

Working Group Update Report

May 17, 2019



As of May 17, 2019, the Richmond 300 Project Management team has hosted 7 working group meetings with a combined attendance of 227 individuals (excluding staff). Below is a brief report of the meetings.

Land Use Meeting #1 – Draft Future Land Use Categories

<i>Date:</i> March 20, 2019	Total Attendance: 47	<i>At-Large Members:</i> 21
<i>Time:</i> 4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i> 8	<i>General Public:</i> 2
<i>Location:</i> Main Library	<i>TT Members:</i> 8	<i>Staff:</i> 6

Discussion Topics

- Orientation and icebreaker
- Overview of the role of the Master Plan in shaping land use
- Review of the draft land use goal
- Review of the difference between land use and zoning
- Discussion on the general description of the future land use categories

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback *(22 forms received)*

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.55**
- Understanding of materials: **4.53**
- Small group discussion: **4.64**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **4.71**

Positive

- Flowed well, was enough info but no overwhelming
- Well planned
- Good meeting – well facilitated
- We got a lot done in a short amount of time. Also, good job explaining concepts (e.g. future land use vs. zoning)
- Glad agenda was kept on schedule
- This was great! Very organized – informative – everyone was super engaged and respectful.
- Great organization!
- An amazing engagement of ideas

Areas for Improvement

- Sometimes discussion got off track into very specific zoning details rather than big picture ideas
- Maybe more time for discussion – too short
- I was a little slow on the learning curve but no fault with the materials or explanation
- It was a lot to digest
- The future land use small group was a tougher discussion than the vision discussion

- A little heavy on presentations but that is to be expected for 1st meeting
- I'm unfamiliar with some urban planning terminology

Land Use Meeting #2 – Draft Future Land Use Map

<i>Date:</i>	April 17, 2019	Total Attendance:	41	<i>At-Large Members:</i>	19
<i>Time:</i>	4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i>	7	<i>General Public:</i>	3
<i>Location:</i>	Main Library	<i>TT Members:</i>	5	<i>Staff:</i>	5

Discussion Topics

- Update on the draft land use goal
- Discussion about the places in Richmond that they visited
- Overview of the “hub and connections” concepts that shaped the draft future land use map
- Review and discussion of the draft future land use categories table
- Round robin review of the draft future land map with six areas of the city at six different tables

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback (9 forms received)

Positive

- Info by staff at each table very helpful
- Liked the chance for dialogue and focus on different parts of the city
- Good discussion and able to provide feedback and suggestion
- Very good facilitation
- A lot of good ideas were expressed during the future land use map breakouts
- Awesome to get down and zoomed in on all the areas of the city with the 6 blown up maps

Areas for Improvement

- Not enough time at each map – maybe groups should have only looked at 3 maps?
- Small group exercise too short

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- Distribute the meeting #3 agenda and materials on May 9
- Reframe the July 24 meeting to be an all working group wrap and coordination meeting

Land Use Meeting #3 – Hubs Refinement

<i>Date:</i>	May 15, 2019	Total Attendance:	30	<i>At-Large Members:</i>	17
<i>Time:</i>	4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i>	3	<i>General Public:</i>	0
<i>Location:</i>	Main Library	<i>TT Members:</i>	3	<i>Staff:</i>	7

Discussion Topics

- Review of the hubs and discussion of refining and defining the hubs

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback (13 forms received)

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.17**
- Understanding of materials: **4.58**

- Small group discussion: **4.25**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **4.83**

Positive

- Enjoyed the hubs in a small format in depth.
- Staff always helps [in helping to explain the materials].
- Keep going.
- Good discussion.
- Thoughtful content.
- So great to have a table of really invested people that bring a lot of expertise to the task.
- Doodling is helpful, map is a nice visual.
- Liked small group conversation better [than the large group] - more productive.
- Great conversation and progress.
- Good meeting.
- Lots of conversation = good
- Small group discussions were good - good input, good flow

Areas for Improvement

- Hard to discuss in a large group.
- Just make South Side Plaza a larger hub. The potential is certainly there.
- I am sometimes confused by the difference between land use and zoning.
- A bit overwhelming.
- Need a graphic scale [on the maps].
- I think the conversation would have benefited from a better explanation of hubs and the implications/next steps.
- It may have been more beneficial to split the city into digestible parts.
- The more abstract the conversation is, the harder it is to understand. The land use categories were intuitive and made a lot of sense, the hubs less so.
- I'm not sure there was a chance to really make big changes to the sites/locations selected for hubs.
- Would like more directed focus on where the discussion needs to take the results - end goal.
-

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- PDR staff to internally define the hubs further by creating a table defining the status, primary users, access, differentiation, urban design and open space, and future land use of the hubs

June 5 Meeting Topics

- Continued discussion on refining and defining the hubs
- Discussion on key themes and strategies to include in the plan related to land use and urban design, historic preservation, and parks and open space

Transportation Meeting #1 – Draft Future Transportation Map

<i>Date:</i> April 23, 2019	Total Attendance: 33	<i>At-Large Members:</i> 15
<i>Time:</i> 4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i> 3	<i>General Public:</i> 5
<i>Location:</i> Studio Two Three	<i>TT Members:</i> 6	<i>Staff:</i> 4

Discussion Topics

- Orientation and icebreaker
- Overview of the role of the Master Plan
- Review of the difference between land use and zoning
- Review of the draft transportation goal
- Overview of the “hub and connections” concepts that shaped the draft future land use map
- Review and discussion of the draft future land use categories table
- Preliminary discussion on future transportation connections as it relates to the draft future land use map

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback (16 forms received)

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.56**
- Understanding of materials: **4.89**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **4.36**

Positive

- Good map and tables
- Educational – good mix of activity and presentation
- Great discussion. Lots of ideas bouncing around and eye-opening to hear about all the different plans in progress/development
- Big maps are sweet!
- Very good facilitator
- Good diversity at the table
- Maritza is a good organizer and leader

Areas for Improvement

- A lot of info to process
- Better location
- A little more background on how all the studies relate would be helpful
- Small group discussion got a little scattered; ensuring one person does not dominate would produce more diverse feedback
- Staff struggled to keep the small group on task (although our group had some big talkers) – may want to train facilitators more
- Too much crammed in – not enough time
- Maps are too busy and hard to review
- More time for conversation
- Could have focused more on the purpose/end goal of the group
- I assume there will be less presentation at future meeting
- Table top exercise was good but the mapping tried to do too much. Would have been helpful to talk more about policy goals before digging into mapping.

- Lack of racial diversity in the group
- Presenters need a microphone and list of topics to mention so as to not forget things later
- There were certain formal statements/proposals I wanted to make and didn't feel like I had a platform to present it since it was more of a casual conversation
- Map was hard with all the land use colors

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- Coordination meeting with the transportation co-leaders on May 14
- Distribute the meeting #2 agenda and materials on May 16
- Schedule PDR staff facilitation training
- Ask Advisory Council and Technical Team for help with outreach to expand diversity

May 21 Meeting Topics

- Update on the draft transportation goal
- Discussion about the places in Richmond that they visited
- Presentation on the population projections for Richmond
- Activity to develop the major policy themes/strategies the Master Plan should address related to transportation
- Review and discussion of the open space network map and the draft future transportation map

Housing Meeting #1 – Major Themes

<i>Date:</i>	April 24, 2019	Total Attendance:	30	<i>At-Large Members:</i>	19
<i>Time:</i>	4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i>	4	<i>General Public:</i>	1
<i>Location:</i>	Main Library	<i>TT Members:</i>	0	<i>Staff:</i>	6

Discussion Topics

- Orientation and icebreaker
- Overview of the role of the Master Plan
- Overview of the Market Value Analysis and population projections
- Review of the draft housing goal
- Activity to develop the major policy themes/strategies the Master Plan should address related to housing

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback *(19 forms received)*

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.33**
- Understanding of materials: **4.79**
- Small group discussion: **4.43**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **4.7**

Positive

- Lots to cover – 3 hours went by fast
- Great job! Well organized meaningful dialogue and ability to move discussion from problem-focused to solution-focused
- Very good prep and organization – just wish more folks attended!
- The exercises were very engaging

- I thought it went very well. I felt like there is a real meaning for this group
- Staff was very well prepared and did a good job of explaining the overall process and timeline
- Good discussion, wide array of subject matter experts, efficient
- Well organized - highly informative and productive
- Well planned and well-paced
- Felt productive, didn't lag - thought the post-it exercise was a good way to get varied input!
- I'm kind of optimistic. I was kind of dreading this meeting because things are getting contentious in local politics. Everyone in my group was respectful and tolerant of differing viewpoints. I am happy that it was not as heated as I expected

Areas for Improvement

- Some of the input sessions seemed rushed
- Too much intro
- More work time
- Definitely need to address racial disparities in plan
- Less presentation needed
- Perhaps a bit less presentation in the beginning of materials that were supposed to be homework
- There were a few terms that needed clarification - i.e. land bank
- Conversation drifted a little - probably ok but could be kept a little more on task
- Instructions not clear for activity. Prioritization and strategy grouping not clear
- Activity was not clearly explained. We were being rushed
- This is a serious process and should not be rushed. The last Master Plan took 7 years during a less challenging time. We may not have 7 years but that amount of effort should be used at least.
- There were times when very technical jargon was used - which can be intimidating for some people

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- Schedule coordination meeting with the co-leaders
- Distribute the meeting #2 agenda and materials on May 30

June 22 Meeting Topics

- Update on the draft housing goal
- Discussion about the places in Richmond that they visited
- Review and discussion of the draft concept map, the draft future land use map, the draft future transportation map, and the draft open space network map
- Review and discussion of the draft housing framework and expansion/editing of the strategies listed

Economic Development Meeting #1 – Major Themes

<i>Date:</i> April 25, 2019	Total Attendance: 36	<i>At-Large Members:</i> 22
<i>Time:</i> 4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i> 5	<i>General Public:</i> 1
<i>Location:</i> Dominion Payroll	<i>TT Members:</i> 2	<i>Staff:</i> 6

Discussion Topics

- Orientation and icebreaker
- Overview of the role of the Master Plan
- Primer on the field of economic development
- Overview of population projections
- Review of the draft economic development goal
- Activity to develop the major policy themes/strategies the Master Plan should address related to economic development

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback (7 forms received)

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.43**
- Understanding of materials: **4.86**
- Small group discussion: **4.54**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **5.00**

Positive

- Great engagement. I was worried I was coming in unprepared but the conversation was perfectly facilitated to allow time for learning/discussion
- Great job. Thank you for the great civic engagement experience
- Pleasantly surprised by facilitators ability to cover so many topics and stay on schedule! Well done!
- Good mix of people/perspectives. Constructive and inclusive dialogue. Efficient and effective facilitation
- Interesting dynamic from a creative perspective

Areas for Improvement

- Ensure everyone on is on task/same page before moving forward
- More details when discussing growth as compared to similarly-sized cities

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- Coordination meeting with the co-leaders on May 10
- Distribute the meeting #2 agenda and materials on May 16

May 23rd Meeting Topics

- Update on the draft economic development goal
- Discussion about the places in Richmond that they visited
- Review and discussion of the draft concept map, the draft future land use map, the draft future transportation map, and the draft open space network map
- Review and discussion of the draft economic development framework and expansion/editing of the strategies listed

Environment Meeting #1 – Major Themes

<i>Date:</i>	May 9, 2019	Total Attendance:	49	<i>At-Large Members:</i>	32
<i>Time:</i>	4-7 PM	<i>AC Members:</i>	5	<i>General Public:</i>	4
<i>Location:</i>	Main Library	<i>TT Members:</i>	3	<i>Staff:</i>	5

Discussion Topics

- Orientation and icebreaker
- Overview of the role of the Master Plan
- Primer on RVAgreen 2050
- Overview of population projections
- Review of the draft environment goal
- Activity to develop the major policy themes/strategies the Master Plan should address related to environment

Summary of Meeting Evaluation Feedback *(36 forms received)*

Average Scores (5 is great, 1 is not)

- Overall meeting rating: **4.57**
- Understanding of materials: **4.74**
- Small group discussion: **4.63**
- Mix of presentation and discussion: **4.84**

Positive

- Thank you for creating an opportunity for the public to influence the plan
- Enjoyed small groups. Felt productive. Exercises were well-constructed
- Good facilitator
- I think the activities had good timing. It seemed like a short meeting
- Great presentation and background overview. Very well-structured group activities
- Relatable facilitation at group discussion
- Well planned and run
- Well run meeting! Most importantly: you stayed on time, which is hard
- Great process + clear communication
- Loved that we got to edit the goal!
- Keep up the great work – this is exciting
- Really good mix between content presentation and interaction of participants
- Very clear [materials]. Thanks!
- All of the different components [of the meeting] made it move faster and more efficiently.
- I liked the collaborate nature of the major strategies game.
- Presenters were informative and engaging and the structure kept everyone focused and involved
- Great ideas being shared with group. My hope is to have more concrete ideas at the next meeting
- I really liked the 6 idea exercise
- Very interactive, I liked the different brainstorming/input activity – good mix of overview and working session
- Good information and collaboration
- Lots of smart and interested people who care about the future of Richmond

- Glad to be part of this process!
- Great facilitation
- Hope one more meeting is enough
- Loved my group!
- Interesting process and I'm interested to see the next iteration
- Well-run and punctual
- Thank you for the food
- Good structure, Will was super great with our table. Good mix of participation/presentation
- Definitely stage setting which is important, how can we push the envelope further?
- Presentations gave a good overview for such a detailed process
- Well organized and thorough. Thank you!
- The meeting was very well done!
- Lots of homework reading, but good information

Areas for Improvement

- I was a little worried with the "story" of Richmond 2037. I hope that this is reflective of future diversity, but not the economic system at that time.
- Just a bit more time for last activity would have been great
- The vision group felt rushed and it was difficult to provide consensus feedback in the time/structure
- I think we need help defining what "environment" means (i.e. just natural environment or also built environment, or healthy living environment)
- Some unfeasible policy discussed
- Some of the visions, goals and strategies are lofty and all over the place
- Work needs to be implemented and maintained
- A little confusion with what this [the small group discussions] accomplished
- Richmond MUST maintain what they have and building and FINISH projects with common sense
- I thought it was very good. Some instructions with sticky notes weren't super clear
- [Goals discussion] felt a little broad. Could have used stronger facilitation to get people to wrap it up.

Project Management Critical Next Steps

- Coordination meeting with the co-leaders on May 22
- Distribute the meeting #2 agenda and materials the week of May 27

June 6 Meeting Topics

- Update on the environment goal
- Discussion about the places in Richmond that they visited
- Review and discussion of the draft environment framework and expansion/editing of the strategies listed
- Review and discussion of the draft concept map, the draft future land use map, the draft future transportation map, and the draft open space network map

Working Group Participation

The following individuals have attended Working Group meetings, some have attended multiple meetings, but those individuals are only listed once:

Adam Lockett	Elaine Summerfield	Mariia Zimmerman
Adrienne Torres	Eldon Burton	Maritza Pechin
Aisha Bullard	Elyana Javaheri	Mark Olinger
Albert Dobbins	Emily Thomason	Martha Culpepper
Alexander Winston	Emily Francis	Mary Larson
Alice Tousignant	Evan Garrison	Mary Rafferty
Alicia Zatcoff	Fabrizio Fasulo	Mary-Stuart Torbeck
Amy Wentz	Glen Besa	Matthew Ebinger
Amy Hagerdon	Gray O'Dwyer	Mayda Colon
Andrea Almond	Gustavo Angeles	Meade Anderson
Andrea Quilici	Jakob Helmbolt	Meghan Gough
Andres Olarte	James Seagraves	Meredith Weiss
Andrew Moore	Jane Ferrara	Michael Todd
Andrew Payne	Janell Baker	Michel Zajur
Ann Pierce	Jason James	Nathan Hughes
Anne Darby	Jeff Eastman	Nathan Burrell
Anne Wright	Jennifer Mullen	Olivya Wilson
Anne Darby	Jer'Mykeal McCoy	Omari Al-Qadaffi
Barbara Jacocks	Jeremy Hoffman	Patrick Zampetti
Bernard Harkless	Jerry Peters	Paul McClellan
Bill Shanabruch	Jodi Dubyoski	Peter Thaler
Brian Palmer	Joe Brand	Phaedra Hise
Brian Mercer	Joe Brancoli	Phil Cunningham
Brooke Saba McDowell	Joh Gehlbach	Preston Lloyd
Bruce Gould	John Sydnor	Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
Bruce Tyler	John Bolecek	Rich Saunders
Bryan Laughlin	John Accordino	Robert Adams
Burt Pinnock	John Le	Sabrina Gross
Catherine Long	Jonathan Bibbs	Sandra Crawford
Channing Martin	Jonathan Brown	Sarah Shaughnessy
Charlene Pitchford	Jonathan Knopf	Sarah Weisiger
Charles Macfarlane	Josh Son	Sean Welsh
Chris Bast	Justin Doyle	Shanteny Jackson
Christopher Tabor	Kendra Norrell	Sheri Shannon
Chuck Davidson	Kim Chen	Stephanie Culbertson
Clare Novak	Kim Hines	Stephenie Harrington
Colin Halligan	LaJuan Neal	Steven Carter-Lovejoy
Cyane Crump	Latoya Gray	Ted Ukrop
Damian Pitts	Lee Williams	Tierra Henderson
Daniel Klein	Lee Householder	Tim Feehan
Darin Simmons Jr.	Leigh Kelley	Tracey Hardney Scott
Dave Johannas	Louise Lockett	Trieste Lockwood
David Lambert	Lucy Meade	Trip Pollard
Deborah Morton	Lynn Mcateer	Will Scribner
Diane Linderman	Marc Lipschultz	William Palmquist
Dironna Moore Clarke	Maria Carra Rose	Willie Hilliard