VIRGINIA TOBACCO
INDEMNIFICATION AND COMMUNITY
REVITALIZATION COMMISSION

THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. HAWKINS
CHAIRMAIN

THE HONORABLE TERRY G. KILGORE
VICE CHAIRMAN

CARTHAN F. CURRIN, III
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DON L. ANDERSON

THOMAS W. ARTHUR

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM W. BENNETT, JR.

JOHN W. BOYD, JR.

CLARENCE D. BRYANT, III

THE HONORABLE KATHY J. BYRON

THE HONORABLE WHITTINGTON W. CLEMENT

J. CARLTON COURTER, III

THE HONORABLE ALLEN W. DUDLEY

THE HONORABLE BARRY E. DUVAL

FRED M. FIELDS

PAUL L. GRINSTEAD

THE HONORABLE RICHARD J. HOLLAND

ISIAH G. HOPKINS

JOHN LANG HURLEY

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH P. JOHNSON, JR.

DONALD K. LAWSON

H. RONNIE MONTGOMERY

WILLIAM E. OSBORNE

THE HONORABLE PHILLIP P. PUCKETT

THE HONORABLE FRANK M. RUFF

JOHN M. STALLARD

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR

CINDY M. THOMAS

THE HONORABLE RONALD L. TILLETT

GARY D. WALKER

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, JR.

THOMAS E. WEST

JOSEPH H. WILLIAMS

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Hotel Roanoke
March 9, 2001

Approved March 29, 2001

Members Present
Senator Hawkins
Delegate Kilgore
Delegate Bennett
Mr. Bryant
Delegate Byron*
Delegate Clement*
Mr. Forbes
Delegate Johnson
Ms. Thomas
Mr. Walker
Senator Wampler
*Arrived late

Senator Hawkins opened the meeting by commenting on the misunderstandings with the localities about how they are informed about the monies that are provided to them. He brought up the question of whether the Commission should update the localities as to the money they are entitled to on a six-month basis so they can update their records.

Delegate Kilgore commented that in the Southwest they do not have it broken down by county.

Senator Hawkins asked **Mr. Currin** his opinion on informing the localities of their available money.

Mr. Currin responded that it would be easier once they do know how much money they are dealing with. The Commission receives money twice a year.

Senator Hawkins asked if the Commission could notify the counties twice a year.

Mr. Currin replied that after the Commission meets and decides what they are going to award, yes, they could inform the localities.

Senator Hawkins commented that the previous day he had heard some people say that they had been unaware of the amount of money they were dealing with. He wanted to solve that problem.

701 EAST FRANKLIN STREET ◆ SEVENTH & FRANKLIN BUILDING, 10TH FLOOR
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219
804-786-2308 ◆ TOLL FREE ◆ 1-877-807-1086 ◆ FAX: 804-786-3210

Janet Bruce responded that the problem came about because many of the large funding decisions were made back in the spring last year, and they had no idea how much money the Commission was going to receive. When the funding estimates came in December and the 50/50 split decision was made, it increased the amounts of money from what had been estimated.

Senator Hawkins asked if this then was an anomaly that would not happen again.

Ms. Bruce replied that yes it could happen again but if the process is moved to May so the Commission knows how much money they are dealing with and the split decisions have been made, then they would be working with more specific numbers.

Mr. Currin stressed that money needs to be awarded based on merit not simply because the money is available.

Senator Hawkins agreed, but stated that he thinks they need to clarify the amount of money that they have to work with. **Senator Hawkins** then clarified that money is held over until the Commission accepts the project. So no one loses anything in the formularies, it stays in place.

Mr. Currin confirmed that it is correct based on the Commission's current set-up.

Senator Hawkins commented that the Committee needed to address applications from non-governmental agencies. The previous day the Senator heard that some of the localities felt they were blind-sided by those applications. Should the Commission notify the localities of the applications received that directly affect them, so they can take them into consideration for their long-term plans? If there is an independent agency applying for tobacco monies to be used within an area, should that area be notified that there has been an application made?

Delegate Bennett commented that he thinks the Commission should.

Mr. Walker stated that if after all the applications were received, the Commission could make a list of all the applications and send them out, then everyone would know who had applied.

Senator Hawkins commented that **Delegate Clement** does not think it is important, that the independence between the two groups should be kept. **Senator Hawkins** disagreed, one of the problems the Commission is having now is a lack of communication and if the governing bodies feel they are being blindsided by a group within the community, it is not going to cause anything but tension.

Senator Wampler clarified that **Senator Hawkins** was speaking more to the Southside. But commented that real problems arose the previous day with the truly for-profit entities.

Mr. Currin commented that the Commission is not supposed to convey money straight out to for-profit entities.

Senator Wampler stated that the Commission is growing and there will be more demand for an "opportunity fund." The Commission presently does not have a direct plan to deal with situations in which someone comes wanting to drop in thousands of jobs but it is not within the guidelines of the Commission.

Senator Hawkins responded they would need to work on that as well. The Senator then emphasized that this is all new to everyone and that it has never been done before.

Mr. Currin commented that several of these issues will be addressed in the long-range strategic plan.

Senator Hawkins stated that **Senator Wampler** brought up earlier the need to start a fundamental discussion on securitization, and how it will be structured within the Commission if they get the money.

Senator Wampler commented on the difficulties that could arise if and when the Commission has to deal with such large amounts of money, as they would be with securitization. The Senator suggested that the Commission needs to have a definite plan of how to deal with the money.

Senator Hawkins added the possibility of having a formula in place to handle the money.

Senator Wampler continued there could be a two-thirds vote to over-ride.

Mr. Currin commented that the staff could work with the Executive Committee to put something like that together if it is indeed necessary. It is something that should be given some thought.

Senator Hawkins agreed with **Senator Wampler** that if the Commission suddenly came into a large amount of money it would be difficult to decide what to do with it without any sort of working relationships in place.

Delegate Bennett commented that there are some people in the organization and the region that would have concern over how the Commission dealt with those monies.

Senator Hawkins stated that he wants to appoint a group from the Executive Committee to work with the staff on this structure.

Ms. Bruce commented that that process is already underway.

Senator Hawkins also wanted to discuss how much money the Commission should set aside to take off of the top for regional projects.

Delegate Bennett asked if that should be done before securitization.

Senator Hawkins commented that the Commission will soon have some expensive discussions soon, the E58 program that will require some investments that we may be able to do without changing the formulas right now. The Senator asked **Mr. Currin** if he knew of any other issues coming up that would require the Commission to make any large investments.

Mr. Currin responded that nothing particular came to mind of the magnitude of the E58 project.

Senator Hawkins asked how much money was being set aside for that.

Mr. Currin replied that there is currently close to $1 million dollars in a Deal Closing Fund. He will address many of those issues in a moment with a budget presentation.

Senator Hawkins stated that **Delegate Clement** had arrived and had some differing viewpoints concerning the notification of localities about the applications that were submitted.

Delegate Clement commented that he thinks that the staff and Commission have in place a good set of policies and procedures. The Delegate related a story of the revitalization of Tupelo, Mississippi, and that they did it by getting it out of the hands of local government. This story was compared to the situation in Danville/Pittsylvania County with the Future of the Piedmont Foundation. The Commission owes it to the jurisdictions to tell them how much money they are allocated, but that is it. There needs to be notice about how much money the locality is entitled to but if a regional non-profit organization wants to apply, let them apply. Competition is good. The application would be stronger if the Board of Supervisors and City Council support it, but it is not necessary. A Board of Supervisors or City Council should not have any greater right to that money. It does not seem good to burden the Commission staff with having to notify all the localities of the applications. As long as they know how much money they have available to them, anyone can apply.

Senator Hawkins stated that as far as the Danville/Pittsylvania funding is concerned, it is money that is worked into the budget and it is money that is dedicated and put into a formulary in the locality. It would not hurt to at least notify the locality of the applications in order to make sure everyone understands what is happening. This would avoid duplication or misunderstandings.

Delegate Bennett added that the Commission should do all possible to encourage creativity. The applicant should notify the locality, the application should denote that.

Senator Hawkins asked if it is not simply common courtesy to let the localities know of the applications. If there is a problem it is better for it to be settled before it comes up before the Full Commission.

Delegate Clement stated that a Board of Supervisors or the like should not feel that they are entitled to the money.

Senator Hawkins reinforced that this would be a simple notification.

Senator Wampler commented that the localities see an amount of money and stake claim to it and try and balance their budget accordingly.

Senator Hawkins again comments that open communication does not hurt anyone.

Mr. Bryant asked **Senator Hawkins** if it was his opinion that this would enhance the localities to work together.

Senator Hawkins responds yes. The Senator then asked if there were any other comments.

Delegate Clement asked about altering the calendar to take care of some of these problems.

Senator Hawkins stated that the Committee decided to change the application process to May.

Delegate Clement asked if there was enough information to have a motion to that effect.

Ms. Bruce replied that it should not be a problem to have the applications mailed out in May because the last payments come in April. The deadline would be in June. The Commission was planning on having another round of applications this May anyway.

Ms. Wass commented that it is a logistical question, does the Commission want the distributions to be based on the actual revenue that comes in or on the budgeted revenue. If it were based on the budgeted revenue, everyone would know at the start of the fiscal year how much they were allocated, and any surplus revenue would be put into the following year's budget. The only time that would cause a problem is when the budgeted revenue is less than the actual received, which is a possibility.

Senator Hawkins asked **Ms. Wass** when the Commission can have a handle on the actual amounts of money they are dealing with.

Ms. Wass replied mid-January.

Senator Hawkins asked if the applications were sent out in May, would they know the actual amount of money they are dealing with then. Returning back to the topic of notification of localities, the Senator would entertain a motion that localities simply be notified with no obligations to sign off on or veto applications that affect the locality, just information.

Ms. Bruce asked if the notification would go out to each applicant at the end of the application process.

Senator Hawkins replied that the staff could send out a list of all the applicants to the localities at the end of the process.

Ms. Thomas asked if they would be sent to each applicant or just to the localities.

Senator Hawkins responded just to the localities because the applicants are part of that local governing body.

Mr. Currin commented that in the spirit of openness why not let everyone know.

Senator Hawkins responded that it does not hurt anyone to have information and communication.

Delegate Johnson *moved for notification of the localities of the applications submitted to the Commission.*

Ms. Thomas *asked if the notification could go out to each applicant rather than just the localities.*

Senator Hawkins *responded okay and is that a motion.*

Motion seconded
Motion adopted by aye vote
Delegate Kilgore *opposed*

Senator Hawkins brought to light the article in Virginia Business. It is incumbent upon the Commission to make sure people understand that these Economic Development monies are heading in a direction that have long-term impact on our regions.

Mr. Walker told the Chairman that he would like to see him write a letter to the editor correcting some of the inaccuracies.

Senator Hawkins responded that rather than criticizing the article, it would be a good idea to write a letter after that day's meeting explaining the Commission's actions toward the economic development of the communities, thus putting a positive spin on a negative article. The Senator asked if anyone disagreed with that.

Delegate Bennett addressed the Committee regarding his Special Projects Committee. The Delegate wanted to make sure he understands where the money for the project is coming from.

Senator Hawkins responded that there is a million dollar Special Opportunity Fund.

Mr. Currin stated that $800,000 of that has been moved to a Deal Closing Fund.

Senator Hawkins asked for an explanation of the project.

Delegate Bennett explained the technology consortium. It is $250,000.

Senator Hawkins stated that there are monies being held in escrow that can be released.

Mr. Forbes responded that some money was held in reserve after the indemnification payments last year. Now that the Commission is getting ready to receive more funds, some of those reserves can be distributed.

Senator Hawkins clarified that they are dealing with several million dollars.

Mr. Currin responded that they have approximately $4,200,000 in indemnification reserve.

Senator Hawkins asked if they move that money into the Special Projects fund for the E58 project and the Consortium, would there be enough cushion left for long term growth, since this money does not effect anyone's pot.

Mr. Forbes commented that they need to ask **Clark Lewis** of Mays & Valentine if there are any other claims that might likely occur. Does the Commission need to hold anything back and if so, how much. Mays & Valentine needs to tell the Commission how much they can release.

Mr. Currin responded that Mays told him the Commission could release the 4 million.

Senator Hawkins commented that if the $4 million can indeed be released, should it be set aside in a Special Projects Fund to anticipate the E58, etc, rather than tying it up in any type of formulary. Is that the consensus of the group, is there any discussion on that?

Delegate Bennett *so moved.*
Motion seconded.

Senator Wampler spoke to the motion, commenting that he thinks it is a great idea but although he is on the Special Projects Committee he is unfamiliar with the project they are discussing.

Mr. Currin informed the Senator that at the last Commission meeting, two projects came up before **Senator Clement's** Economic Development Committee that have a potential company that would like to relocate to Virginia. They needed some "Deal Closing Money" but at that time, the Commission did not have the mechanism to act on that so the Commission shifted the bulk of the Special Projects funding to a Deal Closing Account.

Senator Wampler asked for clarification on when that was done.

Mr. Currin replied January at the last Commission meeting in Richmond.

Senator Hawkins stated that the Commission might be able to clean things up by putting the money in escrow for E58, which is universal in its approach, then for the special projects that apply only to the flue-cured, we might work out some formulary to make sure that money only comes off of our budget.

Senator Wampler commented that that was not his point, rather the Senator is concerned about the other obligations the Commission has with respect to their money, specifically to Va. Tech, the Community College System and the $2 million to Tobio. That is probably not all they are going to need. E58 has tremendous opportunities and the Commission needs to get serious about how they are going to structure it.

Mr. Currin responded that he has not directly put monies toward the Community Colleges because there are many other groups coming and asking for money. It is not fair to guarantee that money to the Community Colleges for three years when it is not certain that it will be there.

Senator Hawkins asked if the Commission has the money to keep the obligations **Senator Wampler** mentioned.

Ms. Wass responded they had set aside money.

Senator Hawkins clarified that money had been set-aside for Va. Tech and Tobio's loan.

Senator Wampler was concerned that the Commission knows where they are going in terms of the revenues and obligations the Commission has. The Senator then asked staff if they had a projection of the funding before they start allocating to different projects.

Delegate Bennett wanted to know where the money is as to avoid false expectations.

Senator Hawkins asked what percentage was set aside last time for economic development for FY 2000.

Mr. Currin responded that the split was 80% for indemnification and 20% for economic development.

Senator Hawkins asked for clarification on how much was taken out of economic development for regional projects.

Ms. Wass responded 5%.

Senator Hawkins continued, if the Commission took the 5% off of the top 50% special projects, how much would that put in the account.

Delegate Bennett commented on the meeting **Mr. Currin** set up for the Special Projects Committee to hear the consortium proposal. The Delegate assumed that they had the money.

Senator Hawkins asked where the money the Commission set aside is now.

Ms. Wass responded that there was $828,000 in the Special Projects account. At the last meeting $800,000 of that was moved to a Deal Closing Fund by the Commission at the last meting. The Commission could vote to move it back.

Senator Hawkins asked if they could move $250,000 to that.

Senator Wampler reiterates his concern that the Commission does not have a total budget of revenues, obligated money and what they anticipate the balance to be in the upcoming fiscal year.

Mr. Forbes agreed.

Senator Hawkins requested that they get the budget out and then discuss it.

Mr. Currin said that **Mr. Byers** from Va. Tech was there to talk about E58.

Ms. Wass confirmed a few decisions of the Commission. Last year, administrative and indemnification costs were taken off the top then it was split 80/20 between indemnification and economic development. The 80% for indemnification was then split between flue-cured and burley. Out of the economic development portion funding was set aside for the Virginia Tech and community college grants and 5% for special projects. The remaining economic development amount was split between Southside and Southwest. But what is going to happen this year is that it was split by region first rather than indemnification and economic development. Then the regions decided upon the split for indemnification and economic development. Virginia Tech and Tobio are currently shown as funded off the top. An alternative to that is to have the Va. Tech grant and the Tobio loan taken out of the economic development portion with each region paying a portion of those.

Senator Wampler asked where the vote was taken for the remainder of the fiscal year to make a 2-year commitment to the Va. Tech and a one-year to the community colleges.

Mr. Currin responded that before the year 2000, the Commission made a commitment to Va. Tech for 2 years. They did not do that for the community colleges. In April at a meeting at Va. Tech, they voted. Va. Tech said they had to have a two-year commitment.

Delegate Kilgore commented that he knew the commitment was for two years. The Delegate thought **Senator Wampler** was concerned about the community college commitment.

Mr. Currin responded that the Commission did not make a commitment to the community colleges, and the presidents are aware of that.

Senator Wampler asked where the payments to the community colleges were for the rest of the fiscal year.

Ms. Wass responded that the payments have already gone out.

Senator Wampler clarified that by June 30, will the $6 million dollars be disbursed?

Mr. Currin replied that the payments have been disbursed. If the Commission is going to support the Community Colleges, they need the money by this September.

Senator Wampler again clarified that the Commission has no cash available in the remainder of this fiscal year to obligate to the Community Colleges, should the Commission decide to do so.

Mr. Currin responds that it would have to be FY 2002.

Senator Hawkins asked for clarification, because he had been out of the room, if the Commission was taking 5% off the top of the budget.

Ms. Wass replied no.

Senator Hawkins asked if they should open discussion about taking a percentage off the top of special projects to include the community colleges.

Senator Wampler commented that should the Commission decide to fund the second year of the community colleges, it would have to wait until the next payments, and take it off of the top.

Senator Hawkins stated that last year they took 5% off the top for any distribution for special projects, and that money provided a cushion to deal with some things the

Commission dealt with last year. The Commission has not done that this year, should we?

Senator Wampler confirmed with **Mr. Currin** that they would have to do that off of the April deposits.

Ms. Wass clarified that they are dealing with a budget that is based on the anticipated revenue. So the budget can be realigned.

Senator Wampler stated that he does not want to do anything in this fiscal year that would harm the grower or any of the other obligations the Commission has made. Any other funding decisions the Commission makes, should come after the April deposit to ensure that the previous obligations are not endangered.

Senator Hawkins asked when the new budget comes into effect.

Mr. Currin replied July 1.

Senator Hawkins clarified that it would be the next calendar year.

Senator Wampler stated that he does not want to de-obligate dollars that are going to Southwest or Southside now by taking something off the top at this point. But any future decisions the Commission makes would come off the next calendar year.

Mr. Currin added that there will be uncommitted monies.

Mr. Bryant asked why the Va. Tech funding is taken off the top rather than from the economic development budget.

Delegate Bennett added it should be split equally between Southside and Southwest.

Senator Hawkins commented that it should come out of the economic development budget so as to not harm the farmer.

Mr. Currin responded that he thought staff was instructed by the Commission to take it off the top.

Senator Hawkins clarified that it was to be taken off the top of the Economic Development money not of the entire budget.

Ms. Wass needed guidance as to how the Commission wishes staff to calculate the budget.

Senator Wampler commented that whether you take it off the top or out of the economic development budget, $5 million is $5 million less to the grower.

Senator Hawkins stated that at a 50/50 split with $5 million taken off is $2.5 million less to the grower.

Senator Wampler commented that if Southwest has to come up with their half of that money, they have no money left and they aren't going to do that.

Senator Hawkins stated that they are going to have to change the way they do this based on geographic areas. Burley wants to stay at an 80/20 split. If that is the case this type of situation does not apply to them.

Mr. Forbes commented that the Commission decided on a budget and it would be good to have these discussions with a copy of it.

Ms. Wass and **Mr. Currin** stated that a copy of the budget was sent out with the last financial statement that each commissioner received.

Senator Hawkins called for a 5-minute break and requested a copy of the budget.

Ms. Wass made sure she understood that the Commission did decide to split by region first and not by economic development and indemnification.

Senator Hawkins confirmed that the budget is to be split by region first, 27/73 is the first split.

Ms. Wass informed the Committee that when indemnification was originally split between burley and flue-cured, that is a different percentage split than the 27/73 split by region.

Senator Wampler stated that he thinks they will have $2.1-$2.2 million, maybe three, for Southwest. If we have projects of about $10 million, we'll be in the hole.

Senator Hawkins added that they will just have to take it off the top and figure out some way to change the formulary so that the farmer comes out even. Does it work if the Commission changes the formulary so that the farmer will always come even?

Mr. Currin replied yes.

Senator Hawkins wanted to make the tobacco side even, firstly.

Ms. Wass confirmed that they do want Va. Tech and Tobio to come of the top of economic development.

Senator Hawkins replied that it needs to come off the top of everything. Then change the 50/50 split to compensate the farmers for the money taken off the top.

Senator Wampler stated that the real question is what the Commission will do in FY 2002.

Senator Hawkins responded that the Commission will change the formulary to take more off the top.

Ralph Byers briefed the Committee on E58. It is a high-speed fiber backbone from Norfolk to Cumberland Gap, bringing a new Internet technology that would decrease the costs and increase the speed. There are private sector interests as well. They hope to be able to present the Commission with a concrete proposal. There will be some people who will not be happy about this; it is a "disruptive technology."

Delegate Bennett asked if the legal issues associated with this project include the law regulating and protecting the current telecommunications companies.

Mr. Byers responded that for just putting in this backbone, it is not a regulated service.

Delegate Bennett asked if after the fiber is laid, anyone can open it.

Mr. Byers replied yes, they are contemplating an RFP. A successful bidder would own it under specified provisions.

Mr. Walker asked if this would be coordinated with the VDOT efforts.

Mr. Byers responded yes, the commissioner is very supportive.

Senator Wampler followed up by adding that they would be moving not only data but also voice on this service. The sensitivities that **Delegate Bennett** brought up are something the Commission needs to discuss before moving forward. This is whoever is the operator of this system should be a certificated carrier to the Commonwealth. We need to be very specific about the quality and price of the service.

Mr. Byers commented that they are not sure that a certificated carrier is the way to go.

Senator Wampler stated that there needs to be some discussion on that or the Commission will not only end up in state court but federal court.

Senator Hawkins responded that they will set up a block of time at the next meeting to discuss the project.

Senator Wampler added that he thinks it is a great idea and where the Commission should be investing their money.

Discussion turned back to the budget.

Ms. Wass explained the difference between splitting the budget by region first rather than indemnification/economic development and how the different percentages change the budget.

Delegate Bennett asked how they voted on that.

Ms. Wass replied that they voted that Southside voted for a 50/50 split.

Ms. Thomas commented that it had been her understanding that the money for Va. Tech, Tobio, and the community colleges would come out of the economic development piece.

Senator Hawkins responded that the Commission will have to adjust the formulary to off set that. If the money came right off the economic development piece, there would be no monies left for burley.

Ms. Wass commented that if you were to take Tobio and Va. Tech out of the picture and just talk about indemnification and economic development, the split between southside and southwest (73/27) is different than the split between flue-cured and burley which is 77.2/27.3. That is were the difference is.

Ms. Thomas added that southwest is getting more of the proportion than what their quota actually was.

Senator Hawkins stated that the money needs to go into the economic development side as quickly as possible without harming the farmer, by region.

Senator Wampler asked for a review of the minutes to see what they actually voted on. His recollection is that the Va. Tech money was off the top. The Senator commented that the Commission obligates money to Va. Tech, Tobio, and the community colleges; they will be obligated through the year 2004 and have no money for economic development through then.

Senator Hawkins stated that they need to start looking at things with a broad perspective and understanding that if one region loses a little and another picks up, it will help everyone in the long run. The Commission needs to maintain a united vision to guide economic development to bring all the localities along at the same speed.

Mr. Forbes commented that a possible resolution would be to regionally shift money from economic development to indemnification automatically.

Senator Hawkins enforced that the formularies can be worked out, but the Commission needs to decide upon a common vision to go beyond the particular counties. There needs to be an economic package that helps everyone.

Senator Wampler redirected the discussion back to the amount of money the Commission has in unobligated funds for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Ms. Wass reported that there is $4.27 million in the indemnification reserve that was set aside last year, and $1.6 million in unclaimed 2000 indemnification payments. Mays & Valentine may want to set that aside for any claims that come up, but it is unlikely because the 2000 books are closed. There is also $137,000 from indemnification costs that was not spent and there is potential surplus interest revenue that may go over budget by about $200,000. $828,000 is in the special projects/deal closing funds.

Senator Wampler *clarified that it sounded like it would be the remaining indemnification money and interest that is unobligated. Moved that, pending further detail from Mays and Valentine, they propose to transfer that money to the Special Projects account to be held in escrow for the purposes of developing E58 and other special projects.*

Mr. Forbes agreed with the motion and added that when the Commission begins their next round of indemnification payments, they should agree upon setting up another reserve.

Motion Seconded

Steve Sheppard commented on HB 2181 and its drop dead on indemnification claims one year after the deadline date.

Senator Wampler responded that the Commission could pay for that out of the next deposits.

Mr. Bryant dissents and commented that the money to be set aside from indemnification would come out of the $19.5 million; the Commission is going to use the surplus from the year 2000 to put into the Special Projects and then take it off again.

Senator Hawkins clarified it would come off of the Economic Development side. The tobacco side stays unharmed throughout the process.

Ms. Thomas commented that she understood that the interest is on all the money, including the indemnification side.

Senator Hawkins responded that they are agreeing upon percentages to go to the farmer, anything extra is legitimate to go into economic development. This money in Special Projects could do more good than trying to reallocate it.

All in favor by aye vote
None opposed
Motion adopted.

Senator Wampler proposed that the decisions come before them at the appropriate time for the FY 2002 budget, with staff providing their recommendations. More information is needed before any decisions are made.

Senator Hawkins commented on the need for a budget discussion when more detailed information is available at the next meeting.

Mr. Currin hoped that at the June meeting the Commission would be adopting the 2002 budget.

Senator Hawkins suggested the possible need for an executive meeting prior to that dealing with the budget sometime in the next several weeks.

Delegate Byron asked if they could try to plan it around Veto Session when they are all together in Richmond in April.

Senator Hawkins inquired about how that suited the citizen members.

Senator Wampler commented that during that session, the legislators will be busy and this is an issue on which they need to be able to focus.

Mr. Currin suggested having the meeting outside of Richmond.

Senator Hawkins recommended having the meeting in Chatham.

Delegate Kilgore proposed the last week in March, Thursday, the 29th around lunch.

Senator Hawkins confirmed those plans and requested copies of all pertinent budget information to review prior to the meeting.

Senator Wampler asked that in that discussion they make sure the payments to Va. Tech are made and discuss what obligations, if anymore, will be needed for E58 for the next fiscal year, and an update on the community colleges.

Delegate Bennett reiterated the need to focus on special projects.

Senator Hawkins confirmed that that date would work for everyone.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by **Carthan F. Currin, III**

_____

Executive Director of the Commission