

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC QUARTERLY COMMISSION MEETING

ITEM #10A: MINUTES

The Minutes of the HRPDC Executive Committee meeting of June 21, 2012 are attached.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The HRPDC staff recommends approval of the minutes.

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Executive Committee Meeting
Minutes of June 21, 2012

The Executive Committee Meeting of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission was called to order at 9:30 a.m. in the Regional Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Thomas Shepperd, Chairman (YK)	Mary Jones (JC)
James O. McReynolds, Treasurer (YK)	McKinley Price (NN)
Alan Krasnoff (CH)*	J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)
Barry Cheatham (FR)	Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)
Brenda Garton (GL)	John Seward (SY)
Molly Joseph Ward (HA)	Louis R. Jones (VB)
Dee Dee Darden (IW)	Jackson C. Tuttle, II (WM)

Executive Director:

Dwight L. Farmer

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ABSENT)

Randy Martin (FR)	Michael W. Johnson (SH)
Paul D. Fraim (NO)	Tyrone Franklin (SY)
Kenneth Wright, Vice Chairman (PO)	

OTHER COMMISSIONERS:

Eric Martin (CH)	Sharon Scott (NN)*
Ella P. Ward (CH)	Kenneth L. Chandler (PO)
Amar Dwarkanath (CH)	Robert M. Dyer (VB)
Mary Bunting (HA)	Harry E. Diezel (VB)
Douglas Caskey (IW)	Barbara Henley (VB)
Robert Middaugh (JC)	James Spore (VB)
Neil Morgan (NN)	Clyde Haulman (WM)

*Late arrival or early departure.

OTHERS RECORDED ATTENDING:

John Gergely, Christine Gergely - Citizens; Earl Sorey, (CH); Brian DeProfio (HA); Jeff Raliski, Ron Williams, Bryan Pennington (NO); James Moore, Katherine Day, Michael King, Jerri Wilson (NN); Sherri Neil, Charles Whitehead (PO); Eric Nielson (SU); Ellis James, Sierra Club Observer; Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky, Portsmouth City Watch Org.; Ray Toll, Bob Kugler, Tom Myers, Oceans 2012; Peter Huber, Willcox & Savage; Cathy Aiello, Aiello Enterprises, Inc.; Staff: John Carlock, Camelia Ravanbakht, Sam Belfield, Shernita Bethea, Melton Boyer, Curtis Brown, Rick Case, Robert Case, Jennifer Coleman, Nancy Collins, Greg Grootendorst, Lisa Hardy, Julia Hillegass, Frances Hughey, Jim Hummer, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Mike Long, Benjamin McFarlane, Jai McBride, Brian Miller, Keith Nichols, Kelli Peterson, Tiffany Smith, Jennifer Tribo, Joe Turner, Chris Vaigneur.

Chairman Shepperd called the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission Executive Committee meeting to order.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Two people requested to address the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission.

Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky

That was actually probably the least bad pronunciation I have heard. It was rather good. Good morning. Honorable members of the Planning District Commission, I am Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky a citizen of Portsmouth and of the region. This morning I would like to underscore the news that we all received in the last month about APM and the port deal that they have proposed. As a citizen of Portsmouth I am deeply concerned about this. As we have seen during this economic downturn of the last four years and counting, when times get tough, localities get pushed aside. When the seas get rocky, aid to localities is the first thing that is thrown overboard and Portsmouth is heavily dependent on the tax revenue it receives from the APM facility, but other communities in the region receive tax benefits as well from various aspects of port operations. Newport News, Norfolk as host communities, Suffolk as a community that has distribution centers, Isle of Wight County also in that boat. I want to take a moment to thank Delegate Jones, who has displayed what I consider a reasonable skepticism about the deal. It is encouraging to see that members of the General Assembly, regardless of party, whether they are the governor's party or the opposition, are taking interest in this issue, and I hope that will continue to maintain vigilance about this deal as details come to light. We as a region need to work together to ensure that whatever comes out of the negotiations does not negatively impact our localities. Thank you very much.

Ellis W. James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission my name is Ellis W. James. I am a lifelong resident of Norfolk. There are several things that I would like to call to your attention this morning. We have been blessed from the perspective of some of us with very cool evenings and cool days for quite some time. We appear to be getting ready to head right straight into some tough sledding for our seniors, for our small children, and for people who do not have air conditioning and so on. I hope that each one of the communities will pay close attention as I did when I went to the library last week and pulled up the map and overview of where the drought conditions are. The southeast is not out of the woods now, and we are now caught in a situation where we have to pay close attention to the extreme heat temperatures and as well as the usage of water. The usage of water and the shortage of water are going to be upon us before we can even turn around. I am convinced of that, and apparently some the scientists are convinced of that because the data and the areas that you can examine also touch us here in the Commonwealth. The second thing that I wanted to call to your attention is something that is pretty important air quality. There is now a big fire burning in northeastern North Carolina and some of us may think, well here we go again, but the fact of the matter is, that air quality is going to be on our plate very quickly, and I hope that each one of the towns, cities, and counties will pay close attention to this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

APPROVAL/MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

Chairman Shepperd asked if there were any modifications or additions/deletions to the agenda. Hearing none he asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Commissioner McReynolds Moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Cheatham. The Motion Carried.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Shepperd stated Item #13 is authorization of a contract with McGuire Woods, LLP, a legal consultant for stormwater. The contact proposal is \$95,000 and the funds will be used when consulting service is needed; otherwise the funds will remain untouched.

The Consent Agenda contained the following Items:

Minutes of April 19, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting

Treasurer's Reports

Regional Reviews

A. PNRS Items Reviews

FY 2013 Chesapeake Bay Monitoring Program (CWA 117d) – Department of Environmental Quality

FY 2013 Chesapeake Bay Monitoring Program - CWA 117(e)(1)(B) –Department of Environmental Quality

FY 12-14 VADEQ Technical Review and Services for Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) Activities at Active DOD Facilities and Environmental Restoration at Base Closure Sites – Department of Environmental Quality

27th Year VA CZM Implementation Application - Department of Environmental Quality

FY 2012 State Revolving Loan Funds Capitalization Application – Department of Environmental Quality

Virginia DEQ DERA2 Project – Department of Environmental Quality

B. Environmental Impact Assessment/Statement Review

Tactical Vehicle Training Course, Fort Story – DOD/US Navy

Downtown Tunnel/Midtown Tunnel/MLK Extension Project – USDOT/Federal Highway Administration

Ironbound Square Redevelopment Project - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

New Education Building – Old Dominion University

Reissuance of State Programmatic General Permit – DOD/Army/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection Upgrades to Naval Special Warfare Development Group – DOD/Department of the Navy

Shoreline Restoration and Protection Project at Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek/Fort Story – DOD/Department of the Navy

Repairs to the Shoreline Protection System at Naval Air Station Oceana, Dam Neck Annex – DOD/Department of the Navy

Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing – DOD/Department of the Navy

Regional Solid Waste Plan for Southeastern Virginia – Amendment No. 2

Consultant Services Contract – United States Geological Survey (USGS) – Groundwater Monitoring

Consultant Services Contracts - Continuing Services Agreements for Water Resources Projects

Consultant Services Contract Task Order – Sanitary Sewer Overflow Reporting System (SSORS)

Consultant Services Contract Task Order – Permit Administration and Review System (PARS)

Consultant Services Contract – Special Legal Consultant on Stormwater Matters

Consultant Services Contract – Marketing and Public Relations Consultant Service for askHR green.org

Consultant Services Contract – Urban Area Security Initiative Effectiveness Report

Reducing Nutrients on Private Property: Evaluation of Programs, Practices and Incentives

Roof Replacement

FY 2012 HRPDC Budget – Amendment No.2

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Cuffee-Glenn Moved to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Cheatham. The Motion Carried.

APPOINTMENT TO HRMMRS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Chairman Shepperd stated Ms. Barbara Henley has agreed to serve a two-year term as the Southside representative to the Hampton Roads Metropolitan Medical Response System (HRMMRS) Oversight Committee.

Commissioner Diezel Moved to appoint Ms. Henley for a two-year term to the HRMMRS Oversight Committee; seconded by Commissioner Chandler. The Motion Carried.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – FY 2013 GRANTS

Chairman Shepperd stated his understanding is HRPDC has an agreement between Norfolk and Suffolk and HRPDC is eligible to receive up to \$60,000 in funding.

Mr. Carlock presented brief details on the background on the Coastal Zone Management Grants. This year Department of Environmental Quality had some additional funds which they are making available on a competitive basis to the PDCs. There are five categories of projects that can be proposed, water quality, coastal resiliency, working water fronts, habitat restoration, and public access.

The State had discussions with the PDCs, and it was favorable to doing public access projects. The HRPDC staff briefed the Joint Environmental Committee and the parks and recreation departments and asked for any proposals for public access projects. HRPDC received three projects from Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Suffolk. Unfortunately, the Portsmouth project was ineligible to move forward because the property in question was not in public ownership. The Norfolk and Suffolk projects are public access canoe, kayak launch, fishing docks, some shoreline habitat restoration, and parking related which would be Americans with Disabilities Act compliant.

Mr. Carlock stated the Norfolk project is adjacent to the zoo on the Lafayette River. The Suffolk project is at Constant's Wharf in downtown Suffolk on the Nansemond River. HRPDC staff has talked to the two city staffs and they agreed to scale back their projects in order for HRPDC to put in two proposals that meet the \$60,000 for the region, and those proposals would go forward from the HRPDC. HRPDC staff has agreements, if the projects are funded, with the two cities. The staffs from both cities agreed they will set aside funds to cover HRPDC administrative costs to keep the projects going.

Mr. Carlock indicated the recommended actions are to authorize the Executive Director to submit the two grant proposals to DEQ for funding through the CZM Competitive grants, accept grant offers when they are made and develop agreements with the Cities of Norfolk and Suffolk to permit project implementation following receipt of the grants.

Chairman Shepperd asked for questions.

Chairman Shepperd asked if the projects are in excess of \$60,000, do Norfolk and Suffolk have enough to cover their contributions on the project.

Mr. Carlock stated they have more than sufficient money on the match side to cover the required minimum of \$60,000 and both cities have agreed to keep their projects at the \$30,000 level.

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion.

Commissioner Cuffee-Gleen Moved to authorize the Executive Director to submit the two grant proposals to DEQ for funding through the CZM Competitive grants, accept grant offers when they are made and develop agreements with the Cities of Norfolk and Suffolk to permit project implementation following receipt of the grants; seconded by Commissioner L. Jones. The Motion Carried.

(Commissioner Scott arrives)

VRS RESOLUTIONS

Chairman Shepperd stated recent legislation passed by the General Assembly mandated employees of localities and political subdivisions begin paying their 5% member contribution effective July 1, 2012 and receive an offsetting 5% salary increase. The HRPDC will begin requiring its employees to pay the full 5% contribution and will provide an offsetting salary increase of 5.73%. The additional offset to employees is to cover the increase in FICA taxes. Additionally, the HRPDC must elect to pay either the 7.94% rate certified by the VRS Board of Trustees or the 5.56% alternate rate which is the higher of the current rate certified by the VRS Board. HRPDC staff recommendation is to pay the 7.94% VRS Board of Trustees certified rate for the 2012-2014 biennium beginning July 1, 2012.

Commissioner Diezel asked who watches the VRS investment portfolio.

Commissioner McReynolds stated VRS is governed by a separate body and board appointed by the state. Virginia Retirement System has their separate independent board.

Commissioner Diezel stated VRS can consistently say starting next year there is an increase take it or leave it or if anybody independently did an analysis of their portfolio.

Commissioner McReynolds stated VRS is required to have an independent actuarial study of the liability given the current retirees and those who are anticipated to retire. An independent actuary looks at this every two years and assesses what the rates should be.

Commissioner Diezel asked is there no local or regional input in this process from a group like us.

Commissioner McReynolds stated it is governed by the General Assembly.

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion.

Commissioner Garton Moved to authorize the Chairman and Executive Director to execute the resolutions pertaining to the HRPDC employer and member contribution rates to VRS; seconded by Commissioner Price. The Motion Carried.

2012 HAMPTON ROADS DATA BOOK

Chairman Shepperd introduced Mr. Greg Grootendorst to brief the Commission on the Hampton Roads Data Book.

Mr. Grootendorst stated the Planning District Commission has been producing some version of the Data Book for years. This is a resource document that contains a great deal of data, historical economic and demographic information, some of which is not available anywhere else. The Data Book does not contain any charts or analysis. This book is used primarily by HRPDC staff, staff from member jurisdictions, other organizations, and the general public. The Data Book is not typically presented to the Commission, however, during the retreat, there was some discussion on presenting data at the jurisdiction level and there is a great deal of information in this document at the jurisdictional levels.

One of the most important reasons for putting this document together is that it is a partial fulfillment of state statute that requires planning district commissions to collect and maintain data. He reiterated this is a resource document, and is not analysis, and, therefore, a lot of these numbers are just presented as data and not within any particular context.

Information in the document includes geographic, demographic and economic. Throughout the report and you can see the diversity and size of jurisdictions from 600 square miles in Southampton to eight square miles in Franklin. There is a great deal of dispersion among localities as well as with respect to population; Virginia Beach with over 440,000 and Surry County just less than 7,000. In raw terms, Chesapeake had the most growth over the past decade, gaining over 23,000 residents. However, on a percent basis there was a 37% growth in James City County and Virginia grew at a rate of 12%, which was double the regional average over that time frame. When looking at population and population growth it is important to look at the net migration. It is no secret that as a region, Hampton Roads has experienced significant out migration over the past decade. Over 21,000 people have migrated out of the region, and on a year to year basis, migration numbers can vary substantially. So you can look at 2008 to 2009 which could vary substantially from the next year depending on projects that are built within the jurisdiction.

Mr. Grootendorst stated two years ago, regional per capita income in the region surpassed the national average for the first time since records were available. Mr. Grootendorst showed a graph of per capita income distribution across the jurisdictions. At the bottom some of the jurisdictions are grouped together, such as Franklin and Southampton, James City, and Williamsburg. This is done by the Bureau of Economic Analysis due to privacy and disclosure issues. There are five localities that are above the state average of \$44,000, and seven of the localities that are above the national average of \$40,000. This chart basically shows you where the employment distributions are by place of work. Norfolk and Virginia Beach have the highest percent respectively. The employment to population ratio is basic

to looking at how many people are employed in the jurisdiction versus the population of that jurisdiction and gives a sense of where the employment centers are, and you can see the regional experience is consistent with the state experience.

Context is the key to understanding data, and that is what this document does, it is merely providing data. When looking through this document you would pull the data to get a sense of what is happening before further analysis is required to understand why things are happening. There are also elevated levels of youth unemployed, which is consistent across the nation, and tourism related seasonality is a big component. When looking at any of this information, simply looking at the data itself without context, you have to watch where those conclusions lead you.

Mr. Grootendorst stated the share of retail sales is one way to look at the dispersion of shopping across the region. When looking at the annualized growth in retail sales, retail sales in the region have grown \$17.5 billion in 2011. The growth in retail sales is going to tend to follow growth in population. On a per capita basis, you can see retail sales in a different light, and that is one of the things this document is pretty useful for because it provides a host of different data types. You can combine different data sets together to begin conducting analysis. For example, look to see where the retail hubs are located.

Mr. Grootendorst showed a graph on building permits. Over a ten year period, the graph showed which jurisdictions were showing growth. In 2001 to 2006, the number of buildings permits issued was roughly double from 2007 to 2011 on an average basis.

The value of real estate when looking at real estate market value, shows the value of real estate on a per capita basis, which gives a much different picture and shows how localities vary. Hampton Roads is below the state average on value of real estate on a per capita basis. Also, when looking at the value of real estate per square mile, it shows how the jurisdictions shift with different perspectives.

The Virginia Tourism Corporation provided HRPDC staff with tourism data. This information varies from year to year. The Department of Motor Vehicles provides staff with passenger vehicle registrations. When looking at the dispersion among localities in the past year vehicle registrations on a per capita basis, Surry County has more passenger vehicle registrations than people. This is a trend that the nation has been heading toward.

The personal property tax collection is the distribution of tax collections across localities. When looking on a per capita basis, each jurisdiction has different tax rates they use based on the specific economy of the jurisdictions, which determine the number and the amount of tax collection.

Mr. Grootendorst stated there is quality of life data in the Data Book as well. One of the things we have in there is on-time graduation rates, the regional on-time graduation rate provided to us by the Virginia Department of Education. The regional average is level with the state average. It also shows the K through 12 enrollments versus the population and which jurisdictions have a high number of kids attending.

Chairman Shepperd asked for questions.

Chairman Shepperd asked if 2010 employment is by job location.

Mr. Grootendorst stated yes. For example, in Newport News it is how many people are working in Newport News not how many Newport News residents are working.

Chairman Shepperd asked if the employment to population ratio reflects retirement.

Mr. Grootendorst stated the amount of people that are working in that jurisdiction divided by the entire population. People who are retired and not working are not considered employed according to the BEA.

Chairman Shepperd stated he thought that would be something to look at in the future and have in the briefing on the retirement portion of the population. It would give some understanding of demand on public services, such as fire and life safety and also the share of retail sales with online activities.

Mr. Grootendorst stated we do not have numbers for on-line activity. What HRPDC has is the expenditures; the total value of goods that have been purchased in the locations that has been reported to the Virginia Department of Taxation.

Chairman Shepperd stated it would be interesting as we progress and we hear more about the on-line businesses and operations, impact on our region. He did not know if the information exists, or if the state has made an effort to find out if you are working in the State of Virginia and have an on-line operation, you are going to pay taxes or collect the taxes, to gather that data to show a relationship between on-line operations and the impact of the operations on the retail sales figures for a particular area.

Mr. Grootendorst stated there have been several attempts to gather that information. There is a limited amount of people that actually declare what they purchased on-line and post that on their income tax forms, as each of us are supposed to pay for the sales tax. That information has not been made available because there are only a few people that have actually done that. That information is not available at a locality level. There is a streamline sales tax project at the national level that is trying to align states in such a way that you can easily and efficiently pull together the sales tax from each of the States for people who are paying on-line. If that was to take place, we would get a much better understanding of what exactly we are losing and how we are losing. At this point in time, the data does not exist.

Chairman Shepperd stated part of the issue of planning is the fact that we are limited, particularly the counties, on sources of revenue and sales. The counties focus is principally on real estate for revenue. The cities have more sources of receiving revenue and understanding the impact of on-line sales to the revenue sourcing for a municipality. To be able to fund services is critical, the Commission could probably do a community a service

by raising at least some awareness or desire to force that a little bit more. Maybe the Commission should draft a resolution or letter and try and get a little more information so we can understand the relationship better between the impact of on-line sales, the loss of revenue, the impact on businesses, because it could be something that could help us understand what is going on in our communities.

Chairman Shepperd referred to the slide on the value of real estate per capita and asked if it included military presence.

Mr. Grootendorst stated it is fair market value but does not include the untaxed land.

Mr. Farmer asked is the military included.

Mr. Grootendorst stated no military or the land the building on is included in the tax rules.

Chairman Shepperd stated he was wondering how that would play out if the military was considered because of their large presence in this area.

Mr. Grootendorst stated there would have to be some way to basically assess those values and then include them, but some of those values are not assessed.

Chairman Shepperd stated what he was getting to was the localities lose opportunity which the federal government is supposed to be paying. York County, for example, 40% of the land is either owned by the state or federal government. It is not a bad thing it helps them to understand what this cost, and looking at the total data helps understand from municipality to municipality the impact. He thought this information will help localities to understand how the different municipalities are dealing with some of the different issues. Looking, at where the dollars were in terms of tourism, you can see that Williamsburg is going to spend a lot more money. James City County and York County are going to spend a lot of money on tourism. Certainly, other areas are not going to spend as much and it helps to understand how the thinking.

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to approve the 2012 Hampton Roads Data Book for distribution.

Commissioner Cheatham Moved to approve the 2012 Hampton Roads Data Book for distribution; seconded by Commissioner Chandler. The Motion Carried.

(Commissioner Krasnoff arrives)

REGIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE PROJECT – PHASE III FINAL REPORT

Chairman Shepperd introduced Mr. Benjamin McFarlane to provide an overview of the Regional Climate Change Project – Phase III Final Report.

Mr. McFarlane stated he would give an update on HRPDC climate change work. HRPDC staff is currently working with government staff to address concerns and incorporate their comments into the Phase III report which has been distributed to localities through the Joint Environmental Committees.

Ms. McFarlane stated he would give some background information on this project. HRPDC staff has been working on this project since 2008. It is a multi-year focal area grant from the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program, which is part of the Department of Environmental Quality. HRPDC staff released the first report which identified the general impact of climate change on Hampton Roads in 2010. The second report, which included GIS based analysis of the region's exposure to storm surge, was released in 2011, and the focus of the third and final report this year has been on sea level rise.

The purpose of this study is to answer two questions: First, which areas in Hampton Roads are vulnerable to sea level rise and, second, how much is potentially at risk in those areas in terms of the assets, population, and other resources. In particular, HRPDC has two main goals. The largest component of the work was a GIS based analysis. HRPDC staff wanted to develop a tool that they could use and also localities could use to model the impact of sea level rise. HRPDC also wanted to demonstrate how this tool could be used to assess the region's exposure in terms of population property, infrastructure, economic activity, and natural resources. To do this HRPDC took advantage of data sets from the U.S. Census, local governments, VDOT, DEQ, and others.

Mr. McFarlane stated HRPDC staff's first step was to identify those areas that could be vulnerable to sea level rise. Staff took advantage of previous work by the United States Environmental Protection Agency that provided useful, regionally consistent, elevation data sets. Due to uncertainty in the data set, staff calculated low, middle, and high estimates for one scenario of sea level rise - one meter above current spring high tide. One meter of sea level rise is large enough to balance out the data sets. It is also considered to be a reasonable estimate of global sea level rise by both academics and government agencies.

Mr. McFarlane showed a chart on the difference between the three elevation estimates depending on where one is in the region. Once the areas were identified that were vulnerable, staff used GIS to calculate population assets and resources within those areas that could potentially be affected. The results are included in the report in two formats: 1) staff included maps for each locality in the region that showed the extent of the three estimates; 2) staff also summarized potential impacts to each sector for each elevation estimate for all the localities, and this data will be made available in both GIS and spreadsheet formats to all localities upon request once the report is finalized.

This report contains several findings and recommendations that were made over the course of the grant and through discussions with local government and staff: 1) Necessary elevation data that would make our analysis more accurate and useful. HRPDC staff is presently working with several partners including VDEM to acquire the data; 2) Sea level rise is expected to be a major issue for many Hampton Roads localities, staff recommended

the localities should begin planning for sea level rise through their comprehensive plan and others; 3) While various federal and state agencies and Commissions have recommendations, there is no official state or federal guidance to local government on how to address sea level rise at the local level and the HRPDC staff recommends that the Commission and Hampton Roads local governments work with state and federal elected officials to develop and fund guidance and assistance to affected communities; 4) The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has developed guidance for incorporating sea level rise projections into infrastructure projects and HRPDC staff recommends that localities and others in the region, including the private sector should consider using this guidance for project planning and design in areas that are potential vulnerable to sea level rise; 5) Subsidence is a significant contributor to sea level rise in Hampton Roads but is not well documented and HRPDC staff recommend that the region continue to study the causes and relative rates of these causes of subsidence in Hampton Roads; 6) The effective adaptation strategies will vary based on context, feasibility, and popular support and staff recommends the region continue studying potential strategies for adapting to sea level rise and impacts of climate change. The final report is currently being reviewed by local government staffs and the HRPDC anticipates seeking approval from the Commission at its July meeting.

Chairman Shepperd asked for questions.

Commissioner Wheeler stated it is difficult for most members of the Commission to respond to a report they have not seen yet. Many of the HRPDC staff members along with the staff in Poquoson have worked very closely, and he appreciates that, the fact that HRPDC staff is listening to what they have to say. Most recently, he stated that he and a Poquoson engineer wrote to the HRPDC staff, to continue to express Poquoson concerns and suggestions. Poquoson concerns start with the lack of data requirement. He also heard the staff report uncertainty in the data set and there was another comment later. The fact that we had to go region wide and put together data sources interjects a lack of refinement and a margin of error in a really important analysis, and that margin of error can have significant impacts on the conclusions as to the planning of substance, some of which Poquoson continues to have concerns about. The impacts are estimated to the dollar on a data set that lacks certainty in the data set with lack of necessary refinement. The way that conclusions are presented is not aligned with the margin of error in the data set. This is certainly not a new thing that the PDC staff has heard. He would encourage all members of the HRPDC staff to speak with their staff that has been participating within this process. This is really important, and the staff has worked really hard on this. They had an almost impossible task. So none of his comments should be interpreted negatively towards the staff working on this, but it is a hard and important thing, and it is worth a read.

Chairman Shepperd stated first his thanks to Mr. McFarlane for a great briefing. Mr. Shepperd stated he was not making these comments in an attempt to degrade any particular organization, federal, state or local, he was making awareness of a problem he saw as the level of frustration was mounting. The issue of how the elected representatives that deal with the constituent problems that are associated with what is called ocean have another problem that is also tied with that as it goes inland and the reason he said inland

because of what happened in York County in particular. The way it works is a body of water that is inland has to drain out towards the ocean; it can be inland just enough that as the tide comes in, the ocean for whatever reason is rising, could be the melting or the lowering of the sea, whatever the reasons are, what it does is it backs the water up inland, and there are techniques to mitigate these problems which the localities are unable to do because of federal guidelines of the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, and DCR. For example, a neighborhood that has been well established for 30 to 40 years in a place that is already starting to experience flooding they never had.

In 1997 there was twenty inches of rain in 24 hours. That was the millennium storm and then all of a sudden there was six and a half inches of rain in twelve hours, then the other day, there was four and a half inches of rain in one hour. There is no stormwater system that is going to be able to handle these problems. Between 2012 and going back to 2000, storm after storm, there was flooding, rain, and the problem of not being able to drain out and impact when the tide comes in, and all of a sudden more of the water is being retained, and you are seeing the streets are being flooded for longer periods of time. In York County, the land was about 25 feet above sea level because it was tied to a large body of water by a ten acre lake that fed out very close into a creek that was tidal that was slowing the flow.

The problem is that the municipalities cannot mitigate the problems. If the cost is so significant that it is prohibitive, and the localities are having trouble with is the application of EPA, and the Corps of Engineers rules that say certain things be done. The wetlands cannot be touched to the point where one would rather have the house flood than have the wetlands touched on houses that has been in place for a long period of time. Every one that has that have houses or communities subdivisions are starting to see more and more of this flooding, but cannot mitigate that in a reasonable manner. The application of that rule is one approach that is not making sense and it is putting property values, quality of life, and safety issues at risk.

Chairman Shepperd stated he talked to his Board of Supervisors about this particular issue. As a district, HRPDC needs to express their concern over the application of these rules. He was not saying to get rid of the EPA application because guidance has come from the federal government through the Corps of Engineers, EPA, and possibly the state have to make sense. Communities cannot have a house or a subdivision that has been there for 40 years and all of a sudden cannot fix a drainage problem because the state allows the building of more subdivisions. Taxes and stormwater drainage fees increase to wetlands at the cost of quality of life.

Chairman Shepperd stated he brought this up, and at the next meeting he can come with a more coherent approach. He has talked to the Board of Supervisors at York County and they agree to take on this subject. There are smart ways of engineering a mitigation plan that will fit without destroying wetlands and destroying the quality of life. The question is what is EPA tied to this? When Mr. McFarlane stated they needed to get more data can the HRPDC approach the EPA, the Corps of Engineers, and the state with any of the data? If you have data that is inconsistent in another place and they try to tie it to another, how can one use this information to help mitigate the problem?

Mr. McFarlane stated one step that can be taken is to take the reports that have been completed and the observances made by localities and reach out to the federal partners, including the Corps of Engineers and EPA, and start a discussion. The larger issue with a sea level raise and climate change in general is that it is going to be causing a lot of these issues that were just discussed and conflicts are going to occur between different adaptation strategies or regulations that are already in place for good reasons in many cases, but they will be more difficult to implement. This will help start that discussion and the next step is to reach out and engage in that dialogue.

Commissioner Price asked did HRPDC fund a study at ODU to look at the federal impact of the value of the impact if the area had flooding and if so, when are the results expected.

Mr. Farmer stated that study is still underway. The purpose of that study was to create sufficient information from a sample of the vulnerable communities again, the key word is sample, to raise the awareness to pursue getting the detailed, high resolution of LIDAR data because at that time it had been two years ago, and at that time we did not have that LIDAR data. The cost of it was millions of dollars. Some events have overrun the area; Dr. Koch is still trying to reach out to get that data from the state and others, but the LIDAR data looks like it is within grasp where it is needed in this community and monies available for that. That was not a definitive study. It was to raise the region's awareness in order to be more successful to get the dollars to get the LiDAR data which is about to happen.

Chairman Shepperd asked when the Commission would see the information.

Mr. Farmer asked Mr. McFarlane did he know when the LiDAR data would be available.

Mr. McFarlane stated staff would be talking about the LiDAR data at the CAO meeting. HRPDC staff had a very exciting opportunity that came about a month ago. He would be happy to have an update on that project at the next month's meeting.

Mayor Krasnoff stated he appreciated what Mr. Wheeler was saying. Chesapeake Council can verify, they have a very similar problem with Main Creek and it might be beneficial based on the comments to go to the localities and include these reports because Chesapeake has a very well established community, that at this point, is threatened because they cannot leave their homes because they are getting flooded to the point where safety concerns are overwhelming, and they have no place to go. With that kind of information, based on what has been said, might be helpful if everyone comes together and lets them see that their impact with numbers is really more of an impact on people's lives and safety.

Chairman Shepperd stated the key to this is that one municipality is not going to have an affect. The Commission has to support this as a group. Chesapeake, Norfolk, or Virginia Beach is not going to affect this bureaucracy. His concern is that somebody is interpreting the rules to the point where it is negative and not taking in the human impact.

Mayor Krasnoff stated that is what he is talking about. Sometimes people are not aware and the Commission needs to make them aware. Hampton Roads has similar communities and he thinks if the Commission makes them aware and shows them the cost to the

citizens, they might at least be sensitive to the fact that people are indeed living in these areas and that there is no fix.

Chairman Shepperd stated HRPDC staff needs to come up with some concept on how this can happen. Perhaps a committee should be formed to pull facts from the municipalities on specific projects and see how the problem can be approached.

Mr. Farmer asked if he was speaking in terms of a Board committee because there are technical people.

Chairman Shepperd stated he thought it would involve gathering data from a lot of municipalities. The HRPDC has a great staff the data needs to be collected because the Commission needs to have factual information.

Mr. Farmer stated the high resolution LiDAR can show with a high degree of certainty where vulnerability is. Vulnerability is a risk, not a certainty in terms of percentage.

Chairman Shepperd stated it is not just the risk but it is also the impact that it is having on the citizens; and the ability of the municipality to fix the problem and how are they going to fix it.

OCEANS 2012 CONFERENCE BRIEFING

Chairman Shepperd introduced Mr. Ray Toll Chairman of the Conference Organizing Committee.

Mr. Toll stated it was an honor to be here. He is a retired Navy Oceanographer, and has been in the region since 1996. He was here to talk about a conference that has never been in Hampton Roads before. The conference is scheduled for the Virginia Beach Convention Center in October. It is a first, and expects about 2,500 attendees and to the most of these people will be coming from out of town. The conference has been in the plan since 2005. He took it on as a volunteer and after he retired from the Navy and started with the Old Dominion University Marine Technologies Society which led to this conference. This conference is done semiannually, one overseas. The one this past May was in South Korea. In 2012, it is sponsored by the Marine Technology Society and the Ocean Engineering Society of IEEE. It is the largest professional society in the world.

Chairman Shepperd offered Mr. Toll to come back to continue his brief at a later date because time was running short.

Mr. Farmer stated HRPDC staff asked Mr. Toll to come the Mayors and Chairs meeting on Friday and brief the committee.

FY 2013 BUDGET – STAFF COMPENSATION

Chairman Shepperd stated this is a proposed base salary adjustment for the HRPDC staff. The Personnel and Budget Committee met and their recommendation is 1.5%. The committee looked at a comparison of municipalities and the HRPDC was within the range.

There is the VDOT and the public law planning money that about \$145,000. This will cover the proposed raise which will be somewhat less than is about \$50,000. The 1.5% adjustment will be covered. The Personnel and Budget Committee recommendation is to approve the 1.5% salary adjustment and this is going to be performance based. HRPDC staff has very extensive analysis and an appraisal.

Commissioner Bunting asked is this in addition to the VRS offset adjustment.

Chairman Shepperd stated is that correct.

Mr. Farmer stated the VRS is an offset.

Commissioner Bunting stated she just wanted to make sure everyone was clear on the total compensation.

Mayor Ward stated she wished there was more time to discuss this. She knows the City of Hampton was unable to give their employees a raise this year, and it has been very difficult for a lot of municipalities. She wanted to hear what everybody else experienced.

Commissioner M. Jones stated she agree with what Mayor Ward said, James City County employees did not receive a raise. It has been very challenging for the past several years, and she would be very hesitant to support this with all due respect, endorsing it here and not having it in my own locality. She asked to defer this for more discussion till next month if possible.

Chairman Shepperd asked is this time sensitive?

Mr. Farmer stated it could be brought back, and staff has collected for personnel and budget the best available knowledge of what everyone has done.

Chairman Shepperd stated he had a handout that the Commissioners did not receive and the important part though is that localities need to step up. There are a lot of unknowns on the handout. This is what was used for a recommendation. Does Commission want to defer this to the next meeting?

Commissioner M. Jones stated yes in order to get more information.

Commissioner Cuffee-Glenn asked what is more information?

Chairman Shepperd stated a comparison chart of all municipalities, and it shows on the chart what has happened between 2009 and 2013, the cumulative data. So that is why he supports the delay.

Commissioner Diezel stated the Commission should have a side bar on this.

Mr. Farmer stated would the Commission like for HRPDC to provide its data in the agenda packet when it is sent out for next month's meeting?

Commissioner Cuffee-Glenn stated yes.

Commissioner Cheatham asked when was the last time the HRPDC staff had a raise. Did they have one last year?

Chairman Shepperd stated yes they did.

Mr. Farmer stated that is why HRPDC went back to 2009, and for the personnel and budget committee, staff did cumulative research because when the information does change, and has historically stayed in the middle of the pack. Going from 2% to 1.5% it puts us in the middle. What staff does not know with certainty is that the HRPDC has been able to get all of the localities merit increase information into the database. Staff is going to try to do that again.

Chairman Shepperd stated the Commissioners will get more information on this and it is deferred until the next meeting.

HRPDC ACTION ITEMS: THREE MONTH TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

No questions or comments noted.

PROJECT STATUS REPORTS

No questions or comments noted.

CORRESPONDENCE OF INTEREST

No questions or comments noted.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

No questions or comments noted.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Thomas G. Shepperd
Chairman

Dwight L. Farmer
Executive Director/Secretary