

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**March 10, 2011**

**Members/Alternates Present**

Chris W. Archer (M)..... County of Henrico  
Richard Ayers (M) .....County of Powhatan  
Willie L. Bennett (M) ..... County of Henrico  
Malvern R. “Rudy” Butler (M).....County of Goochland  
Douglas G. Conner (M) .....City of Richmond  
James D. Crews (M) .....County of Goochland  
James B. Donati (M), Chairman ..... County of Henrico  
Marleen K. Durfee (M).....County of Chesterfield  
Evan Fabricant (M).....County of Hanover  
Daniel A. Gecker (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Richard W. Glover (M)..... County of Henrico  
John E. Gordon, Jr. (M), Secretary .....County of Hanover  
Kathy C. Graziano (M) .....City of Richmond  
Russell J. Gulley (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Dorothy Jaeckle (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
E. Martin Jewell (M).....City of Richmond  
David A. Kaechele (M)..... County of Henrico  
Lynn McAteer (M).....City of Richmond  
Patricia S. O’Bannon (M) ..... County of Henrico  
C. Harold Padgett (M).....County of Hanover  
Faye O. Prichard (M), Treasurer.....Town of Ashland  
Charles R. Samuels (M).....City of Richmond  
Robert R. Setliff (M).....County of Hanover  
Randall R. Silber (A) ..... County of Henrico  
Frank J. Thornton (M)..... County of Henrico  
Stran L. Trout (M), Vice Chairman ..... County of New Kent  
Joseph B. Walton (M) .....County of Powhatan  
Arthur S. Warren (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Deborah B. Winans (A) .....County of Hanover

**Members Absent**

L. Ray Ashworth (M).....City of Richmond  
Robert R. Cosby (M).....County of Powhatan  
Timothy W. Cotman, Sr. (M)..... County of Charles City  
James M. Holland (M) .....County of Chesterfield  
Edward W. Pollard (M)..... County of New Kent  
Millard D. Stith (M).....County of Chesterfield

**Others Present**

John R. Amos..... RRPDC Legal Counsel  
John T. Benton .....Citizen, Chesterfield County  
George Homewood ..... County of New Kent  
Curt Nellis..... County of Chesterfield  
Myra Goodman Smith..... Leadership Metro Richmond

**Staff Present**

Robert A. Crum, Jr..... Executive Director  
Jo A. Evans ..... Assistant Executive Director  
Julie H. Fry..... Executive Secretary  
Sulabh Aryal ..... Associate Planner  
Anne Darby .....Senior Planner  
Tom Dunn .....Principal Planner  
Billy Gammel..... Associate Planner  
Chuck Gates ..... Communications Coordinator  
Barbara Jacocks .....Principal Planner  
Jin Lee..... Senior Planner  
Daniel N. Lysy .....Director, Transportation  
Kathy Robins .....Senior Planner  
Randy Selleck .....Principal Planner  
Jackie Stewart .....Director, Planning and Information Services  
Sarah Stewart .....Senior Planner  
Peter M. Sweetland ..... Finance and Contracts Administrator  
Lee Yolton .....Principal Planner

**Call to Order**

Chairman Donati called the regularly scheduled March 10, 2011 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 1:05 p.m. in the RRPDC board room. He then led members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

**A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum**

Mr. Crum certified that a quorum of members was present.

**B. Requests for Additions or Changes in Order of Business**

Chairman Donati asked if there were any additions or changes to be made to the agenda. Mr. Crum said he would recommend that under the Consent Agenda, Item II.F – Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Filing of an Application to the Virginia Coastal Management Program for a Water Quality Planning Project –

be stricken. Staff has been notified that this funding program will no longer be made available. There were no other changes and the agenda was accepted as amended.

### **C. Open Public Comment Period**

Chairman Donati asked if there was anyone from the public in attendance who wished to make a comment to members of the Commission. He reminded speakers that their time is limited to three minutes. As there were no requests from the public to address the Commission, the Chairman closed the public comment period.

### **D. Chairman's Report**

Chairman Donati reminded members to use low cost carriers whenever they fly from Richmond International Airport. He said the campaign to use low cost carriers is working very well and he encouraged members to promote the use of low cost carriers whenever they could. Southwest Airlines will be arriving soon.

Mr. Padgett reported that his Rotary Club asked the airlines to provide a door prize for a drawing to benefit Hanover Safe Place, and Air Tran donated tickets up to \$1,000 to fly anywhere in the United States.

### **E. Executive Director's Report**

Mr. Crum brought the members' attention to the monthly staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 1, and details work being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. He said staff will be happy to address any questions on what is included in the report.

Mr. Crum reported that the Capital Region Collaborative has launched a scientifically based telephone survey to receive input from the community on the draft priorities. About 2,000 residents around the Region will be contacted. If any constituents contact members about the telephone survey, please let them know this is a legitimate survey.

Mr. Crum said plans for the panel discussion with the college and university presidents has been finalized for June 16, 6:30 p.m., to be held at the Henrico Theatre. An advance notice will be sent to members next week. He said representatives from all seven colleges and universities will be in attendance. The program will last about 90 minutes and will be followed by an informal reception. The theme of the discussion will be to determine how the community and the educational institutions can work together on economic and community development opportunities.

Chairman Donati suggested that all school superintendants also be invited. Mr. Walton suggested that past college presidents who still live in the area also be invited. Mr. Crum said because of the RRPDC's involvement with Dr. Trani through Richmond's Future, he thought that would be appropriate.

## **II. CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Donati said the Executive Committee has recommended approval of the items on the Consent Agenda:

- A. Approval of Minutes – February 10, 2011 Meeting**
- B. Approval of the January 2011 Financial Report**
- C. Approval of a Resolution Adopting the 2011 Virginia Community Development Block Grant Priorities**
- D. Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Filing of a Rural Transportation Planning Assistance Grant Application**
- E. Approval of a Resolution Authorizing the Filing of a Coastal Zone Management Grant Application**
- F. Item stricken**

Chairman Donati asked if anyone wished to have any of these items pulled from the Consent Agenda for additional discussion.

As there were no requests for discussion, on motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Ms. Prichard, the Consent Agenda items were approved unanimously as presented.

## **III. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Legislative Update**

Chairman Donati asked Mr. Gates to provide this update.

Mr. Gates distributed a handout detailing his presentation on four items from the 2011 RRPDC Legislative Agenda.

The status on the first legislative action request – to add a third at-large member to the Commonwealth Transportation Board representing the Richmond Region – is incomplete. Mr. Gates reported there was no bill introduced for this item but there has been significant interest among members of the Capital Region Caucus. Staff will continue to educate legislators regarding this request and to find a patron to introduce a bill during the next General Assembly session. Mr. Gates said a couple of Capital Region Caucus legislators have requested additional information.

The second action request was the Development of Rail Transportation Funding. Mr. Gates said this was completed through HB 2525 and SB 1446, which included a capital investments fund (Rail Enhancement Fund) and an operations fund (Intercity Passenger Rail Fund). Mr. Gates said he would recommend that next year, the request be geared toward securing sufficient funding for these two programs to meet the needs of the Region. He said he will continue to talk with partners to discuss options for pursuing future legislation.

The third legislative request dealt with local aid agreements and has been completed with the passage of HB 2364, sponsored by Del. Chris Peace. As a result, Mr. Gates said he would recommend this action be removed from the 2012 agenda. Mr. Gates said he would like to thank Mr. Setliff for his efforts in bringing this item forward. All 15 delegates from the Capital Region Caucus signed on to support this bill, which was the first time such unanimous support had been achieved. Mr. Gates said this is a significant bill that will assist localities.

Mr. Gates said the fourth item is a state legislative priority on transportation. There were two statements on transportation listed on the 2011 Legislative Agenda. HB 2527 and SB 1446 both passed and included:

- authorizes \$1.2 billion in new financing (GARVEE bonds) for construction
- authorizes \$1.8 billion in acceleration of authorized financing (CPR bonds) for construction
- creates Virginia Transportation Infrastructure Bank (VRA to manage with CTB determining projects; \$250 million from VDOT – none from General Funds)
- creates Intercity Passenger Rail Fund
- expands revenue sharing for localities

Mr. Gates said these bills accomplished most of what was requested, with a concern that the Richmond Region would get its fair share of transportation project funding. He said staff will continue to work with VDOT and the CTB to ensure the Region is fairly represented in the projects that receive funding.

Mr. Gates said he will work to create a legislative summary to include all legislation that will impact the Region. He will work with the local legislative liaisons to develop the summary. Mr. Gates said he will also include ways to reach out to members of the Capital Region Caucus to thank them for their efforts this year.

Mr. Setliff said three years ago the RRPDC did not have a legislative agenda. He is impressed with the fact that for two years, not only did the RRPDC have legislative agendas, but they were agendas that everyone agreed on, and he thanked Mr. Gates for his work in getting the RRPDC to this point.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. Leadership Metro Richmond (LMR)**

Chairman Donati said he is sure everyone is familiar with LMR and many have probably taken a class through LMR. LMR is now the RRPDC's sub-tenant, occupying unused RRPDC office space. He said Myra Smith, LMR President and CEO, is going to provide a brief overview of the other activities LMR coordinates.

Ms. Smith thanked members for the invitation to speak before them today. She said she also appreciates being allowed to be a new neighbor. Her first job was with the Piedmont PDC in Farmville as the economic development and community development planner. She thanked members of the RRPDC for the work they do within the Region.

Ms. Smith invited members to stop by the LMR offices to visit. She said this sub-lease agreement has a mutual financial benefit for both LMR and RRPDC. LMR realized a cost savings by moving into the unused space.

A common theme between RRPDC and LMR is that both organizations believe in collaboration. LMR promotes collaboration and believes in improving the quality of life in the Region.

LMR was created 30 years ago by the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce to strengthen the leadership in the community. It was determined that the leaders within the community were not diverse and needed an opportunity to get to know one another in order to work better with one another to create solutions for the community.

The mission of LMR is to connect and educate a diverse group of community leaders, inspiring them to serve. LMR wants to give individuals an opportunity to see what is going on in their community in order to find their own passion. LMR wants to provide opportunities to be engaged in the community.

LMR believes in having informed leaders through education. Informed leaders make better decisions. LMR educates its class members on transportation, education, economic development, etc. It is the goal of LMR to increase the knowledge, awareness, and different perspectives about regional issues in the community.

Ms. Smith said LMR also works to inspire servant leadership – serving others. She noted that servant leadership is a strong foundation of LMR. LMR believes in productive conversations, dialogue versus debate, and in-depth listening to one another. It is important to think about what each individual can bring to the table as added value.

LMR encourages respect for different opinions and speaking for those who are not able to join in the conversation. LMR also encourages its members to be engaged in the community.

There are over 1800 LMR members. Members include a former governor, political leaders, and governmental and non-profit leaders, among others. The bridge to membership is Leadership Quest. This is the 10-month program that is held each year. This year the class is working on the Capital Region Collaborative's strawman draft priorities.

The current class (72 members) has divided into seven groups, each one representing one of the draft priorities. These groups have identified all organizations already working on the draft priorities. A data base will be created and made accessible to everyone. Class members are conducting interviews with many of these organizations to ask what each one brings to the table and what each one needs in order to move their efforts forward. The class is not only assisting the Collaborative but learning about the Region as well.

Ms. Smith said the goal is to keep class graduates engaged in the community once they've left the program. She asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Ayers asked how to get more information on LMR. Ms. Smith said to either stop by the office or to access the website: [www.lmronline.org](http://www.lmronline.org). She said she will be happy to talk with anyone about LMR at any time.

Mr. Kaechele asked if membership is divided equally around the Region. Ms. Smith said the four larger jurisdictions are represented heavily and LMR is doing outreach into the smaller jurisdictions. She noted that the membership does include individuals from each of the nine RRPDC localities.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if individuals who have applied in the past but been turned down should continue to apply. Ms. Smith said definitely. LMR always receives many more applicants than it has space for in the classes.

Mr. Thornton asked if there are any programs for class graduates. Ms. Smith said the Leadership Committee has just concluded a report that recommends creating programs LMR 101 and LMR 102.

Mr. Thornton asked if LMR had thought about going into high schools to recruit younger people for leadership programs. Ms. Smith said this has also been discussed in the Leadership Committee. She said the concern is not to duplicate any other youth leadership programs already available.

Mr. Crum said he would encourage members to visit the LMR office after today's meeting.

## **B. Generators for Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) Shelter Facilities**

Chairman Donati said this next item will be presented by Tom Dunn. Mr. Crum added that Mr. Dunn is the Principal Emergency Management Planner for the agency, working under the UASI program. Curt Nellis, Director of Chesterfield County Emergency Services, will also assist with the presentation. Mr. Crum noted this is the first of two action items that will be presented this afternoon to authorize RRPDC staff to act as project managers for two UASI projects – emergency shelter facilities and railroad mile post mapping.

Mr. Dunn said the first project deals with the installation of switches for mobile generators in identified facilities in some of the UASI localities. Action will be requested on Phase II of this project. Phase I involved a feasibility study to identify work needed on 60 buildings in the UASI region to install switches for mobile generators. The study identified the equipment needed and cost of the switch installation at each facility (60 were identified and included in the study).

Phase II is the actual installation process. A committee within UASI will select which facilities will have the switches installed in them. UASI would like for RRPDC to be the fiduciary agent for the project. This will involve the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) to hire a contractor to do the installation.

Mr. Nellis said the funds are already in place and no local match is required.

Mr. Butler asked how many of the 60 buildings will be selected. Mr. Nellis said based on the estimates received during Phase I, about 7-8 buildings will be selected.

Mr. Glover asked how much square footage could be supplied by one of the generators. Mr. Nellis said this would depend on what area of the building was designated by the local emergency manager as the actual shelter area. All of the buildings are publically owned buildings such as schools or libraries.

Mr. Kaechele asked if the generators would be mobile. Mr. Nellis said the generators would be brought in on trailers and used as needed. The generators would be rented and the fee absorbed as a disaster related cost.

Chairman Donati asked if an assessment had been made of how many generators might be available in the area. Mr. Nellis said during Phase I, he asked the contractor to find out the region's ability to provide those generators and the capacity of each generator. He said locations have been identified as far west as Detroit.

Mr. Glover asked how the generators would be powered. Mr. Nellis said all of the generators are diesel powered and will have a power supply on the trailer.

Mr. Gulley asked what criteria will be used in selecting the locations. Mr. Nellis said the Health and Human Services sub-committee of the UASI grant will be the ones to make the selection. Selections will be based on sites that will be impacted by an evacuation of the Tidewater area. He said most sites will be in the southern part of the UASI region and in the Richmond area as people exit I-64. Another committee will look at building capacity and accessibility from the major evacuation routes.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if a list of all sites will be made available to the localities to use should the localities decide to have the sites fitted for the switches. Mr. Nellis said each emergency manager in the localities has already received a copy of the initial assessment.

Mr. Jewell asked if the list of 60 buildings is readily available. Mr. Nellis said the contractor is finishing up the evaluations and the completed list should be ready for distribution very soon. Each local emergency manager already has a copy of initial assessment list. Most of the buildings are high schools and middle schools. Elementary schools are not used because the restroom facilities are not geared toward use by adults.

Mr. Archer asked if there is any kind of agreement with the generator vendors to guarantee availability. Mr. Nellis said memorandums of understanding will be executed with the vendors. He also said that there is not enough staff to activate all 60 shelters. The 7-8 new shelters will provide a lot of capacity. Many sites already have generators.

Chairman Donati asked if there were any other questions. There being none, on motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Thornton, the Commission unanimously approved staff's recommendation that the RRPDC become the fiduciary agent for the generator switch installation in emergency shelters and that staff is authorized to act as the project manager, allowing staff to develop the Request for Proposals with the intent of entering into a contract for services on behalf of the Central Virginia UASI program.

### **C. Railroad Mile Markers Inventory**

Chairman Donati asked Mr. Dunn to continue with the presentation of the second project request.

Mr. Dunn said the second project is a railroad mapping project. This will involve mapping the entire railroad within the UASI district, taking note of the railroad mile markers and using them as a guide for everything around them. This will include a 1-mile buffer on each side of the track. All critical infrastructure within the buffer will be identified, such as suppression water sources, access points for public safety personnel, staging and landing areas, etc. This inventory will also allow first responders to know what resources are available and how to reach the

incident. Should events be longer in duration, the inventory will also allow the Office of Emergency Coordination to know which areas may need to be evacuated.

All of the information will be entered into 911 computer aided dispatch (CAD) centers in the region to aid dispatchers in knowing which responding units to send to the event.

Mr. Nellis added that this is the first phase of a larger project that the UASI Planning sub-committee identified several years ago. He said if a train engineer calls 911, the dispatcher would have no idea where the train is located because there is no reference available to railroad mile markers in the current 911 systems. There are 580 miles of track in the UASI region. Emergency personnel need to know where crossings are located to reach an event more quickly and which resources will need to be deployed and from where.

Mr. Nellis said it is also important to know what is around each mile marker so that if there is a hazardous materials spill, responders will know if there are any areas that need evacuation. Mr. Nellis said a train derailment is not just a local incident but a regional incident. Responders will need to know how to get to where they are needed by mapping the problem. Data will be imported into each of the jurisdiction's 911 CAD centers. This will allow dispatchers to know which first responders should be called to the incident. Mr. Nellis said this is especially important in the rural areas so that first responders know the most efficient way to reach an incident.

Mr. Nellis said that the entry of Ft. Lee into the railroad business has compounded the situation. If high speed rail is introduced, that will also increase the need for first responders to know how to access emergencies.

The RRPDC is being asked to serve as the fiduciary agent to hire the contractor who will do the mapping. The mapping will go from the Virginia/North Carolina line up to Caroline County next to Stafford, which is the UASI grant area.

Mr. Glover asked why one mile on either side of the track was going to be inventoried. Mr. Nellis said there is a need to know what infrastructure is around the track. When there is a hazardous materials incident, the first 1000 feet around the spill is called a hot zone; past one half mile is an evacuation zone; past one mile is the exclusion zone where containment efforts would be in place.

Mr. Glover asked if the GIS information already on file would have the information needed. Mr. Nellis said the current GIS information is on household information – size and type. The mapping component to be added to the 911 centers will add information on first due company to respond instead of having to look it up on a map.

Mr. Glover said he thought using a cell phone would give the location. Mr. Nellis said the cell phone would give a location but it would not give the mile marker location.

Mr. Glover said the 1-mile buffer on each side would impact private property. Mr. Nellis said it would be important to know what is in that buffer. Mr. Glover said he did not believe government had the right to overlay information about, for example, Mr. Glover's home into the system. Mr. Nellis said it would be important to know what impact an incident would have on the infrastructure in that buffer zone, such as for evacuations.

Mr. Nellis said the mapping will allow emergency services to respond more quickly. Mr. Glover said there was no need to know what is in his yard. Mr. Walton said it was to identify the population at risk. Mr. Nellis said he was more interested in knowing what the impact would be on the infrastructure in the buffer zone and not what may be sitting in someone's backyard.

Mr. Glover asked what type of incident would require the need to know what was in the buffer zone. Mr. Nellis said there could be a hazardous materials derailment. Mr. Glover said he thought there was already a program in place to handle hazardous materials on a railroad. Mr. Nellis said there is a response capability but there is no plan in place on how to respond.

Mr. Glover said he thought there was a plan in place because there are hazmat teams in place to serve a 75-mile radius of Richmond. Mr. Nellis said that was correct. Mr. Glover said the hazmat team already knows what Mr. Nellis is trying to find out.

Mr. Kaechele asked how many miles of railroad would be mapped. Mr. Nellis said the contractor estimates about 580 miles. This will also include side rails such as the Buckingham Branch, rails that go to Newport News, and to the industrial areas in Hopewell – all within the UASI region.

Mr. Kaechele asked if UASI was part of FEMA or Homeland Security. Mr. Nellis said UASI is a federal Homeland Security grant awarded to the Central Virginia Urban Area Work Group, comprised of 20 jurisdictions. All of the RRPDC area is included.

Ms. O'Bannon asked about RRPDC liability. Mr. Crum said that he would stress that there will be no financial impact at all to the PDC. All time will be reimbursed through the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) program. Mr. Crum asked Mr. Amos if he would like to address the liability issues.

Mr. Amos, RRPDC legal counsel, said he is concerned about the drafting of the contract agreement since private rail companies will be involved, such as CSX. The contractor will be on private railroad property, and Mr. Amos wants to ensure

that there will be sufficient hold harmless or indemnity clauses in place. Should a contractor be injured while on this private property, Mr. Amos does not want the contractor to hold RRPDC responsible.

Mr. Crum said a contract will not be signed until it has been reviewed by Mr. Amos and the Commission.

Ms. O'Bannon said there was a major train accident a couple of years ago at the Huguenot Bridge. She said she is surprised that the railroads haven't already worked on this type of mapping. She asked if Mr. Nellis was certain the information he needed wasn't already available. Mr. Nellis said local emergency managers work with railroad companies all the time. He can assure everyone that the Urban Area groups and public safety groups feel there is not sufficient detail available to respond to this type of incident. He said this is the reason this project was created two years ago. It was identified by the public safety partners as information they need. The railroads will be working in cooperation to share planning information they already have. UASI wants to develop a regional response plan. He said no one jurisdiction has the capability to respond to a major rail incident.

Mr. Glover said GIS is already in place. He said he is not sure who is asking if it is alright to intrude into any area because of some accident emergency personnel is saying existed. Mr. Nellis said the Central Virginia Urban Area Security Initiative Group is asking for this information. Mr. Nellis said he is chairman of the planning committee. The planning committee has identified a need to map the railroad. He said he is asking to map the railroad and not individual backyards.

Mr. Glover asked why the 1-mile buffer on each side of the track is needed – why that distance. Mr. Nellis said when planning is done for a hazardous material spill or derailment, there is a need to know what infrastructure is around the spill. Mr. Glover said such a plan is already in place. Mr. Nellis said such a plan is not in place.

Ms. Jaeckle said she thought the mapping would be like putting an address on the railroad mile marker. When someone calls 911 now and gives a street address, the dispatcher knows where to send help. There is no such address system for railroads. She said the information is available on GIS but it can't be tied to the mile markers on the track.

Mr. Crum said the information is to be used for emergency management planning purposes. Mr. Crum said the recommendations for both projects have not been developed in a vacuum. UASI and UAWG are comprised of emergency managers from each of the local jurisdictions. The recommendation is coming forward from the emergency management professionals in each of the jurisdictions in the Richmond Region.

Mr. Glover asked if this can be deferred until everyone can go back to their jurisdictions and speak with their emergency managers to find out why this project is needed. He said no one has approached him with this information prior to today, and he would like to know more about the project before he votes on it.

Mr. Fabricant said he agreed with Mr. Glover and would also like Mr. Amos' questions answered before a vote is taken. Mr. Fabricant asked if input has been received from Norfolk Southern and CSX. Mr. Nellis said UASI has been cooperating with Norfolk Southern as well as the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and the US Department of Transportation. All three are very excited about the potential of this planning project. They feel this is the type of project that needs to be done in an area that will experience future growth in passenger and commodities rail traffic. What is trying to be accomplished is to make sure first responders have the information they need to respond effectively and efficiently to an incident.

Mr. Nellis said this can be deferred if that is what the Board wishes.

Mr. Gulley said he understands that Mr. Amos will not approve the contract until all of his questions are answered.

Mr. Amos said that he would like more information from the railroad companies because they've always been very protective of their right of ways.

Mr. Gordon said that every contract the PDC agrees to is signed off on by Mr. Amos before the Board approves authorizing staff to enter into the contract. He said he did not see this as an issue. The presentation was made before the Executive Committee earlier today and received unanimous endorsement. Mr. Gordon said he did not see this as being any different from any effort of any other government agency to assess the impact of a potential disaster. He said mile markers are along the interstate. This effort is trying to identify the address along the rail track so that the response can be effective. This is not an effort to look in anyone's backyard. This is an effort to assess the impact on someone's backyard should a disaster take place.

Mr. Gordon said he sees no reason for deferral and moved that the recommendation of staff – that the RRPDC become the fiduciary agent for the railroad mile marker inventory, and that staff be authorized to be project managers for the project, allowing staff to develop the Request for Proposals with the intent of entering into a contract for services on behalf of the Central Virginia UASI program – be approved. Ms. Graziano seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion and the motion was carried. Mr. Glover and Mr. Fabricant voted against the motion.

#### **D. Socioeconomic Data Analysis**

Chairman Donati noted that members received a copy of this report in their agenda packet. He asked Mr. Crum to introduce the item.

Mr. Crum said the report included in the agenda package was developed to support the transportation travel modeling program. He said there is value in looking at the forecast trends shown in the data for other planning purposes. Mr. Crum said Ms. Jacocks will give an overview of the data that was collected.

Ms. Jacocks said she will appreciate any feedback on how to use the data once she provides the overview. She said the socioeconomic data is one more layer of information to make available to the localities for planning purposes.

The data estimates and projects population, employment, and other socioeconomic data within small geographic areas calls Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ). There are 712 TAZs in the Richmond Region.

The primary purpose of the socioeconomic data is to use in the Richmond Area MPO regional travel demand model (working with VDOT and updated every four years) and in the air quality conformity analysis. The 2000 base year data was set to expire prior to the 2010 Census data being released, which is why the data needed to be updated prior to the 2010 Census.

The data collection process began in 2009 with the establishment of a Socioeconomic Data Group comprised of representatives from each of the nine jurisdictions. The group met regularly. The final review of the data was in September, 2010.

The more dense population areas have the most TAZs. A review of TAZs will be made over the next six months and adjustments will be recommended as necessary.

Ms. Jacocks reviewed historic population trends based on US Census data from 1970 through 2000. She also reviewed population projections based on American Community Survey estimates, locality 3C data, information from the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC), and local comprehensive plans. A comparison of census population between 2008 projections and actual 2010 Census data was made.

Regional density and 2035 population growth patterns were also reviewed. Fourteen development centers were identified and categorized into four sub-groupings: rural, suburban, urban, and future growth.

The analysis also allowed a profile of density patterns to be developed for population and employment.

Ms. Jacocks reviewed what is new with the socioeconomic data this year:

- benefit from a 30-year look back to predict over similar period to 2035
- early trends in 2000s show a different regional growth pattern; urban core is growing again
- trending decline in household sizes resulting in slower K-12 school enrollment growth
- intersection of population and employment concentrations – Regional Development Centers
- strong base year for employment statistics and auto registration data
- broader applications for socioeconomic data

Additional uses for the socioeconomic data can be to define characteristics of sub-areas using TAZ data; development of corridor studies, projections of growth and traffic impacts; defining relative project needs and benefits; and environmental reviews. Ms. Jacocks reviewed several instances and projects where RRPDC staff has used this data to advance regional planning efforts.

Ms. Jacocks said the information is available for use in the jurisdictions and she asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Trout asked if the I-64 corridor study was part of this or if it is a separate document. Ms. Jacocks said the study has not yet been completed. Mr. Crum added that the PDC and localities in the study area were asked for information the consultant can use for the EIS project, and the socioeconomic data was used to respond to this request.

Mr. Gordon asked if the area planning directors are aware that this product is available to them. Ms. Jacocks said a specific presentation has not been made to planning directors, but the planning staffs have all been involved in the development of the report. Mr. Crum said the local staffs have been the check-point for verification of data during the entire process. The Socioeconomic Data Group included planning staff from each of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Gulley asked if the comprehensive planning groups had been included in the study development. Ms. Jacocks said they had been included. She said from Chesterfield County, those involved were Barb Fassett and Zach Mayo.

Mr. Setliff asked if the report will be updated to the 2010 Census information. Ms. Jacocks said that information will be incorporated when the next update is completed in 2012. She said she would like for the report to be updated on an ongoing basis depending on staff availability. She said the update for 2012 will begin next year. Mr. Crum said PDC staff meets with the local planning directors on a regular basis and this report can be shared with them.

Ms. Jaeckle said she thought the information on how the size of households has decreased is very interesting.

Mr. Jewell said the VEC service offices should be located according to the information in this study. Ms. Jacocks said that could be possible since it does offer a discreet population number in each TAZ.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

**A. Committee Reports**

There were no other committee reports.

**B. Announcements**

There were no announcements.

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chairman Donati adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:30 p.m.

---

Robert A. Crum, Jr.  
Executive Director

---

James B. Donati, Jr.  
Chairman