

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
December 8, 2016

Members and Alternates (A) Present

Chris Archer Henrico County
Timothy M. Davey Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant..... Hanover County
Gloria L. Freye Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover Henrico County
Mike C. Gray City of Richmond
Kathy C. Graziano, Treasurer..... City of Richmond
Leslie Haley..... Chesterfield County
Jimmy Hancock..... Henrico County
James M. Holland..... Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek Hanover County
Susan Lascolette Goochland County
Floyd H. Miles, Chairman Charles City County
Tyrone E. Nelson, Secretary..... Henrico County
Larry Nordvig..... Powhatan County
Patricia S. O'Bannon Henrico County
W. Canova Peterson Hanover County
George Spagna Town of Ashland
Frank J. Thornton Henrico County
Randy Whittaker..... Hanover County
Christopher Winslow..... Chesterfield County

Members Absent

Parker C. Agelasto..... City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles City of Richmond
Tommy Branin Henrico County
Karin Carmack Powhatan County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman..... Chesterfield County
Michelle Mosby..... City of Richmond
Edward W. Pollard New Kent County
Rodney Poole City of Richmond
C. Thomas Tiller..... New Kent County
Carson Tucker Powhatan County

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Tyee Mallory..... Office of Senator Tim Kaine

William Weinstein McCormick Taylor

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
Julie Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Senior Planner
Diane Fusco Administrative Secretary
Chuck Gates Manager, Community Affairs
Barbara Jacocks Director of Planning
Barbara Nelson Director of Transportation
Phil Riggan Planner
Jackie Stewart Manager, Special Projects
Brenda Stone Human Resources Coordinator
Peter Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator

Call to Order

Chairman Miles called the regularly scheduled December 8, 2016 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:15 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. He asked Mr. Archer to lead members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Ms. Shickle, RRPDC Executive Director, reported that a quorum of members was present.

B. Request for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business

Chairman Miles asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business. No requests from members were received and Chairman Miles indicated the agenda would stand as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Miles opened the public comment period, noting that if anyone wished to address the members, to please come to a microphone and provide his or her name, locality of residence, and if appropriate the name of any organization being represented. Chairman Miles asked that any citizen speaker please limit comments to three minutes, and organizations should limit their comments to five minutes.

As there were no requests from the public to address members of the Board, Chairman Miles closed the public comment period.

D. Approval of October 13, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Miles asked Mr. Nelson to present the minutes of the October 13, 2016 meeting to members for their consideration and action.

Mr. Nelson asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the minutes. There being no corrections or comments, Ms. Graziano moved for approval of the October 13, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Bannon. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the October 13, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously as presented.

E. Acceptance of September and October 2016 Financial Reports

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Graziano to present the financial reports for September and October 2016.

Ms. Graziano said if there were no questions, she would ask for a motion to accept the September and October 2016 financial reports for file as presented. Mr. Nelson so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

F. Chairman's Report

Cancellation of January 12, 2017 Meeting

Chairman Miles said it is customary to cancel the January meeting in order to provide time for jurisdictions to hold organizational meetings during which they may appoint new representatives to the RRPDC Board if needed. Chairman Miles noted that the Executive Committee is going to meet in January as an ad-hoc committee to discuss the FY18 Work Program.

Chairman Miles asked if there was a motion to cancel the full RRPDC Board meeting as recommended by staff and the Executive Committee. Ms. O'Bannon so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Freye. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Recognition of Mr. John Amos

Chairman Miles said he would like to recognize Mr. Amos for his sixteen years of service to the RRPDC as legal counsel. He asked Mr. Amos to come forward. Chairman Miles presented a Resolution of Appreciation to Mr. Amos and thanked him for his diligence and assistance to the RRPDC over the past sixteen years. Members added their thanks with a round of applause.

Mr. Amos said he did not realize he had been serving the RRPDC for sixteen years until he saw the length of time listed in the agenda packet. With his 76th birthday approaching,

Mr. Amos said he and his wife have decided that it's time to slow down and enjoy other pursuits. He said he will pull back from his law practice and will no longer serve as a substitute General District Court judge. Mr. Amos said he and his wife have a home in Florida and he plans to spend more time there playing golf. He said he appreciates his association with the RRPDC and members over the past sixteen years.

Ms. O'Bannon added that she appreciated Mr. Amos' attention to the detail of the law which helped the agency through some tough situations over the years.

G. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 3 and details key projects being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. She said she will be glad to answer any questions on the report.

Ms. Shickle said she would like to introduce two new RRPDC staff members:

- Diane Fusco – Administrative Secretary
- Brenda Stone – Human Resources Coordinator

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Miles noted there are no items on the Consent Agenda this month.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to bring before members.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions of Appreciation to Outgoing Members

Chairman Miles said there are Resolutions of Appreciation for three outgoing members in the agenda packet:

- Jonathan Baliles, City of Richmond
- Kathy Graziano, City of Richmond
- Michelle Mosby, City of Richmond

He asked if there was a motion to approve the resolutions. Mr. Peterson so moved, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Miles said only Ms. Graziano was in attendance today, and he asked her to step forward to be recognized. He said he has appreciated her mentorship and friendship over

the past few years. Members thanked Ms. Graziano for her service with a round of applause.

Ms. Graziano said she has enjoyed serving on the Board over the past twelve years. She noted that she will miss all of her friends on the Board.

Chairman Miles indicated that staff will forward resolutions to Ms. Mosby and Mr. Baliles on behalf of members.

B. Review of FY17 Mid-Year Budget Revisions and Preliminary FY18 Budget

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to provide this information to members.

Ms. Shickle said she will review highlights of the mid-year FY17 budget revisions that were reviewed earlier this morning with the Executive Committee. Staff is requesting that action be taken to approve the revisions as recommended by the Executive Committee.

Overall, the FY17 budget is in better shape at this point than it was when members approved it in May. In May, staff anticipated that approximately \$2,900 would be returned to the undesignated fund balance. Staff is now projecting that approximately \$19,400 will be returned to the undesignated fund balance at the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 2017. She noted the increase is due to a couple of factors:

- grants that had not been confirmed in May have now been confirmed and awarded
- decreases in personnel costs as a result of staffing changes that have taken place over the past few months

Ms. Shickle said under Expenses, while there is a reduction in personnel costs, the figures shown on the sheets under Tab 5 include funding for assistance from a local public relations firm to audit media coverage of the RRPDC and its jurisdictions with regard to local government collaborations. During her discussions with the jurisdictions' CAOs and Managers, as well as the forum discussion held during the October meeting, it has been noted that the public at large hears only about the problems facing the region and hears nothing about the regional collaborative efforts and resulting good works. Work will begin on this effort in January. Input will be sought from other partner organizations as well as from the jurisdictions' public information offices to see how the conversation can be turned around.

Also under Personnel, Ms. Shickle said staff salary increases are included in the figures presented; these will become effective on January 1 if approved. She said there are three pools of funds for these increases:

1. across-the-board cost of living (COLA) adjustments incorporating both the 2016 amount (0.2 percent) and the anticipated 2017 amount (0.3 percent) for a total of 0.5 percent
2. 2.5 percent merit pool that will be awarded based on staff performance evaluations

3. 2.0 percent pool related to targeted staff position reassignments that will become effective on January 1

Ms. Shickle said there are also increases in the Training and Staff Development and Audit line items. Ms. Shickle said she has been in touch with a consultant who works with other government entities to make recommendations on how to reduce the indirect costs rate and how to better negotiate with state agency partners which currently do not reimburse at the full indirect cost rate.

She asked if there were any questions regarding the FY17 mid-year revisions.

Mr. Peterson asked if all funds available were being expended or if any amounts were being held back. Ms. Shickle said the amounts listed are what staff is anticipating the actual expense amounts will be through the end of the fiscal year. She said the budget will be presented again in May and will show more firm projections for anticipated expenses. She said no buffer or contingency funds are included.

Ms. Graziano made a motion that the mid-year FY17 budget revisions be approved as presented. Mr. Fabricant seconded the motion.

Ms. Lascolette asked if the increase in audit expenses is due to insurance increases. Ms. Shickle said the category as a whole is up; fees levied by the auditor remain the same. In that line item, the increase is related to the indirect costs review that has been included. Ms. Shickle said this is a different type of financial audit than what is conducted by Dunham, Aukamp and Rhodes at the end of the fiscal year.

There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Miles said during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, Ms. Shickle brought forward some recommendations for technology improvements that members of the Executive Committee asked be discussed during today's Board meeting. He said this discussion will take place following the FY18 budget review.

Ms. Shickle began her review of the FY18 preliminary budget by noting that revenues and expenses are, at this point, only projections. She drew members' attention to the Revenues table to point out two traditional revenue sources that have not been included. This is resulting in the need, at this time, to transfer approximately \$296,500 from the designated fund balance into the undesignated fund balance in order to meet operating expenses for FY18.

The first item not included is the amount for RRTPO carry-over funds as they have not yet been determined. These figures will be included in the FY18 budget that the Board will see in May.

Ms. Shickle said the other revenue source that is not included relates to a grant that was not awarded to the agency. The agency applied for the grant and received word that

funding from the Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) to support the agency's Emergency Management Planning program – line 7 on the revenue sheet – will not be awarded to the agency for FY18. This totals \$101,200. Staff is currently working with VDEM to identify alternative funding sources to close the gap.

On the last page, Ms. Shickle said there is a chart provided by the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance's (CVEMA) executive committee which outlines a worst case scenario. This is a summary for a local government assessment to try to recoup some of the lost revenue. CVEMA is comprised of 25 member jurisdictions, representing VDEM Region 3. The CVEMA executive committee devised assessments according to localities that have populations under 50,000 and those with populations over 50,000. The total of the assessments is \$77,000.

Ms. Shickle said the assessments will be the least preferred method to make up for the loss of funding for the program.

Other programmatic funding opportunities are being pursued to help reduce the amount of funds that will need to be used from the designated fund balance.

When the FY18 budget is presented again in May, more information will be available that will allow staff to better gauge the revenue and expense figures.

Mr. Elswick asked what the impact will be on the localities as a result of the loss of funding from VDEM. Ms. O'Bannon asked why the funds were not awarded.

Ms. Shickle said she believed there were a couple of reasons the grant application was not approved. She said VDEM's funding was cut by 25 percent last year and this created a funding shortage. This included cuts in both state and federal funding to VDEM. She said the scoring criteria for grants has changed over the past few years as have VDEM's priorities.

Ms. Shickle said there are improvements staff can make on the grant writing side. Another PDC opted to pursue three different sources of funding for their program, while RRPDC chose to pursue only one funding source. A better strategy going forward will be to look for a diversity of funding streams, which staff will set as a goal for next year.

Mr. Elswick asked if the funding is not found, whether the staff position will be lost.

Ms. Shickle said that is one outcome. She would prefer to look at the agency's other programs to see if there is something that is less of a priority. Ms. Shickle said this is one of the things she would like to discuss in January with the Executive Committee's ad-hoc group. She said the agency needs to prioritize work tasks and ensure there are funds to support the work.

Mr. Fabricant asked if the reasons Ms. Shickle outlined for not receiving the grant funds were her reasons or if that was the feedback received from VDEM. He asked if staff

received feedback on what should be done differently going forward in order to receive funds.

Ms. Shickle said staff is in ongoing conversations with VDEM. She said VDEM has indicated the Emergency Management program is important, but the way the scoring criteria was applied during this grant cycle, RRPDC did not rise to the top of the funding list. She said she believes that VDEM is committed to helping find a way to fund the program. Staff needs to reassess how the application is completed going forward, and VDEM needs to reassess its scoring criteria to ensure its priority programs are being funded.

Mr. Fabricant said he feels it will be important to let VDEM know staff will need to have a better idea of how to complete the application in order to receive the funds.

Mr. Peterson asked what will happen if the position does not continue and how the loss of the position will impact the region's emergency management efforts.

Ms. Shickle said CVEMA members, which are the emergency management coordinators from each of the member jurisdictions, would probably said the loss of the position would be a detriment to the region. They have been working for the past three to four months to try to identify ways that will allow the program to continue and to grow.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if Ms. Shickle could describe what the program entails. She said she's involved with interoperability efforts and asked if CVEMA has anything to do with that effort.

Ms. Shickle asked Ms. Robins if she could answer Ms. O'Bannon's questions.

Ms. Robins said she has prepared a document that outlines what the program has been able to accomplish since losing Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) funding. When this funding was available, the program utilized four staff members who did all of the work that she is doing now. Ms. Robins said she has provided administrative support to Regional Preparedness Advisory Committee for Interoperability (RPAC-I), which is the regional group that addresses communications issues referenced by Ms. O'Bannon.

Ms. Robins said she supports and coordinates all of CVEMA's emergency management efforts. She said this is a very active and dedicated group. As a result of the loss of UASI funding and the creation of CVEMA, a network of emergency management staffs has been developed that is very tight-knit. There is a lot of information sharing and joint training exercises.

Ms. Robins said without a central coordinating staff member, she believes CVEMA would continue for a while, but she does not think it could be sustained long-term. Members of CVEMA have also discussed using portions of other grants that have been received in order to fund the RRPDC's program. Ms. Robins said she does not want the region to give up any of its grant funds and hopes this is not the route CVEMA chooses to take.

Ms. Shickle said Ms. Robins supports the region in its grant writing and many of the emergency management grants that have been awarded over the past few years are a result of that support. She also helps with network development building and has been instrumental in coordinating the Survivor Day events.

Ms. Shickle said Ms. Robins has struggled over the past couple of months not to make this situation about herself, but about the program instead. Ms. Shickle said she would like members to understand how difficult it is for Ms. Robins to discuss this situation while her job is on the line. However, Ms. Robins also wants members to know there is more at stake than her position.

Ms. Robins said she believes this is a position that should exist, and it has existed for several years in the Hampton Roads area given that region's more obvious threats and risks. Ms. Shickle said her recommendation is that if there is not a state funding grant, then perhaps the RRPDC needs to look at what the agency does to see if there is something else that can be done within the RRPDC's operating budget to ensure the program can be maintained.

Ms. O'Bannon said public safety is a local government's main responsibility and mission.

Ms. Shickle said she did not want members to think the situation is in crisis; there is still time to work with VDEM and CVEMA to find alternative funding. She said her only reason for bringing this to members' attention now is so they are aware of the funding shortfall and how it may impact the budget when it is brought back to members in May. There are other options that are being pursued, and staff will work toward finding more diverse funding streams for programs moving forward.

Ms. Robins said she would like members to know that she has copies of the Citizens Preparedness Guide available if they would like copies. This is the Guide that is distributed during Survivor Day events. She said the document is also on the RRPDC website, along with a Spanish language version. Additionally, the Guides are available on CDs.

Mr. Fabricant said this is a good opportunity to shore up other grant funding that comes into the RRPDC and to be proactive so this type of situation does not happen again.

Mr. Elswick asked if CVEMA could provide a presentation to the Executive Committee's ad-hoc committee in January. Ms. Shickle said CVEMA is scheduled to provide a presentation to the full Board in February.

Mr. Nordvig asked how the loss of this program would impact the region in the event of some type of emergency or natural disaster. Ms. Robins said the loss of funding is actually cumulative over the amount of time CVEMA has been working together. She said she will make sure members receive a copy of the document she prepared to outline what projects have been accomplished with grant funding over the past several years. A lot has been done with public outreach to show citizens how they can prepare for emergencies. She said projects have been funded to provide generators and other equipment to local shelters

that will lessen the need for the region to rely on the Red Cross to supply those items. Localities communicate and coordinate with each other on a routine basis about pressing emergency management issues.

Ms. Shickle said the document Ms. Robins referred to was distributed to all of the local emergency managers this week, and staff will make sure members also receive a copy.

Chairman Miles said the Executive Committee had additional discussion on some proposed capital expenditures. He asked Ms. Shickle to provide information on these projects.

Ms. Shickle said RRPDC has been undergoing a technology assessment over the past several weeks to evaluate current technology uses and capabilities. She said many members have participated in discussions during RRTPO meetings regarding the equipment and functionality of the Board Room as well as the RRPDC website. Ms. Shickle said she has also received feedback from RRPDC Board members on the issue of sound amplification in the Board Room.

Ms. Shickle pointed out that the microphones in the Board Room are calibrated for recording purposes only; they have been turned down and do not amplify. The microphones are used to point sound to the cassette recording equipment.

Mr. Nelson asked what would happen if the microphones were turned up. Ms. Shickle said there would be feedback from the speakers. These particular microphones are not designed to do both recording and amplification. She said recording has been prioritized over amplification because there needs to be a record of the meetings for transcription of minutes. If the volume was turned up, voices on the recording would be blotted out with the sound of papers being shuffled and sidebar conversations in addition to the feedback from the speakers.

Ms. Shickle emphasized that the agency's recording equipment is analog and uses cassette tapes. These tapes are becoming very difficult to find. The audio/visual equipment has also been found to be less than desirable for the types of meetings that are held in the room.

The Executive Committee provided input on how far Ms. Shickle should continue with bids on equipment. Three firms have looked at the equipment in the Board Room and discussed how meeting spaces throughout the office are used. If upgrades were made to bring equipment up to date in all meeting spaces, the costs would be about \$125,000. If furnishings were upgraded, that would be an additional cost.

Ms. Shickle said she and the Executive Committee will be interested to hear how members think the Board Room should be used. The current configuration cannot be changed due to the AV equipment wiring, which limits the use of the space.

Based on discussions with the Executive Committee Ms. Shickle reported that technology investments that will better achieve compliance for public outreach were listed as the first

priority. That would put an update to the website as first priority. The website is currently hosted locally and uses 2003 software which limits capability.

Next would be a cost-benefit analysis to improve the functionality of the Board Room, which may include amplification and projection equipment. This may also help with transparency and public outreach. Currently there is no place for members of the public to stand to address Commission members unless they walk up to the podium or sit at the table.

Last on the list would be an update to improve furnishings.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if the contract with Leadership Metro Richmond (LMR) had been changed as the budget indicates the sublease income will end. Ms. Shickle said LMR is negotiating its own lease with the building owners as their term as an RRPDC subtenant is coming to an end in June. LMR will remain in the space, but they will be paying rent directly to the building landlord. RRPDC's rent will be reduced to the space it occupies without LMR.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if this will improve the rental expense. Ms. Shickle said the amount is basically a wash as the expense is not offset by LMR's rental fees. The square footage rate stays the same, but the agency will not be paying for the square footage of the LMR space any longer.

Mr. Peterson asked how many years are left on the current lease. Ms. Shickle said there are about six years left on the lease.

Mr. Elswick asked if Ms. Shickle has contacted the other localities to see if there may be current technology agreements in place that could incorporate work to be done at the RRPDC. Ms. Shickle said the CAOs and Managers have already indicated their procurement staffs are working together to discover efficiencies. Ms. Shickle said RRPDC would be interested in exploring any of those opportunities.

Ms. Shickle said the range of costs from the three vendors varied from about \$85,000 up to \$126,000. She said the Executive Committee is interested in how members want staff to proceed. She said the term of the lease is important with regard to how much of an investment to make in this space if there is a chance members may want to relocate.

Mr. Fabricant asked if the costs could be broken down depending on which room was to receive improvements. Ms. Shickle said the firms have all provided what they see as the most cost effective way to make improvements. Mr. Fabricant said he believed what sparked this conversation was a comment that it was very difficult to hear in the room. He suggested that amplification might be addressed first as an easier fix.

Chairman Miles said the priority list from the Executive Committee that Ms. Shickle reviewed is what he'd like feedback on with regard to whether or not members feel those are the priorities that should be addressed.

Mr. Gray asked if the website would be the first priority and if pricing has been determined on that project. Ms. Shickle said in preliminary discussions, it appears that the website upgrade would be about a \$50,000 investment. Mr. Gray said he agreed with the priorities outline that the Executive Committee offered.

Mr. Davey said he also agreed with what the Executive Committee recommended as priorities. He said the outward facing presence is probably the most important place to spend money.

Chairman Miles said the Executive Committee ad-hoc group will be discussing this again in January.

Mr. Peterson made a motion that the technology upgrades phasing as recommended by the Executive Committee should be followed by staff – website, audio/visual, and furnishings in that order. Ms. Graziano seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Miles asked if there was a motion to approve the preliminary FY18 budget as presented. Mr. Spagna so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Graziano. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Miles said he would also like to welcome the new employees to the RRPDC.

He asked if there was any other business to bring before members.

Environmental and Intergovernmental Reviews

Mr. Peterson asked if clarification could be provided on why counties and localities outside of the RRPDC region are included in the Environmental and Intergovernmental Reviews report.

Ms. Jacocks responded that the agency acts as a clearinghouse for information that could impact the region's waterways. If action is taken by a neighboring jurisdiction that could impact regional waters, that information is passed along to the member jurisdictions.

Ms. Shickle added that at times, Sarah Stewart, who is the lead staff member on this report, may be asked to do a more in depth study, but that would be to determine any specific impacts to jurisdictions in the Richmond region.

Board Room Use

Ms. O'Bannon asked if other organizations use the Board Room. Ms. Shickle said that LMR routinely uses the space and will be allowed to continue to use the room after their sublease contract with RRPDC ends. Another tenant in the building, Bon Air Title, also

uses the room on a routine basis. Many state agencies, such as the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), hold meetings here as well because of the office location and the free parking. The regional Continuum of Care, staffed by Homeward, has also used the room on a quarterly basis. She noted the room is not used every day.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if there are ever any room rental fees paid. Ms. Fry said if the group is considered an RRPDC partner agency or organization, like VDOT or DRPT, there is no fee charged. If the group is not a partner, such as Bon Air Title, they are charged \$50 for half a day and \$75 for a full day.

Citizens Preparedness Guides

Mr. Gates announced he will bring copies of the Citizens Preparedness Guide to the main lobby of the building for any members who would like copies to take back to their localities and/or constituents. He said over 75,000 citizens in the region have participated in Survivor Day events.

No other business was identified.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Chairman Miles wished members and their families a happy and safe holiday season and adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:10 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Floyd H. Miles, Sr.
Chairman