

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
February 9, 2017

Members and Alternates (A) Present

Angela Cabell (A)	Powhatan County
Timothy M. Davey	Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Gloria L. Freye	Chesterfield County
Kimberly Gray.....	City of Richmond
Mike C. Gray.....	City of Richmond
Leslie Haley.....	Chesterfield County
Jimmy Hancock.....	Henrico County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman.....	Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek	Hanover County
Kristen Larson	City of Richmond
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
Rodney Poole	City of Richmond
Randy Silber (A)	Henrico 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
Tommy Branin	Henrico County
Karin Carmack	Powhatan County
Eric Leabough	Henrico County
Cynthia Newbille.....	City of Richmond
Edward W. Pollard	New Kent County
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County
Carson Tucker	Powhatan County

Others Present

Eric Gregory

RRPDC Legal Counsel

Walter Johnson CTAC Member
 Grace LeRose City of Richmond
 Todd Kilduff Goochland County
 Ben Ruppert City of Hopewell
 Joanne Simmelink Chesterfield County

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
 Julie Fry Executive Assistant
 Chuck Gates Deputy Executive Director
 Barbara Nelson Deputy Executive Director
 Sulabh Aryal Senior Planner
 Barbara Jacocks Director of Planning
 Jin Lee Senior Planner
 Phil Riggan Planner
 Jackie Stewart Manager, Special Projects
 Sarah Stewart Senior Planner
 Brenda Stone Human Resources Coordinator
 Peter Sweetland Director of Finance
 Tiffany Dubinsky Principal Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Miles called the regularly scheduled February 9, 2017 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:05 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. He said that before beginning the proceedings of the meeting, he would like to ask that members pause for a moment of silence in honor of RRPDC Board member and colleague, Dick Glover, who passed away last week.

Following the moment of silence, Chairman Miles asked Mr. Spagna 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 said each member has at their seat a copy of a resolution in appreciation of Mr. Glover. He said he would like to add approval of this resolution to the agenda as Item C.1 if there are no objections. Members agreed this item should be added.

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

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.

C.1. Resolution in Appreciation of Richard “Dick” Glover

Chairman Miles asked if there was a motion to approve the resolution in appreciation of Mr. Glover. Mr. Nordvig so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed unanimously. Chairman Miles indicated staff will forward the resolution to Mr. Glover’s family on behalf of the Board. A copy of the resolution will be filed with these minutes.

D. Approval of December 8, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Miles asked Mr. Nelson to present the minutes of the December 8, 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, Mr. Nelson moved for approval of the December 8, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Spagna. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the December 8, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously as presented.

E. Acceptance of November and December 2016 Financial Reports

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to present the financial reports for November and December 2016.

Ms. Shickle said if there were no questions, she would ask for a motion to accept the November and December 2016 financial reports for file as presented. Ms. O’Bannon so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

F. Chairman's Report

Chairman Miles said he would like to introduce new members:

Eric Leabough, Henrico County Planning Commission
Kimberly Gray, Richmond City Council
Kristen Larson, Richmond City Council
Cynthia Newbille, Richmond City Council

He welcomed those members in attendance and said he'll look forward to working with them.

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to introduce the new RRPDC legal counsel to members. Ms. Shickle reminded members that Mr. Amos had provided notice that he would not renew his contract to serve as RRPDC legal counsel when it expired in December as he was scaling back his legal practice. Staff issued an Request for Proposals (RFP) for legal services and a contract was approved by members of the Board with the firm of Hefty, Wiley, and Gore. Ms. Shickle introduced Mr. Eric Gregory, who is a member of the firm. She said Mr. Gregory and Mr. Brendan Hefty met with members of the Executive Committee during the Ad-Hoc Work Program Committee meeting held in January. She asked Mr. Gregory if he had any comments.

Mr. Gregory said the firm has worked with state and local government agencies around the Commonwealth, representing mostly local governments and regional political subdivisions, over the past 20 years. He noted the firm is comprised of Mr. William Hefty, Mr. Roger Wiley, Mr. Jeffrey Gore, Mr. Brendan Hefty, Ms. Danielle Powell, and himself. He said the firm's specialty is to provide legal services to political subdivisions. He and Mr. Brendan Hefty have already had an opportunity to work with members of the Executive Committee and staff on a few issues and are looking forward to assisting RRPDC and members of the Board.

G. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the staff Key Tasks 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 point out a couple of items from the report. Members should have received a "save the date" notice for the upcoming Capital Region Collaborative's (CRC) second annual Snapshot meeting, which will be held on March 10, at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College's Parham Road campus, beginning at 8:30 a.m. The event will roll out the CRC's new website and provide an update on the Indicators Project.

During next month's meeting, a staff report will be provided on the Richmond-Crater Hazard Mitigation Plan update that is being completed. Each of the local governing bodies will

receive a copy of the Plan for approval. The Plan is currently going through the federal and state review process and will have been fully vetted prior to being presented to members during the March meeting.

Ms. O'Bannon said she likes the new Key Tasks report format as it makes the information easier to understand. She asked if information could be included on which tasks are being undertaken with grant funds. Ms. Shickle said this information is not currently included, but staff will be glad to look at including that information. Ms. O'Bannon said as members are always being asked to approve grant applications, she would like to see which tasks are using the funds that have been approved. Ms. Shickle thanked Ms. O'Bannon for the feedback.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Miles noted there are two items on the Consent Agenda this month.

- A. Coastal Zone Management Grant Application (Tab 4)
- B. Lower Chickahominy Watershed Grant Application (Tab 5)

He asked if anyone would like to have these items removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion. There was no requests and on motion made by Ms. O'Bannon and seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to bring before members.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Presentation by the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance (CVEMA)

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to introduce today's speaker.

Ms. Shickle said she would like to request that Ms. Robins, RRPDC Senior Emergency Management Planner, introduce Mr. Ruppert.

Ms. Robins said she is happy to introduce Mr. Ben Ruppert, who is serving as chairman of CVEMA. She noted this is Mr. Ruppert's second year with CVEMA. He serves as the Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator for the City of Hopewell.

Mr. Ruppert thanked members for the opportunity to speak with them this morning. He said he would like to provide an overview of the local, state, and federal response structures. He will also provide information on CVEMA's regional efforts and plans for the future.

Mr. Ruppert provided a definition of an incident and the parameters involved in who responds and how resources are allocated in that response:

- where/who/what has been affected
- who is responsible for response
- are there adequate resources to address it

Each incident has its own level of complexity and coordination. There is a standardized hierarchy for response:

1. local government is first response
2. state government provides support
3. federal government is a last resort

Mr. Ruppert provided information on local, state, and federal plans guidance, including requirements included in State Code (§44.146) and Federal Mandates (HSPD-5 and HSPD-8).

The National Response Framework (NRF) establishes a comprehensive, national, all-hazards approach to domestic incident response. It also presents an overview of key response principals, roles, and structures that guide the national response, including the core document, annexes, and partner guides. Mr. Ruppert pointed out that this replaces the National Response Plan. Additional information was provided on the National Incident Management System (NIMS), including its components.

Mr. Ruppert reviewed the Incident Command System (ICS) and its purposes, which include the following:

- safety of responders and others
- achievement of tactical objectives
- efficient use of resources

Mr. Ruppert noted that the benefits of the ICS include:

- meets the needs of incidents of any kind or size
- allows personnel from a variety of agencies to meld rapidly into a common management structure
- provides logistical and administrative support to operational staff
- is cost efficient by avoiding duplication of efforts

Additional information was provided on the responsibilities of governmental officials through NIMS and the institutionalizing of ICS. A list of examples of the types of incidents managed by using ICS was provided.

Mr. Ruppert explained the differences between command versus coordination, noting what drives coordination at the regional level.

Mr. Ruppert provided a short timeline of the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance (CVEMA), including its evolution following loss of Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding. He also reviewed a list of projects completed under the UASI funding.

Today, CVEMA has been able to close 36 regional and numerous local gaps that have been identified through regional coordination and collaboration. There are 25 member localities, 434 members and partners, representing 50 organizations and agencies. CVEMA holds 59 regular meetings per year to collaborate and coordinate regional preparedness and response efforts. All of this work is managed by one Emergency Management Planner, housed at RRPDC. Since the loss of UASI funding, CVEMA has been able to secure almost \$2 million in state Homeland Security funds.

Mr. Ruppert provided examples of CVEMA case study results.

Going forward, Mr. Ruppert said CVEMA will continue to work with the Secretary of Public Safety to communicate risks and infrastructure to the Department of Homeland Security in order to petition for the return of UASI funding to the CVEMA region. It will be important for CVEMA to maintain one regional planner to provide program management and to support regional planning and coordination efforts.

CVEMA wants to continue to hold Survivor Day events and to provide shelter enhancements, training, etc., including projects such as the Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan and Threat Hazard Identification Risk Assessment. Maintaining a regional Emergency Management Planner will also facilitate continued grant application efforts.

Mr. Ruppert asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Peterson asked, if a locality does not have enough resources to handle an incident and the state needs to step in, whether the state would take over command of the incident. Mr. Ruppert said command is always returned to the local level. He added that if the incident included a hazardous materials spill, EPA (federal) and Virginia's Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) have statutory requirements to ensure that the incident is resolved properly. However, those entities will work with the local command in a unified command effort.

Mr. Peterson asked if other regions have maintained an emergency management program similar to CVEMA following loss of UASI funds. Mr. Ruppert said the Hampton Roads region recently lost its UASI status and has been able to maintain its emergency management program. He said he has attended national conferences and has heard speakers discuss what needs to be done to fill gaps left by loss of UASI funds; he's been proud to acknowledge that CVEMA is already doing what is being recommended.

Mr. Davey asked if the Red Cross was one of the integrated organizations in CVEMA. Mr. Ruppert said Red Cross attends meetings regularly and is involved in the Health and Human Services Committee.

Mr. Whittaker commented that he volunteered several years ago in the search for a lost child in Hanover County. He said that he was impressed with the level of coordination in the search efforts. Mr. Ruppert said that effort was made possible because of the relationships that have been formed via CVEMA. Many of the responders had already trained together.

Ms. O'Bannon asked for clarification that the Hampton Roads region did not receive UASI funding. She asked which regions did receive the funding. Mr. Ruppert said the National Capital Region is the only region in the state that has maintained its UASI status. He said CVEMA is now second or third below the cut-off line. He said the federal government has limited the number of UASI regions to larger metropolitan areas such as New York City and San Francisco.

Mr. Nordvig asked why VDEM cut funding for this effort in the Richmond region. Mr. Ruppert said the new state coordinator changed the grant review process when he came on board a couple of years ago. Previously, each grant that was submitted was followed by an interview process that allowed those submitting the grant applications to provide additional information on why they should be the grant recipient. The new coordinator felt this process was not open enough and replaced the process with a risk/benefit scenario process. All grant applications are scored by peers and then scored based on a cost/benefit analysis. Grants applications are then ranked according to those scores. CVEMA was second under the most current cut-line.

Mr. Ruppert added that the dollar value has become the most important consideration. He said \$100,000 projects are very hard to find at this time due to this new scenario. VDEM holds an annual workshop for emergency management staffs from around the state in order to discuss the award process and how to best change the process to match the types of applications that are being submitted. Mr. Ruppert said when he attends the upcoming workshop, he plans to present several ideas on how the process can be changed to benefit CVEMA during the cost/benefit analysis. He also noted that VDEM's budget has been cut significantly. Mr. Ruppert said he would like for VDEM to take the emergency management planner program and set it aside. He said other teams, such as HazMat and Incident Management, are set aside to receive funding before grant awards are made.

Ms. Shickle asked if CVEMA's \$100,000 request for the Emergency Management Planner program was seen as just one community instead of a project that benefits 25 localities. Mr. Ruppert said during last year's workshop, there was discussion on making the regional piece of grant applications higher on the rating scale. He said this was done to an extent, but it did not provide the results that were hoped for. Mr. Ruppert said this will be brought forward again during this year's workshop.

Mr. Nordvig said if localities are asked to contribute funds to help close the gap for the Emergency Management Planner program and those funds cannot be allocated by a locality, what will happen to the program if there is no funding. Mr. Ruppert said CVEMA would operate with less efficiency. He said the current planner maintains all contact lists, schedules all meetings, sends out meeting reminders, arranges for meeting locations, etc., which frees up CVEMA members – local emergency management staffs – to focus on their jobs and

responsibilities to their communities. Many jurisdictions depend on Ms. Robins to assist with grant applications and associated follow up reporting. Mr. Ruppert said many projects and events, such as Survivor Day, may not be able to continue.

Mr. Nordvig asked why contribution amounts were based on population and not a formula that was proportionate to population. Mr. Ruppert said several options were considered; however, it was felt that the option chosen would allow jurisdictions to receive the best value for services received.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification that CVEMA would advocate that regional projects receive a higher level of consideration for funding over local requests for funding. Mr. Ruppert said there are already regional teams that are set aside for funding, such as regional HazMat teams. He said funds are set aside for these types of regional teams before any other grant awards are made. Remaining funds are then made available for other grant applications. He said one proposal would be for the regional planner positions to be handled the same way.

Ms. Lascolette said she was trying to understand why regional projects would be elevated over local projects. Mr. Ruppert said another option is that the section on the grant application that deals with regional benefits and support could be given more weight in the scoring process.

Ms. Lascolette asked what types of local projects would lose funding. Mr. Ruppert said there is no effort to eliminate localities from submitting local projects. He said there is a process by which localities can present their own projects for consideration. These are pushed out to other jurisdictions to see if there is a more regional interest and support for the project. He said there is a wide range of projects that can be submitted for funding.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she hears that when VDEM looks at the requests that are submitted, more weight will be given to the projects that will benefit more than one locality and provide an economies of scale.

Mr. Winslow said it only takes one incident to prove the value of this effort.

Chairman Miles said he would like to bring this topic back during next month's meeting under Unfinished Business. He said he would like members to discuss the issue with their local governing bodies for additional input to bring back next month.

Ms. O'Bannon asked for clarification on a final request from CVEMA.

Ms. Shickle said during preliminary FY18 budget preparations, staff found out that the funding from VDEM would not be awarded. Staff plans to resubmit a grant application and if awarded, those funds will be available in the October 2017 timeframe. In a best case scenario, there is a gap in funding for the Emergency Management program during the first quarter of FY18.

CVEMA members have developed an option where local jurisdictions may be asked to contribute to the program. RRPDC staff is also looking to see if the gap can be filled by using funds from the Undesignated Fund Balance. She said she feels this is a conversation Board members should have as it impacts the program's long-term sustainability.

Ms. Shickle asked if staff should be looking at a different way to fund the program other than solely through grant funding, or if RRPDC should adopt a hybrid method of partial grant funding and use of agency funds, which include member dues from the localities. Ms. Shickle said she would like to have feedback from members on how the program should be prioritized within the agency.

Ms. Shickle said the loss of funding this year totaled \$100,000. She added that the agency typically subsidizes another \$20,000 to \$30,000 for the program. This year's grant amount, that the agency did not receive, totaled approximately \$103,000.

Mr. Nordvig clarified that if each jurisdiction contributes according to the chart provided by CVEMA, then RRPDC will fund the gap from the Undesignated Fund Balance. Ms. Shickle said that was correct. Mr. Nordvig said the other consideration will be to determine how to fund the program going forward. Ms. Shickle said that was correct. For agency funds to be used, she said staff will need to prioritize this program over another one. If this is a priority, it will impact staff's development of a work program and the need to reallocate funds from other programs to cover the Emergency Management program.

Mr. Spagna said that the Town of Ashland is part of the region; however, it was not included on the chart to be asked to contribute. Mr. Ruppert said it was not CVEMA's intent to leave Ashland out. He said individual towns were not addressed as there is a relationship between towns and counties to share resources.

Chairman Miles said he will ask that this be added to next month's agenda for additional discussion.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said it will be helpful to have information sent to them prior to next month's meeting on options that can be discussed locally. She said having the presentation will also be helpful.

Ms. Shickle said each of the local emergency management staffs has had this information for a few months, and it already should have been brought forward in each locality. She said RRPDC staff will provide the information to members, including today's presentation.

Chairman Miles thanked Mr. Ruppert for his time and presentation.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was identified.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Chairman Miles adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:20 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Floyd H. Miles, Sr.
Chairman