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Tim Davey ................................................................. Chesterfield County
Gloria Freye ............................................................ Chesterfield County
Kimberly Gray .......................................................... City of Richmond
Harvey Hinson ........................................................... Henrico County
Leslie Haley .............................................................. Chesterfield County
Dorothy JAcckle .......................................................... Chesterfield County
Kristen Larson ........................................................... City of Richmond
Susan Lascolette ........................................................ Goochland County
William Mackey .......................................................... Henrico County
Tyrone Nelson, Vice Chair ........................................... Henrico County
Larry Nordvig .......................................................... Powhatan County
Patricia O’Bannon ..................................................... Henrico County
Patricia Paige, Secretary .............................................. New Kent County
Canova Peterson ........................................................ Hanover County
Randy Silber (A) ........................................................ Henrico County
George Spagna, Treasurer ......................................... Town of Ashland
Randy Whittaker ........................................................ Hanover County
Christopher Winslow ................................................ Chesterfield County

Others Present

Mark Rhodes ........................................................... Dunham, Aukamp, and Rhodes
Jill Swinger .................................................................. Warren Whitney

Staff Present

Martha Shickle .............................................................. Executive Director
Julie Fry ........................................................................ Executive Assistant
Katherine Busser ........................................................ RRPDC Consultant
Dan Lysy ....................................................................... Interim Director of Transportation

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Nelson called the regularly scheduled November 8, 2018 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:10 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. He 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 not present at this time. Vice Chairman Nelson said members will bypass any agenda item requiring action and return to it once a quorum is reached.

I. ADMINISTRATION

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

Vice Chairman Nelson asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business.

As there were no requests to change the agenda, Vice Chairman Nelson said the agenda will stand as presented.

B. Open Public Comment Period

Vice Chairman Nelson 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. Vice Chairman Nelson 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, Vice Chairman Nelson closed the public comment period.

C. October 11, 2018 Meeting Minutes (Item bypassed until a quorum is reached)

D. Financial Reports (Item bypassed until a quorum is reached)

E. Chair’s Report

Vice Chairman Nelson reported that Dr. Newbille has a conflict this morning and is unable to attend the meeting. He said she did not share any information that she wanted to provide to members.

F. Executive Director’s Report

Ms. Shickle said she shared a more detailed report with the Executive Committee this morning on an update regarding the search for a Director of Transportation. She reminded members that Ms. Barb Nelson left the agency earlier in the year to take a position with the Port of Virginia. The open position was advertised nationwide.

Last week, an interview panel met with four candidates via Skype. From those interviews, the panel has selected two finalists. Both have been invited to meet with members of the
RRTPC Executive Committee, the agency’s VDOT partner, and key staff members on Monday, November 19. Ms. Shickle said if any RRPPC member would like to participate in the meet-and-greet, please let her know and she’ll provide additional information.

Ms. Shickle noted that both Ms. O’Bannon and Ms. Paige served on the interview panel. Ms. Shickle said the consensus of the panel was that either candidate would be well qualified for the position and a welcome addition to the team. She said the meet-and-greet is an opportunity to see how the candidates interact with staff and RRTPC Executive Committee members. Ms. Shickle said she hopes to be able to provide a formal announcement regarding the position during the December meeting. She asked if either Ms. O’Bannon or Ms. Paige had any comments regarding the interview process or the candidates.

Ms. O’Bannon said one of the candidates is a former employee of RRPPC, noting that Mr. Lysy originally hired the gentleman as an intern. She said the candidate has had a complete career since leaving RRPPC. The other candidate wants to return to the region and is also very knowledgeable. She said both candidates are very good and stood out above the other two candidates.

Ms. Paige said she believes the agency will be in good hands with either of the candidates. She thanked Ms. Shickle and her staff for reviewing all of the applications received and narrowing down the candidate pool for the interview panel. All four of the applicants were qualified. Of the two who were not selected as finalists, Ms. Paige said she feels they would also be an asset to the agency in the right position. She said the panel felt it would be worthwhile for both finalist candidates to interact with staff and the RRTPC Executive Committee as these are the persons with whom the candidates will have the most contact.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Vice Chairman Nelson said there is no unfinished business to bring before members.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Draft FY18 Audit Report

Vice Chairman Nelson reported that Dr. Spagna has been working with the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee over the past several weeks to review the draft audit report. Vice Chairman Nelson said Mr. Mark Rhodes, with Dunham, Aukamp, and Rhodes, is in attendance and will review the report with members. Vice Chairman Nelson asked Dr. Spagna if he’d like to provide a report from the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee.

Dr. Spagna reported that the committee has only met twice so members are still learning how to be a committee. The discussions during both meetings have been robust.
About ten days ago, the committee received a detailed report on the draft FY18 audit report from Mr. Rhodes and reviewed changes to the report during their meeting yesterday. He said this is a clean audit and there are no recommendations as a result of the audit for the agency’s financial controls or procedures. There were minor changes made to the report after it was distributed to members and those will be reviewed by Mr. Rhodes.

Dr. Spagna reported that following the audit review during yesterday’s meeting, members of the committee had a discussion regarding the current budget. Among other things, it was decided that the committee would like to wait until the February meeting, after the close of the second quarter, before sharing a mid-year budget review with members of the full Board. The Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee will meet in January to review the mid-year budget revisions.

Also discussed was where the committee would like to see the budget at the end of the current fiscal year. The committee offered suggestions to staff on where to look in the budget for changes that can address the current shortfall between revenues and expenses. One of the recommendations is to consider the current office lease and the high rent rate being paid. Another recommendation is to determine if there are other grants that can be secured to assist with projects related to the strategic plan. Dr. Spagna said another recommendation is for staff to research whether the agency can partner with one of the jurisdictions to provide healthcare to staff at a lower cost. He said that as a small agency, there is less clout when trying to negotiate for lower healthcare costs. Partnering with one of the jurisdictions may assist in lowering those costs for the agency.

Dr. Spagna said a balanced budget for FY20 will be presented to members during the December meeting. Staff is continuing to work to determine how to close the gap between revenues and expenses for the current fiscal year.

Ms. O’Bannon said following the audit report, she’d like for members to discuss some of the options the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee identified yesterday to help correct the budget shortfall.

Mr. Hinson asked when the last member dues increase was set. Ms. Shickle said the rate has been at the same level since it was reviewed by the Board in 2004. Dues assessments may increase each year due to population increases; however, the rate was last reviewed in 2004.

Vice Chairman Nelson asked Mr. Rhodes to begin his report. Mr. Rhodes said he’ll be glad to answer any questions as he moves through the report.

Beginning on page 1, Mr. Rhodes said this is an unmodified, or clean, report. On page 2, there is note of an error correction which is on the Governmental Balance sheet on page 11. Page 33, note 11, provides additional information on the error and correction.

On pages 4-8, the Management’s Discussion and Analysis provides an overview of what went on over the course of the year, with a comparison of last year over this year.
Mr. Rhodes said there was an error on page 9, which was what members received in their packet. A corrected page is available for members. The total net position number did not track correctly in the formula and should be $307,993. The same correction is also shown on page 11. The reason for the change was additional modifications from the Virginia Retirement System actuarial report that had not been included in the reconciliation to the fund balance.

Page 12 shows the balance sheet for Governmental Funds.

Footnotes begin on page 13. Mr. Rhodes said he’d like to skip through these to page 32, which discusses the fringe rate and the rate for indirect costs. The format has changed to include leave wages in the fringe rate, which is a more common way of calculating the fringe rate. He said the reason for this change is because some grants do not accept indirect costs for reimbursement but will accept fringe benefit allocations. If grants accept both types of rates for reimbursement, the result is a wash.

Page 36 begins the Uniform Guidance Reports for compliance. Mr. Rhodes said no errors in how the agency handles its financial processes or controls were found.

Mr. Rhodes asked if members had any questions.

Vice Chairman Nelson asked if anyone had a question for Mr. Rhodes. As there were no questions for Mr. Rhodes, Vice Chairman Nelson thanked him for the presentation and his work on the audit.

Vice Chairman Nelson said a vote to accept the Draft FY18 Audit Report will need to be held until a quorum is reached. If no quorum is reached during today’s meeting, the report will be brought back in December for a vote. He said the Executive Committee recommended acceptance of the report.

Mr. Nordvig asked if absent members can vote via email or phone. Ms. O’Bannon said that was not allowed; the vote must be in person. She noted that this is a restriction as set by FOIA rules. She said there are some exceptions for emergencies.

Chairman Nelson said he’d prefer to defer the vote until the December meeting if a quorum is not reached this morning.

Ms. O’Bannon said she’d like to discuss the fact that in each month’s financial report, additional losses are shown. She said as an organization, she believes members need to understand why this is happening and how the losses are going to be addressed – both short and long term.

Ms. O’Bannon noted that PDCs are charged with certain duties and obligations under the establishing legislative act of the General Assembly – Virginia Area Development Act, which was replaced by the 1995 Regional Cooperation Act. The purpose was for the larger
counties to cooperate with smaller counties for issues such as those that cross county or jurisdictional boundary lines.

Ms. O’Bannon further pointed out that the General Assembly could take action to disband PDCs, which would require the PDCs to meet all outstanding financial obligations prior to disbanding. Ms. O’Bannon said that was the reason members of the Board determined that a reserve fund of $1 million should be established as it would allow RRPDC to meet all of its financial obligations and final payments should it be disbanded. The fund was established by the RRPDC Board in 2004. She noted that MPOs (RRTPO) were established by the federal government and could act as standalone entities. MPOs and PDCs typically work together as many transportation projects involve cooperation in other planning areas.

Mr. Hinson said Ms. O’Bannon was correct and the region is glad to have both the RRPDC and RRTPO working together in the region.

Ms. Shickle said the RRPDC’s Charter agreement is separate from the Regional Cooperation Act, and was entered into as a result of action by each of the nine member jurisdictions. The purpose of PDCs, as set in §15.2-4207 of the Act is, in part, as follows:

The planning district commission shall also promote the orderly and efficient development of the physical, social and economic elements of the district by planning, and encouraging and assisting localities to plan, for the future.

Ms. O’Bannon said any of the member jurisdictions can join an adjacent PDC and leave RRPDC. Ms. Shickle said there is an approval process through the General Assembly and the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). She said Chesterfield County and Charles City County are both members of Crater PDC as well as RRPDC. Previously, the RRPDC Board has entertained requests from other jurisdictions to join RRPDC but the requests were declined.

Ms. O’Bannon clarified that if a jurisdiction felt more aligned with RRPDC, then that jurisdiction could join RRPDC.

Ms. Shickle added that the boundaries of each PDC are defined after each decennial census. Membership in the PDCs is a separate issue and is voluntary as is each jurisdiction’s financial contribution to the PDC.

Ms. O’Bannon said the reserve fund was established in order to handle any situation that may or may not happen. Currently, funds are being removed from the reserve fund. In 2004, it was determined that a $1 million threshold would be adequate to meet all final financial obligations should RRPDC need to disband. Each month some of those funds are being used, and each month the reserve fund is declining.
Ms. O’Bannon said members need to know if the decline in the reserve fund is due to open positions that limit the amount of work hours that can be charged back to a grant for reimbursement or if there are other reasons. She said while FY20’s budget will be presented as balanced, there is a problem with this year’s budget that needs to be addressed.

Ms. O’Bannon said this was part of the discussion held during yesterday’s Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee meeting. She said she was hoping there could be some discussion now to help the broader group understand why the money is being used. She asked if there is a short term plan.

Ms. Shickle said she sees 2018 as the year of the perfect storm. There were several predictable and unpredictable events that occurred. The unpredicted activity included a repayment to the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) for dollars that had been reimbursed to the agency under a 2015 grant in the amount of about $31,000. Indirect expenses had been approved and submitted for reimbursement. The reimbursement was received, and this year, VDEM notified the agency that the reimbursement of indirect costs was not allowed and the payment would need to be returned.

Additionally, there were a number of staff departures that included payment of normal accrued leave and in some cases, the inclusion of severance. There are some retirees who have generated recurring expenses for coverage of healthcare costs until the retiree reaches age 65 and becomes eligible for Medicare. As part of the personnel policy, retirees are entitled to receive these healthcare payments, which are not reimbursable expenses. There are currently four such employees.

Ms. Shickle said another event was when there were two employees on long term leave and thus not productive as a result.

Many of the costs could have been prevented through better budget planning. The committee discussed yesterday the possibility of creating funds for capital expenditures and future leave liability. She said these are things staff can do right away in order to be better prepared. Some operational changes have also been made over the last two years, including making sure that the majority of staff members are working in grant funded or dues funded programs. The Work Program is being transitioned to assist in this reorganization of staff.

Efforts are also underway to reduce overhead and indirect costs in both personnel and infrastructure. As an example, staff is reviewing a model that would move some technology hardware to a virtual environment, thus eliminating the need to purchase new equipment. There will be some upfront investment to accomplish this, but in the long term, costs will be reduced by not having to make capital purchases for computers, servers, etc.

Ms. Shickle recapped by saying changes are being made in how staff spends their time and how the office space is being used. Personnel and rent expenses comprise about 80 percent
of the agency’s budget. Other areas such as printing costs will be examined, copier lease expenses, travel, etc., will also be reviewed.

Ms. O’Bannon said it’s important for the Board to know all of the reasons Ms. Shickle just discussed. She asked if Ms. Shickle could provide the information in written form to members as this would help the Board understand what’s going on in the transition.

Ms. Larson asked for more information on a severance package. Ms. Shickle said the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee has asked staff to look at the agency’s leave accrual policy, which is being done. When an employee leaves through resignation, their final compensation includes all hours worked through their last day as well as accrued vacation leave. Sick leave is not paid unless an employee retires from the agency, and that is paid at a prorated amount.

When the personnel policy was reviewed two years ago, it was determined that this practice was consistent with what the jurisdictions offer. Ms. Shickle said staff will take another look at the practice and check with the localities. Retirees are entitled to one-third of their sick leave balance, and those who are eligible, continue to be covered under the agency’s healthcare program until they are Medicare eligible. She said if a change is made for full time employees, this will also impact how retirees are handled.

Ms. Shickle said the severance payout was applicable to specific situations that were reviewed by the Executive Committee in advance. There is no standard policy for severance payments.

Ms. Larson said the City of Richmond has changed its personnel policies over the last few months. She said they’d be happy to share the information with Ms. Shickle to use as a comparison.

Ms. Lascolette asked if there are other grants programs, such as the one with VDEM, that do not reimburse for indirect costs. She asked if the agency should be more selective about which grants are accepted based on what types of costs can be reimbursed. Ms. Shickle said reviewing match obligations for grants and the eligibility of reimbursable costs should be a common practice.

Ms. Shickle reminded members that several months ago, advice was solicited from the person who authored the OMB circular on how to deal with agencies that won’t reimburse all associated grant costs. Staff has been working with VDEM over the past few years on their refusal to reimburse for indirect costs. The indirect cost rate has been approved by the appropriate federal agency and federal guidelines say that all agencies must follow the guidelines on reimbursement or they must negotiate an agreed upon indirect rate. VDEM will not do either.

She said each of the state’s PDCs has been dealing with the same issue. It seems that approval depends on whoever is sitting in that position at VDEM when the request is submitted. Ms. Shickle said she’s been working on the issue at a statewide level, working
with DHCD to see if they can offer assistance, which they have said they cannot. It is a national issue as well as a statewide issue. She said in addition to VDEM, the Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy also has a problem with indirect costs as well as the Department of Conservation and Recreation and the Department of Environmental Quality.

Ms. Lascolette asked if the agency knows when the grant is accepted if indirect costs will be reimbursable. Ms. Shickle said in the case of VDEM, the agency did not know in advance. She said the agency has correspondence from VDEM saying the rate would be approved, and the person in the approval seat now says the previous person did not have the authority to approve the rate. Ms. Shickle said the funds were repaid in order to maintain a good relationship with VDEM.

Ms. Gray asked if staff can provide a historical look at the budget and how the local contributions have trended over time. She said for the agency, 80 percent of the budget is personnel, which is the same in most of the jurisdictions. A large portion of that budget is fringe benefits.

Ms. Gray asked if there was anything being put forward legislatively at the General Assembly regarding grant reimbursements that the agency can assist with.

Ms. Gray also asked if the healthcare payment for retirees can be reviewed. She asked if there was a process to track those payments to see if the benefits are being used as supplemental insurance once a retiree transitions to Medicare. Ms. Shickle said the agency’s personnel policy is very clear that retirees can only participate in the agency’s healthcare program until they are Medicare eligible. The agency has no mechanism to enforce this rule. It is the responsibility of the retiree to notify the agency. Ms. Shickle said the agency does have birthdates that can be referenced to see when the retirees reach age 65.

Ms. Gray asked if retirees accept other employment that offers healthcare benefits, whether RRPDC stops its coverage. Ms. Shickle that should be another trigger to stop, but again, it’s on the retiree to notify the agency. Ms. Gray said she’s not saying things should be changed for existing employees, but certainly for new hires to ensure the agency’s obligations sync with how the budget is moving forward.

Ms. Shickle said the agency participates in The Local Choice healthcare program, which is a pooled health insurance program for a lot of special district organizations, smaller school districts, and smaller jurisdictions. The program enables smaller organizations to have some control over healthcare costs. There was legislation a few years ago giving direction to look at a state sponsored healthcare plan. When details about the plan were available, the rates were higher than The Local Choice. Ms. Shickle said she believes that state sponsored system was designed to deal with high loss situations. Last year, plan offerings for FY19 were changed that kept costs revenue neutral. The agency offered a high deductible plan with reduced benefits as well as a more standard plan. By doing this, costs were kept manageable for the agency. Staff has said previously that costs for family coverage healthcare plans do not come across as family friendly. Ms. Shickle said she
would appreciate any suggestions from members on how the agency can find more cost effective coverage for staff.

Ms. Gray asked if there is legislation that can be put forward to require VDEM to reimburse indirect costs. She said it should not be up to any one individual in an agency to determine what costs can or cannot be reimbursed. Ms. Shickle reported that the Middle Peninsula PDC did engage with their legislative representatives to develop a bill that may be introduced during the upcoming General Assembly session. Ms. Shickle said she's not sure if the legislator is comfortable singling out one particular state agency. She said there has been some movement on the legislation and she will check on the status of that legislation.

Ms. Gray said if other legislators around the state hear about the issue then there will be a stronger case to show statewide impact. She asked if VDEM allocates federal funding, because if it is federal funding, it should not impact that agency’s bottom line. Ms. Gray said she thinks that if members put pressure on their legislators, there will be more action taken.

Ms. Lascolette asked if Middle Peninsula PDC had developed the bill language. Ms. Shickle said she will check with the staff at Middle Peninsula and report back.

Mr. Hinson said to return back to the budget, he’d said previously that the agency needed to stop the bleeding, but now he thinks the agency is about to break the bank. He said the current personnel policies definitely need to be reviewed based on what he’s heard this morning. He said local governments are always reviewing personnel policies. He said there is an expectation that current employees must always be protected. However, a line is drawn for new employees when new policies are established.

Mr. Hinson said Henrico County has made these types of personnel policy changes numerous times. He said there is no policy in Henrico County that pays for retiree healthcare coverage. Mr. Hinson said he does not see how the agency can continue to do this without causing ongoing damage to the budget. He said he’d like to suggest that a committee of local HR administrators be established to compare their benefits to what the agency offers.

Mr. Hinson said he remembers the establishment of several technical advisory committees that utilized the expertise of local staffs to work through concerns and establish best practices. This practice also reduced the need for PDC staff.

Mr. Peterson said he recommends the legislation that has been discussed be funneled through the VAPDC on behalf of all state PDCs. He said with regard to the budget discussion, the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee tasked staff to develop a short and long term plan to address the gap between revenue and expenses and to bring that plan with options back to the committee for review.
Vice Chairman Nelson clarified that the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee has asked staff to develop plans and options to address the budget issues. Dr. Spagna said that was correct and that the committee will review this information in January.

Vice Chairman Nelson said he’s heard Ms. O’Bannon ask for a written summation of reasons for the shortfall. He asked if this is the same thing that the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee has asked for.

Ms. O’Bannon said if there is a technical committee established with human resource staff from around the region, they could come up with resolutions or suggestions to alleviate some of the funding problems. She said the same can be accomplished with financial staffs. This is the type of tasks PDCs were established to address.

Mr. Hinson said when Henrico County needed to develop a plan to create an address system for 911 calls, a model was created that has now become the standard model for the entire country. He said this is another example of how regional cooperation is supposed to work.

Vice Chairman Nelson said he’d like to be able to give Ms. Shickle clear direction on the information she needs to provide to the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee and what she needs to provide to the Board.

Ms. Larson said a lot of good ideas were voiced today, and she believes everything regarding the budget should be funneled back to the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee so they can prioritize the options.

Ms. O’Bannon said the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee did discuss revamping the agency and changing how things are done. Ms. O’Bannon said as the agency enters into its 50th year, a total refresh is a good idea. Ms. Shickle will be meeting with smaller groups of the CAOs/Managers over the next few weeks. Ms. O’Bannon said Ms. Shickle can also receive feedback from these groups. The Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee said the conversation just held by Board members is exactly the type of conversation that needs to take place. Members need to determine what they need from the agency and how those needs can be dovetailed to everyone else’s needs. Ms. O’Bannon said she thinks the idea of employing technical advisory committees is an excellent suggestion.

Vice Chairman Nelson said Ms. Shickle should continue to work through the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee with regard to budgetary issues. The committee can then bring recommendations back to the Executive Committee and the Board.

Ms. Gray said the budget issues are not insurmountable. With help from a technical committee, the issues can be addressed. She said she appreciates the work staff has already done and will continue to do to bring the budget back into line.

Vice Chairman Nelson said he feels the entire Board has confidence in Ms. Shickle and thinks everyone is headed in the right direction.
Mr. Peterson asked Ms. Shickle if there’s anything from today’s discussion that needs clarification as it relates to what was discussed yesterday during the Audit/Finance/Facilities Committee meeting. Ms. Shickle said the only new topic raised today deals with the legislative request. She said she would like to ask if this could be a secondary priority. She said she will contact Middle Peninsula PDC for an update. She said RRPDC has not had a relationship with state legislators for a long time and she’s not certain the agency is in a position to try to reestablish one now. She said she’d rather focus on personnel issues and the budget given the February deadline to have information ready to bring back to the Board.

Ms. Gray said she would like to know if Middle Peninsula has filed any legislation and, with regard to any legislative deadlines, members can reach out to their respective representatives to bring their attention to the issue.

Vice Chairman Nelson said he agrees that the budget should be Ms. Shickle’s first priority.

Ms. Shickle said she also believes she needs to restructure how she communicates with members of the Board. The agency currently has very active technical advisory committees and staff interacts with them on a regular basis – environmental, transportation, emergency management. She said she thinks staff is not doing a good job to let Board members know how much of the good work they remember is continuing through the technical advisory committees. Ms. Shickle said she will think about the best way to communicate those efforts back to the Board.

Vice Chairman Nelson said a quorum of members was reached during the discussions, so he’d like members to go back to vote on items that had been bypassed.

I. **ADMINISTRATION**

C. October 11, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chairman Nelson said if there are no corrections or changes to be made to the October 11, 2018 meeting minutes, he will ask for a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hinson so moved, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Peterson. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

D. Financial Reports

Vice Chairman Nelson asked if there was a motion to accept the first quarter financial statement as presented. Ms. Paige so moved, and the motion was seconded by Ms. Gray. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.
III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Draft FY18 Audit Report

Chairman Nelson reminded members that the Executive Committee took action during their meeting this morning to recommend acceptance of the Draft FY18 Audit Report as presented. Ms. Lascolette so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Hinson. There was no additional discussion and the motion to accept the Draft FY18 Audit Report as presented carried unanimously.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Vice Chairman Nelson said he’d like to thank Mr. Lysy for agreeing to step back in as Interim Director of Transportation until the new Director can be brought on board.

Vice Chairman Nelson said he’d also like to recognize Mr. Hinson for agreeing once again to step in to fill the Brookland Supervisor’s slot, first following the death of Mr. Glover and again following Ms. Lynch’s resignation. Vice Chairman Nelson said Mr. Hinson began his career with Henrico County in 1961 in planning and worked his way up to become a Deputy County Manager before his retirement. Vice Chairman Nelson said he’s benefited from Mr. Hinson’s extensive knowledge of Henrico County.

Mr. Hinson said he’s enjoyed working with everyone again, but he’s looking forward to getting back into his studio to take up his landscape painting once more.

Vice Chairman Nelson said Mr. Dan Schmitt was elected to fill the Brookland Supervisor’s position on Tuesday, and he hopes Mr. Schmitt will be able to attend Decembers meeting.

V. ADJOURN

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, on motion duly made and seconded, Vice Chairman Nelson adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Martha Shickle  
Executive Director  

Tyrone Nelson  
Vice Chair