

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
October 11, 2012

Members/Alternates Present

L. Ray Ashworth (M)City of Richmond
Richard Ayers (M)..... Powhatan County
Sean Davis (A) Hanover County
Even Fabricant (M) Hanover County
Daniel A. Gecker (M)..... Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover (M) Henrico County
Kathy C. Graziano (M)..... City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley (M)..... Chesterfield County
James M. Holland (M)..... Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle (M)..... Chesterfield County
David A. Kaechele (M) Henrico County
Kelli Le Duc (A)..... New Kent County
Lynn McAteer (M) City of Richmond
Floyd H. Miles (M) Charles City County
John H. Mitchell (M)..... Henrico County
Tyrone E. Nelson (M) Henrico County
Patricia S. O'Bannon (M)..... Henrico County
C. Harold Padgett (M) Hanover County
Ken Peterson, Treasurer (M) Goochland County
W. Canova Peterson (M) Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard (M) New Kent County
Frank J. Thornton (M) Henrico County
Carson Tucker (M) Powhatan County
Arthur S. Warren (M) Chesterfield County
David Williams, Secretary (M) Powhatan County

Members Absent

Thomas M. Branin (M) Henrico County
Douglas G. Conner (M)..... City of Richmond
Steve A. Elswick (M) Chesterfield County
E. Martin Jewell (M) City of Richmond
Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Vice Chairman (M)..... Hanover County
Faye O. Prichard, Chairman (M)..... Town of Ashland
Charles R. Samuels (M) City of Richmond
C. Thomas Tiller (M) New Kent County

Others Present

John AmosRRPDC Legal Council
Michael Aukamp Dunham, Aukamp and Rhodes
Wendy Burtner-OwensCapital Region Collaborative
Virginia Lipford APHA
Joanne Simmelink Chesterfield County

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. EvansAssistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Anne DarbySenior Planner
Chuck Gates Communications Coordinator
Barbara JacocksPrincipal Planner
Jin LeeSenior Planner
Daniel N. Lysy Director of Urban Transportation
Randy Selleck.....Principal Planner
Sarah Stewart.....Senior Planner
Peter M. Sweetland..... Finance and Contracts Administrator

Call to Order

Mr. Peterson called the regularly scheduled October 11, 2012 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:10 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 to the Order of Business

Mr. Peterson asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. There were no requests to change the agenda, and the agenda was accepted as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Mr. Peterson 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, Mr. Peterson closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

Mr. Peterson noted that he did not have a report to present on behalf of Ms. Prichard.

Mr. Peterson reported that Ms. Prichard (Chairman) and Ms. Kelly-Wiecek (Vice Chairman) were not able to attend today's meeting. As Treasurer, he is the next duly elected RRPDC officer in line to serve as Acting Chairman, and he will be presiding over today's meeting.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought 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 Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees are expected to finalize a draft legislative agenda during their October meeting. This draft will be brought to members of the Board during the November meeting for review and consideration for endorsement. Mr. Crum noted, for the benefit of new members, that a legislative reception will be held in early January during which members of the Capital Region Caucus from the General Assembly will be invited to attend in order to hear a presentation on the RRPDC 2013 Legislative Agenda.

Mr. Crum brought members' attention to a handout at each seat from the Transportation Forum hosted by the Greater Richmond Chamber and Building America's Future on September 21. Keynote speakers were former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell and Virginia's Secretary of Transportation, Sean Connaughton.

The Forum centered on the fact that funding for transportation will be depleted in 2017. There is a growing concern that needs for transportation funding cannot continue to be met. At the conclusion of the Forum, audience members used a voting device to identify potential solutions to the funding crisis. The handout showed the results of that vote. Mr. Crum said there is a lot more information available from the Forum that he can provide to members if they would like to have it.

Mr. Crum said the first question asked was for members of the audience to identify their affiliation – business, government, or a non-profit organization. When the voting results were sorted by the groups, there was really no difference in the voting results.

Mr. Crum reminded members that in June, a meeting of the mayors and chairs within the Urban Crescent was held to discuss transportation funding issues. It is hoped that

this group will be able to lead the charge to the General Assembly to ask legislators to address the transportation funding crisis.

A second Urban Crescent meeting will be held on Friday, November 16, at the Workforce Development and Conference Center on the Parham Road campus of J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College. The meeting will begin at 11:00 a.m.

There was a good turnout of representation from the Richmond Region at the June meeting, and Mr. Crum encouraged members to attend the meeting in November.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Peterson said the Executive Committee recommended approval of the items listed on the Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of Minutes – September 13, 2012
- B. Approval of July and August Financial Reports

There was no request to have either item removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion and on motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Williams, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously.

III. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to bring before members.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report of the RRPDC Audit Committee

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Crum to introduce this item.

Mr. Crum said the FY 12 audit was completed by the auditing firm Dunham, Aukamp and Rhodes. Mr. Michael Aukamp is here today to provide an overview of the audit findings to members.

Mr. Aukamp said that his firm audits seven other PDCs in the state, so the firm is very familiar with the types of funding sources used at RRPDC. He said this helps to be able to complete the audit efficiently.

Mr. Aukamp reported that the agency's internal controls and segregation of duties is very strong. He said these are probably the best of any of the other PDCs he audits. He said the size of the agency allows the segregation of duties among several staff members which gives several layers of checks and balances. This reduces the risk of any accounting errors. Mr. Aukamp said that as controls have been put in place over several years, RRPDC staff has used these controls and follows up on the process.

The agency received an unqualified opinion, meaning nothing needs to be changed as it applies to generally accepted auditing standards as applied to planning district commissions. This is the highest rating available. With required compliance reports, there were no problems or other issues found. Mr. Aukamp also reported that no management letter was issued. This letter would be issued to make recommendations that would not affect the process but would improve best practices. There is nothing the firm would recommend to change the procedures already in place.

Mr. Aukamp noted that on page 8 of the report, the statement of net assets is presented. This shows net assets of about \$1.8 million. If the agency had to close and meet all of its obligations, this is the amount that would be left over. The \$1 million threshold set several years ago has been a good decision to maintain the liquidity. Of this amount, there is \$691,000 in cash and liquid investments which indicates a strong position should grant reimbursements be delayed for any amount of time.

On page 9, the statement of activities shows a decrease in net assets of about \$57,000. This loss was planned and budgeted. On page 26, the statement of actual budget shows that when the loss is converted to a budgetary basis, it includes depreciation and excludes capital purchases. This reduces the actual loss to about \$36,000. This compares favorably to the budgeted loss of \$57,000.

Mr. Aukamp said this reflects on the fact that staff is being good stewards with regard to use of these funds.

On page 25, the summary notes that the agency qualifies as a low-risk auditee. This indicates that over at least the last two years, there have been no compliance issues identified. Mr. Aukamp said no compliance issues have been identified over a period longer than two years.

Mr. Peterson thanked Mr. Aukamp for his presentations. He also reported that the Audit Committee and members of the Executive Committee all endorsed the report and recommend adoption and filing of the FY 12 audit report.

Mr. Thornton said he would offer kudos to Mr. Crum and his staff for this exemplary report. He said this reflects the quality of the staff and the entire organization.

Mr. Peterson added that Mr. Aukamp also indicated that RRPDC has the best control practices in place of all the PDCs that he audits.

Mr. Crum said he would like to recognize Mr. Sweetland and Ms. Evans for the work they do in managing the finance and budget tasks for the agency. He thanked them for their efforts on behalf of the agency. Members of the Board joined in that show of appreciation with a round of applause.

Mr. Peterson asked if there was a motion to accept and file the FY 12 audit report as presented. Mr. Williams so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Thornton. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

B. Capital Region Collaborative Update

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Crum to present this item for discussion.

Mr. Crum said the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) is an effort that was begun about three or four years ago as a partnership between RRPDC and the Greater Richmond Chamber (GRCC) to bring government and business together in a collaborative manner to drive progress in the Richmond Region.

Mr. Crum pointed out that several RRPDC Board members sit on the CRC Organizing Council to help drive this effort. The Council has 36 members – 18 from the RRPDC and 18 from the GRCC membership.

The CRC is entering a new phase and it was felt that an update to RRPDC Board members was in order.

Ms. Burtner-Owens is the Project Manager for the CRC. She reports to both Mr. Crum and to Kim Scheeler (GRCC President and CEO). The position is housed at the GRCC and is funded entirely by the Chamber Foundation. Mr. Crum said that Ms. Burtner-Owens is doing some very good and appreciated work for the CRC.

Ms. Burtner-Owens thanked members for the opportunity to provide today's update on CRC activities. She noted that the CRC has the same footprint as the RRPDC.

She said there are two tracks the CRC travels. Each month, the CRC Organizing Council meets to discuss regional issues. She said the other is to work toward moving forward a set of priorities for the Region.

About eighteen months ago, Mr. Crum and Mr. Scheeler convened ten focus groups to begin to identify priorities for the Region. The priorities that were identified were then taken out to 85 diverse groups, about 8,000 people, to receive feedback. Southeastern Institute of Research (SIR) was contracted to undertake a scientific telephone survey. The survey was weighted by each of the nine RRPDC jurisdictions. The survey reached about 1,600 people. Reaching out to the community in these manners ensures a grassroots effort to identify regional priorities.

Ms. Burtner-Owens reviewed the process to improve the quality of life in the Region:

- listen to the community residents
- encourage and support collaboration across the Region and across sectors
- develop a framework of goals and indicators of progress for the entire Region
- build a foundation on which the Region can grow, thrive, and excel

After receiving community input, Ms. Burtner-Owens said the next step in the process was to analyze the information that was received and to identify aspirations and needs. The result of this analysis is the booklet that was provided in each member's agenda packet – Building the Framework.

At this time, the CRC is bringing together work groups for each of the identified seven priorities. These work groups are comprised of subject matter experts in addition to citizens who are interested in and have a passion for the particular subject matter. Each work group will be charged with looking at the information and statistics provided by the community, to fact check the information, and to develop strategies that will achieve the aspirations and goals.

Ms. Burtner-Owens said it will be important to have a way to measure progress. She briefly reviewed the information in the booklet, including information on what was heard from the community. What was heard is that the Region is a great place to live, but more regional collaboration is needed. The top two concerns identified were workforce preparation and job creation.

Goals and aspirations were reviewed for each of the seven priorities listed below:

1. Job Creation
2. Workforce Preparation
3. Quality Place (arts, culture, history, entertainment, sports, etc.)
4. Coordinated Transportation
5. Healthy Community
6. James River
7. Social Stability

It is expected that the work groups will be able to make recommendations on how to move forward within the next six months. Each of the work groups is comprised of local citizens, subject matter experts, and community leaders. Ms. Burtner-Owens said that an effort has been made to ensure that each group has representation from each of the jurisdictions. The work groups will present their recommendations to members of the CRC Organizing Council for review and input. The end product is hoped to be a regional agenda for progress that can be used by localities and businesses.

Each work group will have a facilitator to keep the work group focused and on goal. Capital One has provided professional analysts who will volunteer their time to assist each work group in developing indicators that will be used to measure progress. There will be about two to four analysts per work group.

Ms. Burtner-Owens ended her presentation with a quote that spoke to the goals of the process: “A strong region is vital to economic and social stability. Greater collaboration across sectors and municipal boundaries is key.”

Mr. Crum said no action from members is required. Once the recommendations are presented to the CRC Organizing Council, they will be brought before the RRPDC Board as well.

Mr. Peterson asked if there were any questions for Ms. Burtner-Owens.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the data collected from about 15 years ago had been reviewed and compared to the current set of priorities to see if there are any changes from what was identified during Focus Forward.

Mr. Crum said where data has been available, it was reviewed. He said the current focus for these priorities will be on benchmarking, to see where the Region is now and how the priorities are moving forward over the next five years or so.

Ms. Burtner-Owens said there is a lot of data available, but she has not been able to find any place where the data has been put together succinctly and put into action. Each work group is looking at past data and how it can be benchmarked to where the Region is today and going forward.

Mr. Thornton said the public at large is not aware of efforts that are being made on such initiatives. He said he thought it will be important to make sure the community at large is involved in the process. Ms. Burtner-Owens said a communications plan is key to keep the process moving forward. She said the CRC website is being updated, and she is developing relationships with different media outlets to help get out the word. She said her email address is on the booklet and she encouraged members to contact her with any suggestions or recommendations.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the comment on public safety, with regard to the James River, could be better defined. Ms. Burtner-Owens said each work group will research these types of questions.

Mr. Crum said that responses from the telephone survey can be broken down by jurisdiction and demographics if anyone would like to have the data.

Mr. Glover asked about the ratio of members on the CRC between business and government. Mr. Crum said there are 36 seats on the CRC – half from government and half from the business community. For government, each jurisdiction's administrator or manager is a member in addition to one key elected official.

Ms. Burtner-Owens said the membership listing on the back of the booklet is outdated. An updated list can be provided to anyone who would like one.

Mr. Peterson asked Ms. Burtner-Owens if she would be willing to make this same presentation in the jurisdictions. She said she would be glad to make the presentation to anyone who would like to hear it.

Mr. Glover asked when the telephone survey was completed and if it concerned GRTC. Mr. Crum said the survey was completed about 18 months ago. Ms. Burtner-Owens added that it was very specific to the seven priorities.

Mr. Glover said he didn't remember anyone in his area mentioning that they had received such a call. Ms. Burtner-Owens said the survey was weighted by jurisdiction and she can share the data with anyone who would like to have it.

Mr. Peterson thanked Ms. Burtner-Owens for her presentation.

C. Land Use Inventory Phase II

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Crum to introduce this item.

Mr. Crum reminded members that during the July meeting, Ms. Darby provided an overview to members on the Region's first existing land use inventory. This inventory showed how land is currently used in the Region. Today she will present the second phase on undeveloped land within the utilities service areas of the Region. Ms. Darby will focus on the water and sewer areas during today's meeting and will make future presentations on other areas in the Region.

Ms. Darby showed members the map of existing land use by parcel that was presented during the July meeting. She said this is just one of many tools staff is developing for the jurisdictions to use in making planning decisions.

Ms. Darby provided a map of generalized zoning for the Region. She said land use is what is on the ground at this time. Zoning regulates the use of land. Ms. Darby reviewed each of the zones by color code.

About two years ago, RRPDC staff presented information on a regional water and sewer inventory. Ms. Darby provided maps of each for members' information.

Ms. Darby said in the water/sewer inventory, staff learned that the jurisdictions have done a good job in planning for future development by making water/sewer available. Most of what is available to develop is in southwest Chesterfield County and in Hanover County near Ashland.

Additional maps were shown that indicated the undeveloped land by zoning inside the regional water/sewer service area. Information was also provided on total undeveloped acres in water/sewer service areas in each of the jurisdictions.

Ms. Darby provided a snapshot of how land is currently zoned in the water/sewer service areas in each of the jurisdictions and for the Richmond Region.

Ms. Darby indicated that staff will next analyze land outside of the water/sewer service area – undeveloped land by zoning; constraints – utilities/environmental; and growth/development potential.

Mr. Peterson asked if there were any questions for Ms. Darby.

Mr. Kaechele asked if Ms. Darby could show the slide on the amount of undeveloped land in each jurisdiction again.

Mr. Glover asked for clarification on how it was determined which parcels are developable. Ms. Darby said the data is showing only land that is currently undeveloped. Future analysis will look at environmental constraints and site characteristics to determine how much development these lands can support based on existing zoning. It is hoped the jurisdictions will be able to use the information as they make decisions on future growth.

Mr. Crum said staff mapped the current water/sewer lines and drew a buffer around the area to determine which properties currently have access to water and sewer service..

Mr. Glover asked what distance from that line is considered to be undevelopable. Mr. Crum said if the land is within the water/sewer service area, staff has identified vacant parcels, agricultural parcels, and forested parcels. This is where water/sewer is now available and shows how the land is currently zoned.

Mr. Kaechele said there are probably a lot of wetlands included in what's being shown. Mr. Crum said that was correct. The next step to determine what is developable would be to remove the flood plains.

Ms. Darby said staff will begin to look at the constraints in place when decisions are made to develop the land.

Mr. Amos, RRPDC legal counsel, asked how the Department of Corrections areas in Powhatan and Goochland Counties is handled in this type of analysis. He said the Department of Corrections serves the Goochland courthouse area for water/sewer.

Ms. Darby said it would not be considered developable land and would not be included. Mr. Crum said what is on the map are non-state owned properties located around the courthouse area. Ms. Darby said the Department of Corrections is already a committed land use and is not considered undeveloped in this analysis.

Mr. Peterson said it would be interesting to see an overlay of the jurisdictions' comprehensive plans to see how they match up. Ms. Darby said staff could do that overlay.

Mr. Crum said what is being shown today is how each of the jurisdictions has currently zoned its undeveloped land for future development.

Mr. Peterson thanked Ms. Darby for her presentation. He asked if the information she presented will be available to the localities. Ms. Darby said the presentation will be on the RRPDC website within the next few days. Mr. Crum added that the presentation could also be made in the localities if anyone would like for Ms. Darby to do so.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Committee Reports

- 1. Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees** – Mr. Crum reported that the committees will meet on October 18 to continue development of the legislative agenda. The proposed agenda will be presented to Board members during the November meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There was no other business to bring before the Board and on motion duly made and seconded, Mr. Peterson adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:20 p.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Ken Peterson, RRPDC Treasurer
Acting Chairman