

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
September 13, 2018

Members and Alternates (A) Present

Nolen Blackwood (A) City of Richmond
Angela Cabell Powhatan County
Timothy M. Davey Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick Chesterfield County
Gloria Freye Chesterfield County
Kimberly Gray City of Richmond
Rodney Hathaway (A) New Kent County
Dorothy Jaeckle Chesterfield County
Kristen Larson City of Richmond
William Mackey Henrico County
Sandra Marshall Henrico County
Tyrone Nelson, Vice Chair Henrico County
John Moyer New Kent County
Cynthia Newbille, Chair City of Richmond
Patricia O'Bannon Henrico County
Canova Peterson Hanover County
Randy Silber (A) Henrico County
George Spagna, Treasurer Town of Ashland
Frank Thornton Henrico County
Randy Whittaker Hanover County
Chris Winslow Chesterfield County

Others Present

Eric Gregory RRPDC Legal Counsel
Blair Keeley West Cary Group
Molly McBean Van Go
Jill Swinger Warren Whitney
John Taylor West Cary Group
Dawn Werry West Cary Group

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
Julie Fry Executive Assistant
Barbara Jacocks Director of Planning
Katherine Busser RRPDC Consultant
Ken Lantz Principal Planner
Liz McAdory Transportation Planning Team Coordinator
Sarah Rhodes Principal Planner

Sarah Stewart.....Senior Planner
Brenda Stone-CannadayHR Coordinator

NOTE: The recording device did not function properly. Minutes for this meeting are written based on staff notes.

Call to Order

Chairwoman Newbille called the regularly scheduled September 13, 2018 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:05 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. She then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

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

I. ADMINISTRATION

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

Chairwoman Newbille asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business.

Ms. O’Bannon requested that the financial report be removed from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion.

There were no objections to this request, and Chairwoman Newbille indicated the financial report would be included under Item II.A. RRPDC Financial Update.

As there were no other requests to change the agenda, on motion duly made and seconded, the agenda was accepted as changed.

B. Open Public Comment Period

Chairwoman Newbille opened the public comment period, noting that if anyone wished to address the members, to please stand and provide his or her name, locality of residence, and, if appropriate, the name of any organization being represented. Chairwoman Newbille asked that any 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, Chairwoman Newbille closed the public comment period.

C. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. July 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Tab 1)**
- 2. June 2018 Financial Report (Tab 2 – moved to New Business II.A)**
- 3. Resolutions of Appreciation for Outgoing Members (Tab 3)**

Chairwoman Newbille said if there is no request to remove either Item 1 or Item 3 from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion, she will ask for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. O'Bannon so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. The motion carried unanimously.

D. Chair's Report

Chairwoman Newbille said she did not have a formal report and asked that the next item on the agenda proceed. She invited staff from West Cary Group to come forward to give their presentation.

1. RRPDC Brand Identity Discussion and Presentation

Ms. Shickle reminded members that they had previously authorized staff to enter into an agreement with West Cary Group (WCG) to assist in the development and update of the RRPDC website. She said once the strategic planning process began, WCG was asked to pause their work until the plan was in place and could be incorporated into the website design. Ms. Shickle said the scope of work with WCG was expanded to include development of a brand identity. She introduced members of the WCG team who have been working on the effort – Blair Keeley, Dawn Werry, and John Taylor.

Mr. Keeley said WCG is pleased to be able to provide this presentation to members today. He said he'd begin with an overview of the process.

Ms. O'Bannon asked why there is such a concentration on using the RVA name.

Mr. Keeley indicated that in their work with agency staff and others around the region, the consensus was that the majority of residents refer to the region as RVA. This term is generally accepted to include the entire Richmond region.

Ms. O'Bannon asked how the cost for this work had been paid.

Chairwoman Newbille said she'd like to limit discussion to the product being presented by WCG. She said any other discussion can take place later in the meeting.

Mr. Keeley provided information on how the RRPDC's strategic vision had guided the work done by WCG and how it encompassed the "Better Together" idea. Mr. Keeley noted that the process used by WCG had four stages: brand research/exploration; brand ID development; website and collateral development; and outreach. Mr. Keeley provided

examples of logos from several regional entities, including other PDCs, jurisdictions, and nonprofits, among others.

A listing of exploratory names was also reviewed. This included names in the conservative/traditional style and those that are considered to be in a more contemporary/progressive style. Names that seem to be preferred by the various focus groups included Richmond Regional Alliance (RRA), ThriveRVA, PlanRVA, TogetherRVA, RVA+ / RVA Plus, and The RVAAlliance.

A listing of exploratory taglines was developed, using the strategic plan’s vision of Better Together, and resulting outcomes:

Working Together	Outcomes
Greater Together	For a more vibrant region
Together we thrive	Toward a vibrant region
Building our future	Future focused
Better Together	More Collaboration in the region

The preferred tagline was Greater Together.

Mr. Keeley said several designs were developed using the different names. He provided examples of what WCG developed.

He noted key takeaways from the internal focus groups, which included the following:

- top three names as voted by the group: PlanRVA, RVA Together, RVA Plans Together
- “RVA” is a fair descriptor of the nine localities
- colorful is stronger than dark/earthy
- progressive design is stronger than traditional
- “Plan” is a fair descriptor of what the agency does overall
- “Together” is a fair descriptor of how the agency wants the nine localities to work
- bold typography is key because of the small spaces in which the logo will be placed
- words like “Alliance” and “Plus” felt inaccurate or overbearing

Mr. Keeley provided examples of how the PlanRVA logo could be used with elements of the priority focus areas. He also showed a color chart that designates each of the priority focus areas. He then provided a review of why brands/logos matter, how the seal can illustrate what the agency stands for, and the legal name being used to show who the agency is within the community.

At this time, Mr. Keeley asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Winslow said in looking at the slides, he likes the second design as he feels it gives the impression of encompassing all of the jurisdictions. He said he’d suggest using the word *regional* in the name.

Mr. Peterson said instead of using the word *plan*, he thinks the word *planning* should be used to show action. He said he agrees that RVA is global in its use to describe the entire region.

Ms. Jaeckle said she agrees that RVA no longer refers to just the City of Richmond but to all of the localities. She said she feels the agency should be open to a new vision.

Mr. Nelson also agreed that the entire region is identified by the use of RVA as it has come to be inclusive of the entire region.

Mr. Silber asked if WCG is developing a branding name or if the agency plans to change its legal name. Ms. Shickle said what WCG is working on is a branding identity for the new website. She said the Virginia Code dictates how PDCs can be named. The development of a new brand for the agency will better articulate the work done by the agency. Mr. Keeley added that a branding name will be better recognized in marketing products.

Mr. Silber asked if there are any other PDCs that use a different name. Ms. Shickle said the Lynchburg area's PDC is Region 2000 and LENOWISCO PDC is named for each of the jurisdictions in that PDC region.

Ms. Freye said the agency's brand should focus on the region, and she feels RVA does tell the story of collaboration.

Ms. O'Bannon said if Plan RVA is going to be used as the branding name, there needs to be a reference to the agency's regional makeup.

Ms. Jaeckle noted that the general public needs to know what the agency does within the region.

Mr. Moyer said RVA is a non-copyrighted logo that is open and free for anyone to use. He asked if the agency's new branding name includes the word *regional*, whether that should be copyrighted to prevent anyone else from using it.

Chairwoman Newbille said the effort has been undertaken to make RRPDC more accessible.

Ms. O'Bannon said that the word *regional* can indicate where the public can go to ask about work being done by two or more jurisdictions.

Chairwoman Newbille said members are being asked to take action authorizing staff to work with WCG to move forward with development of the PlanRVA branding name. She said she's heard suggestions that the words *regional* and *planning* need to be incorporated into the design.

Mr. Gregory noted that per Virginia Code, the agency's legal name on the Charter is Richmond Regional Planning District Commission. He said the Code allows for the substitution of the words *regional council* or *regional commission* for *planning district commission*. He said the Code is more vague when it comes to seals or logos.

Mr. Nordvig asked if the Code used the words *like* or *such* when referring to the substitutions.

Mr. Gregory said the Code reads as follows, §15.2-4203:

B. The charter agreement shall set forth:

1. The name of the planning district. An entity organized as a planning district commission under this act may employ the name "regional council" or "regional commission" as a substitute for the name "planning district commission."

With regard to a seal or logo, the Code states, §15.2-4205:

B. Without in any manner limiting or restricting the general powers conferred by this chapter, the planning district commission may:

1. Adopt and have a common seal and to alter the same at pleasure.

Mr. Nordvig said the Code seems to say that the logo can be different as long as the legal name remains Richmond Regional Planning District Commission. A tagline can use the words *regional* or *planning*.

Ms. Gray said she understands what's being said is that the legal name must stay the same but the logo and tagline can be different.

Chairwoman Newbille said that was correct; the legal name cannot be changed.

Mr. Peterson said he'd like to ask WCG to work with Mr. Gregory to ensure that what WCG is proposing can be used within the limitations of the Code.

Chairwoman Newbille summarized by saying she will ask WCG to take the recommendations heard this morning and incorporate them into a new design to be presented at the next meeting. She asked WCG if they will have enough time to make revisions prior to the next meeting. Mr. Keeley said they should be able to provide something by the end of next week.

Chairwoman Newbille thanked the WCG for their work and said the revisions will be brought back to the Executive Committee during next month's meeting and then to the full Board.

2. Establishment of New Standing Committees

Chairwoman Newbille reported that there is a recommendation to establish three new Standing Committees that will be charged with supporting the new strategic plan. In addition to the Executive Committee, it is being proposed that there should also be an Audit, Finance, and Facilities Committee; Operations Committee; and Public Outreach Committee. The current Charter and Bylaws Committee will be folded into the Executive Committee as membership of these two committees has always been the same.

Ms. Shickle added that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, it was suggested that the new committees meet at least quarterly. Meetings will be scheduled intentionally to eliminate the addition of another meeting to everyone's calendars.

Chairwoman Newbille said committee meetings can be scheduled to coincide with Board meetings. She said it will be important to engage with Board members. She said each of the new committees will be charged with supporting various segments of the strategic plan.

Ms. O'Bannon said on page 2 of the memo included under Tab 5, there is a bullet point that refers to confidentiality. She asked, as a public agency, why any meeting materials would not be considered open and subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. Chairwoman Newbille said that all of the committees would need to comply with FOIA requests.

Mr. Gregory added that privileged information refers to discussion that takes place during closed sessions. However, as with attorney/client relationships, the client can always release information if the client so desires. Mr. Gregory said any member can release information from closed sessions even though it is typically held that members will honor the request for nondisclosure.

Ms. Gray said she believes there is a responsibility for members to uphold confidentiality in some circumstances when disclosure could cause harm to the organization. Mr. Gregory agreed with that assessment. He said in some cases, disclosure can subject a client, or organization, to be exposed to liability.

Mr. Nordvig said he thought the Public Outreach Committee would be a good place to continue discussions on the branding and logo efforts.

Chairwoman Newbille asked members to contact Ms. Shickle if they have interest in serving on any of the three new committees. She asked if there was a motion to establish three new Standing Committees – Audit, Finance, and Facilities; Operations; and Public Outreach. Mr. Davey so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

E. Executive Director's Report (Tab 6)

Ms. Shickle said the staff report is included in the agenda packet under Tab 6. She said she'd like to point out a couple of the key items.

RRPDC hosted a Virginia Scenic Rivers Program information session, which was attended by staffs from each of the localities. Ms. Shickle reported that there is interest in the region to submit multiple segments of the region's rivers for designation. She said staff will be working with localities to bring this request to each of the governing bodies for review and consideration.

Ms. Shickle reported there is a new opportunity to partner with Crater PDC and the Friends of the Lower Appomattox River (FOLAR) to implement elements of the Regional Rivers Plan. She said Dr. Casey (Chesterfield County) brought this information to Ms. Shickle's attention. She said more information will be provided to members during the October meeting.

The last item Ms. Shickle said she wanted to highlight is to let members know that during the upcoming meeting of the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO), RRPDC will be recognized with two Innovation Awards. The first was submitted by Barbara Jacocks and referenced RRPDC's support in site locations along Broad Street for the BRT Pulse stops. The second application was submitted by Katie Moody for work in support of the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance's (CVEMA) annual Survivor Day event that celebrated its 10th anniversary in the region.

[Correction: After adjournment of the meeting, information was received to clarify that the Pulse Corridor Plan was not completed to determine where stops (or stations) were to be located along the Pulse route, but to lay the groundwork for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) approaches for land use and connectivity around the stations whose locations had already been determined along the spine.]

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. RRPDC Financial Update; June 2018 Financial Report

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the information that had been placed at each member's seat. She said over the past few months, staff has been working with Ms. Swinger to develop a financial report format that will provide more transparency. The handout outlines the process used to improve financial reporting.

Ms. Shickle noted that the revenue shortfall shown on the June 2018 balance sheet is due to several staff vacancies. These vacancies limit the amounts that can be charged back to grants for project work. In addition, there were payouts for accrued benefits associated with some of the staff vacancies. Ms. Shickle said plans are underway to begin to fill the vacancies which will, in turn, provide more work hours that can be charged back to grants. Until vacancies are filled, it will be a priority to assign current staff to grant funded tasks.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that these are the types of situations the Board had in mind when it established the \$1 million designated fund balance. She said this fund balance was established to cover unexpected losses of revenue. Ms. O'Bannon noted that if grant funding is not used, federal grants may be withdrawn.

Ms. Shickle said transitioning the agency from a cash basis to an accrual basis will also assist. Ms. Swinger has helped to develop internal reports that can better track funding and allow staff to work with better efficiency and to better evaluate how funds are being used.

Chairwoman Newbille thanked staff and Ms. Swinger for their work toward better financial accountability. She asked if there was a motion to accept the June 2018 financial report as presented. Ms. O'Bannon so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairwoman Newbille asked if there were any announcements or other business to bring before the Board. She recognized Ms. O'Bannon.

Ms. O'Bannon asked, given the potential for adverse weather in the region as a result of Hurricane Florence, if the region's emergency managers had been involved in any hurricane related planning.

Ms. Shickle said members of CVEMA have been holding daily conference calls over the past week related to the hurricane. She said all localities have been proactive in staging mobile resources.

Ms. Shickle also reported that in cooperation with The Community Foundation, CVEMA has been able to set up a process to receive donations from various individuals and organizations related to disaster relief efforts. Donations will be received by the National Association of Voluntary Organizations (VOAD). Guidelines to receive donations are being developed.

There is also coordination on public outreach messaging that will focus on providing complete information on family assistance in the event of disasters. This work is being funded through a Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA) grant.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chairwoman Newbille asked if there was other business to bring before the Board. No other business was identified, and on motion duly made and seconded, Chairwoman Newbille adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:10 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Cynthia Newbille
Chair