

**Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
Minutes of Meeting
November 8, 2001**

Members/Alternates Present

Rebecca M. Ringley (M), Vice Chairman County of New Kent
Angela L. LaCombe (M), Treasurer Town of Ashland
Richard W. Ayers (M) County of Powhatan
W. R. Britton, Jr. (A) County of Charles City
Joseph E. Brooks (M) City of Richmond
Malvern R. Butler (M) County of Goochland
Richard W. Glover (M) County of Henrico
Roy J. Harrison, Jr. (M) County of Powhatan
David A. Kaechele (M) County of Henrico
John L. McHale, III (M) County of Chesterfield
Floyd H. Miles, Sr. (M) County of Charles City
George K. Roarty (M) County of Chesterfield
Frank J. Thornton (M) County of Henrico

Members Absent

Patricia S. O'Bannon (M), Chairman County of Henrico
John E. Gordon (M), Secretary County of Hanover
Gregory R. Baka (M) County of Henrico
Edward B. Barber (M) County of Chesterfield
Mark S. Daniel (M) County of New Kent
John G. Dankos, Jr. (M) County of Hanover
James B. Donati (M) County of Henrico
Russell J. Gulley (M) County of Chesterfield
Gwen C. Hedgepeth (M) City of Richmond
Renny B. Humphrey (M) County of Chesterfield
William Russell Jones, III (M) City of Richmond
Joseph T. Lacy, Jr. (M) County of Goochland
Charles D. McGhee (M) County of Hanover
Delores L. McQuinn (M) City of Richmond
Kelly E. Miller (M) County of Chesterfield
Joseph D. O'Connor (M) County of Hanover
Allen J. Taylor (M) County of Henrico
Arthur S. Warren (M) County of Chesterfield

Others Present

John R. Amos..... RRPDC Legal Counsel
Michael Aukamp.....Dunham & Aukamp, PLC
Michael Clower.....Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department
Kathy MessickRetail Institute/Goodwill Industries
Sharon TaylorRetail Institute/Goodwill Industries
Blake Callis ChapmanRetail Institute/Goodwill Industries

Staff Present

Paul E. Fisher Executive Director
Katherine E. BarrettExecutive Secretary
Jo A. EvansAssistant Executive Director
Daniel N. Lysy Director of Transportation
Jackie S. StewartDirector of Planning and Information Systems
Peter M. Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator
Patricia A. Villa Communications Coordinator
Chester A. ParsonsSenior Planner

Call to Order

Mr. Fisher certified that a majority of the members were not present to constitute a quorum. Mr. John Amos, RRPDC Legal Counsel, stated that the Executive Committee could take action on all items except Item III.A.- Bylaws Amendment and Item III.B. – FY 01 Audit. Due to the lack of a quorum of the full Commission (12 members present), Vice Chairman Rebecca Ringley reconvened the meeting of the Executive Committee (a quorum of six members present) at 1:15 p.m. on November 8, 2001.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of Minutes of October 11, 2001 RRPDC Meeting

There being no corrections or additions, on motion of Mr. McHale, seconded by Mr. Harrison, the Minutes of the October 11, 2001 meeting were approved.

B. Open Public Comment Period

There were no requests to address the Executive Committee at this time and Vice Chairman Ringley closed the public comment period.

C. Approval of September 2001 Financial Report

Ms. LaCombe presented the financial report for September 2001. There being no corrections, on motion of Mr. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Miles, the financial report for September 2001 was accepted for audit.

D. Vice Chairman's Report

Vice Chairman Ringley congratulated Mr. Floyd Miles on his election to the Virginia House of Delegates.

E. Executive Director's Report for October 2001

In addition to the work task report included in the agenda, Mr. Fisher reported on the following activities during October:

1. The Executive Director attended the Virginia Municipal League Annual Conference. Two sessions of note will contribute to or impact the work of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC). First was a session on "Domestic Terrorism: Preparing and Responding." This will be useful as we define the role of the RRPDC in this issue. In this regard, Mr. Fisher noted that he sent a memorandum about one month ago to the nine Chief Administrative Officials asking if they thought it was appropriate for the Planning District Commission to convene a discussion group to talk about regional disaster response planning in the area. On November 2, 2001, the RRPDC staff hosted a meeting with representatives designated by each locality's chief administrative official. The participants recommended that the RRPDC form a Regional Disaster Planning Technical Advisory Committee. The initial activity of the committee will be to hold a half-day workshop to establish a work plan that would assure meaningful results.

Secondly, a meeting was held by the Virginia Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), at which time their staff presented "Findings" and "Recommendations" stemming from the "SJR 218 Study of the Condition and Future of Virginia's Cities." The ACIR will further review these draft "Findings" and "Recommendations" at their meeting on November 11, 2001, at the Virginia Association of Counties Annual Meeting. A number of the "Findings" and "Recommendations," if pursued through legislation or administrative actions, could have a significant impact on Planning District Commissions. RRPDC Commissioner Rebecca Ringley (New Kent) serves as a member of the ACIR. Staff will continue to monitor this activity.

2. It was also learned at the VML meeting that the state will be contracting for aerial photography of the entire state to assist local and regional Geographic Information Systems development. This information has been forwarded to RRPDC local governments.
3. Staff also attended the “New Millennium Regional Summit,” hosted on October 19, by the City of Richmond, Chesterfield County, Hanover County and Henrico County. A large number of elected officials and the Chief Administrative Official (CAO) from each jurisdiction participated and heard progress reports on several issues including tourism, law enforcement, airport improvements, taxi service and others. During discussions, several elected officials and CAOs stated that for many issues of regional importance, the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) should be utilized to make sure that all nine local governments in the region were involved and represented. Specifically mentioned was the need for the RRPDC to initiate development of a new Regional Strategic Plan as required by the Regional Cooperation Act. Development and/or support of legislative initiatives of region-wide significance was mentioned. Also from the discussion it appears the RRPDC could play a stronger role in the Federal legislative process. The RRPDC will continue its role in supporting all nine jurisdictions’ individual legislative agendas, as well as a regional agenda. The RRPDC will also play more of a role in working with the congressional delegation in Washington, DC.
4. Also in October, the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce convened a group to discuss their vision for the need to develop a regional “Quality Growth Initiative.” The RRPDC Chairman and Executive Director presented to that group a brief summary of RRPDC Regional Planning initiatives anticipated in the coming year. These included:
 - ? 02 Work Program Element – Regional Growth Assessment.
 - ? Regional Strategic Plan Initiative based in part on consensus from “New Millennium Regional Summit,” and discussions with CAOs.
 - ? New Regional Strategic Economic Development Plan necessary for Regional Competitiveness Act Recertification.
 - ? Possible involvement in a Regional Disaster Response Plan.

Based on these pending activities, it was agreed that the RRPDC Executive Director, John Cogbill, Chairman of the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce Quality Growth Task Force, and Jim Dunn would meet and further discuss the Chamber’s concept in relation to the responsibilities of the Richmond Regional Planning

District Commission. It is anticipated that the initiatives of both entities can be mutually supportive.

5. Planning for a "Regional Planning Commissioner's Forum" continues in anticipation of holding the nine jurisdiction forum in late winter of 2002. This Forum will allow the Planning Commissioners from all RRPDC jurisdictions to meet collectively, share experiences, and benefit from each other's knowledge. Mr. Mark Strickler, City of Richmond Planning Director and Mr. Fisher have been given the authority to handle the logistics for the forum.

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Workforce One Reimbursement Request FY 01 Regional Competitiveness Program

Mr. Fisher stated that Workforce One has requested reimbursement for \$19,552.00 in expenditures made during September for work under the FY 01 contract. This request is the third of six monthly request that are anticipated to be received from Workforce One through January 2002 for a total of \$320,000.

On motion of Mr. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Butler, the Executive Committee unanimously approved the Workforce One reimbursement of \$19,552.00.

B. The Retail Institute Reimbursement Request for FY 02 Regional Competitiveness Program Funds

Vice Chairman Ringley stated that The Retail Institute has requested reimbursement for \$22,786.50 in expenditures made during the first quarter of FY 02. This request is the first of four quarterly requests that are anticipated to be received from The Retail Institute under the FY 02 contract. Regional Competitiveness program funds allocated to The Retail Institute for FY 02 total \$137,711.28.

Vice Chairman Ringley introduced the three representatives present from the Retail Institute. Ms. Blake Chapman, The Retail Institute Program Manager, presented a brief status report covering the period July 1, 2001 through September 30, 2001.

Ms. Chapman reported that The Retail Institute is a free retail skills raining program that is available to anyone over the age of 16 who is interested in a career in retail. There are two goals of the program; to expand awareness of retail, and to foster the buying set of retail as a career

and not just as a job. The program began on September 5, 2000 and will continue through the end of next year. At that time, it is anticipated that the program should be self-sustaining.

The classroom portion of the retail skills training is one week long all day for five days. Students participate in self-study, group study, employability, and life management skills. At the conclusion of the week, students begin a 60-hour internship in the retail field in Richmond. The internship is generally performed at one of Goodwill's seven locations or at an employer outside of Goodwill. After all of the specific aspects of the training are completed, the trainee receives certification from the National Retail Federation (NRF), which is the largest retail organization in the world. The Retail Institute staff members find job openings for the students and match the students' interests and abilities to those openings and places them in careers in retail.

Some of the most recent things that have been done to better the program include employing additional screening techniques such as the read interest inventory, measuring peoples' service ability, their integrity, etc. In addition, distance learning is being explored with the NRF. It's anticipated that the Retail Institute will be able to forge a partnership with the NRF. The Retail Institute is in the process of hiring an individual who will travel to all the localities to find locations to hold seminars and training.

Ms. Chapman asked if there were any questions. Mr. Brooks asked how many people had received training and been placed in jobs. Ms. Chapman said that last year 15 individuals had been placed and this year, through August, there were over 50 individuals trained and placed in jobs. As far as retention, which is measured in terms of 30, 60, 90 days, ninety percent of the students remain at their job for at least 90 days. After 90 days, retention rates drop to about 50%. Ms. Chapman continued to say that there were numerous success stories from the graduates and their employers. After three months, many of the graduates of the program were promoted on their jobs. Ms. Chapman mentioned that The Retail Institute has a very good relationship with J. C. Penney.

On motion of Mr. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Butler, the Executive Committee unanimously approved The Retail Institute reimbursement of \$22,786.50.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Butler left the meeting; therefore, the required number of Executive Committee members required to act on an issue was not present.

A. First Reading of RRPDC Bylaws Amendment

Due to the lack of a voting quorum, action on the Bylaws amendment item was deferred until the December meeting.

B. Presentation and Acceptance of RRPDC FY 2001 Audit

Due to the lack of a voting quorum, action on the Audit report was deferred until the December meeting.

C. Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department Update

Mr. Michael Clower, Executive Director of the Chesapeake Bay Local Assistance Department (CBLAD), presented an update on the activities of the Department. Mr. Clower discussed the results of the local government Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement survey.

Mr. Clower stated that he had not addressed the Commission in about eight years, but was glad to be asked back and pleased to present the latest on his agency to the PDC. He stated that the PDC would be the first to hear about the local government Chesapeake Bay 2000 Survey because it has not been released to the public. As of the previous evening, the Secretary of the Commonwealth had not seen the report.

Mr. Clower stated that unlike sister agencies such as the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), the CBLAD had not grown. The DCR experienced 147 percent growth, while the CBLAD held flat even. However, both agencies' budgets were cut by 13 percent. Of the \$1.3 million that CBLAD had at one point, only \$500,000 is available now. Mr. Clower stated that the CBLAD disburses 100 percent of the money allocated to the local governments by the Virginia General Assembly. The major issue with the CBLAD is regulations. Mr. Clower stated that after five years of preparation, the CBLAD regulations were published and 400 public comments were received. The comments that were received showed overwhelmingly that the CBLAD regulations were largely misinterpreted. The regulations were then revised, published, and presented for public comment. The CBLAD hosted a number of workshop to get additional input. The comments that were received indicated that the CBLAD did a good job with the revisions. The last workshop was October 31, 2001 and was well received. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation had a few comments. Mr. Clower stated that even the Virginia Homebuilders Association was pleased with their revised regulations. Mr. Clower believes there remains one problem with the regulations. There is a potential for interpreting the regulations different than their original intent. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation does not want

CBLAD to give amnesty to those landowners who purchased property under the inappropriate interpretations.

All of the localities will receive a letter of explanation and copies of the CBLAD regulations as soon as they are adopted. The individual localities will be made aware of areas that may need to be modified within their local zoning and subdivision ordinances due to the changes in the CBLAD regulations. In particular, the language in the regulations that was unclear concerning the 50 foot buffer has been changed. Mr. Clower expects the change to the 100 foot buffer to be immediate.

Mr. Clower then proceeded to comment on the Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement which is signed by all the Governors of the states that contain part of the Chesapeake Bay. One particular issue for local government was watershed and land use activities. A total of 35 of the 89 new commitments relate to local government. This means that 35 did relate to local government. Mr. Clower cautioned the members of the Commission to pay close attention to General Assembly actions because he does not see any actions by the state or federal government to help fund these new local government obligations.

One hundred and ninety three surveys containing five questions were sent to local governments in July. The questions were their involvement in each of the commitments in the C2K Agreement. Localities could respond in three different ways: 1) actively in place, 2) planned or expected to be done, or 3) not in place at all. There were 104 responses from the 54 percent of the surveys that were returned. The majority of local governments answering the surveys already have programs in place to encourage the concentration of new development in areas supported by adequate water resources and infrastructure. The majority of Virginia's localities already have improved coordination of transportation and land use planning to encourage compact mixed use development patterns and revitalization. The majority of localities that responded already have programs and policies to ensure that local government's priorities are operated in a manner consistent with Bay objectives to include the use of clean fuels, storm water management and sensitive seismic measures. The majority of Virginia's localities have programs containing nutrient sediment reduction measures, a majority has engagement in watershed management activities, and a majority has incorporated watershed preservation goals and policies through their existing planning documents.

Mr. Clower noted that localities already have many commitments in place, such as: 1) outreach to the development community on sound land use practices, 2) programs to promote designs that limit impervious cover or reduce the impacts of impervious cover, 3) use of GIS, 4) programs to promote alternative modes of transportation, 5) programs to stimulate

volunteer involvement in resource restoration and conservation, and 6) programs designed to increase awareness of the Bay and Bay restoration efforts. Virginia, as a whole, reports favorably on many of these areas.

Mr. Clower noted that five areas Virginia needs improvement include: 1) GIS to track land conservation and preservation efforts; 2) programs that implement the watershed's Tributary Strategies; 3) programs to expand the use of easements, purchase of development rights, or other approaches to protect and conserve natural resource lands; 4) development of greenway plans including conservation easements, and 5) use of emerging urban storm water retrofit practices. In addition, Mr. Clower commented that the Tidewater localities are the ones that most often respond positively on the vast majority of C2K agreements.

Mr. Clower responded to the item on GIS over the entire State that was mentioned earlier in the meeting. There is a bid out to apply to the entire state. The localities that have already invested in imagery would be recognized so efforts would not be duplicated. Localities would be given credit for work already done.

Following Mr. Clower's remarks, questions and comments ensued regarding GIS, how CBLAD fit into the Chesapeake Bay Act, increased regulations, Better Management Practices, etc.

Vice Chairman Ringley thanked Mr. Clower for his presentation.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Announcements

There were no announcements at this time.

B. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports at this time.

C. For Your Information

Mr. Fisher noted several informational items included in the agenda.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Vice Chairman Ringley adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Paul E. Fisher
Executive Director

Rebecca S. Ringley
Vice Chairman