

**Hampton Roads Planning District Commission**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Minutes of September 15, 2011**

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

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

Stan D. Clark, Chairman (IW)	Marcus Jones (NO)*
Thomas Shepperd, Vice Chairman (YK)	J. Randall Wheeler (PQ)
James O. McReynolds, Treasurer (YK)	Kenneth Wright (PO)*
William E. Harrell (CH)	Selena Cuffee-Glenn (SU)
Barry Cheatham (FR)	Tyrone Franklin (SY)
Brenda Garton (GL)	James K. Spore (VB)
Bruce Goodson (JC)	Clyde Haulman (WM)
McKinley Price (NN)	

**Executive Director:**

Dwight L. Farmer

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ABSENT)**

Alan Krasnoff (CH)	Paul D. Fraim (NO)
June Fleming (FR)	Michael W. Johnson (SH)
Molly Joseph Ward (HA)	Louis R. Jones (VB)

**OTHER COMMISSIONERS:**

Ella P. Ward (CH)*	Neil Morgan (NN)
Amar Dwarkanath (CH)	Barbara Henley (VB)
Gregory Woodard (GL)*	Harry E. Diezel (VB)
W. Douglas Caskey (IW)	Jackson C. Tuttle, II (WM)
Robert Middaugh (JC)	

\*Late arrival or early departure.

**OTHERS RECORDED ATTENDING:**

John R. Gergely (Citizens); Earl Sorey (CH); Bryan Pennington (NO); Eric Nielsen (SU); Michael King (NN); Sherri Neil (PO); Bob Matthias (VB); Steve Romine (LeClair Ryan); Sheila Noll (York LGAC); Keith Matteson (SCS Engineers); Barrett Hardiman (Luck Stone Corporation); Ellis James (Sierra Club Observer); Peter Huber (Willcox & Savage), Germaine Fleet (Biggs & Fleet); Staff: John M. Carlock, Camelia Ravanbakht, Shernita Bethea, Brian Chenault, Jennifer Coleman, Natalie Easterday, Kathlene Grauberger, Greg Grootendorst, Richard Flannery, Frances Hughey, Jim Hummer, Whitney Katchmark, Sara Kidd, Robert Lawrence, Mike Long, Jay McBride, Kelli Peterson, Joe Turner, Chris Vaigneur.

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

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

One person requested to address the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission.

### ***Ellis W. James***

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. My name is Ellis W. James, I reside in the City of Norfolk and I have been there for a lifetime. I would like very much to thank all of the communities within this body for what appears to have been an excellent job that you have done in helping the elderly and the most vulnerable of our citizens during the tremendous amounts of heat that we suffered this summer. I felt in the air two nights ago the first tinges of fall and I think by tonight we will realize it. I would like to call to your attention something that not all of you may be aware of. The Tide has luckily not risen, but has been activated and is now going strong in the City of Norfolk. I know that this is a TPO item primarily, but I would like to share something with you that I think it would be helpful for you to know. I was out there on the first day when 30,000 plus people rode the Tide. There were twenty demonstrators there in opposition and they were literally swallowed up by the hundreds and several thousands of riders who came to ride the Tide. Now I do not have stock in the operation and I am not here to promote it from that angle but I would like for you to know something that I did do. The Norfolk Environmental Commission, of which I am a member, handed out cards, thank you for choosing to ride the Tide. That card was not only a thank you, but it also discussed briefly but factually the importance of light rail and the contribution that it could make to reducing greenhouse gasses and to help deal with our carbon footprint here in the eastern part of Virginia. I want you to know that I had an opportunity to not only ride and hand out cards, but I had an opportunity to discuss with people why they were there, what they were interested in and I am sure that Mrs. Henley already knows that the people from Virginia Beach who rode the Tide, one of the first things they asked me, when are we going to get it in Virginia Beach and I politely told them well there is a group in Virginia Beach that is working on it and maybe sometime in the not too distant future we will see that. The other thing that struck me was there were many, many people who came not only for the historical reasons and perspective, but they were people who were interested in well what would it be like. Was it quick? Was it clean? Was it safe? And they also brought their children and their grandchildren because they wanted them to see a glimpse into the future. That is what they told me. And so it was a two week, wonderful experience with lots of information that was gathered, and I do have some of the cards that I will be happy to pass around to you. I will leave them at the Chairman's desk and perhaps they will find their way around the table. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

*(Commissioner E. Ward arrives)*

## **APPROVAL/MODIFICATION OF AGENDA**

Chairman Clark stated there was one modification to the agenda. Item #13, HR Green Program Briefing will not be presented today. He asked if there were any more changes to the agenda. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the agenda with the modification.

Commissioner Shepperd Moved to approve the agenda with the modification; seconded by Commissioner Garton. The Motion carried.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

The Consent Agenda contained the following Items:

Minutes of July 21, 2011 Quarterly Commission Meeting

Treasurer's Reports

Regional Reviews

### A. PNRS Items Reviews

FY 2011 Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program – Safe Drinking Water Act – Virginia Department of Health

FY 2011 Water Quality Management Planning Program – Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

FY 2012 -2014 Wetland Monitoring and Assessment Strategy - Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

Community-Based Participatory Research Approach to Understanding and Reducing Risks from Toxic Pollutant Exposure in the SE Community of Newport News – The Greater Southeast Development Corporation

Whale Migration Corridors for MSP - Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

Shoreline Management Planning and Inventory - Virginia Department of Environmental Quality

### B. Environmental Impact Assessment/Statement Review

Commercial Wind Lease Issuance and Site Characterization Activities on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Offshore – DOI/Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

Tylers Beach Federal Navigation Project - USACE

Major Unit Modification of the Southampton Power Station, PUE 2011-00075 – State Corporation Commission

Install Transformer at York River Pier, Coast Guard Training Center, Yorktown – DHS/U.S. Coast Guard

Expansion of Range Instruction Building, Coast Guard Training Center Yorktown – DHS/ U.S. Coast Guard

Naval Special Warfare Development Group 900-Yd Firing Platform, Naval Air Station Annex – DOD/ Department of the Navy

Cove Point Re-Export Project, Dominion Cove Point LNG, LP – DOE/Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

New Fraternity Housing – Sites 3 and 8 – College of William and Mary

Property Disposal for Marine Animal Care Center – DOD/U.S. Navy

Heritage Forest Phase II – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Hidden-Hussey Commons Expansion – Christopher Newport University

Coastal Zone Management Program – Sea Level Rise Grant Proposal/Water Quality Grant Proposal

FY 2009 – 2010 Annual Report to the Department of Housing and Community Development

Regional Sustainability Program Memorandum of Understanding

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

Commissioner Shepperd Moved to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Garton. The Motion carried.

*(Mayor Wright arrives)*

## **REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Chairman Clark introduced Mr. John Carlock to present the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

Mr. Carlock stated the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for Southeastern Virginia includes eight cities and counties as well as the eight towns in Isle of Wight and Southampton County that are part of Southeastern Public Service Authority (SPSA) service area and includes both public and private facilities. The Peninsula communities are covered by a similar plan that is developed by the Virginia Peninsulas Public Service Authority, and the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority covers all the localities in the Crater PDC; Surry County is covered in that particular plan.

Mr. Carlock stated he would briefly review the state requirements, give the history on how HRPDC arrived to this point, the content of the plan and the next steps. The state code and regulations in the late 1980s required that every city, county, town or designated regional agency working on their behalf prepare a comprehensive integrated solid waste management plan that covers public and private facilities. There is a requirement that HRPDC maintain the plan, update and review it on a five-year schedule, and each of these entities achieves a mandated recycling rate of 25%.

After July 1, 2007, the regulations indicate that no permit for a sanitary landfill, incinerator or a waste to energy facility will be issued until the solid waste planning unit has an approved solid waste management plan that has been approved by the state and those permits need to be consistent with the regional plan.

Mr. Carlock stated to meet the requirements as a region, HRPDC decided in 1989 and 1991 to prepare a Regional Solid Waste Management Plan. In 2005 with the plan amendment; HRPDC was designated as the regional agency and SPSA was designated management. The agreement with the communities at that time, SPSA was designated as the regional planning agency and HRPDC contracted with SPSA to do the work. Since that time, there have been several plan amendments. SPSA, as part of its changes in their system and process, believes they should no longer do the planning and asked that the designation of the regional agency move back to the HRPDC.

In March 2010 the Commission agreed with the designation changes and the HRPDC is in the process of making those changes. SPSA also contracted with HRPDC to prepare the Solid Waste Plan, and HRPDC contracted with SCS Engineers to provide some assistance. The Technical Committee has reviewed the Plan and based on their recommendations, HRPDC moved forward with a public hearing in August 2011. The public hearing is a required step in the process. The plan review includes the existing solid waste management system, special waste, household hazardous waste, tires, appliances, future of solid waste management, what is needed to meet the region's needs, recycling (which includes the public participation component which is a required element), an implementation plan and an amendment process. Once the plan is approved and a new agency designated, there will be plan amendments on a regular basis of about every six months.

The plan follows EPA and the state requirements for waste management; the preferred solution is source reduction. HRPDC focus is on recycling, resource recovery and landfill and other less desirable approaches to waste management. As a region, the Southside has met the state recycling minimum of 25% on a routine basis. They have fallen somewhat below the state-wide average for 2010. The total percentage of recycling fell to slightly less than 32%. One of the things that the plan includes is how to improve the experience with recycling. The plan itself does not include new facilities or recommendations for new facilities, it defers to the 2018 and beyond study that HRPDC is presently managing for the localities and SPSA. HRPDC is expected to provide the localities the information they need to make a decisions on what to do after 2018 in the next couple of months.

Mr. Carlock stated the regional HR Clean program is trying to educate the public to improve and increase the amount of recycling which is carried out in the region. There has been trouble with industry primarily in their reporting, and part of HRPDC effort over the coming year is to increase outreach to the industry and commercial sectors to get their numbers up to help the region. HRPDC is looking at the development of a web-based reporting system similar to what we have for stormwater and wastewater to make it easier for people to report their recycling.

Mr. Carlock stated the recommended actions today are to approve the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan, recommend the plan to SPSA for adoption and, submit the plan with public participation documentation and re-designation package to DEQ for their approval.

Chairman Clark asked for questions.

Commissioner Shepperd asked for clarification as to whether this recycling information should come to the HRPDC and if so what would the HRPDC do with the information.

Mr. Carlock stated historically for recycling information a grocery store or large box store would report the information on an annual basis to SPSA and then SPSA would compile the information to demonstrate the effectiveness or what the percentage is that the region was recycling and report to DEQ on an annual basis. As part of the change of the HRPDC being the planning agency we have been attempting to collect that information. HRPDC compiles the data and calculates to determine what amount of recycling has been done in the eight communities and then reports that to DEQ.

Commissioner Shepperd stated that understood that the municipalities, not just the governments, but the communities, are required to recycle approximately 25% of their recyclable garbage.

Mr. Carlock stated the 25% is achieved by a combination with the localities, the industry or commercial activities. A grocery store does not enter into the local government recycling business. The stores breakdown their cardboard, bail it and ship it somewhere else. We can take that into account and get credit for it to achieve the 25%.

Commissioner Garton asked for the difference between recycling and resource recovery.

Mr. Carlock stated resource recovery is the type of processing plant that SPSA used over the years where they separate the materials at the plant, burn the combustible materials to produce steam and electricity for the Shipyard.

Chairman Clark asked for a motion to approve the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for Southeastern Virginia and recommend it to SPSA for adoption and submittal to Department of Environmental Quality for approval.

Commissioner Harrell Moved to approve the Regional Solid Waste Management Plan for Southeastern Virginia and recommend it to SPSA for adoption and submittal to Department of Environmental Quality for approval; seconded by Commissioner Spore. The Motion carried.

*(Commissioner M. Jones arrives)*

## **REGIONAL HOUSING PORTAL**

Chairman Clark introduced Ms. Shernita Bethea to give an update on the Regional Housing Portal Initiative.

Ms. Bethea stated the objectives of the Regional Housing Portal is to identify all housing related services and programs in this region, and to look for ways to create a uniform database for housing providers as well as other consumers in our community and to take this information and identify any gaps in services as it relates to service areas in our region and create a regional web based portal that consumers and housing providers will have a one stop shop approach to locating much needed services in our community. We want to be able to look at what services are currently available that exist in our region and bring that information into one database. There are approximately 480 services and service types in our database at this time. The region has added services as well as deleted services just based on available funding, the clients served, as well as consumers.

Ms. Bethea stated when it comes to technological needs there will be financial needs as well. A lot of time has been spent looking and researching to see what our in-house capabilities are as it relates to the portal and what can be done in house that can save money and time. HRPDC is looking at software systems that already exist to see if we can build upon them without having to construct an entirely new product. Time was spent talking with software engineers and partners that HRPDC has worked with over the years to make sure they have a clear understanding that this particular tool is consumer and housing provider driven, as well as something on which to build upon later. There have been conversations with different universities and organizations across the nation that have similar portals in place. They gave us insight on things that HRPDC needs to be careful and cautious about when building a site of this magnitude.

HRPDC hopes to be able to utilize the HUD sustainability grant that is already in the process. Most of the goals, missions and initiatives of this particular grant closely match with what the portal is trying to do, which is to create a sustainable community and create products and services from which the entire region can benefit. HRPDC has already received a grant for \$4,500 from Housing Virginia which is a state nonprofit organization. They want to use the portal in other areas of the state; they came forward with the grant to help offset some of the costs in development of this site.

Ms. Bethea stated when looking at some of the feedback from the Regional Housing Portal Committee, the primary tool would be geared toward housing providers and case managers. With the reduction of staff in many organizations, the portal could greatly assist in increasing capacity and decreasing duplication of services. We also found that information referral and giving information to clients has been one of those services where there is a gap. Fully integrating a one stop shop approach and no wrong door was paramount when talking with housing providers. When utilizing the gap analysis, most of the jurisdictions and most of our partners believe this tool could be very beneficial when writing grants and looking to bring in additional funding and sources into their organization.

Ms. Bethea stated when HRPDC met with community partners, it was stressed the site needs to be clear, easy to navigate and the services and programs needed are prominently displayed. Going forth with the development of the housing site, we want to be able to look

at the site as it relates to the four key components of housing services for renters, persons that are in danger of becoming homeless, are already homeless, trouble with existing homeowners as well as home buyers, potential renters, potential people that is homeless are looking towards homeownership or other type of housing issues.

Some of the other future tools that the housing committees and partners want to make sure they are added into the portal are affordability tools, income tools, information about predatory lending and make sure that fair housing is incorporated within our web site, and all homeowners and renters understand their rights and the federal and state laws as they relates to fair housing. The beginning stages of the portal is being able to use it for housing providers and housing consumers then build upon other tools and other capabilities as funding and years progress.

Ms. Bethea stated in conclusion the HRPDC is in the beginning stages of developing the framework for the gap analysis. We want to make sure we are looking at the gap analysis from a regional perspective and break it down as it relates to service types, local services and local programs. Securing financial funding at this point is about one third of the way from building the web site that will give us all the capabilities we need and be totally functional with all the services and GIS functions we are hoping to have in the tool. As stated earlier, the completion of this on-line web tool is contingent on being able to gather the financial funding and move forward with the project.

Commissioner Franklin asked about the actual projected cost.

Ms. Bethea stated an estimate that HRPDC has been given to get started and functional is approximately \$14,000 to \$15,000.

Chairman Clark thanked Ms. Bethea for her presentation.

*(Commissioner Woodard arrives)*

### **CHESAPEAKE BAY TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL)**

Chairman Clark introduced Ms. Whitney Katchmark to give an update on the Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)

Ms. Katchmark stated she would be giving an update on the Bay TMDL requirements, progress and the next step. The two tier approach dealing with Phase II Watershed Implementation Plan is working well and the localities have established teams to look at this issue for each city and county.

HRPDC has a Regional Steering Committee that has been meeting once a month. The steering committee and local teams are focused on meeting two deadlines. In October, the state will be provided with updated land use data and the existing BMPs. February 2012 the state needs to be provided with how we will meet the 2017 and the 2025 target loads.

Ms. Katchmark stated the Steering Committee has been focusing on three different tasks. The tasks are communicating with the state and EPA; working with Chesapeake Bay Program to expand nutrient control menu; and with correspondence to the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). The focus is trying to understand the model, how we can get credit in the model and questions and concerns about the modeling data. There has been regional representation attending meetings for the Chesapeake Bay Program where policy decisions are being made. HRPDC is working with DCR and drafted an extensive letter to Ms. Joan Salvati, Division Director of DCR, about some of the things that have come out of those discussions. The State is not estimating phosphorus reductions associated with the fertilizer ban which means the localities do not have as much to do so HRPDC would like to quantify that; an example is the localities cannot get credit for urban tree planting that is not intended for land conversion.

The Regional Steering Committee is working on identifying the land that is controlled by federal and state agencies and industrial stormwater permit holders. If we can figure out how much land is under those entities then those nutrient reductions can be handled by them instead of the localities. DEQ is to help HRPDC identify all the industrial permit holders, which is about 200 in the region. HRPDC has contacted VDOT to see how much land they control. VDOT does not know the amount of right-of-way on all their roads. HRPDC staff will make assumptions and estimate that area and share with all the localities.

Ms. Katchmark stated the Regional Steering Committee is looking at legislative proposals that will make the TMDL easier to implement such as septic tanks. The TMDL requires localities to reduce the number of septic tanks or upgrade septic tanks to alternative systems which remove more nitrogen which is rather expensive - about \$30,000 apiece. The Steering Committee felt there was no way to get this done, short of paying for homeowners to make these upgrades, or to switch to sewer lines and most localities do not have that kind of funding. A subcommittee was developed from the Steering Committee that will look at other ideas to make this work better and ask the state to provide some sort of mandate, some leverage, and also some funding, or better solutions to implement that goal.

Ms. Katchmark stated the next step in the planning process for the localities is to see how much has to get done. First, quantify the nutrient loads based on your local data and calculate the gap between existing loads and target load. Once localities know what the gap is then next is an interim process to look at how much credit localities can get for different ideas or projects. The goal of this process is to see what are feasible and cost effective solutions for the locality.

The EPA revised the model this summer and HRPDC wanted them to do that; but the state had some questions about whether or not that revision made sense and whether or not it is accurate; so the state is holding up the data because they want it to be right. The state indicated they would give us a tool that would quantify the nutrient reductions or the credit localities would get for different projects. HRPDC decided to look for another alternative as well. HRPDC created a spreadsheet where localities can do an interim process, which is on our website, which gives localities a chance to come up with different ideas and projects to see how much credit they would get for each one.

Ms. Katchmark stated the last topic she wanted to go over is how other localities around the state are dealing with this Phase II WIP process. There are few urban localities (basically Richmond and Northern Virginia) that are not fiercely working to get all this data because they are ahead and they have a lot of their data organized. Those areas are thinking in terms of the February deadline. They have a proposal the committee will be sharing with our Regional Steering Committee in October. Instead of submitting what projects localities would need to do to meet the TMDL requirements, but also show how many of those projects localities can do with their existing funding, with stormwater fees or taxes. Another tier is how much localities could do if they really pushed and stretched to see how close they are to meeting the full requirements. Most of the bay watershed is rural communities are in a little different situation than us. Most of their requirements are doing nutrient reductions on agricultural lands. From a local government perspective they are not sure how to get that done. They don't have a permit that would enforce that and are not sure what their obligations are.

Ms. Katchmark indicated the reason she pointed this out is because around the state people are approaching this differently and some of them being a little slower to get on board and we are not necessarily in the same situation. This process is beneficial because HRPDC is in the planning stage. HRPDC is not trying to make final commitments on what localities are going to do, but figure out what is feasible. In order to move forward on any decisions, we need to know more specifically how difficult it will be and how costly, and what is feasible within the time line that we have been given. If HRPDC finds out it is too demanding, we will have those details to negotiate a more realistic alternative.

Chairman Clark asked for questions.

Commissioner Shepperd stated Ms. Katchmark indicated that the state has not released to the localities the land use and the localities did not have their targets, but he was told by York Chief Engineers they had theirs. What targets are you talking about?

Ms. Katchmark stated the targets are being revised. The localities have model 5.2 instead of 5.2.3. The targets will change because the targets are tied to land use and HRPDC likes the final targets.

Chairman Clark stated the targets are moving targets.

Ms. Katchmark stated unfortunately yes.

Commissioner Shepperd stated one of the things he was concerned about was York County has spent millions, up to \$21 million, for sewer treatments and York County would have to go and buy the sewer systems. What is the difference between what you are talking about and York County establishing a hook up to the HRSD.

Ms. Katchmark stated they looking at how many septic tanks York County has and, the discharge from septic tanks contributes to pollution in the bay. EPA wants York to get more people to abandon their septic tanks and hook up to sewer. The locality may offer

that service, and how you get more people to hook up is of the same issue, or the other alternative is to get a better sewer septic tank.

Commissioner Shepperd stated the implications of what Ms. Katchmark is saying is that we are not doing something like that and we already are doing it through enterprise fund, and, where we go in and prioritize the sewer connections based upon the impact on environment. Is that not being calculated because what I am getting to is if we are spending all this money and are waiting for this TMDL hammer to fall on us, what are we going to do to get credit for this work?

Ms. Katchmark stated definitely localities can get credit because all they have to show is that localities have reduced the number of people on septic tanks, they are now hooked up to HRSD and a lot of times the states data is inaccurate. This is our chance in the planning process and submitting data to show this is what we have done - this is how many septic tanks are left and this is how many we foresee getting hooked up to sewer based on existing programs. You definitely get credit for that. It is a good thing if you already have those in place.

Commissioner Shepperd asked how do localities get credit for this because if it is a moving target and our TMDLs are constantly moving and when does the credit start?

Ms. Katchmark stated the answer is 2005, that part has not moved.

Commissioner Shepperd stated Ms. Katchmark indicated the localities were in the same position they were the last time they were briefed in the sense that we are supposed to have this approved by the end of this year because we are going into 2016 right? The 60% is supposed to be done and we are still flailing because EPA and DEQ seem to be incapable of figuring out what they really want us to do.

Ms. Katchmark acknowledged it is frustrating that some of the things are changing. Localities can continue to do some of the planning processes. She did not think it was helpful for all to stop doing everything because we do not have the answer that we want; but at some point localities can only get so far until EPA gives them the framework with which to comply. Virginia wants to make this right; they have objectives to make sure that what the localities do is clean up the bay, and make sure that the work is technically accurate and done well. But the delays are sort of the cost of that, EPA has not changed their mind, most of the holdups are Virginia's actions.

Commissioner Goodson asked about the base lines because some of the communities have been proactive for 10 to 15 years on these issues and are not going to get credit for anything, and also 2005 is inflexible will that be the base line date for the TMDL initiative.

Ms. Katchmark said HRPDC has tried to make sure it is understood how EPA approached this and how they divided the nutrient reductions that are required based on the land use. This is to locality's benefit and HRPDC wants to make sure this is what the state is doing. For example, one hundred acres of urban area had to do a 20% reduction, and if it turns out

localities have been doing all of these things for last 10 to 15 years, then localities get to count that towards the 20% reduction; you do get credit.

Commissioner Goodson asked that localities do get credit.

Ms. Katchmark stated HRPDC was told that, but wants to make sure because that is not what they wrote in the Phase I Watershed Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Goodson stated he had not heard that until today.

Ms. Katchmark stated HRPDC is pushing to make sure they can get documentation on this because it is a little difficult to get the input files that show those assumptions.

Commissioner Goodson stated it was important to James City and he hoped HRPDC will work diligently on that.

Chairman Clark thanked Ms. Katchmark.

#### **APPOINTMENT HRPDC 2010-2011 NOMINATING COMMITTEE**

The Chairman appointed a Nominating Committee to bring a slate of names to the HRPDC Annual Meeting on October 20, 2011, for the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary as well as each government's representative for the Executive Committee.

Chairman Clark stated the Nominating Committee vacancies needed a elected official, the following were asked to represent: Mr. Cheatham, Franklin; Mayor Wright, Portsmouth; Mayor Hunt, Poquoson.

Commissioner Shepperd Moved to add Mr. Cheatham, Franklin; Mayor Wright, Portsmouth, Mayor Hunt, Poquoson to the Nominating Committee; seconded by Commissioner Haulman. The Motion carried.

#### **HRPDC ACTION ITEMS: THREE MONTH TENTATIVE SCHEDULE**

No questions or comments were noted.

#### **PROJECT STATUS REPORTS**

No questions or comments were noted.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE OF INTEREST**

No questions or comments were noted.

**FOR YOUR INFORMATION**

No questions or comments were noted.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

No questions or comments were noted.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

---

Stan D. Clark  
Chairman

---

Dwight L. Farmer  
Executive Director/Secretary