1. Call to Order

2. Approval/Modification of Agenda

3. Submitted Public Comments

   There were no submitted public comments since the last HRPDC meeting. Any new written public comments received after the preparation of this agenda will be distributed as a handout at the meeting.

4. Public Comment Period

   Members of the public are invited to address the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission. Each speaker is limited to three minutes.

5. Executive Director’s Report (Attachment 5)

6. Consent Agenda (Attachment 6)

   a. Meeting Minutes – October 17, 2019 Commission Meeting

   b. Transcribed Public Comments – October 17, 2019 Commission Meeting

   c. Treasurer’s Report – September 2019

   d. Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Chesapeake Bay Watershed PDC Locality Implementation Program Contract

      In continuance of the Chesapeake Bay Phase III Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) efforts, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is offering PDCs a portion of the funding that the Chesapeake Bay Program provides the Commonwealth. The intent of this project initiative is for the HRPDC (and other participating PDCs) to continue efforts made during the Phase
III WIP process in the non-regulated urban sector. Funding in the amount of $52,000 would be used by the HRPDC to complete the following tasks:

- Conduct an evaluation, resource assessment, and gap analysis of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (CBPA) as it relates to climate change and sea level rise
- Identify opportunities to improve CBPA and align the program with other regional priorities
- Continue to liaison with Bay PDCs and DEQ to share best practices and implementation strategies in support of the Phase III WIP

Staff recommends authorizing the Executive Director to execute the contract between HRPDC and DEQ in the amount of $52,000, with a required match of $13,000 that would be met with the existing HRPDC Stormwater fund, with pre-award cost allowance beginning October 1, 2019 to December 31, 2020 contingent upon staff review and agreement with the final scope of services.

Action Requested: The HRPDC should take action to approve the November 21, 2019 Consent Agenda.

7. FY2019 Audited Financial Statements – presented by Mike Garber, PBMares (Attachment 7) (Enclosure 7 may be accessed online)

PBMares, LLP has completed its annual review of the FY2019 financial statements for the HRPDC/HRTPO and the independent Auditors’ Report states that the statements present fairly, in all material respects, the basic financial statements of the HRPDC/HRTPO. There were no material weaknesses, or deficiencies, identified in any of the internal controls or processes of the financial activity, and all information was free of any material misstatements. The audited financial statements, along with supplemental management letters, and the auditor’s opinion report based on census data reported to the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) have been posted on both websites.

Additional information that may be of value to the Commission is the breakdown of the Fund Balance as shown in the attachment to this agenda note.

A representative from PBMares will brief the Commission on the audit. Both the PBMares representative and Ms. Sheila Wilson, HRPDC/HRTPO Chief Financial Officer, will be available to address any questions the Commission may have.

Action Requested: The HRPDC should take action to accept the FY2019 Audited Financial Statements.
8. **Regional GIS – presented by Ms. Sara Kidd, HRPDC Senior Regional Planner**

   The HRPDC, in partnership with the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD), has been developing an open GIS data portal called HRGEO (Hampton Roads Geospatial Exchange Online). HRGEO currently houses dozens of integrated regional GIS layers incorporating information related to planning, the environment, recreation, transportation, water resources, and coastal resiliency topics. Additionally, staff worked with localities to develop a process for building a regional parcels layer which is hosted at HRGEO.

   Ms. Sara Kidd, HRPDC Senior Regional Planner, will brief the Commission on the progress of HRGEO. This item is presented for information and discussion by Commission members.

9. **Help 2 Others (H2O) Program Update – presented by Ms. Katie Cullipher, HRPDC Principal Environmental Education Planner (Attachment 9)**

   The Hampton Roads Help to Others (H2O) program is celebrating two decades of assisting local families in need. H2O was founded in 1999 by the region’s public utilities departments and the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) and received 501(c)3 nonprofit status in 2011. The purpose of the program is to support area residents who are in a financial crisis and experiencing difficulties in paying their water and/or wastewater utility bills. HRPDC staff will provide an overview of the assistance program, the new program website (shareh2o.org), and the “$20 for 20” anniversary campaign in celebration of 20 years of service.

   Ms. Katie Cullipher, HRPDC Principal Environmental Education Planner, will brief the Commission on the program. This item is presented for information and discussion by Commission members.

10. **Regional Broadband Initiative and Regional Industrial Facilities Authority Update – presented by Mr. Robert Crum, HRPDC Executive Director**

    The Commission will be provided an update on these two initiatives. This item is presented for information and discussion by Commission members.

11. **Three Month Tentative Schedule**

    **December 2019**
    No meeting per Regional Meeting Schedule

    **January 2019**
    Regional Branding Initiative
    Hampton Roads 2020 Economic Forecast
    Roanoke River Basin MOA
    Legislative Update
February 2019
Hampton Roads Economic Benchmarking Study
Regional Economic Development Site Readiness

12. Advisory Committee Summaries (Attachment 12)

Summaries of HRPDC Advisory Committee meetings that were held since the last HRPDC meeting are attached for review.

13. For Your Information (Attachment 13)

- Statement of the Honorable Lucian Niemeyer, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Energy, Installations and Environment), before the Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities and Subcommittee on Readiness of the House Committee on Armed Services

  Note highlighted portions of the statement that the Commission may find of interest

- City of Norfolk Letter and Resolution announcing the appointment of Dr. Larry “Chip” Filer, Norfolk City Manager, as a voting member of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

- City of Chesapeake Letter and Certificate announcing the appointment of Mr. Christopher M. Price, Chesapeake City Manager, as a voting member of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

- The HRPDC/HRTPO Legislative Brochure summarizing the Regional Legislative Priorities that were adopted by the HRPDC and HRTPO Boards is provided as a handout

- Agenda Item from November 21, 2019 HRTPO Board meeting requesting endorsement of Waverly Woods’ appointment as a voting member of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC)

  Ms. Waverly Woods, City of Virginia Beach, has been recommended for CAC membership.

  Ms. Woods joins the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) representing the City of Virginia Beach. A Community Relations Practitioner, Ms. Woods has a background in Human Relations and consulting. She has volunteered with both large and small organizations in Hampton Roads, including the East Coast Equestrian Center and Judeo-Christian Outreach Center (JCOC).

14. Old/New Business

15. Adjournment
TO:     HRPDC/HRTPO Boards

BY:    Robert Crum, Executive Director

RE:    Executive Director’s Report – November 2019

The Executive Director attended the October 2 meeting of the Virginia Beach Division of the Hampton Roads Chamber to discuss the opportunities the emerging offshore wind industry offers for the Hampton Roads region.

The HRPDC staff participated in the October 2 and November 7 meetings of the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance (HREDA) Regional Economic Development Team meetings.

The HRPDC staff is coordinating efforts with Reinvent Hampton Roads, HREDA and Old Dominion University to prepare a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the Hampton Roads region. This document will be a synopsis of existing studies that have been completed by various economic development stakeholders in Hampton Roads. The completion of a CEDS, and subsequent approval by the Economic Development Administration (EDA), is a requirement for a community to be eligible to compete for federal funding through EDA.

On October 8, the Executive Director participated in a meeting to discuss lessons learned from the Raleigh/Durham Inter-Regional Visit.

On October 16, the Executive Director attended a meeting of the Hampton Roads Caucus to discuss regional legislative issues for the HRPDC and HRTPO.

On October 17, the Executive Director provided a presentation to the Hampton Roads Chamber Board on the work of the HRPDC and HRTPO.

On October 23, the Executive Director provided a presentation to the Hampton City Council on the region’s transportation priority projects and the proposed regional express lanes network.

The HRTPO staff participated in the US Route 460/58/13 Stakeholder Meeting on October 24.

On October 24, the Executive Director provided a presentation on the work of the HRPDC and HRTPO at the Gather co-working space in Downtown Norfolk.
The Executive Director participated in the monthly Regional Roundtable meeting on October 25 at the Virginia Shipbuilders Association.

The Executive Director continues to work with the leadership of Hampton Roads Transit (HRT) and the City Managers to discuss the HRT Transformational Transit Project.

The Executive Director and HRPDC Deputy Executive Director attended the Newport News State of the City Address on October 29.

The HRTPO staff participated in the Regional Connectors Study Steering Committee meeting on November 5.

The Executive Director and HRPDC Deputy Executive Director attended the November 5 meeting of the Eastern Virginia Regional Industrial Facility Authority (EVRIFA) in Newport News.

The HRPDC staff is exploring opportunities through the GO Virginia program to advance the next phase of the regional economic development sites inventory.

The Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Committee met on November 6 at the Norfolk Botanical Garden, and discussed the following agenda items:

- Something in the Water Festival – Regional Impact
- Opportunities for Regional Collaboration
- Coastal Resiliency Advocacy
- Recap of October HRPDC Meeting

The Executive Director continues to serve on the project task force for Envision 2020. The goal of this effort is to develop a cohesive brand for the Hampton Roads region.

On November 9, the Executive Director and staff provided a briefing to Senator Warner's Washington, DC transportation representative on transportation planning efforts and needs in the Hampton Roads region.

The Executive Director continues to provide staff support for the Regional Broadband Initiative. An update on this effort will be provided at the November HRPDC meeting.

On November 12, the Executive Director provided a presentation on the region’s transportation planning efforts to Federal Installation Leaders in Hampton Roads. This presentation was hosted at Old Point Bank in Hampton.

The HRPDC staff hosted three public meetings on the Chesapeake/Portsmouth Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) on November 13 and 14.
The Executive Director has been invited to participate in a Transportation Forum at WHRO on the evening of November 14.

The HRPDC/HRTPO Management Team continues to advance work on the following initiatives:

- Completion of the Organization’s Financial Audit
- Management of the Agency’s Server Replacement Project
- Development of a strategic plan for building upgrades and improvements
- Research on establishment of a trust fund to address the organization’s long-term pension liabilities
- IT Management
- Recruitment for vacant positions
- Public Participation Plan
- Provision of human resource management services to HRTAC and HRMFFA
- Financial services support for HRTAC
- Personnel management
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Summary Minutes of October 17, 2019

The October 17, 2019 Meeting of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission was called to order by the Chair at 12:30 p.m. in the Regional Board Room, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

Commissioners in Attendance
Michael Hipple, Chair (JC)  Courtney Doyle (NO)
Andria McClellan, Vice-Chair (NO)  Randy Wheeler (PQ)
Randy Keaton, Treasurer (IW)  John Rowe (PQ)
James Baker (CH)  Sanford Wanner (SM)*
Robert Geis (CH)  Barry Porter (SH)*
Debbie Ritter (CH)  Leroy Bennett (SU)
Ella Ward (CH)  Patrick Roberts (SU)*
Amanda Jarratt (FR)*  Jonathan Lynn (SY)*
Barry Cheatham (FR)  John Seward (SY)*
Brent Fedors (GL)  Robert Dyer (VB)
Donnie Tuck (HA)  Thomas Leahy (VB)
Mary Bunting (HA)  Barbara Henley (VB)
James Gray (HA)  Louis Jones (VB)
McKinley Price (NN)*  Andrew Trivette (WM)
Cynthia Rohlf (NN)*  Neil Morgan (YK)*
David Jenkins (NN)  Sheila Noll (YK)
Kenneth Alexander (NO)  
Chip Filer (NO)

Commissioners Absent:
Stephen Best (CH)  T. Carter Williams (SM)
Phillip Bazzani (GL)  Michael Johnson (SH)
William McCarty (IW)  Guy Tower (VB)
Scott Stevens (JC)  Rosemary Wilson (VB)
Mamie Johnson (NO)  Sabrina Wooten (VB)
W. Eugene Hunt (PQ)  Paul Freiling (WM)
Lydia Pettis-Patton (PO)

Executive Director:
Robert A. Crum, Jr., Secretary

Other Participants:
Carlton Hardy (CTAC)
Jason Purse (JC)
Bob Baldwin (PO)

*Late arrival or early departure.
Others Recorded Attending:

Terry Danaher (CAC); Robert Copeland (CH); Tanner Council and Peggy Sanner (Chesapeake Bay Foundation); John Luker (Chesapeake Bay Sierra Club); Paul Battaglia and Chris Stone (Clark Nexsen); Steve Brinker (Crenshaw, Ware & Martin); Max Bartholomew (Dominion Energy); Ethel Mitchell (Georgetown Civic League); Brian DeProfio (HA); Doug Smith (HREDA); Jim O’Brien and Buzz Halleen (Newport News Shipbuilding); Angela Hopkins, Bridjette Parker, Bryan Stilley, and Jerri Wilson (NN); Jessica Dennis and Thelma Drake (NO); Gina Harris and Sherri Neil (PO); Steve Hansen (Virginia Poor People’s Campaign); Dustin Rinehart and Cathie Vick (Port of Virginia); Brenda Roberts (Principle Advantage); Jonathan Gendzier and Emily Francis (Southern Environmental Law Center); Overton Nichols (Sunrise Hill Civic League); Alice Alston (Unit Owner’s Association of Holly Glen); Caleb Smith (US Representative Elaine Luria’s Office); Drew Lumpkin (US Senator Mark Warner’s Office); Bob Matthias (VB); George Faatz, Jim Kibler and Morgan Whayland (Virginia Natural Gas); Karen Campblin (VSC NAACP); Citizens: Tess Amoruso, Kiquanda Baker, Ann Creasy, Mr. Dickson, Merri Erhard, Cynthia Fayton, Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky, James Hampton, Gwendolyn Matarita, Andrew and Gloria Neal, Steve Padgett, Kim Sudderth, Alma White; Staff: Keith Cannady, Kelli Arledge, Natalie Brown, Rob Cofield, Katie Cullipher, Rebekah Eastep, KC Filippino, Deidre Garrett, Andrea Gayer, Logan Grimm, Greg Grootendorst, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Mike Kimbrel, Sharon Lawrence, Ben McFarlane, Kendall Miller, Cynthia Mulkey, Katherine Rainone, John Sadler, Matt Smith, Jill Sunderland, Joe Turner, Sheila Wilson.

Modification of Agenda

Chair Michael Hipple thanked everyone for their interest in the Atlantic Coast Pipeline topic. He stated that Executive Director Robert Crum had informed him that the HRPDC had received over 150 public comments regarding the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and suggested allowing HRPDC staff time to summarize the information received and Commissioners time to review public input before the Commission deliberates or takes action. To that effect, Chair Hipple proposed removing the Atlantic Coast Pipeline from the agenda and appointing a working committee consisting of representatives from the HRPDC to research the topic and provide recommendations to the Commission for consideration. Chair Hipple asked for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Kenneth Alexander Moved 1) To Remove Item 10, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, from the agenda, and 2) That Chair Hipple appoint a committee to study the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and recommend action to the Commission; seconded by Commissioner Randy Wheeler.

Votes were recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chesapeake</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Baker</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Geis</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen Best</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Debbie Ritter</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 6A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Ms. Ella Ward</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Amanda Jarratt</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Barry Cheatham</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester County</td>
<td>Mr. Brent Fedors</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Phillip Bazzani</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Mayor Donnie Tuck</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jimmy Gray</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Mary Bunting</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight County</td>
<td>Mr. Randy Keaton</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. William McCarty</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City County</td>
<td>Mr. Scott Stevens</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Michael Hipple</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>Mayor McKinley Price</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Rohlf</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. David Jenkins</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Mayor Kenneth Alexander</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Larry “Chip” Filer</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Courtney Doyle</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Mamie Johnson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Andria McClellan</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td>Mayor W. Eugene Hunt</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Randy Wheeler</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Mayor John Rowe</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Lydia Pettis-Patton</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Smithfield</td>
<td>Mayor T. Carter Williams</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Sanford Wanner</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton County</td>
<td>Mr. Michael Johnson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Barry Porter</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Mr. Leroy Bennett</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Patrick Roberts</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry County</td>
<td>Mr. Jonathan Lynn</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John Seward</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Mayor Bob Dyer</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Leahy</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Barbara Henley</td>
<td>Aye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Submitted Public Comments

Executive Director Crum briefed the Commission on public comments submitted since the last HRPDC meeting. The comments received as of 2:30 p.m. October 16, 2019 were compiled, copied and distributed as a handout. Mr. Crum reported that the HRPDC received 50 to 70 additional public comments overnight. He stated that HRPDC staff will compile and distribute the additional comments to the Commissioners. Mr. Crum also stated that HRPDC staff will respond to the public comment authors thanking them for their input and informing them of the process going forward.

Commissioner McKinley Price suggested distributing the public comments via e-mail as opposed to preparing paper copies.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Hipple asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Motion: Commissioner Alexander Moved to approve the agenda as amended; seconded by Commissioner Courtney Doyle. The Motion Carried.

Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Robert Crum, HRPDC/HRTPO Executive Director, deferred his oral report due to time constraints.

Election of Officers

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Commissioner Donnie Tuck recommended the following nominees continue to serve in their respective positions as officers during the upcoming year: Commissioner Michael Hipple as Chair, Commissioner Andria McClellan as Vice-Chair, Commissioner Randy Keaton as Treasurer, and HRPDC Executive Director Robert Crum as Secretary.
Chair Hipple asked for additional nominations. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

**Motion:** On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Commissioner Tuck moved to accept the nominations as presented; seconded by Commissioner Barry Cheatham. The motion carried.

**Approval of Consent Items**

The following items were on the Consent Agenda for approval:

- Meeting Minutes – July 18, 2019 Commission Meeting
- Treasurer’s Report of August 2019
- Fiscal Year 2019 SHSGP and UASI Grants

Chair Hipple briefed the Commission on the consent agenda items and called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Tuck moved to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Andria McClellan. The motion carried.

**Regional Legislative Agenda**

Chair Hipple referenced the enclosed 2020 Regional Legislative Agenda. Executive Director Crum deferred his presentation due to time constraints. Chair Hipple asked for questions or discussion. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

**Motion:** Commissioner Tuck moved to approve the 2020 Regional Legislative Agenda; seconded by Commissioner McClellan. The motion carried.

**Public Comment**

Twenty-three citizens addressed the Commission regarding the Atlantic Coast Pipeline.

> Transcription of the public comments made orally during Commission meetings will be included in the HRPDC Agenda each month. The transcript will also be posted on the HRPDC website when available.

*Commissioners Patrick Roberts, Amanda Jarratt, John Seward, Jonathan Lynn, and Neil Morgan departed*

**Employee Recognition**

Executive Director Crum recognized Ms. Jill Sunderland, HRPDC Water Resources Planner III, for her five-year anniversary milestone with the HRPDC.
Offshore Wind Opportunities

Executive Director Crum introduced Mr. Matt Smith, HRPDC Senior Regional Planner, to brief the Commission on offshore wind opportunities.

Mr. Smith began with an overview of the east coast offshore wind market. He presented a map depicting the 21 offshore wind areas along the east coast, seven of which are leased and planned to be operational by 2023. Mr. Smith reported that the east coast offshore wind pipeline exceeds all installed worldwide wind energy capacities and has the potential to double the total current capacity within ten years. This rapidly growing global industry offers significant economic and employment opportunities related to the supply chain. A study by the University of Delaware estimated the opportunity for US suppliers at $70 billion, and many job creation estimates are in the tens of thousands.

Renewable energy sources, including offshore wind, complement the region’s current environmental and resilience efforts. Transitioning to renewable energy offers considerable benefits including reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other types of air pollutants as well as increasing energy diversity and security.

Mr. Smith updated the Commission on recent developments relating to offshore wind:

- The Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind Project’s onshore groundbreaking in July 2019 signified the commencement of construction on two test turbines that will be located 27 miles offshore of Virginia Beach.

- The Sea to Land Conference in the fall of 2019 focused on the business aspects of offshore wind, and there were two major announcements surrounding the conference:
  - Governor Northam declared Virginia’s goal of 100 percent renewable energy by 2050, and
  - Dominion publicized its plan to build the nation’s largest offshore wind farm near Virginia Beach with the first sector of three becoming operational in 2024.

- Interest from wind companies looking to operate in Hampton Roads is progressing and resulting in additional interest in the region’s port facilities and the prospect of component manufacturing in Hampton Roads. There are other ports along the east coast contending for this opportunity. For example, the State of New York is preparing to potentially spend up to $200 million to upgrade its port facilities.

Mr. Smith described some unique advantages for offshore wind manufacturers and suppliers operating in Hampton Roads including the unmatched port infrastructure, unrestricted air draft, high-quality maritime workforce, abundant waterfront land,
congestion-free navigation, nation’s largest shipbuilding industry, strategic location, and pro-business climate. Mr. Smith suggested the following regional actions:

- Continue supporting the use of particular port facilities for the offshore wind industry. The Port of Virginia has become more supportive of and involved in this industry identifying certain facilities that could be used for offshore wind because of the investments made in Norfolk International Terminal and Virginia International Gateway.

- Encourage the General Assembly to address a potential renewable energy requirement during this upcoming session. Addressing such a requirement may signal to the industry that Virginia and the Hampton Roads region are serious about developing their wind areas. Currently, Virginia is the only state on the east coast vying to become part of this supply chain without a renewable energy requirement.

- Collaborate with neighbors North Carolina and Maryland to identify where partnering can increase the ability to compete in this industry. No one port or metropolitan region can support the offshore wind industry on its own.

Mr. Smith stated that based on regional and state level discussions, he believes that Virginia will need to quickly address if and how it plans to support this industry. He encouraged Commissioners to consider how their localities can work with the state to support offshore wind and attract a portion of the supply chain and related job opportunities to Hampton Roads.

In conclusion, Mr. Smith referenced the offshore wind handout and acknowledged Reinvent Hampton Roads, the Chamber, and HREDA for their support of this initiative and offered to answer questions.

*Commissioner Barry Porter departed*

Chair Hipple asked for questions.

Executive Director Crum thanked Mr. Smith for his presentation and shared with the Commission that there have been companies indicating that the Hampton Roads region is the top metropolitan region on the east coast for this job creation opportunity. He reported that he has attended meetings with Old Dominion University, the Governor’s chief of staff, and the secretaries of commerce, finance, and transportation regarding how to encourage the technology, assembly, manufacturing, and construction jobs of this industry to locate in Hampton Roads. In order for Hampton Roads to take advantage of these opportunities, Mr. Crum encouraged Commissioners to advance conversations with local economic development staff regarding shovel-ready sites that could line up with some of these job opportunities and how to partner with HREDA to market these sites to potential prospects. He emphasized that the time to act is now.

Mr. Smith agreed that time is of the essence because projects are moving forward. There is a lot of competition, and the industry is moving quickly.
Commissioner Randy Keaton suggested that the working committee formed to study the Atlantic Coast Pipeline also analyze how much natural gas will be needed to participate in the offshore wind industry and how the two energy sources may pair together.

*Commissioners McKinley Price and Cynthia Rohlf departed*

Commissioner Chip Filer commented that two to three years ago there was work done on potential supply chain sites in Hampton Roads and that BASF was the top site at the time. He asked if the port has identified one of the terminals as a site and if there has been a layout analysis performed.

Mr. Crum responded that the port has been collaborating with the various secretaries and the Governor’s office as they look at opportunities, and he invited Cathie Vick with the Port of Virginia to respond further.

Ms. Cathie Vick thanked Mr. Crum for the opportunity to respond. Ms. Vick reported that the port has performed facility assessments of both Newport News and Portsmouth Marine Terminals. While nondisclosure agreements prevented Ms. Vick from expanding regarding specific details, she shared that the port has evaluated load and additional infrastructure requirements, possible utility relocations, and capacity demand curves that would be needed for different types of component manufacturing. She concluded her response by stating that the port has done a great deal of due diligence in order to be ready to support this industry coming to the region and that there would likely be an infrastructure improvement request presented to the General Assembly this year.

Commissioner Filer thanked both Mr. Crum and Ms. Vick for their responses.

Commissioner Alexander expressed his concern about the statement that the region cannot grow and diversify its economy without increasing natural gas supply. He stated that the military, port, shipyard, and those that were advocating the development of mega-sites make important and significant points that they require an increase in natural gas. However, he urged the Commission not to lose sight that expanding broadband also has the potential to grow and to diversify our economy in significant ways.

Chair Hipple thanked Commissioner Alexander for his input and asked for additional questions or comments.

Commissioner McClellan noted that each locality can amplify the message to support this exciting opportunity. The item in the enclosed regional legislative agenda specifically requests state support for resources to attract companies to Hampton Roads that support the emerging offshore wind industry and create jobs for Virginia.

Chair Hipple agreed that regional and state support will be important to this initiative.

*Commissioner Sanford Wanner departed*
HRPDC Three Month Tentative Schedule

Chair Hipple briefed the Commission on the Three-Month Tentative Schedule.

Advisory Committee Summaries

Chair Hipple referenced the attached Advisory Committee Summaries.

For Your Information

Chair Hipple noted the items in the For Your Information section.

Old/New Business

- Chair Hipple thanked the citizens for their attendance and comments.

- Commissioner Tuck reported that in the 2011 State of the Region Report, Old Dominion University included a section called the Economic Plight of African American Men in Hampton Roads. The section included statistics about labor force participation, incarceration, income, and more. One of the statistics not included was the number of murders in the region. Commissioner Tuck briefed the Commission on the number of homicides in the region with approximately one murder and eight assaults per day. He suggested that the HRPDC research the causality of the increase in homicides over the last ten years.

Chair Hipple thanked Commissioner Tuck and asked Executive Director Crum to initiate the related research.

Executive Director Crum indicated that the Regional Planning and Economics team, led by Greg Grootendorst, would be happy to sit with Commissioner Tuck to further analyze available data.

- Commissioner Ritter briefed the Commission on a potential addition to the 2020 Regional Legislative Agenda. Last year, a bill referred to JLARC would have allowed retired law enforcement officers to work up to 40 hours a week without impacting their retirement. The bill has the potential to expand the number of fully-trained full-time security personnel in schools and other municipal facilities. Currently, in the Virginia Retirement System, retired law enforcement officers are allowed to work 32 hours a week without impacting their retirement, but this bill would increase that amount to 40 hours a week.

Executive Director Crum responded that while the item was not currently on the 2020 Regional Legislative Agenda, there would be an opportunity to consider additions during next month’s Commission meeting.
Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, the meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

______________________________  ______________________________
Michael Hipple                  Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Chair                           Executive Director
Ms. Terry Danaher: Good afternoon. I usually have a seat over there on the corner where Carlton Hardy is sitting, and he kindly offered to fill in for me because I have to leave. I did want to say that I originally got up here, because I am the chair of the Community Advisory Committee for this body and the HRTPO, and we had not had a chance to look at Item 10. We just found out about it in fact. So, we will have a chance to meet before you all meet again in November, and we will take this seriously. If we could have the information shared with us too, that you all have received, it would be very helpful. As far as the committee goes, I would be delighted to serve on it. So, that’s all I need to say right now. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jim Hampton: Thank you so much. My name is Jim Hampton. I am a homeowner in the Georgetown section of Chesapeake, and I’d like to talk briefly about the pipeline if I may. First of all, it was back in 2017 that I received a letter from Virginia Natural Gas, on the street, the block that I live on, which is Rock Creek Drive in the Georgetown Point section of Chesapeake. There’s four sections, of course, of the Georgetown Community. At any rate, it invited me to a meeting at Bethel Baptist Church on Campostella Road. I didn’t know anything other than the fact that they were talking about some construction. I got there, and when I got there, we found out that Virginia Natural Gas had decided, apparently they already had the authorization, to bury large construction pipes in our community. Initially, quite naturally, it was a surprise. Being a homeowner there for about 32 years now, in fact, I’m retired military. I wasn’t very happy, because I knew then that the home that my wife and I built, and we bought the parcel there to build it, now they’re talking about putting pipes in that’s going to impact on not only my home but also all the community of Georgetown. In Georgetown, we have a lot of retired professional people there. We have a lot of people retired from the education system as well as the military, and I was wondering why we weren’t given some kind of heads up as to these pipes. Now, Les Flora there, he was the project lead. He had copies of the pipes, and I’m going to pass this around because you can see just how large they are. Not anything you would want to put in the community. Those pipes were produced to be able to send gas flowing very quickly. They initially said these were distribution lines, and we found out later that they were transmission lines. As a result of that, we were even more concerned about the safety of our citizens within those three parts of the community. As we went on, we organized, and we organized under the name of Georgetown Neighbors Against the Pipeline. Sunrise Hills joined us, the community right down below Campostella Road area, and then Holly Glen, but my point here is I wish that y’all would take a look at these pipes. They’re very close to homes. When we spoke to the deputy attorney general about it, he was surprised to see that those pipes are just feet away from homes, from the backyards. So, I would conclude, it looks like my time is up, but I wish I had more time. I have a lot of pictures I can show you of the pipes and how close they are to the homes. I’m going to pass these out and get out of the way.

Mr. Stephen Padgett: Hello. Previous speakers made a good point. Dominion Energy likes to do their deeds in secret because they know that it’s not going to be that good for the people. Now, of course, they want to make money, and the stockholders, if this thing goes through, they may make some money, but that’s not really the point. The point is that it’s a bad idea
and everybody knows it. There is so much misinformation. The economic benefits here I read from the chamber letter. The economic benefits would occur concurrently with environmental progress as is well known natural gas produces half the carbon emissions of coal. What they don’t tell you is that the flaring of methane from the fracking industry is driving up. Since the fracking boom began, the methane in the atmosphere has been moving up rapidly due to fracking. It’s been proven by satellite studies. So it’s bad. Then what they don’t tell you is the fracking industry that Bloomberg is advising its investors not to invest in fracking. Since 2015, there’s been 170 shell operations that have gone bankrupt. This year alone, first half of this year, nine shell companies have gone bankrupt. The future is not in fossil fuel. So you build out these pipelines, which they don’t mention in the letter. Sure, the CO2 emissions of Virginia is going to be a drop in the bucket in global warming, but it's going to damage the water supplies in rural Virginia. I mean, they're violating. The DEQ, to their credit, is holding them to the standards of the EPA, but that’s not necessarily going to solve the problem. In fact, nobody knows what’s going to happen. They build these things out. It can be a disaster for wildlife and water supplies, and then what? Then business is going to shut down anyway because another thing they don’t tell you is that due to the increasing global arm of climate change, there’s tremendous amount of research going on all over the world, in the United States in the top institutions Stanford and MIT. They’re developing energy storage technologies at a furious rate, and those technologies will allow Virginia, in the near future, to take full advantage of solar energy and wind farms. Thanks.

Ms. Ann Creasy: Hi everyone. Thanks for taking the time to hear comments from the public on this issue. I initially put in the front end of my comment that I hope that you all take time to hear from more experts, so I’m really glad that there is a plan to create a working group around this issue. There’s a couple of claims made in the letter from the Chamber of Commerce that is before y'all that I would like to dig into specifically. It might be good for the working group to aim to address some of these discrepancies in information. So the Hampton Roads Chamber of Commerce letter that is attached to the HRPDC Agenda makes claims that the gas from the ACP is needed by the region for economic growth but offers no analysis to document that need. There is some information that brings the need for an additional transmission pipeline into question. Dominion’s claim that extreme cold snaps necessitate more gas infrastructure contradicts the reality of the capacity contracts for Hampton Roads. Chris Stockton, a spokesman for Williams Partners, which operates the Transco Pipeline in the western part of the state that the Atlantic Coast Pipeline would connect to, said that the Transco Pipelines performed remarkably during the cold weather. There was a date on January 5th of 2018 where temperatures were especially low, and during that time period, he goes on to say, we were able to meet all of our firm capacity contracts. The system delivered a record amount of gas. It produced ten percent of the natural gas consumed in the country on that day on January 5th. So, that definitely points to the fact that maybe our gas infrastructure in this state is enough to supply our gas needs. Another interesting aspect that brings the need into question is that the attorney general’s office reported in a discovery response that Virginia Natural Gas stated that no curtailments had occurred on annual system peak days in the past ten years. So, I think we really need to get to the bottom of the question for the need of this gas before making any consequential decisions. Another claim that was kind of egregious to be honest, in the letter, it says that there would be 17,000 jobs produced from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. In Dominion’s own Chmura report, Dominion
contracted Chmura to do an analysis, even Dominion’s report claims that there would be 2,873 jobs during construction across three states, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia, and the long-term jobs would be 271. So, I don’t know where 17,000 came from. Thank you. Those are just some of the concerning points that I hope the working group can address.

**Ms. Kiquanda Baker:** Good afternoon, Commission Members. My name is Kiquanda Baker, and I’ll make any comments very short as I’m sure most people that are commenting will hit some of the points that I would have made anyways. I would just suggest that you also consider during your deliberation, putting out an opposition, a resolution opposing the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. Thank you.

**Ms. Kim Sudderth:** Good afternoon. I’m not a pipeline expert. I just happen to be a mom that fell in love with a house in Berkley. Berkley is a neighborhood in Norfolk, and I just love it. I know my neighbors now, which has never happened before, and we get together very frequently. I’ve lived there a year, and I feel like I’ve lived there my whole life. Never felt more at home. Actually, my husband and I, we have 8 children between us. We’ve been busy, but we don’t have grandchildren yet, and I really want grandchildren, and I can see them coming over. Who all has grandchildren? You get your sleepovers, and you get to love on them and give them back. I can’t wait. But I also know that I live three blocks away from the Southside Connector, and I literally live in the incineration zone. So, if I do have a sleepover with these grandchildren, I have to worry about is it going to take me out and them too. That keeps me up at night. I can tell you that the Southside Connector, which is the spur of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline is 24 inches wide, high pressure, and buried three feet deep, and they bury dead people deeper than three feet. We and a lot of people over there, we’ve been fighting these pipelines for several years now. Some of you have probably seen me at your council meetings before, but we’re still fighting, and we’re hoping that you’ll do the right thing. You’re in a position to do so. Maybe not today. We thought you were going to vote today, but when the time comes, I hope and I know that you’ll do the right thing. If you do nothing, Virginia Natural Gas and Dominion will ply the state with dangerous predatory and unnecessary fossil fuel infrastructure. But if you vote no, you send a message to all Virginians letting us know that you’re willing to stand up for us. Just a quick shout-out. All the folks that are here against the pipelines, if you could raise your hand or stand up. These are the folks that came out midday midweek to come to this meeting and let you know, and they’re all, they represent everyone else that feels the same way, and they’re counting on you like me. Thank you.

**Mr. Jim O’Brien:** Thank you. I’m Jim O’Brien from Newport News Shipbuilding. I think the comments that have been made to-date are good, and I think it’s a good idea that the committee is going to be formed to look for solutions to the issue that we have here today. I represent the largest private industry employer in the state of Virginia. Let that sink in for a minute. Newport News Shipbuilding, we currently are over 24,000 employees, and we, in the past six years, have converted from No. 6 Fuel Oil to natural gas. With this conversion, we are currently saving 30 percent. Our emissions have been reduced by 30 percent, so we’ve made a significant impact to the environment by converting to natural gas. We did that about six years ago. This year, we’re in the process of converting our steam plant, that produces steam to test our aircraft carriers, over to natural gas and that will be in production later this year.
And with that conversion, now we can test our aircraft carriers that we’re overhauling and deliver them back to the Navy. Without this natural gas, we will not be able to test our aircraft carriers and get them back to the Navy. We’ve done a full conversion from fuel over to natural gas in order to provide our testing platform for the aircraft carriers. So, from the company that employs a significant amount of people in this region, we are relying on natural gas. Our concern is that the natural gas supply will not be available in the future, so whatever needs to be done in order to ensure that we can get natural gas to supply large customers like us is very important to us. We welcome and we'll gladly participate and help in any way that we can to come up with solutions to satisfy everyone that has a need for this natural gas. So, thank you.

**Mr. Overton Nichols:** Good afternoon. My name is Overton Nichols. Nichols is the last name. I live in Sunrise Hills, where I am the president of the civic league. I live in Sunrise Hills. I have enjoyed that section until Virginia Natural Gas came in, and I was very disturbed with what they had done. The pipelines were placed underground with no regard for my community. They moved into a section that I know they weren’t supposed to be, but they are there. They heard my feelings along with everyone in the neighborhood. So, let me tell you some of the things that has happened. They came in with their heavy equipment pounding on the area. The pounding was so hard that it caused some people’s countertops to come from the wall. Now, let me tell you this. This is not a ghetto. These houses are well built. They’ve been there for a while because I’ve been there for 51 years. Fifty-one years. Some of these pipes are 30 feet from individuals homes. Now, here’s the thing. These pipes are near churches, schools, rec centers, and play parks where our children play. They weren’t able to play in their play area this time, because pipelines were there with their heavy equipment. The pipeline was so bad banging, that on the weekend some of these people had to go to hotels to live, and that’s a shame. Sometimes during the week, you had your floodlight. Their floodlights were shining in someone’s bedroom window where they couldn’t sleep. Now, the worst part to me is that I want everyone to remember is this: In Sunrise Hills, you got one way in and one way out, which means that if anything should occur, you know what that means. There’s a possibility that you can’t get out. It happened to me three times. As a matter of fact, it happened to me Sunday. Thank you.

**Mr. Jonathan Gendzier:** I’m Jonathan Gendzier with the Southern Environmental Law Center. I’m foregoing my comment. I simply want to thank the Commission for its action today to delay a vote, and we look forward to continuing to communicate with you all about this important issue. Thank you.

**Ms. Merri Ehrhard:** Good afternoon. Dominion wants to get approval for its $7.5 billion project before all of the facts are known. These costs will be passed along to the ratepayers. This 600-mile project is slated to cross often geologically unstable land and 1,100 bodies of water in the State of Virginia. This land disturbance will cause erosion and sediment build-up and will have an adverse effect on the health of the Chesapeake Bay. No amount of mitigation on Dominion’s part can prevent this. The 42-inch natural gas pipeline and its spurs and compressor stations often go through towns and neighborhoods that are economically challenged. The compressor station in Buckingham County is slated to be built in a predominantly African-American community. They don’t want it. This is economic racism.
Dominion claims that natural gas is needed for economic development in the Hampton Roads area. If you go to one of their shareholder meetings, you will learn, you will hear them state that gas is for export. Ratepayers will pay for the construction of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline and the shareholders will reap the benefit of the natural gas sales. Ultimately, it seems that construction of the ACP will be dependent upon the price of gas overseas. It is not for our benefit. This fracking process that is used to extract natural gas from deep in the earth uses millions of gallons of fresh drinking water in the extracting process. This water is forever contaminated. It is put back in the ground and will be there in perpetuity. Now, what about the future, climate change, sea-level rise, and its effect on Hampton Roads? The natural gas that comes from fracking is methane. Methane is worse than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas because it warms the planet on steroids for a decade or two before decaying to carbon dioxide. Methane is roughly 30 times more potent than carbon dioxide in trapping gas. You don’t see them talk about that much. Hampton Roads should not want to be a part of this horrible rape of our land, air, and water by Dominion. Please wait to decide until all of the facts are known. Look into the fight being fought by other communities all along the ACP’s route. Don’t just rely on Dominion’s lies. Thank you.

Ms. Karen Campblin: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Karen Campblin. I’m here representing the Virginia State Conference NAACP today headquartered in Richmond, Virginia. I currently serve as the environmental and climate justice committee chair. The purpose of our environmental and climate justice program is to 1) eliminate all contributors to greenhouse gas emissions, 2) support and encourage energy efficiency, and 3) and this is the best part, to encourage community resiliency and liveability. These natural gas pipeline projects are the antithesis of our No. 3, which is the most vital part of our program, which is community vitality and resiliency. Later on, I’ll be submitting several reports and documents that goes into some of the detailed information about the health impacts associated with these types of facilities, particularly to African-American communities of color and low-income communities. One of the ones, which is a really interesting report Fumes Across the Fence-Line, which was written by National NAACP in collaboration with the Clean Air Task Force details that the siting of these locations are not coincidence. Typically, these utility companies identify areas in which they feel that the communities will not have political support, but as you can see, there is a lot of community groundswell behind everyone in the Mountain Valley Pipeline, the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, the Union Hill Compressor Station and most importantly, what we’re talking about today, the Southside Connector. We feel that instead of focusing on these infrastructures that have a life span of anywhere from 20 to 40 years, what we really should be focusing on is how do we transition to the clean energy. That’s where we’re going. There are reports after reports that indicate we do not need a new infrastructure. There are reports that indicate the capacity is sufficient. The current that we have a lot of detailed documents that show with their PJM collaboration, as well as the voluntary curtailment program that it is suffice in transitioning to solar and those types of clean air energies would be enough to address the energy demands. So, I thank you very much for tabling the decision, and I really do hope that the committee not only looks at existing infrastructure but look at all the different ways in which we can support and promote liveability and to kind of clean up a lot of these fence line communities that are overburdened, as Mr. Nichols had indicated. His community has a pipeline electric substation. They went through wetlands and these pipelines and substations and also two abandoned coal ash ponds.
in one neighborhood and these facilities are located by parks, churches, and schools. We need to stop that type of thinking and focus in on how we can fix and rebuild our communities and promote healthy communities. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Tess Amoruso: Thank you for this opportunity to speak to the Commission. I’d also like to say thank you so much for the wise decision to table decision today and for there to be further study and if at all possible and citizens are invited to be part of that committee, I think that would be a very good and wise decision. So thank you. So I did not prepare notes. I’m just going to speak off the cuff what I know about the Atlantic Coast Pipeline is that it’s unneeded, unwanted, dangerous, environmentally racist, and environmentally destructive. It is just a fact that the gas is not needed. As I said, I apologize I didn’t prepare notes, but that is something that is a fact and can easily be researched. There is sufficient capacity now with existing infrastructure that would not create all the perils that this pipeline would create. It’s obviously unwanted. I’d like to say that the communities, of which some of the residents have been here speaking, are beautiful communities. I don’t know if anybody here has been to these neighborhoods and seen how close these pipelines are to community centers, churches, and schools, but for example, there’s the line let us say standing where I’m standing, and there’s a school, that’s maybe I’d say about where the back wall is, there’s an elementary school. So, my question to the committee is, would you want your child going to a school where the pipeline was here and your child was going to school in that building? And if the answer is no, then you have a moral obligation to say then none of our neighbor’s children should be put in that peril. So, it’s clearly unneeded, it’s unwanted, it’s dangerous. Our opposition in terms of the dangers is not hype. That’s another thing that is a quick three-minute Google search will be able to show anybody in this room the number and extent of explosions and accidents that’ve happened recently actually even with this very same technology that’s being proposed. It’s extremely environmental racist, and if you haven’t researched this, please go research Union Hill. Again, that’s a three-minute search. The community, so let me just backtrack this important point. Originally, the length of this pipeline would have been built with seven compression stations along the route, and because in other areas there was great opposition in the areas where the compression stations were going to be built, the decision was made instead of that number, there would be one giant mega station to be built in the State of Virginia, which is in this historic and important African-American community called Union Hill. That’s, again, a three-minute search. The environmental destruction, it’s already been demonstrated. I just want you all to know that you’re in my prayers on a nightly basis. I still feel like we can do the right thing, and we will do the right thing. So thank you for your attention.

Ms. Gwendolyn Matarita: Thank you so much. My name is Gwendolyn Matarita. I’m a resident of Georgetown. When I was a teenager, I used to ride through Georgetown Community hoping one day I could purchase one of those homes. It was a neighborhood that exemplified lots of care of their homes and their property. About ten years ago, I finally bought one of those homes, and as an added bonus, it came with an inground pool. Yay. Three years ago, our electrician came by to do some work on the lights in the pool and noticed all the high voltage power lines located over the pool, and with his thingamajigger I do not know what you call it that he uses to test the electrical outlets, he pointed it up in the air and received a strong electromagnetic signal. Now, the combination of pipelines being installed
under those high voltage lines compromises the integrity of the pipelines, and then let’s add the children playing in the pool just a few feet away from those 24-inch transmission gas pipelines that were installed by Virginia Natural Gas. Really? Do the math. I’m now in a position that I don’t believe I will ever be able to move out of my house or to sell it because no one is going to purchase a house knowing that gas pipelines are pretty much right at their back doors. Not to mention that the value of our homes was dropped significantly. What now? What happens to all the equity that we’ve been building, once we retire. What happens to that? It went down the pipeline. We have shared our concerns to the governor, Congressman Bobby Scott, the mayor, and Attorney General Herring. Virginia Power even came out at one of our rallies, wrote an article about it. Channel 10 came out, covered everything, and then I wondered does anyone really care? A gas explosion can be extremely detrimental and then there’s a slogan that we as Americans have adopted, if you see something, say something. Well, we see a problem, a big problem. Running gas pipelines in our backyards and we are saying something and hopefully to someone who will listen and then do something. Thank you.

Mr. Jim Kibler: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, thanks for the opportunity. Thank you for your attention to this vitally important issue for the region. I’m the son of two local elected officials, and I know from personal experience that often you’re the ones who have to separate heat from light, and I thank you for your work in that regard. I’m going to be very brief. We’re going to be happy to participate with the committee in any information it needs about this project. Just let us know. But I’m also here not only as president of the gas company, but outside of my day job I serve on Go Virginia Region 5 Council and we just updated our regional growth and diversification program, and it was noted, it’s in the minutes that were published today, we’re not sure the region, in fact, we have serious doubts about the ability to implement that growth and diversification plan without the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. I’m also one of 33 directors of the Hampton Roads Business Roundtable, and I’m authorized today to tell you that we have also come out in support of this project for all the reasons that you’ll hear about the need for gas in the region. This is not the Southside Connector. So to the extent there’s confusion around that, I want you to know that the Southside Connector is in service today. It’s built, and for the first time in over 20 years, last month, we ran our entire system on the Southside Connector, because we had to, and so it was necessary for reliability in this region, and that’s the reason it was built. There is insufficient gas capacity into our region today. We are already in our five-year horizon in terms of reserve margin for VNG. There’s a tremendous need for this. You’ll also see later recent work that’s been done around the region to identify 139 sites for economic development 25 acres and greater. We can’t serve any of them, load more than perhaps a coffee roaster. There’s just not enough capacity for economic development in the region. I thought VNG was alone in that regard, and Columbia Gas of Virginia has recently stated that it’s in the same position we are. We have curtailed customers 32 days for the last, over the last two years. A lot of the largest employers in the region. That’s a sign that the system is struggling to keep up and needs extra capacity. Thank you very much.

Ms. Ethel Mitchell: Thank you very much. I’m trying to find out where I leave my notes. It is a pleasure to be here. Good afternoon. I am Ethel Whitfield Mitchell, a resident of Chesapeake for more than 70 years. My family and I have lived in Georgetown Colony for more than 46 years. I have enjoyed my community and surrounding communities. These communities
provided my family with a level of comfort, security, safety, and respect. Recently, our way of life has become threatened. Many of our communities can no longer enjoy this level of safety and certainly respect because of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. Imagine this: One morning you wake up to the sound of huge machinery putting 24-inch natural gas pipes into the ground just a few feet from your backyard, from your swimming pool. Now, these are not just any pipes. These are transmission natural gas pipelines used to move large volumes of gas at high pressure around the country, not around neighborhoods. Well, in your case, that’s a horrible nightmare, but it’s just a nightmare. In our case, it’s a horrible reality. I have described that horrible reality in which we are living. It is a grave safety issue and a high level of disrespect. Such disrespect that I never experienced or thought I would experience from my community leaders. From my city leaders. In some neighborhoods in Chesapeake, there is a Southside Connector Pipeline, which if connected to the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, after all, it is called a connector, it connects, it has to connect, would be used in assisting natural gas around the community. May I simply jump to the very end, sir? Now, does all of the fighting we have done for two years to protect our neighborhoods and ourselves come down to this moment? Are you commission, the answer? You can be. We have experienced racial discrimination and environmental discrimination. We need you. Please vote no to racial discrimination and environmental discrimination and of course to what could come down to annihilation of selected communities. A no vote would be a yes vote to the sanctity of life in Hampton Roads, to include a level of safety and continued economic growth in the region in which you represent. Thank you and be blessed.

Ms. Alma White: Good afternoon. Again, my name is Alma White, and I am a resident of Georgetown of Chesapeake, and before I start my report, I just want to let you know that the Southside Connector Pipeline has been installed right behind my backyard, and I have a disabled daughter, and there’s no way I can get her out of there if there is an explosion. The citizens of Georgetown, Sunrise Hills, and Holly Glen have joined together to do an environmental study by Stokes Environmental. This paper was supposed to have been passed out to you today. Unfortunately, you don’t have them in front of you, but please before you leave here, please get a copy of Stokes Environmental Study, which explains the risk of the Southside Connector. This study was done to evaluate the risk of the SCDP natural gas pipeline, which has been installed in the Georgetown, Sunrise Hills, and Holly Glen areas of Chesapeake. We want to keep them from ever using this pipeline. Risk was defined as the probability of personal injuries to residents or damage to their homes resulting from a rupture in the proposed 24-inch natural gas pipeline. It was predicted that if a six-inch rupture occurred in the pipeline, an explosion will take place after one minute of gas leakage, and it will be releasing 6,970 pounds of natural gas from the pipeline before detonation. It was determined too, that homes within 540 feet will be destroyed if there’s a rupture and an explosion. Homes within 744 feet will have homes damaged, destroyed or serious injuries will occur. Homes within 1500 feet will have shattered windows, destroyed homes, and injuries. That means about 366 homes will be affected by a single explosion. The proposed pipeline has been installed right next to the bedroom windows of many of our homes and only 40 feet from Thurgood Marshall Elementary School, which is located right here on Border Road. Several schools are in the blast zones and they include, again, Thurgood Marshall, Indian River High School, Indian River Middle School, and Georgetown Elementary. The children would be playing right over this pipeline. Disabled people will not be able to get out of their homes. The
study evaluated the risk of a pipeline rupture is ignited instead of detonated. My time is up. Well, thank you very much for listening to me, and I do hope that you decide not to approve the use of this pipeline. It is already there, but we would like to see that pipeline be removed because it involves so many risks and dangers to the residents who live there. Thank you.

Ms. Peggy Sanner: Thank you. Peggy Sanner, Chesapeake Bay Foundation. I came down from Richmond this morning because I knew you all were going to address a really important subject. Last time, the first time I was here, speaking before this very respected body was about 2011, 2012, when you all and your colleagues were considering the Phase 1 Watershed Implementation Plan shortly after the bay TMDL came out. That was a big moment for Hampton Roads, and I will say it inaugurated, for me personally, a long set of opportunities continuing to the present of working with your staff in partnership for our common goal of a restored Chesapeake Bay. Thank you for that staff work, thank you for your collegiality and your commitment. Honestly, it is our commitment the bay that brings me here today and has caused me to be concerned about this pipeline cause the Bay Foundation to be engaged in work related to, and frankly, in opposition to the pipeline, we’re concerned about its effect on the bay, and I would ask you after I thank you for thinking about this seriously and postponing the moment, thank you, I would ask you to remember as you engage in more detailed study, your commitment to the bay, remember how much money you all as a community are spending on bay restoration, and I can name the various categories. I know what you’re doing on stormwater, I know what you are doing on wastewater, I know how much more in the governor’s plan you are being asked to do. It’s a very big deal. I won’t recite the figures. I’m sure you’ve got them in your brain, but I would say please recall as you consider down this path how important it is not to undermine all of the good work that you all have been doing on the bay by embarking on a project that in our view will have deleterious effects on that work. It doesn’t make sense fiscally, and in our view, it doesn’t make sense in terms of the kind of work that we need to do for the bay, for our communities, for our children. So, keep that in mind, and if you have any questions about what the specific interactions are between the bay restoration plan, the steps going forward, and the pipeline, we would certainly be happy to provide our perspectives. Again, many thanks for your very serious consideration of these questions and for your ongoing commitment to the bay.

Ms. Cathie Vick: Good afternoon. Sorry, I’m losing my voice. If you can’t hear me, raise your hand. First, I want to thank you on behalf of the Port of Virginia for all of your support as we have been investing, like the shipyard, in reducing our carbon footprint and reducing emissions, and we’re doing that by over $700 million in investment to electrify the terminal gantry cranes and shift to other equipment that’s hybrid in nature, but it is increasing energy demand on our terminals, and likewise, our customers, like the shipyard, have been moving to this cleaner more reliable energy source of natural gas, we had 45 announcements last year, economic development related that our port users, 80 percent of those were manufacturing facilities and require this reliable energy source. Mr. Keller referenced earlier the site preparation planning that we’ve been doing in collaboration with you all. Very forward-looking, very visionary as we look to attract more business and opportunity to this region, we have to be able to provide product, product in sites that are available and have the infrastructure and the energy resources that they need in order to create jobs and opportunity for our citizens. We look forward to continuing to do our part in that, but we
need you all to partner with us as we’ve been doing over these last several years and provide that energy source for them from the Atlantic Coast Pipeline. Quite frankly, there just is no Plan B, and if we don’t not just look at demand for today but demand in the future, and be visionary about that, then we’re going to find ourselves in a major competitive disadvantage with other states to bring that business opportunity here. The last point is as the IMO, the International Maritime Organization, is restricting the use of diesel for our shipping lines that call here to the Port of Virginia, these ultra-large container vessels, we’re going to see more of a demand for liquified natural gas. The order book for the shipping lines now has 45 new vessels that will be built that will use LNG. If we cannot provide an opportunity for them to fuel here, we will lose opportunities to have first-in and last-out calls because they will have to call on other ports in order to get liquified natural gas before they head back to Europe and Asia and other areas. So, again, another demand for that resource that is going to continue to grow over the next several years. Thank you again for your partnership and continued collaboration and for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon.

Mr. Steve Hansen: Thank you. I am representing the Virginia Poor People’s Campaign, called The Revival. I wanted to tell you, on record, that the Poor People’s Campaign is adamantly against the ACP. Primarily, because of its environmental impacts on the least of our citizens, the poor and the disadvantaged. Our National Chairman Co-Chair Reverend William Barber along with Vice President Al Gore has been to Union Hill several times to decry the environmental impact that compressor station has had on that community. And similar consequences are possible here as far as safety and health hazards for a high-pressure pipeline that is almost unprecedented in its route through residential and parks and churches and certainly schools, to include Title I schools, such as Thurgood Marshall. So I won’t – I can’t give you an answer on whether the demand, we need more demand, we need more energy. I could suggest though that what we need to be doing is not is going forward with cleaner nonrenewable energy as opposed to nonrenewable energy, which is on the table for your consideration too, but to continue down this path is only going to cause more environmental problems and those problems usually end up being burdened by the low-income poor people more than others. I reference Flint and other areas. Thank you for your time.

Ms. Alice Alston: Welcome to you all. This afternoon, I’m here to represent the unit owners association of Holly Glen. I’m on the board of directors. Two years ago, we did start a battle against the Southside Connector that’s associated with the ACP. Through that time period, a lot of our family members, they were afraid, just like so many others. We read through tests of environmental problems, we went through the safety level, then we came back to say our lives matter, all lives matter. Not just the big company who has the finances to do more. We want someone to listen. We weren’t given this advantage when our turn came for the pipes to come through. No one let us know ‘til the last minute what was going on. So, what we’re saying now is maybe you all can sit back and think because people have been affected right now. It’s between eight and ten feet from my back door. They have put it in, cut wires, messed up our irrigation system, but they are fixing it now. So, we haven’t signed off on anything. Our problem is we want people to think about other communities, it’s too late for mine because the pipes are in 23 inches, but we want to know can you look at it, what is the plans, let the public know what is happening. Where is it going? It was a change in plans. It should have been Bainbridge, then it came through Georgetown. Why weren’t we given the advantage?
Why weren’t we told what was happening? So, again environmental racism or was it just racism period or is it just for people that you think are less than and don’t matter? I again will say, big businesses have the finances. Every day people we don’t, but our lives matter, and we want you to think about that and if you can sleep well at night, I bless you, but I thank God for the opportunity to say we didn’t want it, but it’s there, but we don’t have gas, so God is still working. I thank you for this afternoon.

Mr. Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon Mr. Chair, Honorable Commissioners, and fellow interested parties. Those of you who serve on the CAO committee, Chief Administrative Officer committee, have heard my substantive objections to the pipeline already, and many of the speakers who preceded me stated them and others more eloquently than I. What I want to speak to is process. In September, I was present at the CAO meeting when the two presidents one from Dominion, one from Columbia Gas, had a half-hour or so of time to make their case for the pipeline. Now, what disturbs me about that is there was no balance. There were no speakers from other groups as there are today, talking about the downside of the pipeline, and I know that when people sing the siren song of economic development to the chief administrative officers and the elected officials of the region, it is a very sweet song and it’s very seductive because economic development is of concern to all of us. All the citizens of this region and all the citizens anywhere. But economic development does not come without costs, and there are environmental costs that have to be considered in this era of climate change. So, the fact that there was no pro and con in that discussion is disturbing and the other disturbing aspect of it is that at the subsequent CAO meeting, there was a resolution introduced to support an earlier letter written by the chamber and the military alliance to our congressional delegation seeking support for the pipeline. Again, no balance. So, I would urge you to take a good look as you step back now at what the arguments are pro and con in a balanced way. Thank you very much.

Mr. John Luker: Thank you. My name is John Luker, and I’m chair of the Chesapeake Bay Sierra Club group. Once upon a time, people believed the world was flat and then scientists discovered no, it’s not flat. Well, now scientists are saying climate change is a big deal, and we need to reduce carbon. There’s some people that don’t believe that. I guess there’s some people who believe we faked the moon landing, but it doesn’t make it not true that we went to the moon. But if you don’t care about climate change or what scientists say, I know y’all care about money. There is a pipeline called the Transco Pipeline with slight modification can provide all the gas that we need if we need gas. Dominion, they make money on how much money they spend on capital projects. The pipeline power plants, they get a guaranteed rate of return. They do not have an incentive to use the Transco Pipeline. Our rates are going to go up. As you’ve seen with coal plants, utilities are retiring coal plants, and they become stranded assets. Their projected to have a long lifetime. Their lifetime is being ended before their useful life because it’s too expensive to operate. The same thing is going to happen with these even if you discount the Transco Pipeline, clean energy, solar energy, and wind energy, the price is going down like a ski slope over the past ten or 15 years. Countries all over the world are going to clean energy. So, there’s a lot of reasons not to approve the pipeline. Environment is a big one. Money is another one. We’ve got a pipeline here. Promote clean energy. I mean, I’ve lived here for 32 years, the flooding has just gotten worse and worse. Insurance rates are going up. If you can’t afford to live here, to insure your home, if your business or home is...
underwater, we all know roads get underwater. It’s ignorant to keep on going down the same road when we need to change course. Thank you.

Mr. Dickson: Thank you. Good afternoon. I won’t be before you long. I know when you get to the last one, y’all ready to roll, but listen, before we go, there’s just a small article I’d like to read. On September 13, 2018, excessive pressure in natural gas lines owned by the Columbia Gas of Massachusetts had a series of explosions and fires that occurred in 40 homes. Over 80 individuals were injured – 80 individual fires, excuse me. One person was killed, 30,000 forced to evacuate. Then it goes on to say about the cause. Overpressurized gas mains. The cost is greater than a billion dollars in property damage, personal injury, infrastructure damage, and mutual aid payments to other utilities that helped in the recovery process. Now, this happened in Massachusetts last year. It doesn’t really affect us, or does it? This is something that we have to take into consideration when we are making the choice that we’re about to make, that you’re about to partake on. It may not affect you. It may affect other people later on. You can take a look around and see if there are any individuals in here that you would prefer not to see that may be taken out by the gas line. I don’t think you would like a choice like that. I wouldn’t like a choice like that. But in actuality, these big pockets, 7.4, seven-point something, billion dollars financial might doesn’t make it right coming through. I’m not going to be before you long. I just ask you to make the right choice. Some things to think about. Something may never happen, but it already is. And as we know, we’ve got stuff in the news, buildings collapsing, things are happening, because people, these are all man-made things. Man is not paying too much attention or he’s under too much pressure nowadays. From my understanding is, that when this was brought before the city of Chesapeake, the information about the pressure wasn’t accurate until later on investigated by Norfolk Naval Shipyard. Then we found out the amount of pressure that’s going to be going through these pipes. So take that into consideration when you make your votes, please. It’s a lot at stake. Children, grandchildren, friends, and neighbors. Thank you.
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### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Previous YTD</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>% Received /Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State PDC Revenue</td>
<td>$151,943</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>112,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing DHCD/ Portsmouth/ Chesapeake</td>
<td>910,217</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>33,008</td>
<td>43,008</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Assessment</td>
<td>467,502</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDEM</td>
<td>681,175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jurisdiction Membership Dues</td>
<td>1,381,541</td>
<td>387,746</td>
<td>12,146</td>
<td>399,892</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Jurisdiction Programs</td>
<td>1,881,951</td>
<td>843,100</td>
<td>136,603</td>
<td>979,703</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMFFA</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLUS</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke River Basin Association</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES, INTEREST &amp; MISC</td>
<td>83,515</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>4,519</td>
<td>16,789</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT-PL SEC 112</td>
<td>2,961,330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC - SEIS Feasibility Study</td>
<td>1,684,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDRPT 5303/ Pass Through</td>
<td>783,045</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP&amp;R</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contracts/Deferred/Pass Through</td>
<td>1,021,697</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,092,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,253,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,439,391</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Previous YTD</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>% Received /Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>$4,880,327</td>
<td>$592,690</td>
<td>$324,390</td>
<td>$917,080</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD CONTRACTS</td>
<td>192,555</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL CONTRACTS/PASS THROUGH</td>
<td>7,444,668</td>
<td>432,180</td>
<td>151,591</td>
<td>583,771</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SERVICES</td>
<td>575,366</td>
<td>58,765</td>
<td>12,404</td>
<td>71,169</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241,982</td>
<td>132,441</td>
<td>374,424</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,092,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,325,813</strong></td>
<td><strong>621,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,947,540</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**  
$-  
(72,698)  
(435,450)  
(508,149)  
*  

* HRTPO grants operate on a quarterly reimbursement basis; as such the total YTD does not reflect the commission’s current financial position.
FUND BALANCE REPORT  
FROM FY2018 - FY2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>6,593,874</td>
<td>6,406,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED*</td>
<td>(2,266,786)</td>
<td>(2,197,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES</td>
<td>(315,836)</td>
<td>(251,069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: Prepaid Expense</td>
<td>(53,563)</td>
<td>(29,359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 45</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE</td>
<td>(374,881)</td>
<td>(397,753)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE (UNASSIGNED)</td>
<td>2,582,808</td>
<td>2,530,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASH IN BANK:
- BB&T Investments 2,918,330 2,212,314
- LGIP Investments 1,899,420 1,806,459
- Checking & Petty Cash 441,467 776,363

TOTAL CASH IN BANK 5,259,217 4,795,136

Plus: A/R 1,725,922 2,082,653
Plus: Prepaid Expense 53,563 29,359

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS/LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE 7,038,702 6,907,148
- Minus: A/P (234,482) (364,390)
- Minus: Contracts A/P (197,656) (125,936)
- Minus: Misc. A/P (12,690) (10,648)

TOTAL LIABILITIES (444,828) (500,974)

TOTAL FUND BALANCE 6,593,874 6,406,174
- DESIGNATED (Committed)* (2,266,786) (2,197,682)
- RESERVES (Committed)* (315,836) (251,069)
- Minus: Prepaid Expense (53,563) (29,359)
- GASB 45/75 (Assigned) (1,000,000) (1,000,000)
- LEAVE (Assigned) (374,881) (397,753)

AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE (Unassigned) 2,582,808 2,530,311

Note 1: From Balance Sheet
- Total Assets
- Minus: Capital Assets
- Minus: Accounts Payable
- Minus: Trans Pass-Thru (Contracts Payable)
- Minus: Misc. Accounts Payable
= Fund Balance
This year, the seventeen municipalities of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) and the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) are celebrating two decades of assisting local families in need through the Help to Others (H2O) program. H2O was founded in 1999 by the region’s public utilities departments and HRSD, and received 501(c)3 nonprofit status in 2011. The purpose of the program is to support area residents who are in a financial crisis and experiencing difficulties in paying their water and/or wastewater utility bills.

We’re proud to say that since 2011, the H2O program has raised approximately $350,000, helping over 2,100 Hampton Roads families in crisis with their utilities service bills. However, the need for this program is great, and too often our funds run dry leaving those seeking assistance without help. For our neighbors in need, this means no glass of water from the tap, no hot water to shower, and no water to help prepare their next meal.

We’re asking all Hampton Roads citizens to visit shareh2o.org/donate and make a $20 tax-deductible donation - $1 for each year of the program’s 20 year existence. Every pledge, great or small, helps to keep the water flowing for a local family in need. Thanks to the collaboration of local water utilities, HRPDC, HRSD, and The Salvation Army, donated funds are never used for any administrative expenses. Every penny raised goes directly to helping those in need.

We’re also asking that all municipality staff in Hampton Roads and partner agencies support Help to Others by encouraging “$20 for 20” donations and promoting the H2O program by using the media toolkit available online at shareh2o.org/toolkit. There are program logos, social media assets, sample news releases, and other promotional materials available for sharing.

Let’s help make a difference and show our community an outpouring of support.

Sincerely,

The Regional Directors of Utilities Committee/Help To Others Board of Directors
The Directors of Utilities Committee met on November 6, 2019. The following items were discussed:

- Ms. Katie Cullipher updated the Committee on the Help To Others (H2O) rebranding initiative and fundraising campaigns.
- The Committee discussed the proposed changes to the Lead and Copper Rule.
- Mr. Ted Henifin briefed the Committee on his work with the EPA Finance Workgroup and provided updates on the Federal Consent Decree.
- The Committee participated in a workshop-style discussion of groundwater levels in the Coastal Plain Aquifer System.
- Staff reports included: Fats, Oils, and Grease MOA, HRSD Integrated Plan updates, FY2020-2021 budget reminders, and an update of the most recent Waterworks Advisory Committee meeting.
The Regional Environmental Committee met on November 7, 2019. The following items were discussed.

- Ms. Jill Sunderland, HRPDC, gave a presentation to the Committee on biochar as a soil amendment stormwater best management practice.

- Mr. Jeff Flood, DEQ-Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program, gave a presentation to the Committee on potential priority issues for FY21-25 as part of the ongoing Coastal Needs Assessment.

- Dr. Ashley Haines, Norfolk State University, gave a presentation to the Committee on a STEM partnership between NSU, the city of Norfolk, and the Elizabeth River Project.

- Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC, briefed the Committee on the recommendations and budget requests that resulted from Governor Northam’s Executive Order 6, which tasked DEQ with evaluating the effectiveness of its programs.

- Ms. Katchmark and Ms. Jill Sunderland, HRPDC, briefed the Committee on highlights from the 2019 One Water Summit related to water infrastructure, resiliency, and policy implementation.

- Ms. Sunderland briefed the Committee on a new External Training Committee established by DEQ to improve communication between DEQ staff and practitioners regarding DEQ’s training courses.

- Several Committee members and guests provided status reports.
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Good afternoon Chairmen Langevin and Garamendi, Ranking Members Stefanik and Lamborn, and distinguished members of the Subcommittees. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the programs and policies within the Department of the Navy to improve the resilience of our installations, ranges, and infrastructure.

Since the release of the National Defense Strategy (NDS) in February 2018, we have revised our priorities to ensure that our installations, the platforms from which we generate and project naval power, are resilient to an ever-growing range of threats. Installation resilience represents a multi-domain, multi-dimensional challenge. It is present in the physical and virtual operating space, requiring the Department to address threats in one or more areas individually or simultaneously.

We are continually assessing the impacts on mission resiliency from an increasingly complex security environment defined by rapid technological changes and challenges from adversaries in every operating domain. Many of the risks and vulnerabilities we must address today did not exist a decade or even five years ago. While concerns of installation resilience have in the past focused on natural impacts, the range of adversary threats today represent a growing and even more demanding challenge.

The NDS outlines two threat imperatives that are guiding our assessment and prioritization of installation resilience:

1) **The homeland is no longer a sanctuary.** America is a target, whether from terrorists seeking to attack our citizens; malicious cyber activity against personal, commercial, or government infrastructure; or political and information subversion. During conflict, attacks against our critical defense, government, and economic infrastructure must be anticipated.

2) **Today, every domain is contested - air, land, sea, space, and cyberspace.** For decades, the United States has enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain. We could generally deploy our forces when we wanted, assemble them where we wanted, and operate how we wanted. That is no longer the case.
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As a result, we continue to make difficult choices and prioritize competing resilience requirements to field lethal, resilient, and rapidly adapting naval forces capable of defeating any threat. The Department defines installation resilience as the ability of naval platforms around the world to accomplish their missions despite the actions by adversaries or other events to deny, disrupt, exploit, or destroy installation-based capabilities.

Looking to the future, the quality of installation resilience directly impacts the entire spectrum of military operations from force development through power projection and force sustainment. The Department is tackling these challenges holistically across six broad categories of resiliency: contingency, energy and water, data and network, control systems cybersecurity, physical security, and environmental resilience. In addressing these requirements, the Department incorporates requirements for resiliency as a crosscutting consideration for our installation planning, design, construction and sustainment processes rather than as a separate program or specific set of discrete actions.

**Contingency Resiliency**

The Department’s ability to protect our Nation’s interests and those of our allies around the globe requires the resilience of our main operating bases to increase; the survivability of expeditionary advanced bases, forward operating bases, and cooperative security locations are equally important.

The Department sees a significant long-term risk to the resiliency of our installations domestically and around the world from the exertion of political will to limit access to, or operations from military bases and on ranges. The NDS addresses this imperative by prioritizing the strengthening of our alliances and attracting new partners as crucial to our strategy, providing a resilient, asymmetric strategic advantage. This concern is particularly acute overseas as adversaries employ various forms of coercion, activism, or economic levers to influence host nations or allies to limit cooperative security activities with the United States and access to ports, facilities, airfields and other infrastructure. We remain engaged in a series of initiatives to sustain worldwide access to infrastructure critical for the Department of the Navy to protect open sea lines of communication and other national objectives for our country and our allies.
Our adversaries also have the ability to strike the large centralized concentrations of forces we have assembled around the world. In response, we are prioritizing the authorities, policies, and resources needed to transition from large, centralized, unhardened infrastructure to smaller, dispersed, resilient, adaptive basing in multiple theaters that includes active and passive defenses. We have initiatives underway to develop new locations within the Europe and Indo-Pacific regions for the placement of forces. These initiatives will include measures to mitigate risks in cyberspace and use of foreign telecommunications infrastructure and port facilities. We will need to quickly construct facilities needed to support rapid force dispersal and protection.

While we have prioritized military construction requirements for munitions deliveries to theater, we still have significant challenges with resilient storage for new generations of high-yield munitions in theater.

We must also address resilient and agile logistics to include access to fuel around the world and on future battlefields. We are in the process of prioritizing facility requirements for prepositioned forward fuel, stocks, and munitions, as well as non-commercially dependent distributed logistics and maintenance to ensure logistics sustainment while under persistent multi-domain attack.

The Department of the Navy is integrating advanced technologies and concepts, to include cyber protection, in energy demand reduction, power generation & distribution, as well as fuel surety and distribution in order to enhance the effects of combat power to produce decisive results.

**Energy & Water Resiliency**

A revolution of technological change in our country is occurring, and it is driven by artificial intelligence, robotics, autonomous systems, machine learning, advanced telecommunications and additive manufacturing. These changes impact both society and our Nation’s security and have **ONE common critical enabler** – electricity. As energy does more, we also **NEED MORE electricity to power new generations of vehicles, sensors, robots, cyber forces, directed energy weapons and artificial intelligence. The quality of electricity will matter too** – the Navy’s future infrastructure, weapons systems, and communications will be controlled by systems sensitive to fluctuations in voltage or frequency. On the battlefield, future warfighters will need exponentially more energy with rapid recharge and resupply.
capabilities to adapt and prevail in future conflicts. Our adversaries are already seeking to counter these superior technologies with low technology, inexpensive approaches designed to deny, disrupt or attack our energy supply and distribution systems both at home and on future battlefields. They are also using access to energy as a coercive tool to influence political decisions regarding alignments with U.S. policies and interests. Most alarmingly, our infrastructure is being tested and probed today; cyber threats to our electrical grid are real and growing.

The Department’s mission assurance is a key input into defining installation resilience requirements and ultimately mission critical energy and water resiliency gaps. Our dependence on the public and private sector means they too must be integrated into the installation resilience defense team.

During FY19, the Department of the Navy conducted energy resiliency planning at fifteen high priority bases resulting in Installation Energy Plans that identify resilience gaps on and off the installation. The Navy is executing over 20 critical power energy resiliency projects (>15M) to install, repair, or upgrade various generation, switchgear, control, and uninterruptable power systems for Fleet and other mission critical activities that provide special warfare, satellite, computer, and radio / telecommunications capabilities around the globe. Additionally, the Navy saved over $20M through the execution of 55 Mobile Utility Support Equipment missions to provide energy resiliency in support of mission critical and Fleet readiness requirements, and natural disaster relief.

The Department’s robust mission assurance assessments have highlighted resilience, reliability, and cybersecurity gaps both on and off the base. As a result, the Department has implemented energy focused governance processes to mitigate its highest priority energy resilience gaps (e.g., the Energy Mission Integration Group). By bringing multiple resiliency issues into an integrated Navy and Marine Corps planning and governance process, the Department is able to pursue innovative solutions involving communities, industry, and other Federal agencies.

As an example at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, through a series of initiatives and aggressive execution, we now have the ability to operate the base for up to three weeks without commercial power. The new power plant for our Navy base at Guantanamo Bay incorporates a multi-fuel power solution using liquefied natural gas (LNG) as its primary fuel. This solution enables this remote outpost to operate for 30 days (dependent on loads) without refueling; and finally, if LNG supplies were disrupted the system is capable of operating on diesel fuel.
We are pursuing similar goals for other critical platform installations for both the Navy and Marine Corps.

Moving forward, we are building upon our successes by expanding the use of Congressional authorities to acquire energy resiliency through Inter Government Support Agreements (IGSA), Other Transaction Authority (OTA), Utility Privatization (UP), Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC), Utility Energy Service Contracts (UESC), Enhanced Use Leases (EUL), and the Defense Community Infrastructure Program. The Department is also appreciative of Congressional support for the Energy Resilience and Conservation Improvement Program (ERCIP) that allows us to target military construction funds to projects that are moving the needle on our energy resiliency and conservation goals.

Installation resilience depends on innovation and flexibility to use a vast array of fuel resources effectively and efficiently. We are pursuing all types of energy sources and have reached out to local utility service providers and experts in the private sector to collaborate on initiatives to reduce vulnerabilities, add redundancy, or improve energy management. The Department is also considering working with the Department of Defense (DOD) to explore the feasibility of stationary micro-reactors to provide long-term energy resiliency to our U.S.-based installations and is working with the recently established Navy Battery Development and Safety Enterprise Office to participate in the development of enterprise-wide battery standards and the safety of lithium-ion batteries. Additionally, the Department is exploring a digital twinning effort to include creating digital replicas for utility and telecommunications to support new platforms and major modernization efforts.

In pursuit of our goal to improve our access to sustainable water sources in drought-prone areas, we are working on cooperative regional management action plans and a review of water rights to benefit both the Department and local communities that want to continue to enhance local economic development. To meet the committee’s interest in increased water conservation, we have recently stepped up our collaboration with industry leaders to improve water conveyance systems to reduce loss, recapitalize aging infrastructure and meet installation mission requirements.
**Data and Network Resiliency**

In response to the increased role data and information play in maintaining our maritime competitive advantage, the Secretary of the Navy recently ordered the establishment of a new Special Assistant for Information Management and Chief Information Officer (CIO). The CIO is supported by two three-star deputies aligned to the services with four subordinate directorates including: a Chief Technology Officer to design a fully integrated digital mission capability platform; a Chief Data Officer to harness the power of raw data; a Chief Digital Innovation Officer to leverage emerging technology to deliver transformative capabilities; and a Chief Information Security Officer to protect data and information, regardless of where it resides.

The newly empowered CIO is chartered with developing and implementing an overall vision and strategy to guide the department over the next five years to modernize our technology, apply current and emerging technology to bring winning, transformative capabilities to our Sailors, Marines, and civilians, and defend our information by leaning in on cyber hygiene and operations.

From an installations perspective, we are tackling cybersecurity for Information Technology (IT) and Operational Technology (OT) separately. This integration of IT and OT data and network resiliency is the foundation for moving our installations to smart technologies, artificial intelligence and increased automation required to deliver efficiency and optimize the talents of our Sailors and Marines.

Our Nation has historically thrived upon the spirit of entrepreneurship and innovation to tackle bold infrastructure initiatives, and rapidly enhance economic prosperity in every corner of our country. These initiatives have also required collaboration with States and local communities to manage the impacts of rapid development. **We now have a new opportunity to collaborate on the national development of small cell technology and a Fifth Generation (5G) network.** In fact, collaboration is critical to our national security to reduce the threat of foreign cyberattacks to this revolutionary new infrastructure.

5G has the potential to significantly enhance our Nation’s security by supporting new capabilities, intelligence sharing, and synchronized effects. The Department could use backbone 5G networks to upgrade training, planning, logistics, and unit performance at all its bases around the country. We know that future militaries will depend on the quality and speed of the decisions, enabled by
software, data, and artificial intelligence through wireless networks. Whichever country dominates 5G will gain an economic and military edge.

With a revolution of new 5G-enabled military capabilities, decisions of where to locate those new technologies, and the supporting industries, will be impacted by the security and resiliency of local power and telecommunications networks. The military value for the “base of the future” will depend on the availability and relative security of a small cell telecommunications infrastructure. As such, States and local communities have an economic stake in national defense and must take an active role now during permitting processes to ensure the development of local 5G infrastructure minimizes security risks.

In consultation with the Wireless Infrastructure Association and its members, we are in the process of updating a series of policies that will guide the secure deployment of wireless broadband, including small cell technologies on Navy and Marine Corps installations to ensure cybersecurity of 5G infrastructure. In February 2019, we authorized Navy and Marine Corps installations to participate in First Net. We believe participation in First Net will improve and enhance coordination among all first responders serving Navy and Marine Corps installations regardless of whether they report to the Department of the Navy, another federal agency, a State, County, City, or Tribe. We view our participation as truly a win-win.

Control Systems Cyber Resiliency

The rapidly advancing technology to enable smart cities and industries has outrun the security needed to protect our lives, privacy, and resources. The Department increasingly depends on integrated, digital control systems to govern and monitor many aspects of military installation and platform operations. Millions of control systems convert virtual commands into physical actions. Control systems enable every type of weapon system to respond to human or virtual commands. These control systems are vital to the operation of all U.S. critical infrastructure from dams, power plants, water systems, electricity distribution, to the oil and gas main pipelines we depend on, with 90 percent owned and operated by private industry. While digital technology improves efficiency, it adds risk and increases vulnerability to cyber exploitation or attack.
Recent intelligence and government warnings cite control system cybersecurity as a critical national security vulnerability with threats ranging from hostile governments, terrorist groups, and malicious intruders to disgruntled employees. Control systems are vulnerable to data theft, service manipulation or denial. In addition, cyber-attacks targeting building management systems can result in the incapacitation of key systems and infrastructure. In extreme cases, unsecured control systems can be exploited, threatening privacy, safety, and lives on our installations, in our homes, in our cars, and in nearly every public gathering place. Adding to the concern, any mobile device connected to publicly available networks affords bad actors millions more entry points for these types of attacks.

Responding to these challenges, the Department has engaged to reduce our risk and vulnerability starting with enterprise-wide inventories, cyber-hygiene initiatives, and deployment of an enterprise architecture to provide control system security and monitoring. The Navy has deployed a control system test-bed working with the private sector to enable rapid design, testing, integration and deployment of control system technologies at our bases. As a result, this year the Navy successfully built a framework to assess and reduce the risk of cyber vulnerabilities for facilities related control systems. The Navy has prioritized its investments and efforts towards cyber securing the facility control systems supporting its Defense and Task Critical Assets. To date, the Department has secured 144 of 187 known mission critical facility related control systems, with the rest currently in various stages of the Risk Management Framework process with a projected completion date of FY21.

Finally, the Department of the Navy is leading the DOD effort to detect, respond, and recover from cyberattacks to control systems by piloting the initial phases of DOD More Situational Awareness for Control Systems (MOSAICS).

**Physical Security Resiliency**

Keeping pace with current and emerging threats to the physical security of our installations and assets is criticality important to ensure continuity of our mission and the protection of personnel. Our most important capability continues to be the men and women of our Navy and Marine Corps Security Forces and we are committed to ensuring they have the training and equipment necessary to perform their jobs. In addition to well established anti-terrorism and force
protection standards, the Department is leveraging rapidly advancing physical security technologies to enhance the effectiveness of our Security forces as well as counter unique and emerging threats to Department assets. As an example, both the Navy and Marine Corps are moving out rapidly to deploy Counter-Unmanned Aircraft Systems (cUAS) at mission critical locations to mitigate the rapidly developing “drone” threat. Likewise, both the Navy and Marine Corps are employing the Defense Biometrics Identification System (DBIDS) at our installation gates and access control points to ensure personnel and visitors are properly vetted prior to coming aboard our installations.

We also include within the realm of physical security resilience the ability to test, train, and operate in areas free from foreign surveillance. In CY2018, the Navy was directly involved in 48 cases to protect equities related to capabilities, technologies, and the supply chain or in close proximity to sensitive areas through the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFIUS). We appreciate the passage of the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act (FIRRMA) to expand working interagency processes to identify, review, and advise about impacts of intended real estate transactions that could pose a national security threat to the Department’s training, testing, and operations.

Finally, because the threat environment is continually changing and it is imperative that we apply our investments to counter the most current and emerging threats, the Navy and Marine Corps have developed robust Mission Assurance programs and aggressive installation assessment schedules. The specific purpose of this program is to provide Department of the Navy leadership with the most current threat assessment and vulnerability analysis for our installations and recommend solutions to ensure maximum return on future investments in personnel, technologies, and projects.

**Environmental Resiliency**

The DON faces an array of challenges for installations and ranges to be environmentally resilient. We consider the impacts of extreme weather, rising sea levels, land subsidence, wildfires, droughts, and incompatible development as factors restricting or altering our ability to train, test, and operate.

Most recently, we are recovering and restoring critical weapon system test and development capabilities at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake in the
aftermath of earthquakes that struck outside Ridgecrest, California in July 2019. In our review of damage, it is starkly clear those modern facilities designed with seismic features fared far better than older facilities previously built to code, but lacking special engineering features based on current understanding of earthquakes. As we proceed with design and construction efforts this year, we will be engineering stronger, more resilient facilities capable of withstanding future earthquakes and other threats.

We approach these challenges within a fixed topline that forces us to prioritize investments among a myriad of competing mission requirements. It is difficult to predict where the next hurricane, flood, tornado, or earthquake will hit. As a result, we prudently respond to unique environmental conditions during the planning and design of a facility by addressing the location of a facility, wind and snow loading, the placement of building systems and special structural considerations. We are also working with regions and communities to develop comprehensive engineering plans to reduce the impacts of flooding and geological subsidence. In some cases where we have waterside bases built on fill material that is eroding, we must work with local communities to restore sea walls.

The Department regularly updates its building requirements, known as Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) to reflect updated or more stringent industry and local standards. For example, recently the Master Planning and High Performance and Sustainable Building Requirements UFC were updated to incorporate additional weather considerations.

Competition for air, land, sea space, electromagnetic spectrum, and other forms of encroachment continues to present a challenge to the resiliency of our ranges and the need for larger hazard areas to execute training, testing, and operations to meet NDS requirements. The Department appreciates the reliable support of Congress for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) program, which we successfully use to reduce pressure from competing land uses and impacts to natural resources near installations and ranges.

Many environmental resiliency challenges require collaboration with local communities, States, other federal agencies, and industry leaders to develop regional plans to protect military capabilities. As an example, we are working closely with the State of California to ensure that future renewable energy development off the coast and in the Eastern part of the State will not negatively impact critical DOD training and testing ranges. Our goal is to support the
development of all energy sources while ensuring the resiliency of range capabilities that are required to support future generations of weapon system development.

The Navy has implemented a robust environmental compliance program for at-sea training and testing activities to ensure the Navy can meet its Title 10 responsibilities while balancing the need for environmental stewardship and conservation. Through implementation of the at-sea program, the Navy conducts training and testing activities in ways that minimize impacts to natural, cultural and other environmental resources to ensure the continued resiliency of the environment to support vital Navy missions. The Navy has worked diligently with environmental regulators to provide safeguards to important species and habitats, while preserving access to vital ranges, operating areas, and airspace, and providing the operators with flexibility in how they execute training and testing requirements to support rapidly changing operational demands.

The Department also implements a comprehensive conservation program under the Sikes Act, Endangered Species Act, and other environmental laws to conserve, enhance, and restore natural resources while achieving no net loss to the military mission. We have proactively engaged with federal agencies to ensure that their actions taken to promote environmental resiliency, such as the listing of endangered species, designation of critical habitat, and establishment or expansion of National Marine Sanctuaries and Monuments, are accomplished in ways to protect national security interests.

Our experience is that the resiliency of our installations is enhanced by integrating into, and not competing with, the environmental and economic activities of our surrounding communities. Over time, this resiliency has been tested by communities concerns about our military activities, even where Congress or regulators have provided specific designation for military readiness use or in areas historically used for naval operations. With shared long-term vision, planning and development, we continue to address and resolve community concerns and execute infrastructure projects, implement force movements, avoid financial obligations for mitigation measures, and maintain full naval training, testing, and operations.
Conclusion

The threats challenging installation resilience are multi-faceted, extending across domains and technical disciplines that require highly integrated and holistic solutions. The contributing factors are complicated, and interwoven into a threat continuum, whether energy reliability, C-UAS, digital controls, or environmental impacts. The broad spectrum of threats to our installations represent risks to the Navy and Marine Corps operating environment, missions, and the ability of built infrastructure to support force generation and power projection. Mitigating these risks must be prioritized among competing Department priorities. Absent stand-alone remedies, we rely on the application of appropriate mitigation and resiliency measures during the development of installation requirements to build a stronger and more adaptive platform to deter aggression and project power. The Department will continue to work with Congress, industry leaders, and our community partners to maintain the flexibility we need to evaluate risks both inside and outside our fence lines, and incorporate mitigations to those risks into various planning and management processes.

We appreciate the opportunity provided by your committees today to discuss initiatives to improve the resiliency of the Shore Domain. We hope to use this opportunity to continue to partner with Congress on actions to address our priorities. Installation resilience, in all its dimensions – those described here and emerging threats we have not yet encountered – is inextricably linked to the readiness and lethality of naval power to represent, and if necessary, defend America’s interests anytime, anywhere.

End of statement
October 16, 2019

Mr. Robert A. Crum
Executive Director
Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
723 Woodlake Drive
Chesapeake, VA 23320

Dear Mr. Crum:

Attached for your records is a copy of the Resolution adopted by the Norfolk City Council on Tuesday, September 24, 2019, appointing Dr. Larry “Chip” Filer, Norfolk City Manager, to the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission for a term beginning September 24, 2019. Dr. Filer replaces Mr. Douglas L. Smith.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 664-4296.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Bull
City Clerk
Resolution 1,764

A RESOLUTION APPOINTING DR. LARRY FILER TO 1 BOARD, 1 COMMITTEE, AND 1 COMMISSION FOR CERTAIN TERMS.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Norfolk:

Section 1:- That Dr. Larry Filer is hereby appointed to the Norfolk Employees’ Retirement System, for a term beginning September 24, 2019, which is the unexpired term of Mr. Douglas Smith, resigned.

Section 2:- That Dr. Larry Filer is hereby appointed to the City Investment Management Committee, for a term beginning September 24, 2019, and expiring March 12, 2021, which is the unexpired term of Mr. Douglas Smith, resigned.

Section 3:- That Dr. Larry Filer is hereby appointed to the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, for a term beginning September 24, 2019 and expiring June 30, 2020, which is the unexpired term of Mr. Douglas Smith, resigned.

Section 4:- That this Resolution shall be in effect from and after its adoption.
Adopted by Council September 24, 2019
Effective September 24, 2019

TRUE COPY
TESTE:

______________________________
RICHARD ALLAN BULL, CITY CLERK

BY: ____________________________
ADISA MUSE, CHIEF DEPUTY CITY CLERK
October 24, 2019

Mr. Christopher M. Price  
Office of the City Manager  
306 Cedar Road  
Chesapeake, VA 23322

Dear Mr. Price:

I am pleased to advise you that City Council, at its meeting of October 22, 2019, appointed you to your first term on the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission replacing Mr. James E. Baker. Your term begins on November 1, 2019 and expires on July 12, 2021. Your Certificate of Appointment is enclosed.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to call me or Deputy City Clerk Jenifer Freeman at 382-6151.

Sincerely,

Sandra M. Madison, MMC  
City Clerk

SMM/jnf

Enclosure

cc: City Attorney  
Commonwealth’s Attorney  
Kelli Arledge, Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

I, Sandra M. Madison, City Clerk, City of Chesapeake, Virginia, do hereby certify that

Christopher M. Price

was appointed by Chesapeake City Council to serve on the

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission

for a term to begin November 1, 2019 and expires on July 12, 2021.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and cause the Seal of the City of Chesapeake, Virginia, to be affixed hereto this Twenty-fourth day of October, 2019.

Sandra M. Madison, MMC
City Clerk