

1.7.2026

Steering Commission Meeting Minutes

Commission Attendance

- Sam Davies
- Troi Hughes
- Boz Boschen
- Tiffany Gunn
- Abbey Delaney

Public Attendance

- Sam Jones
- Zoe Jenkins
- Titus Anderson
- Lauren Anderson
- Paige Swem
- Zoe Jenkins
- Odie Donald

Meeting called to order 5:45 pm

Attendees shared their connections to the Richmond People's Budget

Matthew went over the agenda for the meeting and mentioned that the RVAPB staff has officially moved into the office of the CAO

Zoe from the CAO office mentioned that she was shadowing to better understand the commission's function and see how they and the PB staff work together

Matthew showed the temporary PB project map and discussed that interdepartmental meetings are still happening - [Fund - Richmond People's Budget](#)

Tiffany asked/ requested before and after photos of the project sites

Matthew mentioned that Gilpin Court residents had requested that their project (a shade structure) possibly pivot to a Calhoun Center improvement given the mass renovations of Gilpin and Calhoun and desire to have Richmond steward funds

Abbey inquired if the district 5 traffic study was connected to the current Richmond Connects studies currently happening in the area

Matthew referenced that communicating implementation is just as critical as communicating during the engagement

Zoe mentioned how long typical capital projects take place (nationwide) – referencing that capital improvement plans are developed YEARS before ground breaks

Attendees discussed the inherent complications of capital projects

Boz mentioned the opportunity to educate the public on the process of capital improvement projects intertwined into the PB communications

Matthew mentioned an interest in helping participants submit ‘more fully developed’ ideas in the next cycle

2 public attendees mentioned that they found out about the event via Facebook posts

Matthew mentioned that bylaws draft need to be revisited and reviewed – and referenced that the steering commission meetings would become quasi work sessions

Sam mentioned the commission making recommendations to the city council regarding how the commission could be structured. Also mentioned that the group could discuss amongst themselves how their meetings could be structured (regarding roles).

Sam discussed that the commission’s current ordinance is not quite accurate to how the commission is made up (referencing that seats are filled by council districts – not exactly by ‘north of river and south of river residents’).

Matthew mentioned that the ordinance (that specifies the different types of members: ie, one public housing resident, non-voting members, etc.) was created in 2021 prior to his time at the city

Commission members asked if shifting the structure could be too restrictive and counterproductive (ie: 2 current members are from the same district)

Sam mentioned that the purpose of the bylaws can be a method to protect the integrity of the program

Boz mentioned that the stipends (to incentivize participation) are critical to making commission

Sam suggested that in the bylaws we make a recommendation that 2 commission seats should be filled by former budget delegates

Tiffany, as a former budget delegate, mentioned that there were difficulties having enough participation from 9th district community members during the project development phase

Matthew mentioned there are pending commission members (8 applications currently submitted)

Tiffany asked a point of clarification – are the term limits for consecutive or overall. They are currently for overall meaning members can serve, take a break then return.

Boz asked if we need a mission and value statement – and mentioned that it could be critical for recruitment.

Boz mentioned that Richmond City Democratic Committee also regularly meets at this time and that could create a conflict for community members that want to participate in both.

Commission members generally agreed that meetings should happen outside of traditional work hours.

Sam stated the bylaws will be the self-imposed rules so the group can essentially make them as loose or restrictive as they please – possibly shifting to a model where the meeting could be set with the option for moving for scheduling accommodations.

Sam asked if a fuller draft of bylaws could be developed and presented to the commission for their review and input.

Abbey suggesting commission members taking responsibility for sections for bylaws

Sam discussed empowering the chair (and possibly co-chair) and giving them more responsibility

Sam discussed the notion of the rotating chair model ‘weak chair’ versus the ‘strong chair’ model where they could assign more responsibility to their fellow commission members

Commission discussed the desire to avoid burnout (for themselves) – however they are still in favor of sharing power laterally

CAO asked what the root of the desire to rework the bylaws and/ or ordinance was

Commission and CAO discussed the value and importance of making sure the integrity of the original ordinance should be preserved. Specifically, the commission makeup structure (disabled community member, public housing resident, youth/ minor)

Commission members expressed a desire to keep the commission seats filled NOT to ignore the value of representing these groups

CAO mentioned that the purpose of moving the RVAPB program (not just staff) was to strengthen the commissions connection to the city. In terms of being on administration side making it feasible to be operational. Strengthening the connective tissue with relevant stakeholders.

CAO clarified that the ordinance was the 'enabling' legislation and the bylaws were the 'governing' rules.

Tiffany discussed the nuanced challenges of connecting with certain demographics (socially vulnerable, handicapped, low-income, etc.)

Tiffany – mentioned a desire for flexibility in bylaws without abandoning the integrity of the group's structure.

The group discussed the previous complications of filling commission seats and how these complications can be avoided going forward.

CAO discussed that it is the commission's responsibility is to accept the charge of steering a PB while the staff fulfills the how and makes sure everything is complying.

Matthew notified the group that the meeting time had ran over – but revisited the purpose of tonight's meeting was to discuss bylaws (and revisit the ordinance conversation).

CAO referenced the bylaws as the commissions' ability to be creative in their execution – and cautioned against revisiting the 'enabling' legislation (ordinance) without a true need for the program's functionality (again referencing that the program can run smoother on the admin side).

Abbey mentioned possibly putting a pin in the ordinance for now – and stating they would follow up regarding establishing bylaws.

Meeting adjourned 7:29 pm
