caps on how much nitrogen can be released. Water treatment plants can trade credits under this permit. This will be expanded to allow agricultural, stormwater, and septic systems to buy and sell credits. A study is underway and will develop a plan on how to expand the program. A report will be presented to the General Assembly in 2012.

A study is also going to be conducted on the James River to determine the most appropriate chlorophyll criteria for the tidal James River. At the same time, pollution reduction actions will begin during Phase II of TMDL to achieve the 60% reduction target by 2017.

Mr. Moore reviewed the different proposals for wastewater, onsite/septic, agricultural/forestry, and urban/suburban stormwater.

Virginia has \$36.4 million in the state's water quality improvement fund. When there is an excess in the general fund, 10% goes into the "rainy day" fund. After that, another 10% goes into the water quality improvement fund. This year the amount added was \$36.4 million. The Secretary of Natural Resources determines how the money is divided: 90% goes to non point sources and 10% goes to point sources. The state is putting \$27.8 million in the Virginia Natural Resource Commitment Fund: 55% to the Chesapeake Bay; 35% to southern rivers; 8% to soil and water conservation districts. The remaining funds, \$3 million, will go to point source pollution reductions.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the water quality fund can be used to assist farmers in meeting the requirements. Mr. Moore said the fund could be used for non point source best management practices. He said there are several funds available to assist in meeting best management practices (BMP).

EPA is currently adjusting its model for inconsistencies. One of these is that the model did not account for stacking of BMPs. These changes should be finished by June 30. Drafts are due December 2011 and final plans for WIP are due on April 1, 2012.

Mr. Moore indicated Phase I (state program) of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Plan is completed and work has begun on Phase II. Other components of the plan will include enhanced nutrient credit exchange, fertilizer, James River chlorophyll study, and resource management plans.

The goal is to engage the local governments to find out the best way to gather all of the information needed to develop a plan that will work for the state and take into consideration what will work for each of the localities.

Mr. Moore said local assistance will be needed to collect baseline data, including information on what plans localities already have in place to reduce loads into the Bay. Once all of the information is received, it will be summarized to determine what will need to be done to meet all requirements by 2025.

DCR staff will contact the localities to determine how each locality wants to assist. The information collected will also help in verifying data supplied by EPA. This will also allow allocations to be adequate.

Mr. Moore indicated this is a 15-year process. Many programs already in place will help meet the goals. Two-year milestones will be developed.

Mr. Butler asked how small horse farms will be addressed as the horses have access to creeks and streams. Mr. Moore said the contribution of the farm to the Bay will be determined. Those farms that have the greatest contribution will be looked at first. Mr. Butler said the number of horses across Goochland County is significant. He said dog kennels are also an issue because the runoff goes into local streams and creeks. Mr. Moore said these types of contributors will be addressed during the process. Mr. Butler said he felt DEQ did a good job addressing the larger issues but did not do as good a job in addressing the smaller issues. Mr. Butler said all of the smaller issues add together to become large problems.

Chairman Donati said there have been questions regarding the models used by EPA. He asked if the state has questioned the models. Mr. Moore said the EPA models have been and still are being questioned. He said the plan can be changed to incorporate any modifications needed. EPA is calibrating its plan due to land use issues.

Mr. Fabricant asked how enforcement will be handled. Mr. Moore indicated there are a number of programs in place to monitor runoff from non point sources. DEQ and DCR have jurisdiction in their regulation to address any type of runoff.

Ms. Durfee asked how Virginia compares with other states. Mr. Moore said the plans from Virginia, Maryland, and Washington DC were all accepted by EPA without backstops. He said there are many caveats in the plan that will depend on

federal funding. Funding continues to come through for programs already in place.

Ms. Durfee asked what roadblocks may hamper the plan process. Mr. Moore said that's why he is making this presentation to the PDCs, in order to ask for assistance from the PDCs and localities. He said there is a stakeholders group in place representing all of the Bay districts.

Chairman Donati asked if this will have an effect on bio-solids. Mr. Moore said he's not sure if regulations will be changed, but changes will be made where they are determined to be needed.

Mr. Crum asked about flexibility in the plan that will assist localities in meeting the plan goals. Mr. Moore said he would like to have as much flexibility as possible. One of the reasons for expanding the nutrient credit exchange program is to allow the localities to look at what types of programs will meet their plans in an economic fashion. Current programs still need to be managed. The goal is to have one state plan that will work in each of the localities.

Chairman Donati said it has been suggested that localities may have to create their own stormwater department at a significant cost to the locality. Mr. Moore said he's not heard of this before and would welcome hearing more about these concerns. He said DCR does not want to make this process any more complicated than it needs to be.

Mr. Pollard said he feels that some of the regulations will force farmers to go out of business. He said his concern is the quality of food brought in from other countries, and he would not want the country to become dependent on foreign food sources. Mr. Pollard also said he would hope that requirements for septic users will be adjusted according to the number of persons using each septic system. Mr. Moore said the septic system requirements have been discussed and it has been determined that some type of financial assistance would be provided should septic systems need to be replaced in order to meet the requirements. He said with regard to farms, DCR has worked closely with Farm Bureau and the Agri-Business Council, as members of the stakeholder team, to address these concerns. He said the goal is to keep agriculture as the state's number one industry.

Chairman Donati thanked Mr. Moore for his presentation.

Mr. Crum said that he would recommend this item be referred to the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees for further discussion to determine how the PDC and localities can work with DCR to gather the information needed. The committees meet on April 28 in a joint session.

Mr. Bennett so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Durfee. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. State Interoperability Program

Chairman Donati asked Mr. Crum to introduce the next speaker.

Mr. Crum said that during the February meeting, members expressed an interest in learning more about the state's interoperability program. Mr. Chris McIntosh, who is the state's interoperability coordinator, will provide an overview of the state's program.

Mr. McIntosh thanked members for the opportunity to speak before them today.

Mr. McIntosh began his presentation by showing a map of all the different radio frequencies in use throughout the state. He said this presents a problem when resources on one frequency are needed in another locality that uses a different frequency. He said his primary job is to coordinate communications across the state.

Mr. McIntosh said there are radio caches available at locations across the state for use: Montgomery, Harrisonburg/Rockingham, Fairfax, Chesapeake/Hampton, and in Richmond. These are all type 2 radios. States of emergency must be declared before the radios can be used. They are jointly owned by the state and the host localities. The caches can also be used for large events in the localities.

The Commonwealth has a mobile command post available for use in the localities. This command center includes the following capabilities:

- interoperable gateway device
- satellite voice and data interoperability
- video conferencing capable
- geospatial information system data integration capable
- mast camera and lighting to provide real time video feeds
- 12 work stations for command/control activities.

The strategic technology reserve can be used for pre-planned responses, infrastructure contingencies, and natural and man-made incidents and events.

The state of Virginia has spent over \$600 million on communications systems since September 11, 2001. He said not all of the equipment is compatible. A new governance structure has been created. This included a state interoperability executive committee comprised of seven regional preparedness advisory committees. There are also work groups that address policy issues.

Mr. McIntosh reviewed how the Office of Commonwealth Preparedness (OCP) uses grants. He noted that the pool of grants is growing smaller and that once a program has been funded through a grant, the funds may not be sustainable.

On January 1, 2013, the FCC has said that all equipment must be narrow-banded. Fines for not meeting this requirement will be \$8,000 per day per person. This includes all agencies that use the equipment.

On July 1, 2015, Virginia Code will require all localities to be interoperable. The OCP is working to define "interoperable." If this deadline is not met, localities will not be eligible for grants.

Mr. McIntosh said the areas of focus are:

- Grants
- COMLINC
- STARS
- Narrowbanding
- State Level FOG
- Training and Exercise Plan
- COML Training
- Broadband strategy (rebranding)
- Alignment of State and Local Technology Plans
- Alignment of SCIP and Ops Model with Local Plans

Mr. Ashworth asked if the mobile command center has been adapted for flight. Mr. McIntosh said all mobile equipment is certified for C-5 and C-17 use through the Air Force.

Ms. O'Bannon thanked Mr. McIntosh for his presentation and asked if localities would be expected to bear the cost of the new equipment. Mr. McIntosh said most localities are dependent on grants to fund communications systems. The OCP is looking at ways to maximize statewide programs and make them available to localities. This will assist in dealing with vendors that provide equipment. Mr. McIntosh said a state radio system may be another solution to the problem.

Chairman Donati thanked Mr. McIntosh for his presentation.

C. Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan Amendment 6 for Expansion of the 623 Landfill in Goochland County

Chairman Donati asked Mr. Crum to introduce the next speaker.

Mr. Crum said this is a requested action item. Attending today are Kim Hynes, Executive Director, and Bernie Harris, Director of Operations, with Central Virginia Waste Management Authority. They will provide information on the

proposed amendment to the Solid Waste Management Plan which will expand the 623 Landfill in Goochland County. Mr. Crum said after the presentation, he would ask Mr. Butler, as a representative from the host locality, to offer comments on the proposed amendment. Mr. Crum said the proposed resolution is included in the agenda book under Tab 6.

Ms. Hynes thanked members for adding this item to the agenda. She also introduced Mr. Tad Phillips from Republic Services, which owns the 623 Landfill.

In 2004, the Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan (Plan) was prepared for the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (Authority) and the 13 member local governments within the Authority's service area in accordance with the requirements and provisions of the Virginia regulations for solid waste planning 9 VAC 20-130-175. The 13 localities included in the Plan are all of the Richmond Regional PDC localities and, within the Crater PDC, Prince George County and the cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, and Petersburg. The Plan provides an integrated solid waste management strategy for the period 2004 through 2024. The Plan was approved by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) on August 20, 2004.

One of the purposes of the Plan is to assure that a jurisdiction covered by the Plan has a viable process in place to meet and maintain the state mandated 25 percent recycling rate. For the calendar year 2009, the Central Virginia Region achieved a recycling rate in excess of 50 percent.

Another purpose of the Plan is to assure that a region has a viable plan for managing the solid waste generated over the 20-year Plan life. This includes having identified adequate disposal capacity for that portion of the solid waste that is not recycled.

The Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Authority is requesting an amendment to the Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan. The amendment would allow for the expansion in size and capabilities of the landfill facility located in Goochland County at 1961 Ashland Road, Rockville, Virginia (also referred to as the 623 Landfill.). The facility is owned by Republic Services and is currently permitted to accept construction, demolition, and land clearing debris. This amendment requires approval by both the Crater and Richmond Regional PDCs as well as DEQ.

Republic Services has submitted an application to the DEQ to add approximately 6.5 acres to the existing 5 acre Cell 3. The expansion also includes a request to convert Cell 3 to allow for construction and demolition debris in addition to the land clearing debris already permitted for Cell 3. A liner and leachate system will be added to Cell 3. The expansion will result in a total 11.6 acre construction,

demolition, and land clearing debris cell that will provide 1.7 years of additional capacity.

The new capacity for the entire landfill will be 30,500,000 cubic yards. The permitted average daily acceptance rate for the landfill is 4,000 tons per day with a daily maximum of 5,500 tons per day. The landfill does not accept hazardous waste, Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), regulated medical waste, sludges, liquid waste, and friable asbestos. The expansion and continued operation the 623 Landfill and the addition of the MRF will help assure adequate and economical disposal capacity for the region over the life of the Plan.

A public hearing has been held and input from the host locality has been received. No comments were received during the public hearings.

Mr. Phillips noted that the landfill is adjacent to a Luck Stone quarry. In addition, Republic Services plans to add a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF). The MRF would allow for materials such as metal, cardboard, and wood to be recovered from incoming loads for recycling. Material not recovered will be transferred to another Republic Services landfill, such as the Old Dominion Landfill, for disposal. The new MRF will be permitted to accept 1,000 tons per day of waste and would serve the western portion of the Richmond Metropolitan Area. The MRF is anticipated to help serve the needs for waste disposal in the western portion of the Richmond Metropolitan Area once the Springfield Road Landfill, operated by the County of Henrico, closes in the near future.

Mr. Butler said some changes have been made to the proposed plan – to move the expanded area away from the Goochland County boundary line with Henrico County to an area adjacent to the quarry. Luck Stone and Republic agreed to a land transfer to accommodate this move which also includes a 1000 foot buffer along the boundary line between the counties. He said he believes the proposed expansion will be good for all parties involved.

Chairman Donati asked if the recycling services will count toward the 25% goal set by the state. Ms. Hynes said it will comply with that goal.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the expansion is for acreage only or if there is a height change. Mr. Phillips said the height limitation will not be changed as this is set by the permit condition. He said the new area is behind the existing fill and will not be visible from I-64.

Mr. Gates asked what will happen next if the resolution is approved today.

Mr. Harris said a public hearing is required and this has been held. The amendment must be presented for approval by both RRPDC and Crater PDC. Crater PDC will take action on the amendment during their meeting later today. Then the amendment will go before the CVWMA board at its meeting tomorrow.

Once this approval is received, it will be forwarded to DEQ. Should the amendment be approved by DEQ, the permit will be processed. He said this process will take about two months before construction can begin.

Chairman Donati said the resolution for approval is in Tab 6. Mr. Butler moved that the Plan Amendment resolution be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walton. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

B. Announcements

There were no announcements.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Donati adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:45 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

James B. Donati, Jr.
Chairman