

RRPDC CHARTER AGREEMENT
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED SIGNIFICANT CHANGES
MAY 4, 2020

- **Art. I, § 2.** This provision currently requires the RRPDC’s office to be located in the city of Richmond. The RRPDC’s current office is located at 9211 Forest Hill Avenue, Suite 200. The proposed change would allow the RRPDC to relocate its office outside of the city so long as it is “centrally located within the Region.” The term “Region” is not defined but presumably means the land area covered by the RRPDC’s member jurisdictions. The argument in favor of this change is that the RRPDC may save funds on rent once its lease expires in 2021 if it can locate outside of the city. This change appears to be an important motivation for the RRPDC in amending the Charter Agreement. Currently, there appears to be no opposition to this change.
- **Art. II, § 2.** This provision currently sets the City’s membership at four governing body members, one planning commission member, and one citizen member. The City’s current governing body members are President Newbille and Councilwomen Gray, Larson, and Lynch, and the City’s current planning commission member is Planning Commission Chairman Rodney Poole. The proposed change allows a governing body to authorize one of its governing body members to vote on behalf of more than one voting seat. The objective of this change is to make it easier for the RRPDC to obtain a quorum. Currently, there appears to be no opposition to this change.
- **Art. II, § 5.** This provision currently authorizes a governing body to appoint an alternate member “who may serve in lieu of one of the elected officials of that governing body.” The current language is consistent with Va. Code § 15.2-4203(B)(4), which provides, “Should the charter agreement, as adopted, so provide, an alternate may serve in lieu of one of the elected officials of each of the governing bodies of the participating localities.” The proposed change would allow an alternate member for each of a locality’s governing body members and allow the alternate to be either another governing body member or a citizen of the member jurisdiction. It has been suggested that an employee of the member jurisdiction could also serve as an alternate. The proposed change seems contrary to Va. Code § 15.2-4203’s stipulation of only one alternate per locality and could result in a situation where fewer than a majority of the votes on the RRPDC, which Va. Code § 15.2-4206(2) empowers to issue debt, are exercised by elected officials in contravention of Va. Code § 15.2-4203(B)(4)’s provision that “[a]t least a majority of [the RRPDC’s] members shall be elected officials of the governing bodies of the localities within the district.” Currently, opposition appears strongest to this change.
- **Art. III, § 1.** This provision currently prescribes the terms of RRPDC members. Governing body members’ terms are “coincident with their elected terms of office.” Planning commission members’ terms are “coincident with their appointed terms of office.” Citizen members’ terms of office are three years. The proposed change would replace these prescribed terms with a statement that terms “shall be determined by the respective governing body.” Language providing that the term of an alternate member will be coincident with the “terms of office of their designated member of the governing body” would be retained. Currently, there appears to be no opposition to this change.
- **Art. IV, § 3.** This provision currently provides that the Chairman of the RRPDC “shall not be eligible to serve consecutive terms.” The proposed change would provide that the Chairman of the RRPDC “shall be eligible to serve no more than two consecutive terms.” Customarily, office of Chairman has been rotated among the members. The argument in favor of the proposed change is that allowing the Chairman to serve more than one consecutive term allows for continuity and prevents a member newly elected to his governing body and newly appointed to the RRPDC from suddenly rotating into the chairmanship without any prior engagement with the RRPDC. Currently, there is some opposition to this change.