

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Quarterly Commission Meeting
Minutes of January 19, 2012

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

COMMISSIONERS:

Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr. Chairman (YK)	Robert Middaugh (JC)
James O. McReynolds, Treasurer (YK)	Mary Jones (JC)
William E. Harrell (CH)	McKinley Price, (NN)
Clifton Hayes (CH)	Marcus Jones (NO)
Amar Dwarkanath (CH)	J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)
Dr. Ella Ward (CH)	Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)
Barry Cheatham (FR)*	Tyrone W. Franklin (SY)
Brenda Garton (GL)*	Harry E. Diezel (VB)
Ashley Chriscoe (GL)	Robert M. Dyer (VB)
Mary Bunting (HA)	Barbara M. Henley (VB)
Molly Joseph Ward (HA)	Jackson C. Tuttle II (WM)
W. Douglas Caskey (IW)	Clyde Haulman (WM)
Delores Darden (IW)	

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

Dwight L. Farmer

*Late arrival or early departure.

ABSENT:

Dr. Alan P. Krasnoff (CH), June Fleming (FR), Ross A. Kearney (HA), Neil A. Morgan (NN), Sharon Scott (NN), Paul D. Fraim (NO), Anthony Burfoot (NO), Thomas Smigiel (NO), Theresa Whibley, MD (NO), W. Eugene Hunt (PQ), Kenneth L. Chandler, (PO) Kenneth Wright (PO), Michael W. Johnson (SH), Linda T. Johnson (SU), John Seward (SY) Louis R. Jones (VB), James Spore (VB), John E. Uhrin (VB), John Moss (VB).

OTHERS RECORDED ATTENDING:

John Gergely (Citizen); Ron Williams, Jeff Raliski, Dan Montaque (NO); Eric Nielsen (SU); Brian DeProfio (HA); Michael King, Brian Lewis (NN); Dave Hansen, William J. Johnston (VB) Christy Everett, Chris Moore - Chesapeake Bay Foundation; Ellis W. James - Sierra Club Observer; Patrick Ctute, Frank Sgromozo, Jim Oliver - HRCCE, Cathy Aiello - Aiello Enterprises; Staff: John Carlock, Camelia Ravanbakht, Richard Case, Shernita Bethea, Curtis Brown, James Clary, Jennifer Coleman, Katie Cullipher, Nancy Collins, Kathlene Grauberger, Greg Grootendorst, Lisa Hardy, Julia Hillegass, Frances Hughey, James Hummer, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Mike Kimbrel, Mike Long, Jai McBride, Kelli Peterson, John Sadler, Jennifer Tribo, Joe Turner and Chris Vaigneur

Chairman Shepperd welcomed Ashley Chrisco, Gloucester; Delores Darden, Isle of Wight and Mary Jones, James City County as new representatives on the Commission.

Mr. Farmer stated he would like to introduce HRPDC's new emergency management staff member Curtis Brown.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Christy Everett

Good morning, Christy Everett, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Hampton Roads office. I wanted to speak to the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission Regional Planning framework scenario and strategy on the Total Maximum Daily Load document that was distributed yesterday and will discuss today on the agenda. Hampton Roads Planning District staff should be commended for their work in pulling together such a comprehensive document. It is obvious that staff invested significant resources in this effort. Section five of the document lists initiatives for policies support, and its impressive implementation of these initiatives will provide additional tools and water quality benefits throughout our region and watershed. CBF hopes that the municipalities and elected officials of the region will take an active role in advocating for these initiatives at the state level and this General Assembly, as well as future General Assembly sessions. CBF pledges assistance to help with many of these initiatives. For example, wastewater treatment funding, explicit mentioned in there. We have been actively engaged for the past several months and are engaged today with a coalition of eleven statewide entities, including Virginia Association of Counties, Virginia Municipal League, Hampton Roads Sanitation District, Virginia Manufacturers Association and two bills, Senate Bill 494 and House Bill 1180, to increase funding for wastewater treatment plants, particularly using Virginia Public Bonded Authority. We are also working to support budget amendments for agricultural best management practical cost share and technical assistance. While on paper the estimated nutrient sediment reductions under this regional scenario does meet and in some cases exceed pollution reduction goals needed by 2025, without municipalities or county specific data, there is not any reasonable assurance really available to the public regarding how and where the proposed plans for pollution reduction would effectively be implemented. We do believe this is one thing missing and one thing needed to round out the process. We also look to our Hampton Roads elected officials to encourage their staff to share their specific commitments and strategies with their constituents. CBF remains concerned that some of the in stream technologies proposed, such as submerged aquatic vegetation and oyster restoration, further investigation of these technologies and their propriety for in stream treatment for nutrient reduction is warranted, and we will remain open-minded and reserve judgment until this further investigation is concluded. Thank you very much.

Ellis W. James

Thank you, Chairman Shepperd and members of the commission. My name is Ellis James. I reside in Norfolk and have done so for a couple of years. I, first of all, would like to endorse and echo the comments that you have just heard. She does an excellent job and I would commend the information to you strongly. I had the privilege of being able to travel on Tuesday with a bus load of citizens from this area, both on the Southside as well as the Peninsula, with the Virginia Interfaith Center Group. We went specifically to address health

issues, ID issues, immigration, and my favorite subject, uranium mining of the moratorium. Now, at the last meeting, you heard from me on that issue. I would like to point out something to you just so that you can keep pace with what is happening. We had an opportunity to meet with about a dozen senators in Richmond and a number of delegates, and one of the meetings that we had was I thought very significant. We packed conference room 4e at the State House Building, and we were able to have a very vigorous and meaningful exchange with our delegates and our senators at that meeting. They strongly committed to not voting to lift the moratorium, and I am very hopeful that you in turn will now make sure that there is no back door effort to introduce legislation. Senator Phil Puckett assured me that if there were such an attempt at the last moment, and tomorrow of course is the cutoff date, that he would oppose that. I was very happy to see him willing to take that position, and I think it is extremely important and instructive for Hampton Roads. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

APPROVAL/MODIFICATION OF AGENDA

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

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Commissioner Harrell Moved to approve the agenda; Commissioner Dyer seconded. The Motion Carried.

RESOLUTIONS OF APPRECIATION

Chairman Shepperd stated there were two people receiving Resolutions of Appreciation today, Mr. Gregory Woodard who served on the Commission for a number of years was not present, and Mr. Robert Jacobs who has been an employee of the Hampton Roads Planning District for 44 Years.

Chairman Shepperd presented Mr. Jacobs with a Resolution of Appreciation for his many years of service and wished him well in his retirement.

Mr. Farmer stated Mr. Jacobs preceded him, John Carlock and Art Collins.

The Commission and staff recognized with applause.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Shepperd stated he would like to make one modification to the consent agenda, remove Item #11, Litter Control Funding Letter – HR Clean.

Chairman Shepperd stated this is a small item, but it is something he thought the Commission should be aware of and he knows his constituents will comment on. HRPDC staff is recommending the Commission send a letter of support to the Hampton Roads Members of the General Assembly concerning the Litter Control and Recycling Advisory Board and Litter Control Recycling Fund. If the letter is approved by the Commissioners, it

will be sent to the state asking them to ensure funding for this program. Billions of dollars in our state offers the things we are struggling with, transportation and different issues, one of the things the state does is provides \$2 million that is spread across the state to help control the litter that you see along the roadsides. This program's \$2 million is spread across for volunteers and contributions to the program by the municipalities which equals \$18 million and is a great leverage.

Chairman Shepperd stated he wanted to make sure the Commissioners were aware of this program, it is small but has a major impact on the quality of life in our community because it is a reflection of what we feel about our community. Those of you that have driven down the roads, and see the explosion of paper or down the expressways or anywhere in your community, the cans and the bottles that end up in Chesapeake Bay, which we are getting ready to spend billions of dollars to fix. He stated this is something he thought was very important and wanted to bring to the Commission's attention.

The Consent Agenda contained the following items:

Minutes of December 15, 2011 Meeting

Treasurer's Report

Regional Reviews

A. PNRS Items Review

Chesapeake Media Service – Bay Journal – Chesapeake Media Service, Inc.

B. Environmental Impact Assessment/Statement Review

Demolition of the Aircraft Landing Dynamics Facility Complex, Langley Research Center, National Aeronautics & Space Administration

Community Solar Power Program and Certification of Proposed Distributed Solar Generation, State Corporation Commission

Air Field Clear Zone Management Plan at Naval Air Station Oceana, DOD/Department of the Navy

Multidisciplinary Biomedical Research Center, Hampton University, DHHS/National Institutes of Health

Emergency Management – Jail Assessment Contract

Urban Areas Security Initiatives (UASI) Funding

Amendment – Legal Consultant – Legislative Representation

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to move Item #11 from the consent agenda and send the letters to the Hampton Roads Members of the General Assembly.

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

Commissioner Harrell Moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the modification; seconded by Commissioner McReynolds. The Motion Carried

(Commissioner Cheatham arrives)

CHESAPEAKE BAY TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL)

Chairman Shepperd introduced Whitney Katchmark to present the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load Phase II Watershed Implementation Plan Update.

Ms. Katchmark stated at the December 15, 2011 Executive Committee meeting there were three action items taken. Item #2 authorized HRPDC staff to select BMPs to fill the gap between local scenarios and the Phase I WIP level of treatment. BMP scenarios for the James and York basins will be included in the Regional report. HRPDC staff was not able to create a regional scenario for both the James and the York basins. HRPDC staff combined both scenarios into one, but felt that the information is adequate to satisfy the state's request.

HRPDC staff wants to remind the Commission of item #3, the HRPDC is not submitting the report to the state. Localities will each submit an individual plan to DCR that focuses on narrative strategies and include the Regional Report as an appendix.

Ms. Katchmark stated she would go over the highlights of the report. She stated that DCR asked localities to provide a scenario with the nutrient and sediment reductions equal to the Phase I levels of effort. Ms. Katchmark presented a slide that showed what the Phase I level of effort is; the amount of pounds of nutrients and sediment removed if localities apply the regional scenario, which is implementing all of the BMPs that localities proposed; it also shows whether or not localities met that target. Localities exceeded the target for nitrogen and sediment; they reach 93% of the target for phosphorus. Localities can exceed the phosphorus target if DCR would acknowledge two other actions. The first one is localities' efforts to minimize sanitary sewer overflows and, secondly, localities do a lot of street sweeping.

The VAST tool, which was the accounting tool, did not give localities credit for the reductions of nitrogen and phosphorus associated with street sweeping, and HRPDC feels the Bay Program has already acknowledged that as a legitimate credit. If DCR includes those, that will reduce phosphorus by another 27,000 pounds, which far exceeds the 6,000 pound gap. The localities identified a lot of other types of BMPs that cannot be counted. This is a small selection of those BMPs. If localities can get approval for even a fraction of those BMPs, it will also give localities more flexibility on how they want to meet the targets.

Ms. Katchmark cautioned the localities there are a couple of concerns with the regional scenario. As part of the effort, the localities reviewed their local land use data and existing BMPs they constructed. Once that was complete, HRPDC staff compared the local data to the VAST data, which is the data that is in the bay model; they do not match. There were a lot of discrepancies and inconsistencies. The only way to quantify how much those data corrections would influence nutrient reductions, which is really the target, is to recalibrate the bay program's watershed model.

Ms. Katchmark stated EPA plans to do a recalibration in 2017. HRPDC staff is recommending it as soon as possible. If they recalibrate the model, the state will need to divide the reductions by sector and it will change the localities' targets. If the localities targets are likely to change, then the state should hold off on renewing the MS-4 permits until recalibration is complete. Most likely the MS-4 permits are going to be tied to locality targets. Localities would want to know what they need to do before they start working on new permits.

Ms. Katchmark stated another element DCR requested was to find out what resources localities needed in order to implement all of these nutrient reductions. In the HRPDC report there are some recommendations. Ms. Katchmark stated she would talk about the top four priorities. She wanted to point out that a large portion of the state's plan, which is the Phase I WIP, relies on voluntary actions. HRPDC is concerned that if the voluntary programs are not effective, then more would be asked of the urban stormwater sector and that is also a very costly way to do nutrient reductions. So the priorities are really focused on supporting those other voluntary programs: 1) HRPDC would like to see the budget and the staff increased for the agricultural cost share programs; 2) a new cost share program for all the septic upgrades that are included in Virginia's plan needs to be created because there is no way to get that done; 3) there are a lot of parts of the state in which there are urban areas that are not regulated; 4) it is supporting the state bond proposal to provide a cost share for the upgrades to the wastewater treatment plants.

Ms. Katchmark stated she wanted to recap the cost estimates HRPDC has done in the past and how things may have changed. In October of 2010, HRPDC gave localities a cost estimate of \$9.5 billion that was for the stormwater sector, based on requirements of the EPA backstops. That was the worst case scenario. The backstops asked urban stormwater to do a lot more of the reductions compared to the other sectors. In January 2011, HRPDC gave localities another cost estimate of \$2.5 billion for the stormwater sector which was based on Virginia's Final Phase I WIP which required less of urban stormwater than the backstop.

The cost to implement the regional scenario and the Phase II WIP, which is what localities have today, will change, it will not be the \$2.5 billion. There are a few reasons: 1) HRPDC can now quantify the amount of land that federal agencies and state agencies own in the Hampton Roads region and we can exclude the cost associated with doing the nutrient reductions on those lands; 2) in this past year, localities have gotten a much better handle on the existing BMPs that have already been built and localities can really quantify how much progress has already been made, so those costs can be eliminated; and 3) as part of

this Phase II WIP process, localities identified more cost effective BMPs than the prescriptive ones that were in the Phase I WIP from last year. When localities put all those factors together, HRPDC expects the costs will change. The cost may go down and localities should not assume that the regional scenario will cost \$2.5 billion.

Ms. Katchmark stated the next step is pretty straight forward. The state is going to submit the final Phase II WIP to EPA by March 30. HRPDC is going to keep track of legislation in the General Assembly on expanding the nutrient credit trading program because it will influence how we will get the TMDL requirements done. HRPDC will be watching the MS-4 permit renewal process. The state has indicated it is going to start for quite some time. HRPDC is hoping they will back off for a while and we are going to work on the cost estimate.

Ms. Katchmark stated the recommended action is to approve the report for distribution to local governments. Each locality will be responsible for their submittal to DCR by the February 1st deadline.

Chairman Shepperd asked for questions.

Chairman Shepperd asked who are the localities cost sharing with.

Ms. Katchmark indicated the agricultural cost shares are trying to bring together federal and state funds, and the farmer or the land owner or property owner, would share the cost of doing BMPs. It is to encourage farmers to put nutrient management strategies on their own property. That's the agricultural piece. The cost share for septic would be to ask homeowners to pay part of the cost to get better septic systems, especially if they are not functioning properly, and have the state provide a portion of that.

Chairman Shepperd stated that is one of the problems he has with these kinds of programs because we are asking who wants to spend thousands of dollars out of the goodness of their heart that is when it becomes a problem. One of the things you have an assumption in the report, or you raised it as a problem, is access to BMPs, especially private BMPs. The assumption and strategy is that localities would get that either through voluntary access for municipalities to act upon the BMPs as necessary or, localities would have to buy them.

Ms. Katchmark stated there are a couple of different options localities could have. BMPs on private property that were voluntarily installed and maintained and the localities could ask those property owners or watershed groups to report that those BMPs exist and are being maintained; and another one is for the localities to have easements or condemn land to own the BMPs. That is the most expensive option, and HRPDC is not advocating it.

Chairman Shepperd stated he guarantees the homeowners association would love that. It is a huge bill. When talking about \$2.5 billion, which way that is going to go when localities have to start buying BMPs that are currently owned by homeowners associations. No telling which way that bill is going to go.

Ms. Katchmark stated different localities are trying options and one option is to have maintenance agreements, with homeowners associations, and some localities are already doing that. That was part of the original assumption when the development was created, but there are a lot of details and a lot of specific circumstances that make that decision easier or harder.

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to approve the report for distribution to local governments.

Commissioner Franklin Moved to approve the report for distribution to local governments; seconded by Commissioner Wheeler. The Motion Carried.

(Commissioner Garton arrives)

2012 ECONOMIC FORECAST

Chairman Shepperd introduced Mr. Greg Grootendorst to present the 2012 Economic Forecast.

Mr. Grootendorst stated the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission staff has been delivering economic forecasting for over 20 years. He realizes the word forecast and especially the term "economic forecast" is hardly a term that inspires any confidence and accuracy. There are too many unknown factors that affect the economy for anyone to make accurate predictions; from earthquakes, labor disputes, bank policies, international conflicts and unknown factors that are limitless. However, the application of economic theory is important because it enables us to avoid the assumption that the future will be just like the past. Mr. Grootendorst stated he would like to talk about where the economy is right now and then speak on what may lay ahead.

Mr. Grootendorst stated looking back, the great recession has taken its toll. Peak employment was in December of 2007. Currently, employment levels are still 4.5% below that peak. Since the recession began, labor force participation has dropped from 66.2% to 64%; unemployment rate has increased from 4.9% to 8.5%; household debt has declined by 5.3%; 6.3 million jobs have been shed; and GDP has declined by 5.1%.

Mr. Grootendorst showed some graphics that explain how the most recent recession has compared to other post World War II recessions in the United States. However, for further perspective, another chart compared our great recession, with other countries that experienced a recession that has been coupled with the financial crisis.

Much of the discussion in the U.S. has been focused on jobs and the abysmal unemployment rate. The most common description of the unemployment rate often reported by the press and referred to as U3 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has six different measures of unemployment, and looking at their U6 unemployment, which is the broadest measure of unemployment, emphasizes the magnitude of the employment crisis, showing that approximately 16% of the labor force is either unemployed or under

employed. In evaluating the employment crisis several trends have emerged including the disparate rates included in age and race cohorts. It is evident that education is now a key component in finding new jobs.

Mr. Grootendorst showed a chart that compares industry employment in Hampton Roads with that of the U.S. over the past four years. Hampton Roads tended to experience the same direction of growth and loss in employment as the nation, but the extent of those employment gains and losses very substantially. Growth in federal employment was 2.5% in the U.S. and it was 12% in Hampton Roads. Loss of information jobs was 12% in the U.S. versus 24% in Hampton Roads.

Hampton Roads' regional experience of this recession has differed in other ways, most importantly with respect to jobs. The nation began a very slow recovery trend after twenty-four months of employment declines. However, regional employment has been in decline for 4.5 years without a sustained trend toward recovery. Major sectors in Hampton Roads where they lost employment: are in local government, finance, insurance, information, manufacturing, construction, and retail. Combined these six categories account for almost 43,000 lost jobs.

Mr. Grootendorst stated there has been some job growth over the past two years. Hampton Roads sees that in federal government, administrative support, education, transportation, but these job gains have not been enough to counter the job loss effects. For some perspective, to make up for the jobs that have been lost, it would take three years to regain all lost employment if Hampton Roads managed to grow at a sustained growth rate of our best growth rate ever, and that was 2.5%. If Hampton Roads could grow at its best annual growth rate, it would take over two and a half years to regain all those jobs. Conversely, if Hampton Roads managed an average growth at a rate less than one percent, it would take ten years to reclaim the jobs that were lost in this past recession.

One of the difficulties this region is experiencing is related to housing. Hampton Roads experienced a much larger housing boom than the nation. From 2000 to 2003, Hampton Roads had the same rate of growth as the nation before there was a change and the region took off. Therefore, it will take longer for the regional market to correct itself. Construction is typically an industry that helps pull an economy out of recession. Given the current imbalance in the supply and demand for housing in the region, it will likely take several years before Hampton Roads sees strength in the construction market that they are accustomed to.

Mr. Grootendorst stated in looking to the year ahead, there is some positive news. He showed a chart that represents the consensus forecast of growth over the next two years and some of the positive news was the forecasters are looking at: industrial production which is trending upward, manufacturing is up, homebuilder sentiment has improved, mortgage applications have increased, average weekly hours are up, the interest rate spread has come down and initial unemployment claims have come down. Mr. Grootendorst stated just this morning there was a release that indicated initial

unemployment claims dropped 50,000 which is fantastic news because that is a precursor to what Hampton Roads will see in unemployment.

The consensus forecast for the nation over the next two years is for continued growth. To put this growth in perspective, it is unlikely Hampton Roads will see the growth rates that follow recessions; and typically after recessions, there is a spike in growth where growth ramps up. Consensus forecast is that Hampton Roads will not exceed the long-term average growth rate of 3.4%. There are some concerns that lie ahead. The Eurozone crisis, developing countries are overheating and have tightened their monetary policies to curb inflation. And there are cuts in federal expenditures that are looming. Also, there is rising fuel prices tied to tension building.

There is strong correlation between national defense outlays and Hampton Roads per capita income. Looking to the year ahead, Hampton Roads is somewhat secure that it will see continued growth in federal expenditures because the budget goes through the end of September and that federal budget sees continued growth.

Chairman Shepperd asked for questions.

Commissioner Diezel asked what is the relationship between manufacturing and natural resources?

Mr. Grootendort stated one of the things that we see in manufacturing is what we expect to see with most recessions is where you see the cutback in consumption that is directly tied to manufacturing. When looking at natural resources and construction, that is how the Bureau of Labor Statistics combines the industries. However, the main category there is actually construction. It is not the natural resources component that's losing jobs. It is the construction components. So manufacturing and construction are kind of tied together in that same way where you see a decrease in consumption. Consumption tied to both the purchase of goods, which is tied to manufacturing and the purchase of homes and buildings, which is tied to construction.

Commissioner Diezel stated he was not suggesting that HRPDC become job creators, but where we have a relationship, we should probably be cheerleaders on the sideline for those industries that are capable of employing folks. In talking to most of the people in the construction industry, the money that is available to them is in rental. It is not the single family. So you may see a boom in that, particularly the impact on higher density units. He has never heard the Commissioners talk about a collective strategy at this meeting in terms of being job supporters or job cheerleaders.

Chairman Shepperd stated we had a benchmark study given to us last time and then this time we got a regional forecast, and it is interesting information in that we get a sense of our region, but to him as a representative of my municipality, he is always hungry for how am I doing, how is my government, how is my piece of the earth doing? He talked with Mr. Farmer about this and Mr. Shepperd indicated we do not have the staff to get into a very comprehensive review, but there might be one or two things that we can use that will help

each of us in our municipalities, cities, or counties to see how we are doing, what is our forecast. This is a subject that will carry over into the next item of the schedule when HRPDC has its retreat, and this is something can be addressed, but he thought that might be of interest to the Commissioners to know when they talk to constituents, or sit in front of the supervisors and go from here to that meeting, one can say, this is what is going on. You get a sense of what you might want to do. I thought something like that might be helpful.

Chairman Shepperd asked for a motion to approve the 2012 Economic Forecast.

Commissioner Dyer Moved to approve the release of the 2012 Economic Forecast; seconded by Commissioner Franklin. The Motion Carried

HRPDC ACTION ITEMS: THREE MONTH TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Chairman Shepperd stated February 16th will be the HRPDC Retreat. Mr. Farmer suggested the localities could invite two staff members. The TPO meeting has been canceled and the meeting time is scheduled for 11:30 AM and lunch will be served.

Mr. Farmer stated having the Retreat during the lunchtime is more efficient and effective use of everyone's time. He hopes to be finished by 1:30 PM. Mr. Farmer stated this will be localities' time to talk about where they want this organization and staff putting its resources. If localities have any suggestions, they can get their information to the HRPDC in time to be put on the retreat agenda; otherwise staff is going to lay some things out as they see it, and what they think is important and then wait for the feedback from Commissioners and then HRPDC staff will develop the work program.

Chairman Shepperd stated on the March and April tentative schedules there is the list of subjects that are going to be addressed during that time. He wanted to point out the April meeting is a full Commission meeting and in April the Commission will have the salary discussion with the full Commission, and when the Commission asks for approval of the budget there are no surprises.

Mr. Farmer stated HRPDC will have the anticipated budget information at the February retreat. During the Retreat there will be talk about everything from products, services, budgets, cuts in budgets, and potential salary adjustments for your consideration. In April, during the full Commission meeting, HRPDC will bring the budget back for formal approval. Please note also prior to each budget discussion the Personnel and Budget Committee meets prior to the meeting and HRPDC staff give them the information ahead of time.

Commissioner Franklin asked what time will the meeting begin.

Mr. Farmer stated the meeting will begin at 11:30 and during that hour it will be a buffet lunch and a working lunch so Commissioners and staff can work while they are eating and having discussions.

PROJECT STATUS REPORTS

No questions or comments were noted.

CORRESPONDENCE OF INTEREST

Chairman Shepperd stated he wanted to point out there are letters in this section from Senators and the House of Delegates. He strongly recommend not to gloss over them, to go in and take a look at some of the letters to see if you are familiar with what we are saying. He wanted the Commissioners to note the kinds of letters in this section, to get a sense of where we are going.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

No questions or comments were noted.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

No questions or comments were noted.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chairman

Dwight L. Farmer
Executive Director/Secretary