

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**March 9, 2017**

**Members and Alternates (A) Present**

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Angela Cabell .....	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
Jimmy Hancock.....	Henrico County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman.....	Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek .....	Hanover County
Kristen Larson .....	City of Richmond
Susan Lascolette .....	Goochland County
Eric Leabough .....	Henrico County
Floyd H. Miles, Chairman.....	Charles City County
Tyrone E. Nelson, Secretary.....	Henrico County
Cynthia Newbille.....	City of Richmond
Larry Nordvig.....	Powhatan County
Randy Silber (A) .....	Henrico County
George Spagna .....	Town of Ashland
Randy Whittaker.....	Hanover County

**Members Absent**

Tommy Branin .....	Henrico County
Karin Carmack .....	Powhatan County
Leslie Haley.....	Chesterfield County
Harvey Hinson.....	Henrico County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Patricia S. O'Bannon.....	Henrico County
W. Canova Peterson .....	Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard .....	New Kent County
Rodney Poole .....	City of Richmond
Frank J. Thornton .....	Henrico County
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County
Christopher Winslow.....	Chesterfield County

**Others Present**

Emily Ashley .....Chesterfield County  
Eldon Burton..... Office of Congressman Don McEachin  
Eric Gregory.....RRPDC Legal Counsel  
Todd Kilduff .....Goochland County  
Lisa Kyle..... Office of Congressman Dave Brat  
Ben Ruppert ..... City of Hopewell

**Staff Present**

Martha Shickle ..... Executive Director  
Julie Fry ..... Executive Assistant  
Chuck Gates ..... Deputy Executive Director  
Barbara Nelson ..... Deputy Executive Director  
Tiffany Dubinsky ..... Principal Planner  
Barbara Jacocks.....Director of Planning  
Phil Riggan ..... Planner  
Jackie Stewart.....Manager, Special Projects  
Peter Sweetland ..... Director of Finance

**Call to Order**

Chairman Miles called the regularly scheduled March 9, 2017 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:15 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. Chairman Miles asked Ms. Lascolette 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 February 9, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

Chairman Miles asked Mr. Nelson to present the minutes of the February 9, 2017 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. Nordvig moved for approval of the February 9, 2017 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lascolette. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the February 9, 2017 meeting were approved unanimously as presented.

#### **E. Acceptance of January 2017 Financial Reports**

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to present the financial reports for January 2017.

Ms. Shickle said if there were no questions, she would ask for a motion to accept the January 2017 financial reports for file as presented. Mr. Spagna so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nordvig. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **F. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Miles reported that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, members discussed the upcoming election and rotation of officers for the RRPDC Board. Members have instructed staff to provide to all Commission members and the jurisdictions' CAOs and Managers, a summary of what is expected of all members who are appointed to serve on the RRPDC Executive Committee and Board. Staff has also been instructed to provide an attendance record for each RRPDC member.

During the discussions this morning, Executive Committee members determined that it is not appropriate for the CAOs and Managers to dictate who should be appointed to serve on the RRPDC Board as they work for and report to the jurisdiction's elected officials.

Chairman Miles said Executive Committee members want each appointee to know what is expected of them when they are appointed to serve on the RRPDC Board. It is also important for members' peers, in their own jurisdiction, to know who is attending meetings regularly and who is not.

Ms. Jaeckle added that the concern centers around the established leadership rotation that can place a member into a leadership position even if that member does not regularly attend

meetings. Continuing this practice could leave a vacuum in leadership. The current established rotation of jurisdictions to serve in leadership positions is not set in stone and does offer some flexibility for the Commission to skip over a jurisdiction if the appointed representative has not shown any interest in attending meetings.

Chairman Miles said the Nominating Committee will take all of this into consideration when they are appointed to develop a slate of officers for FY18.

Chairman Miles said he is bringing this to everyone's attention so they will be aware that the expectations and attendance records will be sent out within the next week. He asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised.

### **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 items in the report.

## **II. CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Miles noted there is one item on the Consent Agenda this month.

### **A. Regional Community Development Block Grant Priorities (Tab 4)**

Ms. Shickle noted this is an annual request for submission from the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) for the region's non-entitlement communities (Charles City County, New Kent County, Goochland County, Powhatan County, Hanover County, and the Town of Ashland). She said at this time, no grant applications have been brought forward from any of the jurisdictions. The form that is submitted is used in scoring and should be in place if any of the jurisdictions decide to submit applications.

Members agreed by consensus that the form should be submitted to DHCD as requested.

## **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Funding Options for Emergency Management Program**

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to introduce this topic.

Ms. Shickle reminded members that during the February meeting, they heard a presentation from Mr. Ben Ruppert, who is the Deputy Emergency Management Coordinator for the City of Hopewell. Mr. Ruppert is also chairman of the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance (CVEMA). Mr. Ruppert provided background on CVEMA's work and projects. Ms. Shickle said that Mr. Ruppert and a few other CVEMA members are in attendance this morning.

Chairman Miles asked that this topic be brought back during today's meeting in order to continue conversation regarding an unsuccessful funding application submitted last year to the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) to maintain the Emergency Management Program at RRPDC. This program is the only support program for CVEMA members.

Following the meeting last month, information was distributed to members that included a worksheet providing funding scenarios should the localities wish to contribute funding to preserve the staff support for CVEMA. Also included was background information on the types of projects that have been completed by CVEMA members and coordinated by the staff support person.

Ms. Shickle said she will open the floor for discussions on whether members have an interest in directing Ms. Shickle to communicate directly to localities about contributing financially to the program in FY18.

Chairman Miles said this topic was brought back again in order to allow time for members to discuss the issue in their own jurisdictions. He said he would like to know which direction RRPDC staff should take in response to this funding request.

Mr. Nordvig said this was discussed by the Powhatan County Board of Supervisors and the funding options that were provided were also reviewed. He said the consensus was that the County would be in favor of providing funds this year to help close the gap created when the grant application was not approved. Mr. Nordvig said the County's Board discussed the population split amount of \$2,665. He said the County would be in favor of supporting the following options: the per capita contribution of 8 cents; the per capital contribution of 6 cents; the per capita contribution of 3 cents plus a flat fee of \$1,500; and the population split at 50,000. He said members of the County's Board also asked if this would be a one-time request or if this will become an annual request. The County is concerned about contributing to a program on an annual basis that, for whatever reason, was not deemed eligible to receive the grant funding. He said the County is agreeable to assist this year with the understanding that RRPDC staff must aggressively seek funding for the program in future years.

Ms. Lascolette said the Goochland County Board of Supervisors shares the concern of being asked to provide funding each year. She said the County is in favor of providing funding in FY18 at either the per capita contribution of 8 cents or the per capita contribution of 6 cents.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said the Hanover County Board of Supervisors noted that the County has a very strong working relationship with all of the jurisdictional partners. The County already has its own emergency management staff and resources that may put it in a different place with regard to what the County would be willing to do regionally. She said the County will be glad to contribute this year at the even split option. The County sees this as providing regional assistance as opposed to seeing a specific benefit for Hanover County. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said the County would not favor any of the per capita

assessments. She said she might be able to garner some support for the 50,000 population split option, even though some of her colleagues thought the population split should be at 200,000. If the per capita options were used, the larger jurisdictions would be funding more of the gap when they already fund their own emergency management resources.

Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Silber to provide Henrico County's position. Mr. Silber said Henrico County also wants to be a regional partner and agrees the even split option is the right approach to take. Because the larger jurisdictions already have the resources they need to carry out emergency management operations, Henrico County doesn't see the need to have this additional support. The County believes the even split funding option is the most equitable and that all jurisdictions should bear the same costs. The County feels that any of the per capita options are inappropriate and would support the even split option of \$3,100 with all 25 localities participating. The County will also agree to the even split if only 20 localities participate (\$3,800). Mr. Silber said a fallback position would be the population split at 50,000.

Ms. Jaeckle said Chesterfield County had similar discussion as Henrico County. She said Chesterfield County would support the even split for the same reasons Mr. Silber listed. She said the County wants to be a regional player and feels RRPDC is of greater support to the smaller jurisdictions which may not have the ability to meet all of its emergency management needs at the same level as the larger jurisdictions.

Chairman Miles said Charles City County's concern is that while the County wants to be a regional partner, they need to know if this will be an annual request and that RRPDC is doing everything possible to support the program going forward.

Mr. Spagna reminded members that the Town of Ashland was not included in this request as it shares emergency management resources with Hanover County.

Ms. Newbille reported that the City of Richmond will discuss this during their meeting on March 27. She asked what the past practice has been with regard to this program and what is anticipated going forward.

Ms. Shickle said the program originated when the region received its Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant funding. This is a federally designated program that provided a significant amount of funding to the region for equipment purchases and the coordination of emergency response within the region. When the UASI designation was lost, due to various factors at the federal level (reduction in funding that limited the number of regions receiving UASI designations), the region determined that regional collaboration and coordination around emergency management was important. They formed CVEMA in order to continue the coordination efforts.

Through this current fiscal year, Ms. Shickle said funding has been available to RRPDC through a competitive grant process from VDEM. Last summer, RRPDC applied for renewal grant funding to continue the program. In the fall, staff received notice that the

application did not score at the level needed for funding. Since that time, there has been a lot of discussion on opportunities of how to fill the funding gap.

Ms. Shickle said she has tried to communicate to both the RRPDC Executive Committee and Board that while RRPDC has funds internally to continue the program, it would be at the cost of prioritizing this program over other RRPDC programs. She noted that just like the localities, RRPDC has a finite amount of funds and needs to make decisions on what activities to support.

CVEMA members, which include emergency management staff from all of the jurisdictions, have had numerous discussions to identify various options to fill the funding gap. Ms. Shickle said the current request being considered this year should be seen as gap funding. Staff will submit another application for funding in June and feels better informed on the application process and how to approach it. Ms. Shickle said staff is also more optimistic about this application process. She said it was felt that the funding issue should be brought forward to members in order to provide continuity of service at the current level.

Ms. Shickle said staff has not looked at this as an ongoing request, but as a request to fill a gap in funding. She said she sees merit in diversifying funding streams for any project taken on by RRPDC in order to prevent this type of situation from occurring. She said this discussion is important to learn if localities are interested in contributing financially. This evening, Crater PDC will hear the same presentation from Mr. Ruppert that he gave to this Board in February.

Ms. Shickle said she sees the bigger issue as how members of the RRPDC want to prioritize resources and how RRPDC staff spends its time on programs. She would like this type of feedback from members annually as the agency's work program is developed. Taking into consideration the general membership dues assessment, the special assessment for the RRTPO, and the combination of those two funds to match the transportation planning dollars received through federal aid, along with the other programs administered by RRPDC, it needs to be determined whether the current revenues are sufficient to do the work currently done by RRPDC. Ms. Shickle said a Board-level discussion will be needed on setting priorities for programs taken on by RRPDC and what needs to be supported or cut based on revenue outlooks.

Mr. Nordvig said he's heard this morning that the localities seem to be divided along monetary lines. The smaller localities are leaning toward the per capita assessments while the larger jurisdictions are looking at the even split contributions. He said for the larger localities, most have indicated they already have emergency management resources on staff. Mr. Nordvig said that's not really the case in this case. The RRPDC emergency management staff person coordinates 25 localities through emails, phone calls, meetings, etc., that local staffs do not and cannot handle. There seems to be an assumption that the larger localities have all emergency management needs covered without CVEMA. Mr. Nordvig said CVEMA is about the type of communication between all localities' emergency management staffs that not one locality can do on its own.

Mr. Nordvig said it appears the population split at 50,000 is something that the localities may have in agreement. He said in his discussions with RRPDC and CVEMA staff, there were only a couple of localities that fell into the gray area of that 50,000 split. He said he would recommend that this option be the one selected.

Mr. Elswick said the fact that CVEMA coordinates for all localities is why he believes the contributions should be evenly split. He said the number of resources Chesterfield County has in place every day with regard to emergency management might be more than the other localities have combined. Mr. Elswick said he didn't see how it would be fair to think the larger jurisdictions should absorb additional costs. In this situation, he feels an even split is the most fair approach.

Ms. Lascolette asked if the other localities, such as those in Crater PDC, have offered their input. Ms. Shickle said they have not. The Crater PDC Board meets tonight and will hear Mr. Ruppert's presentation. Ms. Shickle said she had hoped to be able to share the thoughts of RRPDC with Mr. Morris (Crater PDC Executive Director) following this morning's meeting. She said Mr. Morris and Mr. Ruppert have agreed that it would be awkward to ask the RRPDC jurisdictions for a decision when the Crater PDC localities have not yet been asked.

Mr. Silber asked if the 50,000 population split is the option selected, would the funding amount requested fluctuate depending on the number of localities participating.

Ms. Shickle said if some communities opt not to participate, that would not mean they would not receive CVEMA services. She said it is understood that this funding request is outside of the normal budgeting cycle and many localities have already set a budget.

Ms. Shickle said regardless of the amount that results from this effort, the total program cost is about \$100,000 - \$140,000. She said any information she has on external resources helps her to be able to develop a budget for RRPDC. If there is no external contribution, she will need to develop a budget that will fully fund the emergency management program at a loss of some other RRPDC program or fund the program by drawing on reserve funds. She said this would be a policy decision the Board would need to make on whether or not the program is maintained. It is anticipated that a grant opportunity will be announced in June, and staff will submit an application at that time. Ms. Shickle said she understands these grant funds could be available as early as October 1. She said she cannot incorporate these grant funds into the budget because the application has not been submitted.

Mr. Silber asked if fewer localities do not participate, then would it follow that the amount of the split would be increased. Ms. Shickle if at least half of the program could be funded, she believes RRPDC could be able to find funding internally to support the balance. She said she did not think the amount requested would go up if fewer than 20 localities participated.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said that if only ten communities participate, that would indicate to her that there is no interest in maintaining the program. Ms. Shickle said this is where she

would expect input from Board members at a policy level as to whether the RRPDC should maintain the program.

Ms. Lascolette asked for the amount of the grant that was not awarded. Ms. Shickle said the application was made to request \$104,000. She said that amount was used because staff had been informed any amount over that would not be scored.

Ms. Lascolette asked if that was the same amount for the previous year's application. Ms. Robins said the amount for FY16 was \$106,500; the amount for FY15 was \$103,400.

Ms. Lascolette clarified that the program costs about \$140,000, and of that amount, \$104,000 is not available. That means the RRPDC already funds \$40,000 from membership dues. Ms. Shickle said the nine jurisdictions share in that cost from their per capita dues assessment. Ms. Lascolette clarified that this gap in funding means part of the program is funded through the dues assessment and part will be funded from the 50,000 population split. Ms. Shickle said that was correct.

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle what she needs from members at this point. Ms. Shickle said she would like to know what she should pass along to Crater PDC – does RRPDC need more time for deliberation, is the Board leaning toward a specific option, etc. She said she didn't want to misrepresent the feelings of the Board to the Crater Board. Ms. Shickle said both Chesterfield County and Charles City County will have representatives in attendance this evening at the Crater PDC's Board meeting.

Mr. Elswick said he would not want to make a decision until the City of Richmond has time to discuss this with their City Council.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if Ms. Shickle was looking for a vote on an option or just a general idea. Ms. Shickle said she had promised Mr. Morris that she would touch base with him following this meeting. She said she did not think a vote was necessary.

Ms. Jaeckle asked how things would be settled if all of the large jurisdictions want an even split and the small jurisdictions want a per capita contribution.

Ms. Lascolette said all other dues are paid on a per capita assessment, and Goochland County thought that would be the most equitable approach. Mr. Nordvig said Powhatan County was not firm on the per capita assessment.

Mr. Nelson asked Ms. Lascolette if she thought Goochland County would be receiving the short end of the stick if the per capita assessment was not used even though the larger jurisdictions may not benefit at the same level as the smaller jurisdictions. Ms. Lascolette said that was correct. She said she really did not know how to quantify benefits received from CVEMA.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said recently one of Hanover County's former fire chiefs died and many of the County's personnel wanted to attend the funeral. She said that Chesterfield County

offered to fill in at the Hanover County fire stations to allow as many of Hanover County's staff who wanted to go to attend the funeral. She said she is relating this with all due respect to Goochland County, but it's a matter of numbers. When something happens in Hanover County or one of the larger jurisdictions, the majority of aid is going to come from another large jurisdiction. She said there are already mutual aid agreements in place. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said this level of cooperation already takes place. She said Hanover County is always going to help out one of its regional partners.

Ms. Ashley (Chesterfield County Emergency Management) said she appreciates the opportunity to hear today's discussions. She said there is a regional benefit from CVEMA. She noted that the larger jurisdictions have staff members who are fiduciary agents for other grants through the Homeland Security system. She said Chesterfield County staff is also supporting regional efforts through its resources in other ways.

Ms. Shickle said she believes this type of discussion is what the RRPDC Board needs to focus on over the next few months. What do members want the agency to do and who benefits? She said as the work program and budget are developed over the next several years, these are the questions that will be asked. The region is very diverse, and the Emergency Management Program is unique. The agency will need input from the localities on how the agency should be used and for what types of projects and/or programs.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she believes there are three large jurisdictions on record that favor the even split option; the smaller jurisdictions favor the per capita assessment.

Chairman Miles said Charles City County will be willing to participate with an even split for one year. He said he served as a volunteer fireman for 19 years in Charles City County and the County was always calling on Henrico County to provide some sort of assistance. In those 19 years, he said Henrico County made only one request for help from Charles City County. He said he felt obligated to offer that assistance when asked.

Ms. Jaeckle said one of the things she sees on the list provided is that CVEMA coordinates a regional Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program and research. Ms. Jaeckle said Chesterfield County has its own CERT program. She said she's not certain if the County uses the CVEMA CERT program. She can understand that this would be more of a benefit for smaller jurisdictions and she believes the smaller jurisdictions should look through what CVEMA provides and determine if they benefit from those services.

Ms. Lascolette said she knows Goochland County does benefit from CVEMA participation. She said if the even split option is chosen, she would not want the amount to go up if other localities do not participate.

Chairman Miles reminded members that the City of Richmond has not had the opportunity to discuss the issue with City Council and he would like to wait until they have the chance to hold the discussions.

Mr. Ruppert said he agreed that the larger jurisdictions do have more resources. He said some of the relationships that were alluded to this morning have grown out of what the committee has done first through UASI and now through CVEMA. A large part of training and equipment for the Incident Management Team has come from CVEMA cooperation. He said this is about building and maintaining relationships around the region. In the larger incidents, one jurisdiction would not be able to handle it on its own regardless of resources. CVEMA is trying to maintain regional relationships so when larger incidents do occur, the region can respond as one cohesive unit.

Mr. Ruppert said the Chesterfield County CERT program is heavily involved in the CVEMA CERT program through regional training and exercises. There is a tremendous amount of benefit to these types of regional efforts.

He said CVEMA is actively pursuing the grant process and is working with his state counterparts to ensure the program is maintained in the future. Mr. Ruppert said CVEMA wants to have RRPDC's support and endorsement for what CVEMA is doing.

Chairman Miles said he would encourage additional discussions in the localities prior to next month's meeting, when the City of Richmond will be able to provide its input.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. Review of Audit Request for Proposals (RFP) Results**

Chairman Miles asked Mr. Sweetland to provide this information to members.

Mr. Sweetland said full information on the audit RFP results is in the agenda packet under Tab 6. He said there is one correction to be made to the information that was sent to members. The eVA publication was not finalized and as a result, the RFP did not post to the eVA website. Mr. Sweetland said he submitted the information to eVA and was not aware until after the submission deadline that the RFP did not post to the eVA site. However, the state's procurement requirements were met through publication of the RFP in two local newspapers, on the RRPDC website, and direct solicitation sent to six auditing firms.

Mr. Sweetland reported that only one response was received, and that was from the agency's current audit firm – Dunham, Aukamp & Rhodes, PLC.

Ms. Lascolette asked why the RFP was not published on eVA. Mr. Sweetland said it was due to an error he made in the posting process.

Chairman Miles asked if there was a motion to authorize staff to execute the proposed contract with Dunham, Aukamp & Rhodes, PLC as included in the agenda packet. Ms. Larson so moved, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

## **B. Richmond-Crater Hazard Mitigation Plan Update Briefing**

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to provide this update.

Ms. Shickle said she would first like to acknowledge those staff members who have worked on the plan update. Jackie Stewart was the project manager for this effort. Kathy Robins served as the primary liaison with the CVEMA. All of the local emergency management coordinators assisted in addition to other RRPDC staff – Leigh Medford, Sarah Stewart, and Chuck Gates. Staff members from Crater PDC were also involved in the project.

Ms. Shickle provided some background on the plan, noting having an approved plan is a pre-condition for requesting certain types of non-emergency disaster assistance from FEMA. The plan must be updated every five years, and VDEM incentivizes multi-jurisdictional planning to increase efficiency and to promote coordination.

There are benefits to hazard mitigation planning, including:

- increase awareness of hazards, risk, and vulnerabilities
- identify actions for reduction
- focus resources on the greatest risks
- communicate priorities to state and federal officials
- increase overall awareness of hazards and risks

Ms. Shickle said the project involved 26 localities that align with the CVEMA geography and the jurisdictions of both RRPDC and Crater PDC. RRPDC staff coordinated the funding application to VDEM and served as the project lead in cooperation with CVEMA and Crater PDC. Ms. Shickle noted that consultant services were provided by Dewberry (through an RFP process).

The project costs totaled \$180,000. Of that amount, \$135,000 was awarded by VDEM and \$45,000 was provided through in-kind staff support from RRPDC. There was an amount of \$71,100 budgeted for consulting services. Remaining project costs included RRPDC and local staff time as well as direct expenses such as printing, advertisements, and travel.

Ms. Shickle provided a timeline of the project, noting it was begun in August 2016. A preliminary compliance review submission was made to VDEM in February. VDEM will forward the plan to FEMA for further review. Public information and input sessions have been held and all comments are due in March.

Once all public comments have been received, these will be forwarded to VDEM, FEMA, and the public for an additional public review period that is expected to last between 60 – 90 days. Ms. Shickle reported that once this review has been completed, the plan will be reviewed with the Hazard Mitigation Technical Advisory Committee to see if any substantial changes need to be made to the plan. The plan will be submitted to all localities for adoption with a target completion date of September 2017.

Ms. Shickle said that once all localities adopt the revised plan, the localities will be eligible to apply for certain federal funds. During the local adoption process, RRPDC staff and local emergency response coordinators will be available to address questions regarding identified risks, capabilities, and mitigation strategies.

Chairman Miles asked if members had any questions. He thanked Ms. Shickle for her presentation.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

Chairman Miles said he would like to welcome two new members to the Board – Harvey Hinson, who has been appointed by Henrico County to serve in Mr. Glover’s place; and Angela Cabell, who has been serving as Powhatan County’s alternate voting member and is now joining the Board as a full voting member, replacing Mr. Carson Tucker, who has opted to step down.

Mr. Silber noted that Mr. Hinson had a previous commitment and could not attend today’s meeting.

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 10:15 a.m.

---

Martha Shickle  
Executive Director

---

Floyd H. Miles, Sr.  
Chairman