

AGENDA NOTE – HRPDC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

ITEM #7: SUBMITTED PUBLIC COMMENTS

Written public comments are attached. Any new written public comments will be distributed as a handout at the meeting.

Attachment 7

ITEM #8: PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

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

ITEM #9: APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

A. Minutes

The Minutes of the October 16, 2014 Annual Commission Meeting is attached.

Attachment 9-A

Recommended Action:

The HRPDC staff recommends approval of the minutes.

B. Treasurer's Reports

The Balance Sheet and Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for September 2014 activities is attached. This Statement reflects the financial status of the HRPDC as a whole.

Attachment 9-B

Recommended Action:

The HRPDC staff recommends the Treasurer's Reports be accepted.

~~~~~  
**HRPDC Public Comment**  
~~~~~

RE:

Name: Mr. Ryan Matthew Baham

Date: November 2, 2014

Public Comment Input (Via E-Mail)

I recently sent out an open letter to a number of public officials and similar figures regarding Hampton Boulevard, Norfolk International Terminal truck traffic, and some of the socio-economic dynamics here in Norfolk. That letter is copied below. After sending it out I received a letter from the Transportation Secretary of Virginia thanking me and encouraging me to bring the issue up with a few other organizations. I also had the chance to meet with John Reinhart of the Port Authority to discuss the ideas in my letter.

Because one of the central ideas relates to the creation of an alternative energy market through Norfolk's regulation of terminal traffic on Hampton, I have been sending this letter around to various other parties and it was suggested to me by Ann Regn of the VA Department of Environmental Quality that I approach the Planning Commission with the suggestion of examining the prospect of using the unique opportunity presented by Hampton Boulevard's restricted hours as a way to stimulate a local biofuel and alternative energy market.

In speaking to Reinhart about alternative fuel and other energy use in port operations, he seemed not unsupportive, but the economics weren't quite there yet and his concern was his appointment mandate to bring the port back into the black. But it's not to say that the authority wouldn't be supportive of future efforts if it had a few years of positive balance sheets. Reinhart did tout a few environmentally friendly efforts at some of the terminals, even in limited maneuvering room.

I focus mostly on biofuel because the infrastructure is present for its distribution, the Port of Virginia is a huge grain port, the waste/refuse (read: biofuel-feedstock) of tens of millions of people line the rail and trucking routes that already utilize the HR gateway, not to mention the tens of millions that line the coast to the north and south. The demand for the fuel is found/created in 2 ways:

- 1.) The regulated trucking hours of Hampton Boulevard were put in place because of excessive fuel emissions and excessive noise. It's not unreasonable to work out an agreement with the City and civic organizations that if trucks are certified biofuel/alternative energy and modified to be no louder than standard traffic, then they could be permitted to operate after hours. This problem with Hampton Boulevard will persist at least until the third crossing is finished, and likely even afterward. So there is a temporary artificial market incentive to use cleaner fuels in order to be allowed to operate on an extremely useful segment of road. The companies that can modify their vehicles to operate on that section of road will have quicker deliveries and perhaps even save on fuel costs that might be incurred by the forced circumnavigation. -And perhaps could even benefit from the PR.

2.) I think that there's a large market for environmentally-minded people who would prefer to use non-fossil fuels in their vehicles, but are unable to get that fuel freely or easily. These are the sorts of folks who might spend extra money on hybrid vehicles, for example. They would be willing to pay a marked premium for non-fossil fuel, if they could find it. The fuel would be explicitly sold AS a premium fuel, like craft beer. Budweiser and Miller are standard gasoline, \$1.95/can. Devil's Backbone, a craft beer, sells for \$8.00/can. It's a perception of quality, community, artisan craft, etc. There IS a market for the more expensive fuel, it's just not developed.

I have submitted message to a few other specifically interested groups like the VA Trucking Association and the Biofuels Association. The last set of people I'd like really like to contact are the mechanics and garages to see about streamlining a process to A.) convert standard diesel or gasoline engines to burn biofuels and B.) to see about a process to further muffle diesel engines and see about padding and joints to quiet the containers as they shutter and bounce down the roads.

Thank you so much for entertaining these suggestions. Should you have any specific points of contact or organizations willing to lend an interested eye or ear, please forward my letters on to them or direct me.

Below is the original letter referenced in the above comment, sent on Monday, September 15, 2014.

My name is Ryan Baham and I'm just a concerned citizen with a few thoughts for the folks involved in the issue surrounding roads, traffic, the terminal, and residential development. I have addressed this letter to the people that I regard as the major stakeholders or representatives thereof in the matters that I discuss below.

In advance of the West Ghent Civic League's meeting on Tuesday (<http://hamptonroads.com/2014/09/norfolk-civic-leagues-oppose-longer-truck-hours>), I wish to add some considerations and suggestions. I will not be able to attend due to prior engagements, but please keep my thoughts in mind during the meeting and as this conflict continues to drag out.

I'm a Ghent resident and live a block from Hampton, sandwiched between the Midtown Tunnel and the railroad underpass. I sometimes choose to risk the 10 minute wait to get onto Hampton to head south to work. I often walk to Chelsea, crossing what can only be described as a horrifying river of steel-composite death. And my Saturday morning bicycle group rides feature a brief jaunt up Hampton to cross the Lafayette River. It is a busy, dirty, polluted, noxious, loud, dangerous road. I do not like being anywhere near it. Ever. Not only do I hate the cars bearing down on me when I'm trying to calmly turn onto my road at a reasonable speed, but when I'm afoot, it stands as a physical and psychological barrier to one of my favorite places for unimpeded scenic runs and evening strolls full of sweet smiling faces and kind people: West Ghent. Those are my sincere feelings. Having read them, please keep them in mind as you shift gears with me to follow the next bit.

It seems clear that there will be an increase in throughput to the terminals of Hampton Roads once post-Panamax shippers and liners start looking to deep-water ports on the East Coast. That's what Norfolk is (so far): a gateway for cargo. The increase in cargo traffic is especially likely as Craney Island will eventually provide the additional capacity and equipment to make it easier for much larger transactions to occur at a single port, making it worthwhile for shippers and liners to add the port to their list of stops and with that will come an increase in secondary services to the region. Though Craney Island is in Portsmouth, the added capacity of the entire port system will allow NIT the breathing room to specialize in cargo types and related services and more fully utilize its space. This increased cargo capacity and services concentration is great for Hampton Roads, but does pose a challenge, especially for the City of Norfolk, which is surrounded by water, by forcing its road grid to squeeze truck-bound container traffic through a few tunnels and bridges to get it from and out into the hinterlands - the source of and destination for much of the import and export business that provides so much of the area's non-military sustenance. It means that the major ways out of NIT are 64 North by truck and through a tunnel, 64 South to circumnavigate the city, two sets of tracks across Hampton Boulevard and out onto the rail system, or Hampton Boulevard south through a tunnel and out onto the interstate from there.

Given the relatively few methods of transporting cargo out of the city and the absolutely vital place of the terminal for the city, it is not an option to continue to limit its operations. If residents of this city wish to continue to see the city prosper and develop, they simply cannot also entertain the idea of forcing traffic from what is essentially a terminal service road, Hampton Boulevard. It's slightly thoughtless for a relatively small group of residents living along a de facto service road for one of the major economic engines of the region to redirect trucks solely onto the interstate system in an already heavily traveled grid segment connecting commuters between Hampton/New Port News and Chesapeake, and Norfolk and Virginia Beach. It unnecessarily hampers the expansion and functioning of the terminal and severely gluts the flow of traffic along the other major routes. It's a NIMBY mentality that just shifts the place of inconvenience to another part of the region. The civics organizations should spend more time making their communities more hospitable, appealing, and walkable internally and focus on connective access points to transportation arteries and other neighborhoods or destinations (that is, direct foot traffic to safer and well-constructed and centrally placed crosswalks over Hampton and direct vehicle traffic to a few well designed and placed intersections). Spend more time drawing people out of their cars and away from the main roads. Advocate better insulated homes that are less apt to allow the sound of the highway in. And in particular, I suggest looking at my first suggestion below and start spending your energy pursuing solutions along those lines.

As for how the various governmental and institutional organizations should handle the situation, I've come up with a list of suggestions that can be used individually or in concert to address the issue with Hampton-adjacent residents directly as well as to better position Norfolk's stake in the Port of Virginia for future development.

- 1.) Push for clean fuel and quieter trucks. Much of Virginia's trade is with Europe, which has a propensity to choose less wasteful and polluting methods of doing business. This is illustrated by the number of ads on foreign trade and shipping websites touting eco-friendly and carbon-zero terminal operations, logistics, supply chains, etc. An entire

industry in Polish ports has cropped up around just that. Norfolk has the talent and industries to pursue this. Encourage those nascent and experimental companies to scale up with their wild fuel and energy ideas. Partner with our military. Push our military vets to put their skills to work in Norfolk innovating new fuels for our domestic truck fleets to stop choking us with their effluent. And ask for trucking companies to modify their trucks with a muffling device to quiet their trucks. This can easily be implemented by an "After Hours" certification process. All that's required is a quick check by the City to verify that the vehicles have been muffled to no louder than the obnoxious pick-ups and cars that buzz up and down Hampton as well as a clean fuel system and a nice green sticker or decal rewarded. This could encourage the development of an entire alternative fuel industry in Norfolk, already known for its hydrocarbon exports, and also provide work for repair/alteration companies to muffle the semi equipment. This could be a chance for Norfolk and VPA to help set industry standards in a way that will benefit both residents and the environment.

- 2.) The VPA 2040 Master Plan only set aside 1% of its budget for NIT improvements, but the Authority should examine this suggestion and consider the benefits. Build a bridge between NIT and the NS coal terminal linking to Brambleton/Midtown Tunnel - an agreement could be had to share costs with the trucking companies to pay tolls for use of NS' land, instead of the City having to buy the land outright. The ongoing toll, especially given its bond potential, may also encourage the rail company to help foot the bill for the bridge and highway as well as other port improvements. This would allow trucking to operate throughout the night while bypassing the neighborhoods along Hampton almost entirely and will be another draw for shippers and logistics companies concerned about the gridlock of Norfolk.
- 3.) Begin offering ro-ro ferry services to move trucks from NIT to the other shore during Hampton restriction hours. Build a pier or use an unused pier at PMT or APMT to move ready to roll trucks from NIT and also ready to load trucks over to NIT from PMT or APMT. This could also be planned in such a way that ferry service can be offered at unplanned last-minute notice or special request to add additional flexibility to the terminal. It can be employed during particularly busy days on the roads, during road flooding periods, and any other time that congestion is an issue or concern.
- 4.) An NIT-adjacent not-so-far-inland terminal could be established along the CSX/NS tracks near the industrial area or airport to serve as a second logistics hub to relieve lower Hampton Boulevard and feed cargo directly onto the interstate system on the eastern side of the city. There are a number of sites that are roughly the size of VPA's Front Royal Inland Terminal, including the Ford Plant, Lake Wright Golf Course, the baseball fields in Norfolk Industrial Park, and the landfill near Campostella. There are also numerous underused plots around the city roughly half the size of Front Royal that could serve as nice inland terminals. This should create the benefits of reducing traffic glut while increasing Norfolk's/VPA's intermodal capacity and cargo and warehousing space, encourage the growth of manufacturers who will have easier access to import/export facilities, bring in more companies looking to offer supply and logistics services, expand the financial services necessary to bond and insure those previously mentioned trade services, and of course help disperse the concentration of truck traffic away from the west side of Norfolk. One of the requirements for this plan

would likely be that more grade separations would have to take place over the railroad tracks and additional tracks could be put in place to be used to ferry cargo to and from the terminals so that trucking companies have multiple access points to cargo loading yards and don't have to worry as much about congestion, wait times, idle trucks, road use schedules, and so forth. This is another opportunity for the rail companies, as they would collect fees for providing the rail services to and from the nearby not-so-far-inland terminal.

- 5.) It seems that the City has really done a poor job of projecting and developing its maritime-trade identity. Residents only vaguely recognize the existence of terminals lining the river, much less their importance - as illustrated by the people of Ghent wishing to limit semi traffic on that extremely important stretch of road. Gantry cranes? You mean those dinosaur-looking things?

Why, in a city that helps make up one of the largest ports in the nation, do residents not have a robust sense of identity and understanding of their city's place in global trade and maritime history? The city's people should be proud of their maritime importance. To live in this port city should be a badge of honor and we should see more of a maritime identity shaped into the physical and cultural representation of the city. The mermaid is pretty, but she is a stand-in for the development and projection of a real identity for this city, one undeniably tied to its water and rails. The city that was once denied development by cities like Richmond and Petersburg, but vigorous rail development in postbellum Virginia propelled this backwater into what it is today: home to the largest Naval complex on the globe and one of the largest seaports in the nation. Residents should be proud that the hard work of this city supplies so much of the country with goods from the world and the world with the goods of so much of the country. That is an on-going amazing feat. It's incredible. It's cool. And it's worth being proud of the hard work that those before us put into the creation of this region as well as the hard work that this city does for so many people within and outside of it.

The City needs to get behind this and project its identity as one of the most important ports in the nation and globe. The benefits of developing that image obviously include having citizens who are enthusiastic and supportive of terminal and port developments, but also can really go a long way to helping further develop a domestic merchant community. It surprises me that this port town doesn't have a distinct manufacturing and merchant mindset. As a matter of fact, as indicated by recent figures by the economic development department, Norfolk has a notably lower than average percentage of manufacturing, as compared to other towns and the nation at large. -And this in a port town. Refer back to suggestion 4.

These suggestions of mine, new bridges, clean energy and muffling devices, ro-ro ferries for cargo trucks, inland terminals in town, and identity campaigns, will be expensive and difficult to get approved, funded, and implemented. They will cause lots of inconveniences for the workers and residents of the city. Many residents and businesses will fight it. People will grumble about the dust. But those are the sighs of short-sighted, self-centered moments of frustration.

The projects are long-term positioning meant to benefit everyone. If the City and Authority are serious about remaining a part of the sea trade industry as it expands, these are the sorts of things they'll need to work very hard to put in place.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I hope that it can contribute to a constructive movement forward.

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission
Annual Commission Meeting
Summary Minutes of October 16, 2014

The Annual Commission Meeting of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission was called to order at 9:35 a.m. in the Regional Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

Commissioners:

Kenneth Wright, Chairman (PO)	McKinley Price (NN)
Clyde Haulman, Vice Chairman (WM)	Saundra Cherry (NN)
James Baker (CH)	Marcus Jones (NO)
Amar Dwarkanath (CH)	John Rowe (PO)
Debbie Ritter (CH)	J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)*
Dr. Ella P. Ward (CH)	Michael W. Johnson (SH)
Barry Cheatham (FR)	Barry Porter (SH)
Randy Martin (FR)	Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)
Mary Bunting (HA)	Tyrone Franklin (SY)
Chris Snead (HA)	Barbara Henley (VB)
George Wallace (HA)	Louis R. Jones (VB)
Anne Seward (IW)	James Spore (VB)
Mary Jones (JC)	Jackson C. Tuttle, II (WM)
Bryan J. Hill (JC)	James McReynolds (YK)
Jim Bourey (NN)	

Interim Executive Director:

Randy R. Keaton

Legal Representation:

Peter Huber (Willcox and Savage)

Commissioners Absent:

Brenda Garton (GL)	T. Carter Williams (SM)
John Meyer (GL)	Linda T. Johnson (SU)
Dee Dee Darden (IW)	John Seward (SY)
Paul Fraim (NO)	Robert Dyer (VB)
Thomas Smigiel (NO)	John Moss (VB)
Angelia Williams (NO)	Amelia Ross-Hammond (VB)
Eugene Hunt (PQ)	John Uhrin (VB)
Peter Stephenson (SM)	Thomas Shepperd (YK)

*Late arrival or early departure.

Others Recorded Attending:

Robb Braidwood, Earl Sorey (CH); Hui Shan Walker (HA); Bryan Pennington, Jeff Raliski, Jim Redick, Ron Williams (NO); Britta Ayers, Brian Stilley, Jerri Wilson (NN); Sherri Neil (PO); Dallas O. Jones (SH); Bob Matthias (VB); Cathy Aiello (Aiello Enterprises); Leslie Roberts (Dixon, Hughes Goodman); William Ginnow (HRMMRS); Mark Geduldig-Yatrofsky, (Portsmouth City Watch.org); Steve Best (RCPT); Ellis James, (Sierra Club Observer); Martha McClees (VB Vision); Tara Reel (Virginia Tech Transportation Institute); Pamela Jamieson (Citizen); Staff: Kelli Arledge, Shernita Bethea, Melton Boyer, Jennifer Coleman, Nancy Collins, Kathlene Grauberger, Greg Grootendorst, Julia Hillegass, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Mike Long, Jai McBride, Benjamin McFarlane, Camelia Ravanbakht, John Sadler, Jill Sunderland, Jenny Tribo, Joe Turner, Chris Vaigneur.

Chairman Wright welcomed The City of Hampton's newly appointed Commissioner, Ms. Chris Osby Snead and James City County's new County Administrator, Mr. Bryan J. Hill.

Approval/Modification of Agenda

Chairman Wright announced a new item, MS4 process update, would be covered in the Old/New Business section of the Agenda.

Commissioner Barry Cheatham Moved to approve the agenda, as amended, seconded by Commissioner McKinley Price. The Motion Carried.

WORKSHOP AGENDA

FY 2013-2014 Audit

Dixon Hughes Goodman Partner, Ms. Leslie Roberts, briefed the Commission on the results of the FY 2013-2014 Audit.

The Independent Auditors' Report states that they present fairly, in all material respects, the basic financial statements of the HRPDC. There were no material weaknesses or deficiencies in any of the internal controls or processes of the HRPDC financial activity, and all information was free of any material misstatements.

Emergency Management Sustainability

Mr. Steve Best, Regional Catastrophic Planning Team Chair, updated the Commission on the progress of the restructuring of the Emergency Management Committees.

The consolidated Hampton Roads All Hazards Committee would contain the following:

- Encompass all current efforts from emergency management committees
- Broad scope
- Align with FEMA's national response plan
- Align with the State of Virginia's emergency operation plan
- Stakeholders beyond the HRPDC boundaries

Current levels of staffing and resources are sufficient to fund the Committee. If the Region ceases to receive federal funding, a comprehensive review will commence to draft sustainment options.

Chesapeake Bay TMDL

Ms. Jennifer Tribo, HRPDC Senior Water Resources Planner, provided the Commission a historical timeline of Chesapeake Bay TMDL activity.

The Chesapeake Bay TMDL was established by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in December 2010. Concurrently Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia developed watershed implementation plans (WIPs) outlining how the load reductions would be met in each State. All pollution control measures needed to fully restore the Bay and its tidal rivers must be in place by 2025. Practices that will meet 60 percent of the necessary pollution reductions must be in place by 2017.

In 2012, the States submitted Phase II implementation plans designed to strengthen the initial cleanup strategies. In 2017, the EPA will conduct a midpoint assessment to inform Phase III WIPs. This assessment will evaluate the nutrient reduction progress to date and incorporate the latest science and data into the Bay models used to develop the TMDL. In 2018, jurisdictions will submit Phase III WIPs that will provide additional detail on restoration actions beyond 2017 to ensure that the 2025 goals are met.

The HRPDC staff had the following concerns in regards to the TMDL and WIP:

- Inconsistencies between model and local data
- Virginia used estimates for BMP implementation in its baseline scenario
- Cost of stormwater BMPs is very high compared to other sectors
- All urban lands treated equally in Virginia's WIP
- No clear plan to address non-regulated urban loads

Ms. Tribo reviewed the following solutions:

- Solicit local land use and land cover data from localities throughout the bay watershed
- Collaboration between the State and the localities to provide more accurate data for the bay model
- Invest in research for innovative stormwater BMPs
- Urban reduction scenarios should account for past progress and prioritize areas with the highest delivered loads
- Focus implementation efforts and identify funding for non MS4 areas

Commissioner James McReynolds Moved for the State to review the process of voluntary nutrient reduction, provide funding for voluntary reduction programs, and analyze loading rates and opportunities for nutrient reductions, seconded by Commissioner Robert Dyer. The Motion Carried.

Groundwater Withdrawal Permits

Ms. Whitney Katchmark, HRPDC Principal Water Resources Engineer, stated the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has proposed cutting the permitted groundwater withdrawals of the largest fourteen users. Eight of the fourteen permits are held by localities in Hampton Roads.

DEQ has concluded that the existing withdrawals from the Coastal Plain aquifer system are not sustainable and reported to the State Water Commission that withdrawals are contributing to declining water levels, saltwater intrusion and land subsidence.

DEQ has held meetings with each user that has a permit up for renewal and suggested a specific reduction to the permit. DEQ would like all eight permits to be issued by September 2015 and include steps to reach the reductions within the ten year permit term.

Ms. Katchmark noted two studies are currently being conducted, the economic impact of groundwater reduction and the State Water Supply plan. The completed studies will be an invaluable tool in finding long term, viable solutions.

Commissioner John Rowe Moved to authorize the Chairman to send a letter to DEQ requesting for DEQ to collaborate with the HRPDC on this issue, seconded by Commissioner Selena Cuffee-Glenn. The Motion Carried.

Legislative Agenda

Ms. Julia Hillegass, HRPDC Public Information and Community Affairs Administrator, reviewed the FY 15 legislative agenda with the Commission. Numerous items were carried over from the previous year, with the new priorities listed below:

- Chesapeake Bay Watershed Improvement Plan (WIP) funding
- Sea level rise and climate change
- Amending Virginia stormwater management law
- Well construction data
- Groundwater permitting
- Water resources study
- Lower groundwater permit threshold from 300,000 gal per month to 100,000
- Installation of chloride monitoring network for groundwater
- Establish land subsidence monitoring program
- Agriculture programs
- Alternate power for commercial fueling sties
- Flooding and sea level rise
- Emergency shelters
- Realistic alignment of Standards of Learning and Standards of Accountability with State standards of Quality funding levels
- Balloon releases

Commissioner Louis Jones requested the City of Virginia Beach not be included in the land acquisition program item.

Commissioners Debbie Ritter and Mary Bunting indicated the cities of Chesapeake and Hampton continue to possess land acquisition programs as a legislative priority.

REGULAR AGENDA

Employee Recognition

Chairman Wright acknowledged and commended Mr. Jim Hummer, HRPDC IT Manager, for his 15 years of service and dedication.

Submitted Public Comments

Chairman Wright indicated there were no submitted public comments.

Public Comment

Mr. Ellis W. James of Norfolk commended Surry County on its presentation of the Solar Panel Farm and the dangers of fracking.

Approval of Consent Items

Chairman Wright asked for approval of the following consent items:

- A. Minutes of September 18, 2014 Executive Committee Meeting
- B. Treasurer's Report of August 2014
- C. FY 2015 Budget Amendments
- D. FY 2013-2014 Audit
- E. Legislative Agenda
- F. Waters of the U.S. Rulemaking
- G. Sea Level Rise Adaptation Plan for Virginia Beach
- H. Emergency Management Sustainability
- I. Authorizing Resolutions and Certifications for FY 2014 State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) Funds

The City of Virginia Beach requested Item G, sea level rise adaptation plan, be deferred until next month.

Commissioner Cheatham Moved to approve the consent items, as amended, seconded by Commissioner Price. The Motion Carried.

Nominating Committee Report/Election of Officers

Chairman Wright announced the Nominating Committee recommendations for officers for the next year below:

Chairman: Mayor Kenneth I. Wright

Vice-Chairman: Mayor Clyde Haulman

Secretary, HRPDC Interim Executive Director, Randy Keaton

Treasurer: County Administrator, James McReynolds

Commissioner Price Moved to approve the nominations, seconded by Commissioner Ella Ward. The Motion Carried.

HRPDC Three Month Tentative Schedule

Chairman Wright outlined the Three Month Tentative Schedule section of the agenda.

Advisory Committee Summaries

Chairman Wright highlighted the Advisory Committee Summaries section of the agenda.

Correspondence of Interest

Chairman Wright stated there were items in the Correspondence of Interest section of the agenda.

For Your Information

Chairman Wright noted the For Your Information section of the agenda.

Old/New Business

Ms. Jennifer Tribo, HRPDC Senior Water Resources Planner, indicated Phase I MS4 localities will be expected to receive updated permits in November. The HRPDC staff will be collaborating with DEQ before the next Commission meeting and will report any new information at the November 20, 2014 Executive Committee Meeting.

Adjournment

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

Kenneth I. Wright
Chairman

Randy R. Keaton
Interim Executive Director/Secretary

**FISCAL YEAR 2015
9/30/14
BALANCE SHEET**

ASSETS		LIABILITIES & NET ASSETS	
Cash & Cash Equivalents	\$ 459,595	Current Liabilities	\$ 1,611,265
Accounts Receivables	2,181,066	Net Assets	6,822,224
Investments	4,540,772		
Other Current Assets	664		
Net Capital Assets	<u>1,251,392</u>		
Total Assets	<u>\$ 8,433,490</u>	Total Liabilities & Equity	<u>\$ 8,433,490</u>

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

REVENUES	Annual Budget	Previous YTD	Current Month	YTD
Grant and Contract Revenue	\$ 5,475,927	\$ 958,610	\$ 346,066	\$ 1,304,676
VDHCD State Allocation	271,943	-	37,985	37,985
Interest Income	16,000	1,629	-	1,629
Local Jurisdiction Contributions	1,402,710	1,358,370	-	1,358,370
Other Local Assessment	1,124,190	1,208,295	-	1,208,295
Sales and Miscellaneous Revenue	11,000	3,632	972	4,604
Special Contracts/Pass thru	-	-	-	-
Total Revenue	<u>\$ 8,301,770</u>	<u>\$ 3,530,535</u>	<u>\$ 385,023</u>	<u>\$ 3,915,559</u>
 EXPENDITURES				
Personnel	4,957,156	652,198	345,852	998,050
Standard Contracts	235,756	20,905	23,694	44,599
Special Contracts / Pass-Through	2,713,679	442,548	63,775	506,323
Office Services	395,179	78,357	26,674	105,031
Capital Assets	-	-	-	-
Total Expenses	<u>\$ 8,301,770</u>	<u>\$ 1,194,008</u>	<u>\$ 459,995</u>	<u>\$ 1,654,003</u>
 Agency Balance	 <u>\$ -</u>	 <u>\$ 2,336,527</u>	 <u>\$ (74,971)</u>	 <u>\$ 2,261,555</u>