

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
July 12, 2012

Members/Alternates Present

Douglas G. Conner (M).....City of Richmond
Steve A. Elswick (M)County of Chesterfield
Even Fabricant (M)County of Hanover
Richard W. Glover (M)County of Henrico
Kathy C. Graziano (M).....City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M).....County of Chesterfield
Dorothy Jaeckle (M).....County of Chesterfield
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Vice Chairman (M).....County of Hanover
Kelli Le Duc (A).....County of New Kent
John H. Mitchell (M).....County of Henrico
Patricia S. O'Bannon (M).....County of Henrico
C. Harold Padgett (M)County of Hanover
Ken Peterson, Treasurer (M)County of Goochland
Edward W. Pollard (M)County of New Kent
Faye O. Prichard, Chairman (M).....Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M)City of Richmond
Randy Silber (A)County of Henrico
C. Thomas Tiller (M)County of New Kent
David Williams, Secretary (M)County of Powhatan

Members Absent

L. Ray Ashworth (M)City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M).....County of Powhatan
Thomas M. Branin (M)County of Henrico
Daniel A. Gecker (M).....County of Chesterfield
James M. Holland (M).....County of Chesterfield
E. Martin Jewell (M)City of Richmond
David A. Kaechele (M)County of Henrico
Lynn McAteer (M)City of Richmond
Floyd H. Miles (M)County of Charles City
Tyrone E. Nelson (M)County of Henrico
W. Canova Peterson (M)County of Hanover
Millard D. Stith (M)County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M)County of Henrico
Carson Tucker (M)County of Powhatan
Arthur S. Warren (M)County of Chesterfield

Others Present

Manuel Alvarez County of Goochland
John Amos RRPDC Legal Council
James Burrell County of New Kent
Jeff Fitch Sports Backers
Andy Flavin Dominion Resources, Inc.
Melissa Gay J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
Megan Schultz Sports Backers

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Associate Planner
Anne Darby Associate Planner
John Fogg Senior Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Barbara Jacocks Principal Planner
Jin Lee Senior Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director of Urban Transportation
Kathy Robins Senior Planner
Greta Ryan Senior Planner
Randy Selleck Principal Planner
Jackie S. Stewart Director of Planning
Sarah Stewart Senior Planner
Peter M. Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator
Lee Yolton Principal Planner

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Prichard called the regularly scheduled July 12, 2012 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. She 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. Installation of FY 13 Officers

Mr. Crum reminded members that the RRPDC operates on a fiscal year that runs from July 1 through June 30. At the beginning of each new fiscal year, new officers are installed to serve for that fiscal year. During last month's meeting, officers for FY 13 were elected:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Chairman | Faye Prichard, Town of Ashland |
| Vice Chairman | Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Hanover County |
| Treasurer | Ken Peterson, Goochland County |
| Secretary | David Williams, Powhatan County |

Mr. Crum said as a government entity, there is a requirement that officers take an oath of office, which he then administered to each of the new officers.

Members congratulated the new officers with a round of applause.

Chairman Prichard took this opportunity to introduce Mr. Thomas "Tommy" Tiller who has been appointed to the RRPDC Board as a representative from New Kent County. Mr. Tiller will replace Mr. Burrell. Members welcomed Mr. Tiller with a round of applause.

C. Requests for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business

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

Mr. Crum requested that an item be placed on the agenda under Old Business. He reminded members that during the budget review at the May meeting, there was conversation regarding how membership dues were being calculated for the Town of Ashland and Hanover County.

During today's RRPDC Executive Committee, a recommendation on how to move forward was approved. Mr. Crum said as this is old business, he would like to ask that this item be added to the agenda under Old Business as Item III A, Ashland / Hanover Funding.

There were no additional requests to change the agenda, and the agenda was accepted as changed.

D. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Prichard asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. She 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.

E. Chairman's Report

Chairman Prichard thanked members for their warm welcome and said she is pleased to be serving as Chairman this year. She noted that when she first became a member of the RRPDC six or seven years ago, she thought she would not be on the Board long enough to serve as Chairman. She said she has enjoyed her time on the Board and looks forward to serving this year as Chairman. Chairman Prichard said the chief good of the PDC is that it gives everyone a chance to learn who their neighbors are and how each jurisdiction works. She said a lot can be done by learning to work together.

Recognition of Outgoing Chairman

Chairman Prichard recognized Mr. Burrell in the audience and asked him to step forward. On behalf of the RRPDC, Chairman Prichard presented Mr. Burrell with a small token of appreciation for his service as Chairman during the second half of FY 12. She said she appreciated how he stepped into the role quickly on short notice with a willingness to work with everyone. She said everyone was very glad to have had the opportunity to work with him.

Mr. Burrell thanked Chairman Prichard for her kind remarks. He said he was sorry to have missed several meetings during his tenure. Mr. Burrell noted that the RRPDC is a prime example of regional cooperation and he wished the RRPDC future success.

Members joined in a round of applause to express their thanks and appreciation for Mr. Burrell's service to the RRPDC.

Cancellation of August Meetings

Chairman Prichard advised members that it is tradition for the August meetings to be canceled unless there are major agenda items that need to be addressed. During today's RRPDC Executive Committee meeting, action was taken to recommend that the August meetings be canceled.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the Executive Committees would meet.

Mr. Crum said staff proposed, and the Executive Committees agreed, that all of the August meetings be canceled.

Chairman Prichard asked if there was a motion to cancel the August meetings. Ms. Graziano so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

F. 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 later today a presentation will be given on a land use inventory completed by staff. He brought members' attention to data that was cycling on the monitors. The slides were showing residential development in the Region over the past several decades. He said this analysis was completed by staff in order to understand how residential development has progressed in the Region. Today's land use inventory presentation will offer more detailed information.

One of the RRPDC's priorities is to bring together staff members from the jurisdictions who work on preparation of grant applications and to encourage cooperation among these staff members. The Regional Area Funding Team (RAFT) was formed as a result. On July 19, a training session on grantsmanship will be offered and will be facilitated by a professional grantsperson from the Robins Foundation. This training will be provided at no cost to anyone in the jurisdictions who would like to learn how to write more competitive grant applications. He asked that members pass this information along to their jurisdictions. Mr. Crum indicated that invitations to attend are also being extended to several non-profit groups in the Region.

Mr. Crum said work continues on the regional economic development strategy. A meeting will be held at the RRPDC tomorrow and will include staff members from each of the jurisdictions as well as private sector representatives. Further updates will be provided as the strategy development moves forward.

Mr. Crum said there are two housing reports available to members on the table in the back of the room. The first was prepared by the National Association of Realtors on sustainable housing. This association does a good job with discussions on housing trends, and Mr. Crum said he thought members would find the information interesting. The other report was prepared by Virginia Housing and deals with the effects of housing on the local economy.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Prichard said the Executive Committee recommended approval of the items listed on the Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of Minutes – June 14, 2012
- B. Approval of May Financial Report
- C. Authorization for the Executive Director to Enter into a Contract with Convergent Technologies Group to Provide Information Technology Systems Support to the Agency

Mr. Crum reported there is a minor change to the proposed Convergent contract. At each member's seat is a handout showing the change in yellow highlight. Legal counsel suggested this friendly amendment to the contract. The original contract, which is in the agenda book, included an early termination clause that said if the agency terminated the contract before the end of the three-year term due to a lack of funding, there would be a \$5,000.00 penalty assessed. Mr. Amos recommended that penalty fee be removed from the contract, and Convergent Technologies agreed to this change. A vote to approve the contract will be on the contract as amended.

Mr. Gulley asked about the service call fee on page 2 of the contract. He asked if this was a standard charge.

Mr. Crum said the agency decided to outsource IT services about three years ago. At that time, the agency contracted with Convergent Technologies. The decision to outsource was made because it was determined to be more cost effective. Over the course of the three years the agency has been using Convergent, there have not been any such instances. Convergent can handle most service issues remotely. They only come on site when requested by the agency and only after it has been determined that issues cannot be solved remotely.

Mr. Crum introduced Mr. Jeff Garell, with Convergent Technologies. Mr. Crum asked Mr. Garell if he had any comments related to Mr. Gulley's question. Mr. Garell said generally about 90 percent of all service issues can be handled remotely. On site visits are generated only when there is a need for a technician to be on site. If the problem cannot be solved remotely within fifteen minutes, a decision is made on whether or not to dispatch a technician. Based on the past three years of working with RRPDC, the contract was written with that experience in mind.

Chairman Prichard asked if anyone wished to have any of these items pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion.

As there were no requests for further discussion on the items, on motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Williams, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented with the inclusion of the amendment to the Convergent Technologies Group contract as discussed.

Mr. Fabricant abstained from the vote as he noted he has a professional relationship with Convergent Technologies.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Hanover County / Town of Ashland Funding

Chairman Prichard reminded members this item was added at the request of Mr. Crum. She asked Mr. Crum to lead the discussion.

Mr. Crum reviewed that this item is a follow-up on the discussions held during the May meeting on the RRPDC FY 13 budget. It was noted during that discussion that when population was counted to determine membership dues, the population for Ashland was also included in the population for Hanover County, resulting in a double payment of dues by Hanover County. Jurisdictions pay a rate of 60¢ per person based on population. This covers funding for the RRPDC as well as the local match for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

The question raised during the budget discussions was why Ashland's population was being counted twice – once for the Town of Ashland and as part of the total population for Hanover County. Members wanted to know how long this double count had been taking place and the reasoning for the double count.

Staff conducted a thorough search of agency records and meeting minutes to look for documentation related to this dues calculation methodology. Staff also contacted previous Executive Directors and Board members to hear their recollections on why the double count was initiated. Mr. Crum said Mr. Amos, RRPDC legal counsel, was consulted and conversations were held with Mr. Rhu Harris, Hanover County Administrator, as well as the RRPDC Executive Committee.

Staff found that this method of calculating dues has been used since FY 97. Since that time, the population of Ashland was used to determine Ashland's dues and the population was also included in the total Hanover County population to determine the county's dues.

Unfortunately, RRPDC records from the 1990s are not very complete. There was a period during that timeframe when it was determined minutes for Executive Committee meetings would not be kept. All agency files and records were searched and no documentation on why this dues calculation change was made could be found.

Conversations with previous Board members who served during that time and a conversation with the Executive Director who served at that time indicate there was a recollection that everyone knew why the change was made and that it was done intentionally. There is, however, a lack of clarity on why the change was made. One reason given was that the Town of Ashland is also part of Hanover County and that Hanover County might also benefit from services provided by RRPDC to the Town of Ashland. There is no written documentation to confirm this reason. Staff could not find anyone who was willing to say that he/she definitively remembered the reason why the change was made.

Mr. Crum said a lot of conversations were held with Hanover County. Mr. Crum provided members with information on the amount of monies paid in dues each year by Hanover County for the portion of the total county population that is Ashland's population. Over the last fifteen years, the amount averaged about \$4,000.00 a year, totaling \$63,834.00.

Hanover County was present at each meeting during which the RRPDC budget was approved using this dues calculation methodology and the Hanover County representatives voted to approve the RRPDC budget based on those calculations. However, concern has been expressed about the double payment and whether some reimbursement should be made to Hanover County.

Legal counsel has concluded that he does not believe the double count was a mistake, that there was a reason for it, but there is no written documentation or proof.

Hanover County has held discussions with its Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission. They have proposed a compromise solution which is being presented today for RRPDC Board consideration. The RRPDC Executive Committee reviewed this compromise earlier today. Mr. Crum asked Hanover Board members to add any comments they may have as he continues.

Mr. Crum reported that Mr. Harris, Hanover County Administrator, recognizes that the county has not raised the issue over the past fifteen years, until Mr. Padgett brought this to everyone's attention during the May meeting. Mr. Harris does believe that some reimbursement is appropriate.

The compromise proposal is that moving forward, the population for Ashland will be removed from that of Hanover County when calculating dues, beginning in FY 13. This results in a deduction in the county's dues of about \$4,200 for FY 13. Rather than reimbursing Hanover County for double payments over the last fifteen years, the RRPDC will credit Hanover for five years' worth of the double payments. That total is \$20,731 and will be payable over a three year period.

The RRPDC Executive Committee is recommending that this refund be viewed as a credit on dues payable to RRPDC. Mr. Crum said Mr. Harris stressed that he did not want to place a financial hardship on the RRPDC by requiring the reimbursement in one lump sum.

Chairman Prichard noted that Ashland really does not have a place in this conversation.

Mr. Glover said he brought to the attention of the Executive Committee that he has some recollection of what happened in FY 97. He asked if projects are completed by the RRPDC for each jurisdiction. Mr. Crum said a technical assistance project is undertaken each year on a rotating basis for one of the large jurisdictions.

Mr. Glover said each of the two jurisdictions is represented on the RRPDC Board. He said he recalled that if the jurisdictions wanted separate representation, they needed to pay separate dues. Mr. Glover said he remembers this because he was a Board member at that time.

Chairman Prichard pointed out that each jurisdiction does pay separate dues.

Mr. Glover said he remembers that Ashland benefits from dues paid by Hanover because Ashland is part of Hanover County. Hanover will benefit from assistance given to Ashland because Ashland is part of Hanover County. Mr. Glover said he did have a clear recollection and understanding of why the decision was made to change the dues calculation and he thought Mr. Klotz (former board member) also had a clear recollection of the reason for this change in dues calculations.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she has discussed this in detail with Mr. Buddy Klotz, who represented Hanover County on the RRPDC Board at that time. She said he has indicated that what he remembers is to the best of his knowledge, but he does not have a clear recollection. She said she believed it would be a misrepresentation to say that Mr. Klotz had a clear recollection of what happened.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said there is no disagreement going forward for Ashland and Hanover to have representation on the RRPDC Board and that the representation should mirror the dues that are paid. For the last fifteen years, Hanover's representation has been based on a split population, but dues are paid based on the full population. She said the county is in agreement that going forward, dues should be paid as it is being recommended – with Ashland's population carved out of Hanover's population. Since there is no documentation on why the change was made, the county felt it was fair that some sort of reimbursement be made for the double payment. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she hoped everyone would consider that fairness when voting today on the proposed compromise.

Mr. Fabricant said the county completed research to see when a project was last done by the RRPDC for Ashland and it was fifteen years ago. He said originally the county wanted to ask for the entire amount to be reimbursed but decided it would not be fair to cause potential financial harm the RRPDC. The county determined that five years was a fair number.

Mr. Glover said he has no problem with the proposed compromise. He said he did want members to know there is someone on the Board now who was there at the time and remembers what happened.

Mr. Glover said he would make the motion to accept the proposed compromise from Hanover County as presented by Mr. Crum. Mr. Gulley seconded the motion.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if any research had been done to see how other PDCs handle the situation if there is an incorporated town in a county.

Mr. Crum asked Ms. Evans to respond to this question. Ms. Evans said she did contact other PDCs and those in similar situations do count the populations separately. She said there is one PDC that offered a town the option of having separate representation and the town declined; the town's population was added back to the county's population.

Ms. Jaeckle asked, for the counties and towns that have separate representation, if the county pays double dues. Ms. Evans said they do not.

Mr. Amos said that there is no question that Ashland and Hanover are charter members of the RRPDC and both are treated as separate voting members.

Mr. Pollard asked if each jurisdiction levied separate taxes. Chairman Prichard indicated that was correct.

There was no further discussion and the motion to accept the compromise as presented by Mr. Crum on behalf of Hanover County was approved unanimously.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Appointment of FY 13 Standing Committees.

Chairman Prichard noted that the list of appointments was included under Tab 5 and indicated that all those appointed agreed to serve during the coming fiscal year.

Chairman Prichard recognized Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams said he wanted to advise members of the death of Bill Britton, who was the former planning director in Charles City County. He said Mr. Britton was a friend to many RRPDC members. Mr. Williams said that even though Mr. Britton had been ill for a long time, everyone felt that he would be able to overcome his illness. The obituary will be in the paper on Sunday.

Chairman Prichard asked if there was any place remembrances could be sent. Mr. Williams said he did not know at this time.

Mr. Crum reported that he sent a sympathy card to Mr. Britton's family on behalf of the RRPDC.

B. MARTIN'S Tour of Richmond Gran Fondo

Chairman Prichard asked the guest presenters to please come forward to provide their presentation.

Megan Schultz introduced herself and said she works with Sports Backers. She thanked members for the opportunity to share information on Sports Backers' new event, which will take place in October. The cycling event is the Martin's Richmond

Tour Gran Fondo. Ms. Schultz said “gran fondo” means *big ride* in Italian. These events typically have a large group of participants and are not true races. The Sports Backers event will take place on October 6.

Ms. Schultz said this event is unique to Sports Backers because it’s a cycling event. Many persons are familiar with the Ukrop’s Monument Avenue 10K or the Anthem Richmond Marathon. Sports Backers does have the Anthem Moonlight Ride, which is a cycling event.

The Gran Fondo will be a ride of 102 miles. It will start and finish at Richmond International Raceway Complex (RIR). To appeal to a broader audience, there are shorter distance options. One is a 59 mile ride which will begin at J. Sargeant Reynolds Goochland Campus and end at RIR. The second is a 29 mile ride that will begin at Patrick Henry High School in Hanover County and end at RIR. It is anticipated about 800 riders will participate.

Ms. Schultz said Sports Backers is very excited about the opportunities the ride will offer to the Region. The ride will extend through a total of eight jurisdictions, many of which are RRPDC members. Ms. Schultz reviewed the ride route, pointing out the route through each of the jurisdictions.

Ms. Schultz said the mission of Sports Backers is to make the Richmond Region more physically active. Part of this new mission will involve more infrastructure awareness on the part of the communities. The Gran Fondo will offer an opportunity to discover what types of infrastructure will be needed to make the Region more bike and pedestrian friendly.

Ms. Schultz introduced Jeff Fitch, who also works with Sports Backers. Mr. Fitch said most events sponsored by Sports Backers take place in one locality. The Gran Fondo will involve several localities, which is one reason Sports Backers wanted to announce the ride to members of RRPDC.

Mr. Fitch said events sponsored by Sports Backers are meant to drive economic development using sports as a vehicle to accomplish that as well as to position Richmond as the most active and healthy community in the nation. Mr. Fitch said he will be speaking with a reporter from Outside Magazine later today, and this magazine article will feature Richmond as the best river region in the country. The article will appear in the October edition. This will bring incredible exposure to the James River and the Richmond Region.

Sports Backers would like to work with all of the localities’ local planners to make sure as many commuter miles as possible can be accomplished on a bike. The Richmond Times-Dispatch featured an article recently on an opportunity to work with a local cement vendor to expand the Virginia Capital Trail. Another project will be featured in this Sunday’s Times-Dispatch.

Mr. Fitch reminded members that in 2015, the same riders who are now participating in the Tour de France will be in Richmond to participate in the World Championships cycling event. This will bring further attention to how bike friendly the Region is for riders.

Mr. Fitch noted that Ms. Schultz has been meeting with public safety officials in the Gran Fondo participating localities to discuss any concerns the localities have regarding the ride route. As these concerns are voiced, Sports Backers will make the appropriate changes to the route.

Mr. Williams asked what the public safety officials in Powhatan County had advised about Route 711. Ms. Schultz said officials in Powhatan did express concern about that route. She said one of the county's police officers bikes along Route 711 often and said while he did have some concern, he thought Route 711 could be used. Mr. Williams said this is a two-lane road with no shoulders and no recovery zone. He said trees are right next to the road, so he does have concerns regarding the safety of the riders. Mr. Williams said it is a dangerous road for bikers when there is also traffic involved.

Mr. Fitch said this is the type of feedback Sports Backers needs to ensure the safety of the participants. He said they will take a look at alternatives for Route 711.

Mr. Fabricant asked what the RRPDC can do to assist between now and the 2015 event.

Mr. Fitch said the five year strategic plan for Sports Backers will involve discussions with local elected officials and planning departments with regard to infrastructure needs. He said the improvements made to Gayton Road in Henrico County are the types of improvements Sports Backers would encourage in each locality.

Ms. Schultz said Sports Backers will work to identify ways the localities can assist.

Mr. Fitch said it is the hope of Sports Backers that this type of cycling event will grow each year.

Mr. Crum asked how counties can take advantage of this event with respect to business opportunities. He asked if there will be specific viewing areas that will give local businesses the opportunity to participate.

Ms. Schultz said the route will be more natural; however, there will be seven aid stations along the route. One of these will be in a shopping center parking lot.

Mr. Fitch said riders typically find places along routes to congregate, such as Ashland Coffee and Tea during the Anthem Moonlight Ride. He also indicated that many businesses in Charles City County are seeing an increased number of cyclists, who are using the Virginia Capital Trail, coming into their stores.

Mr. Fitch said as the event matures, places to congregate will occur naturally as riders become familiar with the route. He said as an example, the Anthem Midnight Ride has been around long enough that people will gather at specific places along the route.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked if the Gran Fondo would take place at night. Mr. Fitch said the Anthem Moonlight Ride, which will be held on August 4, does begin at 8:00 p.m. The Gran Fondo will take place beginning at 7:00 a.m.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked if there will be small festivals at each of the three starting points. Ms. Schultz said there will be places for family and friends to congregate to see off riders as well as a place to make signs, much like any other Sports Backers event.

Mr. Alvarez, MPO Board member (Goochland County), asked if the Gran Fondo would become an annual event. Mr. Fitch said it will be an annual event. The World Championships will be a one-time event held during the fall in 2015.

Mr. Alvarez asked if this course would be the same as the one for the World Championships. Mr. Fitch said the World Championships course is being set by its own organization in cooperation with the Richmond 2015 organization. He said the World Championships will take place over eight days on different routes in the City of Richmond.

Chairman Prichard thanked Ms. Schultz and Mr. Fitch for their presentation.

C. Richmond Region Land Use Inventory

Chairman Prichard asked Mr. Crum to introduce this presentation.

Mr. Crum said staff has completed the Region's first land use inventory. The data collection for this project took a lot of time and was managed by Anne Darby, who will give an overview of the inventory to members for their information.

Ms. Darby said the project was done over the course of a year and a half. She said she will welcome feedback from members and noted that a packet of information was placed at each member's seat.

Ms. Darby indicated that an existing land use inventory uses direct observations, by use of local records and aerial imagery, in order to assign a use classification to each parcel. This inventory was developed to better understand regional patterns, to create a benchmark and to track patterns, and to provide a precise data tool to the jurisdictions.

Ms. Darby said the inventory was developed by researching best practices and by meeting with each jurisdiction's planning staff to gather data. After the meeting with

local staffs, PDC staff formulated a process and evaluated and normalized data to a regional rubric. After a baseline was developed, the draft was taken back to the individual planning staffs for feedback. Using the feedback received, the data was refined and a regional meeting was held in April with local planning directors and staffs to review the inventory again.

The existing land use inventory is parcel-based. It is not affected by zoning, future land use plans, comprehensive plans, development plans, or owner intent. Each parcel was identified by how it is currently being used on a parcel by parcel basis to fill the entire Region. The different types of parcels identified were:

- high density residential (parcels less than 0.2 acres): apartment complexes, condos, mobile home parks
- medium density residential (parcels greater than 0.2 acres but less than 0.5 acres)
- low density residential (greater than 0.5 and less than 2.0 acres): rural residential 1, rural residential 2, rural residential 3
- forest: parcels are at least 80-90% forested but most are 100% forested
- agriculture/forest: parcels roughly between 46-60% either agriculture or forest (aerials used)
- agricultural: parcels at least 80-90% plowed, tilled, or planted and also include pasture, barns, silos, etc.
- undeveloped
- commercial/office: includes retail, office, food service, etc.
- institutional: prisons, schools, and government buildings as well as churches and other parcels previously labeled “public/semi-public” in urban/suburban jurisdictions
- industrial: heavy and light industrial as well as public utilities, cell tower parcels, water treatment plants and other municipal service locations
- airport: both commercial and general aviation
- parks/open space: parks, golf courses, ball parks, tennis courts, and cemeteries

Ms. Darby provided a map of the entire Region to show all of the designations. She said feedback on how this data can be used in the jurisdictions will be appreciated. Ms. Darby said that data is accumulated as parcels and acreage and not by square feet or population. A pie chart of regional land use as a percentage of the total acreage was provided.

Ms. Darby briefly reviewed the land use maps provided for each of the jurisdictions.

The regional information was also broken down to developed and undeveloped/natural land, as illustrated on the pie chart provided. Ms. Darby also provided this information in map form to show the entire Region as well as the acreage in each jurisdiction.

Additional examples were provided with an overlay of water service area and by land use types as well as by parcels with significant ecological cores.

Ms. Graziano thanked Ms. Darby for putting this inventory together. She said it will be very useful to the jurisdictions.

Chairman Prichard asked how the information will be kept up to date. Ms. Darby said staff will use a more streamlined process every two years when new aerial photography is available. She said each jurisdiction has a different process to gather the data, but PDC staff has established a process to pull all of the data together after it has been collected from each jurisdiction.

Mr. Peterson asked how the localities will be able to access the information. Ms. Darby said the GIS information has already been shared with the jurisdictions. She said local staffs can be given the information in the same handout form that was provided today to members.

Mr. Crum said this can also be put on the RRPDC website and shared electronically with the localities. Additional copies of the handout can be provided to the localities as well.

Mr. Gulley asked if zoning was taken into consideration. Ms. Darby said zoning was not considered. Mr. Gulley said zoning information will be helpful when comprehensive plans are developed.

Mr. Crum said the information presented today is a baseline for the Region. He said a next step will be to show developable land by zoning designation and build-out potential.

Mr. Williams asked if data files can be obtained so each locality can make their own updates. Ms. Darby said if any staffs want additional information, PDC staff will be glad to share the information. She said each locality does currently have the GIS files.

Mr. Crum said a regional baseline is needed to monitor development. He said he wanted to commend Ms. Darby for the work she completed on this inventory, which produced an impressive product.

D. Richmond Region Electric Vehicle Plan

Chairman Prichard said Mr. John Fogg will make this presentation.

Mr. Crum noted that Mr. Fogg is a contract planner working for RRPDC who is assisting in the development of an electric vehicle strategic plan for the Region.

Mr. Fogg thanked members for the opportunity to make this presentation to them today.

He said the Richmond Regional Electric Vehicle Initiative (REVi) is a coalition of several local partners, with over 50 local and national experts. It has identified synergistic opportunities between these groups to facilitate successes.

The objectives for REVi are:

- create an attractive and sustainable market for EVs (electric vehicles)
- lay the educational groundwork for EVs
- develop a regional strategic plan
- provide the planning tools for a coordinated approach to electric vehicle introduction and sustained implementation

Mr. Fogg reviewed the growth potential for plug-in electric vehicles (PEV):

- global PEV market will reach 137,950 units in 2012
- US 2012 projections for PEV sales are 47,966 units, 34.8% of the global PEV market
- 1 million mark of US PEV units on the road is projected to be hit in early 2018
- installed cost of Li-ion batteries projected to drop by one-third by 2017
- US is projected to lead world PEV sales through 2020

Mr. Fogg presented information on PEVs trends and noted the work being done in the Richmond Region to foster an electric vehicle future. He provided examples of the current vehicles that are now available, including hybrid, plug-in, and electric vehicles.

There are three levels of electric vehicle charging equipment: Level 1 which takes about 14-21 hours to charge; Level 2 which takes 6-8 hours to charge; Level 3 which is the fastest charge at about 30 minutes.

Mr. Fogg reviewed the planning analysis and methodology used to develop the Region's electric vehicle strategic plan. Part of the analysis was to determine where electric vehicles are currently registered in the Region and how this has changed over a two-year period.

Information was provided on where EVs spend time when driven. By knowing this, it makes it easier to plan for charging infrastructure locations. Mr. Fogg reviewed where charging stations are now located in the Region.

Mr. Fogg provided information on current and projected regional population density and high employment areas as well as median household income distribution. This is an indication of who will purchase EVs and how this translates to primary and

secondary EV growth areas in the Region, including areas represented by the Crater PDC.

The Electric Vehicle Strategic Plan (EVSP) is focusing on the following areas:

- Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE) codes, permitting, and installation
 - review current codes for any potential barriers/impediments to EVSE introduction
 - regional approach to electric vehicle signage
 - opportunities to streamline current codes and inspection processes
 - determine EVSE and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) implications
- policy and incentives
 - encourage local municipalities to promote EV use: promote the introduction of EVSE infrastructure and designated EV parking locations; inform local municipalities of the available EV incentives in the State Code of Virginia – State Statute §46.2-1220 and §58.1-3506(B).
 - business community EVSE outreach: encourage businesses to install EVSE for patrons and/or employees; encourage business organizations to implement an EV awareness program; encourage vehicle manufacturers to include charging infrastructure cost in vehicle financing
- education and training
 - promote the J. Sargeant Reynolds hybrid and electric vehicle technology certificate plan; develop and promote an EV Technology non-credit service class addressing EV types, cost, maintenance, and electrical wiring requirements; online EV campaign to maintain virtual communications points through web development and content management, social media management, and email programs; public and educational events promoting electric vehicles

Mr. Fogg reviewed the key points of the Electric Vehicle Strategic Plan:

- Advance the Richmond Region as an attractive and sustainable market for electric vehicle technology
- Provide the Richmond Region with the planning tools for a coordinated approach to electric vehicle and EVSE introduction and sustained implementation
- Review municipal permitting and inspection requirements for electric vehicle charging stations
- Propose potential government and private sector policy changes that encourage the introduction of electric vehicle technology
- Promote EV education programs available in the community

There was also a review of proposed signage to indicate parking for electric vehicles and locations of charging stations.

Mr. Samuels asked if Mr. Fogg could repeat the two sections of Virginia Code that he referenced. Mr. Fogg said those were State Statute §46.2-1220 and §58.1-3506(B). The first references parking regulations and the second concerns the tax rate for electric vehicles that can be assigned by localities.

Ms. O'Bannon said it seems that not much progress has been made since she served on an electric vehicle study committee several years ago. She asked how much charging will cost and what owners will do when there is a power outage. Mr. Fogg said costs will depend on the type of vehicle that is owned. Mr. Fogg said power outages are still being addressed, but noted that hybrids have a back-up gas engine.

Ms. O'Bannon said she understands that training will need to be given to public safety personnel on how to respond to accidents involving electric vehicles. Mr. Fogg confirmed there is ongoing training to teach emergency responders how to approach and handle electric vehicles following an accident to prevent shocks.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked if designated parking for electric vehicles will take away from the already limited parking available in the downtown area. Mr. Fogg said he does not believe this will become an issue, noting that only a small percentage of parking spaces would be designated for electric vehicles. Designated parking is only a recommendation for localities.

Mr. Crum added that this would be a very small percentage of the overall available parking, about 3 percent.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said her concern is that she does not want to discourage people from visiting downtown or any other locality because of the potential lack of parking for non-electric vehicles.

Mr. Glover asked about the cost of an electric vehicle. Mr. Fogg said the costs can run from \$25,000 to \$40,000 depending on the manufacturer. He said the two most popular models on the market at this time are the Nissan Leaf and Ford Focus. He said all major manufacturers will have an electric vehicle model out soon. He said the cost of the battery is what drives the cost of the vehicle.

Mr. Glover asked about the cost of a battery and the life expectancy of the battery. Mr. Fogg said he believed Ford is saying their battery costs about \$12,000 to \$15,000 and should last about eight years.

Mr. Fogg recognized Mr. Andy Flavin seated in the audience, from Dominion Virginia Power, and asked if he had any additional information to add. Mr. Flavin said there is typically an 8-year/100,000 mile warranty on the battery.

Mr. Glover asked if there is a break-even point on electric vehicle ownership. Mr. Fogg said research indicates it takes about 8-10 years to recoup the amount of money spent on an electric vehicle over that of a non-electric vehicle.

Mr. Glover said he owns a Toyota Prius and the break-even point on that is about eight years. He said he thought the break-even point for a pure electric vehicle would be different than that of a hybrid.

Mr. Peterson asked about the cost to charge a battery. Mr. Fogg said some charging stations are at no cost. Other companies are offering monthly memberships for a pre-paid swipe card to use at charging stations.

Ms. O'Bannon said she understands that Dominion Virginia Power uses clean coal to operate its charging stations.

Mr. Flavin added that the cost for an overnight charge, or a charge during off-peak hours, will be about 50¢ to 60¢ for the total charge time. He said with regard to power outages, cars can be charged off of a generator if the owner has a generator. He said during a major power outage, gasoline pumps do not work either. Mr. Flavin said it's a matter of training to get electric vehicle owners to charge their vehicles in advance of a major storm forecast, similar to the way people now prepare their gas vehicles ahead of hurricanes.

Mr. Flavin also noted that most of Dominion's energy now comes from nuclear power, about 40 percent, and not coal. Only about 30 percent comes from coal with the remainder coming from natural gas and hydro-electric sources. Mr. Flavin said Virginia is in a good position to be able to handle electric vehicles based on the varied sources of electricity.

Mr. Glover asked if the Leaf and the Volt (Chevrolet) both have a gasoline back-up. Mr. Fogg said this option is available on the Volt.

Mr. Glover asked about the estimated cost for a homeowner to install what is needed to charge an electric vehicle. Mr. Fogg indicated the minimum cost will be for the installation of the charging unit, which is about \$1,500 for a Level 2 charger.

Chairman Prichard noted that time was running short before the next meeting was scheduled to convene at 3:00. She thanked members for their interest and questions, and she thanked Mr. Fogg for his presentation.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to be brought before the members.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

On motion duly made and seconded, Chairman Prichard adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:50 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Faye O. Prichard
Chairman