

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
October 13, 2011

Members/Alternates Present

L. Ray Ashworth (M).....City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M)County of Powhatan
Willie L. Bennett (M)County of Henrico
Malvern R. “Rudy” Butler (M), Secretary.....County of Goochland
Douglas G. Conner (M)City of Richmond
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan
Timothy W. Cotman (M) County of Charles City
James D. Crews (M)County of Goochland
Douglas C. Dunlap (A)City of Richmond
Marleen K. Durfee (M).....County of Chesterfield
Evan Fabricant (M).....County of Hanover
Richard W. Glover (M).....County of Henrico
John E. Gordon (M), Treasurer.....County of Hanover
Kathy C. Graziano (M)City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M)County of Chesterfield
James M. Holland (M)County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M)County of Chesterfield
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond
David A. Kaechele (M).....County of Henrico
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M)County of Henrico
C. Harold Padgett (M).....County of Hanover
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... County of New Kent
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover
Randall R. Silber (A)County of Henrico
Millard D. Stith (M).....County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M).....County of Henrico
Stran L. Trout (M), Chairman..... County of New Kent
Deborah B. Winans (A)County of Hanover

Members Absent

Chris W. Archer (M).....County of Henrico
James B. Donati (M)County of Henrico
Daniel A. Gecker (M)County of Chesterfield
Lynn McAteer (M).....City of Richmond
Faye O. Prichard (M), Vice Chairman.....Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond
Joseph B. Walton (M)County of Powhatan
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Michael Aukamp..... Dunham, Aukamp and Rhodes
Rob SinclairBranscome
Matthew Smith..... Virginia Commonwealth University

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director
Jo A. EvansAssistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary
Sulabh AryalAssociate Planner
Jacob Epstein Intern
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Jin LeeSenior Planner
Daniel N. LysyDirector, Transportation
Barbara Nelson.....Principal Planner
Jackie StewartDirector, Planning
Peter Sweetland.....Finance and Contracts Manager
Lee YoltonPrincipal Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Trout called the regularly scheduled October 13, 2011 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. He then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Mr. Crum certified that a quorum of members was present.

B. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business

Chairman Trout asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda.

Ms. O’Bannon asked that Item II.C. on the Consent Agenda – Appointments to CEDS Strategy Committee – be pulled from the Consent Agenda for further discussion. Chairman Trout said that any member may request that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda. He said this would be added to the agenda under New Business, Item IV. D. There were no other requests and the Consent Agenda was accepted as changed.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Trout asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. He reminded speakers that their time is limited to three minutes. As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, the Chairman closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

Chairman Trout reported that during the Executive Committee meeting, Committee members took action to change the RRPDC Commission meeting dates in January and February. He said he would like to add this to the agenda for discussion as Item IV. E. There were no objections to the addition of this item to the agenda.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought the members' attention to the monthly staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 1, and details work being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. He said staff will be happy to address any questions on what is included in the report.

Mr. Crum said the American Planning Association (APA) has identified Maymont Park as one of the ten best public spaces in the country. He said this is the second time in four years that the City of Richmond has been on the APA's top ten list. In 2007, Monument Avenue was listed as one of the ten best streets in the country. Mr. Crum congratulated the City on this recognition.

Mr. Crum said yesterday it was announced that America's Promise Alliance has named Chesterfield and Hanover Counties as two of the top 100 places in the country for young people. He said this is a very significant accomplishment. Only five communities in Virginia made the list, and of those, two were in the Richmond Region. Mr. Crum said this is the fifth consecutive year that Chesterfield County has made this list and the fourth consecutive year for Hanover County.

Mr. Gordon said Hanover County is certainly proud of this recognition. He said it would be great if all of the localities in the Richmond Region could receive this same recognition. He said this would be national news because no other region in the country has accomplished this. He said he feels the localities are doing what is needed to receive this recognition and that it's just a matter of applying for consideration. He said he hopes at some point a conversation can be held to encourage all of the jurisdictions to apply for this recognition.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Trout said the Executive Committee has recommended approval of the items on the Consent Agenda:

A. Approval of Minutes – September 8, 2011 Meeting

B. Approval of the August 2011 Financial Report

Chairman Trout asked if anyone wished to have either of these items pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion. He noted Item C. has already been pulled from the Consent Agenda earlier in the meeting and added as Item IV. D.

As there were no requests for discussion on the remaining items, on motion made by Mr. Butler and seconded by Ms. Graziano, the Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously as presented.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees Report

Chairman Trout asked Mr. Gordon if he would give a report on discussions from the meeting held in September. Mr. Gordon reported that the committees met jointly on September 26. He said on behalf of the MPO, a resolution of appreciation was presented to Mr. Gerald McCarthy, the outgoing member of the Commonwealth Transportation Board representing the Richmond District. Mr. Gordon said he felt that Mr. McCarthy was very appreciative for the recognition.

The other agenda item discussed by the committees was the 2012 Legislative Agenda. He said action was taken to finalize the agenda for presentation to the full Commission for additional discussion and action in November.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Audit Committee Report

Chairman Trout asked Mr. Gordon if he would give a report from the Audit Committee.

Mr. Gordon reported that the RRPDC Audit Committee met earlier today and received a report from Mr. Michael Aukamp on results of the FY 11 audit. Mr. Gordon said the Audit Committee (Gordon, chair; Butler, Cosby, Holland, Trout) made a recommendation to the Executive Committee that the report be accepted and brought to the full Commission for review and action. He asked Mr. Aukamp to provide a brief overview of the report to members.

Mr. Aukamp thanked members for the opportunity to present the FY 11 audit report to them today.

The audit was given an unqualified opinion, which is the highest level that can be given. There are no changes or recommendations to make in the financial management of the agency. The audit was performed using the generally accepted accounting principles that apply to governmental organizations. There were no compliance findings for internal controls or major programs.

Mr. Aukamp said staff is to be commended for the excellent job they do in managing the agency's financial matters.

Chairman Trout also thanked staff for the good work that they do in managing the agency's records. He asked if there was a motion to accept the FY 11 audit report as recommended by the Audit Committee and the Executive Committee. Mr. Gordon so moved; the motion was seconded by Mr. Cotman.

Mr. Padgett asked about an item on page 17, with regard to the actuarial valuations on the retirement plan. Mr. Padgett asked how the 7.5 percent return had been determined. Mr. Crum said this comes from the actuaries with the Virginia Retirement System (VRS). This is their forecast. He said the forecast is used to determine the agency's rate of contribution to make the system solvent. The rate came from VRS and not from staff.

There was no additional discussion and the motion to accept the FY 11 audit report as presented carried unanimously.

B. Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Planning Grant

Chairman Trout asked Mr. Crum to make this presentation.

Mr. Crum said before he begins his presentation, he wanted to take a minute to recognize Mr. Sweetland and Ms. Evans for the work they do to manage the agency's finances. He said this is his third year with the agency and there have been no negative audit findings in that time. He said he appreciates what they do and wanted to recognize them for their good work. Members of the Commission joined Mr. Crum in a round of applause. Mr. Crum noted it is a complicated financial system with a lot of federal and state funds that require different reporting methods, and Ms. Evans and Mr. Sweetland ensure that the correct reporting methods are used for each type of revenue received.

Mr. Crum said the RRPDC has a grant opportunity that will require action from the Board to authorize him to accept a grant from the U.S. Department of Energy. He said this is a great opportunity to receive funds for a work item that has already been approved as part of the work program. When the work program was approved by the Board in May, it included staff support for Sustainable

Transportation Initiatives for Richmond (STIR). An event was held about a year and a half ago in the parking lot that offered members an opportunity to see various electric vehicles, a natural gas powered bus, and to test drive a Segway. He said staff has been working in this area as part of the approved work program.

Mr. Crum said Ford Motor Company made an announcement last year that brought this issue to the forefront. Through STIR, the Richmond Region has been named as one of 19 metro areas in the country where Ford is going to introduce their all electric Ford Focus. The vehicles should be seen in the Richmond Region in the spring of 2012. Other metro areas selected include Chicago, Boston, New York, and Los Angeles, among others.

Mr. Crum provided illustrations on the style changes to electric vehicles over the past few years. In 2013, an all electric SUV will be available (Toyota RAV4). The arrival of electric vehicles speaks to the need of whether the Region's electric infrastructure is ready to support these vehicles.

A map was shown that indicated the distribution by zip code of hybrid vehicles already in use across the state. The most concentrated area is northern Virginia, followed by Hampton Roads, the Virginia Tech area (Blacksburg), and Richmond.

Some of the electric vehicle infrastructure planning grant partners include:

- Dominion Virginia Power
- City of Richmond
- Virginia Commonwealth University (which already has a charging station in one of the parking decks)
- J. Sargeant Reynolds (one of two community colleges in the U.S. that has a program to train students to repair electric vehicles)
- Greater Richmond Chamber
- Richmond Homebuilders Association
- Virginia Motor Vehicles Dealers Board

The goal is to prepare a plan to make certain the Richmond Region's electric infrastructure is ready for the introduction of electric vehicles.

Mr. Crum showed a brief video from the New Kent County west-bound rest stop that has an electric vehicle charging station. This station is free of charge to use. The typical cost to fully charge a vehicle is about 50¢ to 75¢. There are three levels of charging stations. The fast charge takes about 30 minutes to fully charge a vehicle. The type of charging station that most homes would have takes about seven hours to fully charge the vehicle, or overnight.

Mr. Crum said some things that need to be considered in identifying locations for charging stations are:

- identify key market areas in the Region
- residential centers
- employment centers
- retail/hotel centers
- travel patterns
- Park and Ride locations

Charging strategies will also have to be developed: urban, suburban, and rural areas. Those living in suburban areas may be able to have a charging station installed in a home garage. Urban dwellers and those who do not have garages will need charging stations that are accessible to where they live, such as on parking meters or utility poles.

Planning work will be done in close concert with local planners in the Region. Meetings have taken place previously with planning directors. In most cases, the jurisdictions have already begun to discuss the need for this type of infrastructure, including zoning, subdivision/land development and permitting, definitions, design standards, and development of a database of charging station locations.

Mr. Crum suggested there may be a lot of interest for retailers to provide free charging stations at their locations to draw customers into the stores. There will be a need to ensure local regulations have design standards for these types of facilities.

The cost to install a home charging station is about \$2,000, with a \$1,000 tax credit. The vehicles themselves will cost about \$36,000, with a \$7,500 tax credit. It is anticipated that over time the vehicles will become more affordable but will never completely replace gas powered vehicles.

Mr. Crum provided a breakdown on the grant funds:

Total of \$99,400 to the RRPDC –

- \$45,000 in salary for a Senior Planner through 9/30/12
- \$6,200 to cover salary of existing staff who are working on this as part of the approved work program
- \$19,400 to cover fringe benefits of the Senior Planner
- \$23,300 for indirect costs such as rent, overhead, utilities, etc.
- \$3,500 in travel, equipment, supplies
- \$2,000 to the Crater PDC which is participating in the planning process but not at the same level as RRPDC

The net benefit to the RRPDC is about \$30,000 in additional revenue for work staff will already be doing as part of the approved work program.

Mr. Crum said he is requesting that the Commission accept the grant award and authorize him to execute necessary actions to receive the Department of Energy funds and fulfill the requirements of the grant.

Mr. Padgett asked how the cost for a home charging station had been developed. Mr. Crum said this is the estimate received based on supplies and labor. He said most localities handle charging stations as another appliance.

Ms. Jaeckle said care needs to be taken in determining where charging stations will be placed. She said if a person can afford the vehicle, then he should certainly be able to afford installing the charging station. She said it will be difficult to determine who will use the charging stations. She said she would be uneasy about leaving her car plugged into a public station unless there was a way to be notified if someone was tampering with it.

Mr. Crum said outreach to the private and public sectors will be key to discuss those types of concerns.

Mr. Glover asked if the funds would be RRPDC funds and not MPO funds.

Mr. Crum said the funds will be coming to the PDC and transportation work is not done without consulting the MPO. The MPO is supported by the RRPDC.

Mr. Gulley suggested that manufacturers should develop a tamper-proof device that will allow vehicles to be charged at public stations without having to worry about the plugs being pulled while the driver is away from the car.

Ms. O'Bannon said anyone could unplug the cord and walk away with it. She said the reason for parking meters is to ensure parking spaces are available for everyone to use for a short time period. When a person uses a parking meter, money is paid to remind the person time at that space is limited. If the same type of function is not applied to charging stations, a vehicle could remain parked there all day and no one else would have an opportunity to use it. If there's no demand for parking in a certain area, then parking meters are not needed. The same would hold true for charging stations.

Mr. Crum said these are the types of issues that will need to be considered.

Ms. O'Bannon also remarked that if enough electric cars are brought into the area, Dominion Virginia Power will need to build another power plant to produce more electricity.

Mr. Ayers made a motion that the Commission adopt staff's recommendation to accept the grant award and authorize the Executive Director to execute any actions necessary for the purpose of receiving US Department of Energy funds

sub-granted through the Commonwealth of Virginia and fulfilling the requirements of the grant. Ms. Graziano seconded the motion.

Mr. Amos asked if the grant stipulated the planner be a staff person or a contracted position. Mr. Crum said since this is a short term employment situation, he would prefer a contracted position.

There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

C. Update on Hazard Mitigation Plan

Chairman Trout asked Ms. Stewart to make this presentation.

Ms. Stewart said this is a five-year update of the Region's current plan. Work is being done in cooperation with the Crater PDC. The update needs to be completed to identify and mitigate problems caused by natural disasters before they become a life safety issue. The update is also required to maintain eligibility for localities to receive FEMA funds following a natural disaster.

The combined RRPDC and Crater PDC regions include 26 localities.

The plan has been developed through a steering committee comprised of local emergency management staffs with support from other departments within the localities. Crater PDC has also worked with its localities to gather the same types of information. A consultant, Dewberry, is being used for technical assistance and to ensure that the plan is in compliance with FEMA regulations.

The plan contains hazard identification and risk assessment; capability assessment; mitigation strategies; and plan maintenance.

Mr. Glover asked for clarification on mitigation strategies.

Ms. Stewart said flooding is one of the identified hazards. Signage can be used as a mitigation strategy in flood-prone locations to let the public know not to enter the area when it is flooded. Other strategies might include public service announcements and public education regarding safety procedures in each of the identified local hazards.

Mr. Gates pointed out that mitigating hazards involves limiting damage and injuries. He said public education awareness about what to do when earthquakes happen is a type of mitigation strategy.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if a mitigation strategy could be to provide emergency alert radios at discounted costs to residents. She noted that fire departments provide smoke alarms at no cost.

Ms. Stewart said each locality identified hazards and their probability. Once these were identified, the localities then determined strategies to consider for mitigation. Each of the local emergency managers will outline strategies to the governing bodies.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the funds received were UASI funds. Ms. Stewart said this plan update involves being eligible to receive FEMA funds following natural disasters.

Ms. O'Bannon said Henrico County has done studies regarding the need to require trucks to have the proper signage on them so that in the event of accidents, emergency responders would know how best to respond. She asked if this type of mitigation was included.

Ms. Stewart said there is a lot of overlap in emergency management responses.

Ms. O'Bannon said a lot of money has already been spent to collect similar information, such as UASI funding, and she thought the information could be applied to the hazard mitigation plan. Ms. Stewart said other plans had been referenced to gather information. The focus of this particular plan is on natural disasters and not man-made disasters.

Ms. Stewart reviewed each of the local hazards as identified by the localities and a map that had been developed to show locations of emergency and critical facilities. Each locality developed a similar map.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if this information was online. Ms. Stewart said there is a website that she can pass along to those who want to access the report online. All of the local emergency managers have access to the information.

Ms. Stewart said the plan is currently being reviewed by FEMA for a final time. It is hoped the final plan can be brought before each governing body for adoption prior to the December 31 deadline.

Ms. Stewart said the FEMA review may be delayed due to the recent natural disasters. She said staff hopes a final approval will be received in time for the December deadline. She said staff will present the final plan in good faith to the localities for votes prior to December 31. If the plan is not adopted, the locality will not be eligible to receive FEMA funds.

Mr. Jewell suggested that the information be brought to the localities for a vote prior to the Christmas holiday to ensure everyone is in attendance to hear the presentation and to vote on the updated plan.

D. February 2012 Meetings

Chairman Trout said he would like to take up this item before discussion of the CEDS steering committee appointments. He reported that during both the RRPDC and MPO Executive Committee meetings earlier today, action was taken to cancel the February meetings and to hold meetings in January. The February meeting date is in conflict with the annual VACo/VML/VAPDC Legislative Day. There was a concern that a quorum might not be in attendance at the RRPDC/MPO meetings as most members will want to participate in the Legislative Day activities.

The Bylaws say that meetings can be cancelled by action of two-thirds of Commission members present at the meeting during which the vote is taken or by the Chairman.

The Executive Committee is recommending that the Commission meet in January and that the February meeting be cancelled. The January meeting is typically cancelled to allow the jurisdictions an opportunity to appoint members to the Commission if needed. Chairman Trout said he has always felt the Commission should meet in January in order to react to any actions being taken at the General Assembly.

Ms. Graziano made a motion that the February meeting be cancelled and that the Commission hold its regularly scheduled meeting in January. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ayers. Mr. Crum noted the January meeting will be held on January 12. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

E. Appointment to the CEDS Steering Committee

Chairman Trout noted that this is the item removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion. He asked Mr. Crum to provide background information on this item.

Mr. Crum directed members' attention to Tab 4 in the agenda book. He said there is a proposal outlined by staff for the appointment of a steering committee to guide the development of the regional economic development strategy (CEDS). Grant monies have been received from the US Economic Development Administration (EDA) to develop the first regional economic development strategy. The grant comes with a requirement that the effort must be led by a steering committee. Mr. Crum said the proposal uses the word "guidelines" but this is indeed a requirement issued by EDA.

The steering committee is required to be comprised of public officials, community leaders, workforce development board representatives, representatives of institutions of higher learning, minority and labor groups, and public sector

representation. Over 50 percent of the steering committee is required to be from the private sector.

Staff has developed a proposal for a 39-member steering committee. Mr. Crum said staff understands this is a large committee, but in order to meet all of the EDA requirements, it was difficult to come up with a smaller number to serve on the steering committee.

At the bottom of the page, there is a proposal that four sub-committee work groups be established. These groups will be asked to develop strategy suggestions. Mr. Crum asked Ms. Jacocks to provide some additional information.

Ms. Jacocks said input on the make up of the steering committee was provided from each of the localities. This means that the steering committee will have nine members to start with. Other members needed are representatives from the Greater Richmond Partnership and other public sector organizations. Another requirement is to have representation from higher education institutions. Ms. Jacocks said the intent was to keep the committee as small as possible.

Ms. Jacocks said staff will have the responsibility to manage the process to keep all members engaged over the 24-month period. Each of the localities will be asked for input on who should serve on the steering committee.

Ms. Jacocks said it is important to make sure this is a public/private partnership. All potential members suggested will add a vitality to the committee that it would not have if they were omitted.

Mr. Glover asked why is it necessary to have a majority of members from the private sector. Ms. Jacocks said this is a requirement from EDA in order to receive the funding.

Mr. Glover asked if this is a decision making committee. Ms. Jacocks said the development of the economic strategy will be a first for the Region. She said it will encompass EDA requirements as well as whatever the Region wants to include.

Mr. Glover said a previous economic development strategy had suggested that revenue from new businesses be shared. He asked if that would be part of what is now being developed. Ms. Jacocks said that is not a requirement.

Mr. Crum said this is an advisory committee to the Commission Board. Any recommendations will need to be brought before the Board. The reason for developing the CEDS is to identify, particularly in distressed areas, the needs for infrastructure upgrades and improvements to spur economic growth and job creation in these areas. Once the plan is approved with the projects identified, the

Region will become eligible for funding through EDA to implement these projects.

The local bio-technology park tried to obtain EDA funding for projects but because there was no regional CEDS in place, an application for funding could not be submitted. A bio-tech park in Gainesville, Florida did receive over \$4 million in funding because there was a CEDS in place there.

Ms. Jacocks said other funding that is compatible with the same objectives will also be available.

Mr. Glover asked if the state would provide the funding. Ms. Jacocks said it would be federal funding.

Chairman Trout said he sees that of the 39 members, 20 would need to be from the private sector and 19 from the public sector. He said he would consider the 39 members a maximum number.

Mr. Kaechele asked if funding was available to administer this project. Mr. Crum said funding has been received to support staff time for the planning process only.

Ms. Durfee asked if the goals and objectives would be identified by the full steering committee or by the work groups. Mr. Crum said this has not yet been discussed and will be one of the first points taken up by the steering committee once it is in place. He said staff sees the work groups in an advisory position to the steering committee.

Ms. Jacocks said the steering committee will request input from the Commission and there is also a requirement for public review.

Ms. Durfee said she hopes there will be parameters in place to guide the work groups. Ms. Jacocks said specific requirements will be developed

Mr. Butler made a motion that the appointments to the CEDS steering committee as proposed by staff be approved. The motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

B. Announcements

Mr. Crum announced that each member received an invitation via email to attend a webinar taping that will be held on October 20, at the WCVE television studios. The webinar is being sponsored by Leadership Metro Richmond and will include EDAC members on the panel. This particular webinar will focus on individuals with disabilities and how to increase awareness of the challenges they face within the community. The taping will take about an hour. A link to RSVP was provided in the email.

Chairman Trout said the webinar will be available online through various outlets, including the LMR website and the RRPDC website.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Trout adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:15 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Stran L. Trout
Chairman