

RRPDC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting
October 11, 2018

Members Present

Angela Kelly-Wiecek..... Hanover County
Susan Lascolette..... Goochland County
Tyrone Nelson, Vice Chair Henrico County
Cynthia Newbille, Chair City of Richmond
Larry Nordvig Powhatan County
George Spagna, Treasurer..... Town of Ashland

Others Present

Eric Gregory..... RRPDC Legal Counsel
Kristen Larson..... City of Richmond
Jill Swinger Warren Whitney
John Taylor West Cary Group
Dawn Werry..... West Cary Group

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
Katherine Busser..... RRPDC Consultant
Diane Fusco Office Coordinator
Brenda Stone-Cannaday..... HR Coordinator

Call to Order

Chairwoman Newbille called the regularly scheduled October 11, 2018, RRPDC Executive Committee meeting to order at approximately 8:25 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room.

Quorum

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

1. Minutes for the September 13, 2018 Meeting

Chairwoman Newbille said the minutes are included in the agenda packet under Tab 1. She said if there are no corrections, she'd ask for a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Nordvig so moved and the motion was seconded by Dr. Spagna. There was no additional discussion and the motion to approve the September 13, 2018 Executive Committee meeting minutes as presented carried unanimously.

2. Chair's Report

a. Resolutions of Appreciation

Chairwoman Newbille said the resolution is included in the full RRPDC Board agenda packet under Tab 3. She said she'd like a motion to forward the resolution to members of the full Board during this morning's meeting for consideration and action. Mr. Nordvig so moved and the motion was seconded by Ms. Lascolette. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

b. FY 2019 Committee Membership and Status

Chairwoman Newbille asked Ms. Shickle to lead the discussion on this item. Chairwoman Newbille noted a handout was provided to members at their seat.

Ms. Shickle reminded members that during the September meeting, members approved the formation of three new Standing Committees. She said in cooperation with Chairwoman Newbille, she has a listing of proposed members for each of the committees.

Ms. Shickle said she has included members who have volunteered to serve on a specific committee and then tried to use some logic to determine how the remainder of the members should be appointed. As an example, she is suggesting that all Citizen representatives be asked to serve on the Public Outreach and Engagement Committee; Planning Commission representatives on the Operations Committee; and those members with a certain professional background, such as Mr. Holland with his financial background, to serve on the Finance/Audit/Facilities Committee. Ms. Shickle said she has also tried to provide a good geographic distribution of members among the committees.

Ms. Shickle said two members have volunteered to serve as chairs – Dr. Spagna on Finance and Mr. Nordvig on Public Outreach. Ms. Shickle said she'd like to ask Mr. Nelson to serve as chair of the Operations Committee. This will meet Chairwoman Newbille's request that a member of the Executive Committee chair each of the new Standing Committees. Ms. Shickle said also included in the packet are draft charters for each of the committees.

Ms. Shickle said with consensus from the Executive Committee, she will begin working with each of the chairs to contact proposed members to see if they will be willing to serve as indicated. She said members will be offered a chance to serve on a different committee if they so desire. She said staff has reached out to members twice to ask for volunteers.

Chairwoman Newbille asked if members had any comments or questions on what was being proposed.

Ms. Lascolette noted that on the Operations Committee, elected officials do not make up the majority of the membership as compared to non-elected members. She said she feels that the ratio should be two-thirds elected versus one-third non-elected. Ms. Shickle said staff will revisit the membership listings to ensure there is that preferred ratio.

Ms. Shickle said the Finance/Audit/Facilities Committee has scheduled a meeting for Thursday, October 25 to allow time for a review of the FY18 Audit Report prior to the November meetings. Members will also provide feedback to allow for development of the FY20 budget.

It is anticipated that the Operations Committee will not be mobilized until after the first of the year.

The Public Outreach and Engagement Committee met on Thursday, October 4. She said she'd like to provide an update on that committee's meeting along with a quick review of the slides that have been provided to members at their seats. She said emphasis is being placed on what problems need to be addressed as well as a way to address them.

The first slide shows a current brand identity that is disconnected and inconsistent. There are several visuals used by the agency for different projects. She noted that even letterhead and agenda formats are inconsistent. Social media representation as well as business cards show an inconsistency in how the agency is represented. This makes it difficult for stakeholders and the public to recognize the RRPDC and its work.

Ms. Shickle said text on the current website was also reviewed to show ease of reading. She said content on the agency's website has been analyzed and is shown to be at a college graduate level. Ms. Shickle said better accessibility in representing the agency is key.

Ms. Shickle provided an overview of the score card for RRPDC's current brand identity, noting the following:

- inconsistency in how the agency is represented
- general public and key stakeholders don't know RRPDC
- acronyms are inaccessible
- long names are difficult to say and hard to fit into small spaces
- agency exudes a bureaucratic look – honest but not accessible
- media appears to celebrate the entity but not the collaboration or outcomes of localities working together
- current website performs poorly in accessibility scores

Staff has tried to provide guidance to West Cary Group (WCG) with regard to these issues as they work to help address them.

Mr. Nordvig added that the current website focuses on the RRPDC as an organization and not about the work being moved forward. He said the agency needs to focus more on what is being done and not on what or who the agency is as the work is more important.

Ms. Shickle said during the discovery process with WCG and the strategic planning process, those points were brought to the forefront.

The theme heard in all previous discussions with members centers around public engagement and the emphasis on how approachable the agency is to the public. These are the issues that are trying to be resolved.

WCG was engaged to assist with defining and solving for a new identity and how this is communicated to the public, stakeholders, and owners (localities). Ms. Shickle reviewed each of the key points discussed with WCG and feedback received from members.

Ms. Shickle said WCG has shown the need for the following:

- brand identity/logo – why it matters
- icon/seal – what the agency stands for
- legal entity name – who the agency is

During the September meeting, members discussed brand and logo using the Nike example. Ms. Shickle said she asked WCG to take a look at the elements of that brand identity, including key elements such as color, font, icons, legal name vs. trading name, and taglines/slogans.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she'd like to caution members with regard to the legal name. She said the way websites and media are going, there is focus on short names or logos. She said it's important to limit the use of brands or taglines and to make sure the legal name is prominent to identify the agency.

Mr. Nordvig said when the Public Outreach Committee met, a lot of the discussion was about the issue Ms. Kelly-Wiecek just brought up and it was discussed with legal counsel.

Ms. Shickle provided information on feedback shared with WCG. She said the focus should be on how the localities come together to work together. She shared specific information on the following:

- use of RVA
- use of *plan* versus *planning*
- use of *region* versus *regional*
- full name: Plan RVA – The Regional Commission; how to meet legal name requirements
- logo/iconography

Ms. Shickle said she wanted to present a final recommendation with examples of different uses.

Mr. Taylor added that color coding will be used to denote other programs within RRPDC, such as with the Capital Region Collaborative and Natural Resources.

Ms. Shickle also provided examples of how letterhead and other reports can be updated using the Plan RVA logo.

Ms. Shickle said staff is looking for guidance on the next steps. With regard to a name change, a review will be made of the Charter which will offer an opportunity to consider a legal name change.

Chairwoman Newbille asked if there was a recommendation for staff based on the outline provided on page 22.

Mr. Nordvig said color changes will be better defined. Ms. Werry said the intention is for the colors to match those used in the Collaborative priority areas.

Chairwoman Newbille thanked WCG for their work to incorporate feedback into what is being proposed today. She asked if the Executive Committee is ready to forward this recommendation on the full Board.

Mr. Nordvig clarified that it is the name, logo, etc., that will be moved forward to the full Board. He said extensive discussion was held during the Public Outreach Committee meeting on legal requirements for PDC naming.

Chairwoman Newbille pointed out that time is short before the full Board meeting needs to convene.

Mr. Gregory said he submitted a more detailed explanation to Chairwoman Newbille and Mr. Nordvig regarding naming limitations as outlined in Virginia Code. He said the Code states the name must include Planning District Commission, or there can be a substitution of either Regional Commission or Regional Council. He said there's broad understanding when looking at names of other PDCs around the state. He said the majority uses one of the three names provided in the Code. Mr. Gregory said he's spoken with some of the other PDCs and the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) regarding the name. He said the state's attorney general on record recognizes the Code stipulates which names can be used. When a statute uses specific language such as this, it is excluding other options. Mr. Gregory said he wants to help RRPDC as much as he can, but he needs to advise that based on the Code, he's not sure the proposed name is fully compliant with the Code. He said he's not sure if the name change will expose the agency to any liability via a complaint that the Code is not being followed.

Chairwoman Newbille said a review of the Charter is being undertaken as the agency's 50th anniversary approaches, and a legal name change can be part of that review. Mr. Gregory said he's not sure if the Charter has any bearing on whether or not the name will be compliant with the Code. He said RVA is not really a word.

Ms. Shickle said one of the PDCs uses the first few letters of each member locality as its name. This is the official Charter name.

Chairwoman Newbille said members can move forward with direction to WCG, with the understanding of the concerns that have been laid out. Mr. Gregory said that decision will need to be made by the full Board; he said he's issued his opinion.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked for the Code section in question. Mr. Gregory said it's Section 15.2-4203 and reads as follows:

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."

Mr. Nordvig said Plan RVA should be looked at in the same way as Nike's *Just Do It* tagline. It's not Nike's official name.

Ms. Shickle said if this is the direction the Board would like to go, one option is to employ Plan RVA as the logo. Mr. Gregory has indicated he believes this is inconsistent with the Code. The other option is to move forward with an actual name change in the Charter – Plan RVA The Regional Commission.

Ms. Lascolette said this can't be done.

Mr. Gregory said Plan RVA The Regional Commission can be used as a sort of motto. It's a representation of what the agency does, like a brand identity. Richmond Regional Planning District Commission can be included, as the agency's legal name, on any document using Plan RVA.

Mr. Nelson said this conversation is going to be held at the full Board meeting in a few minutes. He said he'd like to defer additional discussion to that meeting.

Mr. Gregory noted he has a conflict and will need to leave at 9:30 this morning. Chairwoman Newbille said this item can be moved up on the agenda.

Chairwoman Newbille thanked members of the Public Outreach and Engagement Committee for their work on this issue.

3. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Shickle said in the interest of time, she'd like to call members' attention to Item 3.b. and noted she did not believe there will be time to discuss this item today. She'd like to bring this item back at the next meeting.

Ms. Shickle said Item 3.a. is an action item that needs to be moved forward to the full Board meeting, and she'd like to have members take that action. She said background information is in the full Board agenda packet under Tab 4. The opportunity was brought to her attention by the Friends of the Lower Appomattox River (FOLAR), to partner with them in the creation of a new position that will be completely focused in a project manager role to work on the Appomattox River Trail Development project.

The position is an opportunity to support a regional priority of developing a trail project in the southern portion of the region. Ms. Shickle said this will build staff capacity and offer a funding source for the project. She said over time, it can be determined whether the position can be funded through other sources. In the near term, the proposal is for FOLAR to provide funding for 100

percent of salary and benefits in addition to any technology costs related to the position. Ms. Shickle said the funding will be through June 30, 2019.

Ms. Lascolette asked what will happen to the position when the funding stops. Ms. Shickle said as with all positions in the agency, it will be subject to the availability of funding. Because of the relationship that will be created, the position will be recruited specifically for FOLAR. If there are no longer resources to support the position, it will not continue.

Chairwoman Newbille added that this is a grant-funded initiative and staff will seek to have continued funding. This is offering an opportunity for further cooperation.

Ms. Lascolette asked for the name of the project. Ms. Shickle said it will be through the Friends of the Lower Appomattox River. The group focuses on advocacy and projects to support river life and health. Ms. Lascolette asked for the location associated with the group. Ms. Shickle said the project is based in Colonial Heights and extends into Hopewell and Chesterfield County. The request was brought forward by Chesterfield County. Ms. Lascolette confirmed that only Chesterfield is located with the RRPDC region. Ms. Shickle said that was correct. The position will work on a project that does extend outside of the Richmond Region.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she's curious as to why Crater PDC isn't asking to house this staff position. Ms. Shickle said this position aligns with the Regional Rivers Plan through the Collaborative and allows the opportunity to work with details surrounding a north-south route for trail connectivity between Ashland and Petersburg. RRPDC has a better capacity to house the position. RRPDC has also been in close coordination with Crater PDC regarding the position. They have also requested that RRPDC host the position.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek asked if capacity meant physical office space. Ms. Shickle said RRPDC is a participant in the Virginia Retirement Service (VRS) while Crater PDC is not; RRPDC also has more flexibility in its health care benefits options.

Chairwoman Newbille asked if there was a motion to move forward with the recommendation to create and house the FOLAR project manager position as outlined. Dr. Spagna so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek and Mr. Nordvig abstained from the vote saying they need more information on the position; Ms. Lascolette voted no on the motion. The motion carried with affirmative votes by Chairwoman Newbille, Dr. Spagna, and Mr. Nelson.

Chairwoman Newbille said she wants to continue this conversation as she feels it's an important position and she wants to ensure that members have all of the information they need to move forward with the position.

4. Other Business

No other business was brought forward due to time constraints.

5. Adjourn

As there was no additional business to bring before the Executive Committee, on motion duly made and seconded, Chairwoman Newbille adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:15 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Cynthia Newbille
Chair