

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
June 11, 2015

Members (Alternates) Present

Parker C. Agelasto.....City of Richmond
Daniel Arkin.....City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles.....City of Richmond
Timothy M. Davey.....Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....Hanover County
Daniel A. Gecker, Treasurer.....Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover.....Henrico County
Jimmy Hancock.....Henrico County
James M. Holland.....Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle.....Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek.....Hanover County
Floyd H. Miles, Secretary.....Charles City County
Patricia S. O'Bannon.....Henrico County
C. Harold Padgett.....Hanover County
Ken Peterson, Chairman.....Goochland County
W. Canova Peterson.....Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard.....New Kent County
Rodney Poole.....City of Richmond
Frank J. Thornton.....Henrico County
Carson Tucker.....Powhatan County
Robert Witte.....Henrico County

Members Absent

Karin Carmack.....Powhatan County
Steve A. Elswick.....Chesterfield County
Kathy C. Graziano.....City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley.....Chesterfield County
David A. Kaechele.....Henrico County
Michelle Mosby.....City of Richmond
Tyrone E. Nelson.....Henrico County
Faye O. Prichard.....Town of Ashland
C. Thomas Tiller.....New Kent County
Arthur S. Warren.....Chesterfield County
David Williams, Vice Chairman.....Powhatan County

Others Present

Eldon Burton.....Office of Senator Mark Warner
 Cyane Crump Historic Richmond
 Robert Dortch..... Robins Foundation
 Susan Davis..... The Community Foundation
 Lloyd Lenhart..... Office of Congressman David Brat
 Kelley McCall.....Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond
 Mark Mullinix.....Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond
 Myra Goodman Smith.....Leadership Metro Richmond
 Sam Louis Taylor.....Office of Senator Mark Warner
 Delegate Lee Ware..... Virginia House District 65
 Kaitlyn Wark..... The Community Foundation

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum..... Executive Director
 Jo A. Evans.....Assistant Executive Director
 Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
 Sulabh Aryal..... Planner
 Anne DarbySenior Planner
 Tiffany DubinskyPrincipal Planner
 Billy Gammel Planner
 Chuck GatesManager, Community Affairs
 Barbara Jacocks..... Director, Planning
 Jin LeeSenior Planner
 Dan Lysy Director of Transportation
 Kathy Robins.....Senior Planner
 Sarah Stewart.....Senior Planner
 Peter M. Sweetland..... Finance and Contracts Administrator
 Chris Wichman.....Senior Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Peterson called the regularly scheduled June 11, 2015 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:10 a.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 reported that a quorum of members was present.

B. Requests for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business

Chairman Peterson asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business.

Ms. O'Bannon was recognized by the Chairman. Ms. O'Bannon said she'd like to point out that typically a Consent Agenda is placed at the top of the meeting agenda so items can be acted upon quickly in case some members may need to leave. Ms. O'Bannon said the Consent Agenda on the RRPDC meeting agendas is usually listed further down on the agenda. She said she'd like to recommend that the Consent Agenda be moved up so that it can be acted on as soon as a quorum is certified.

Chairman Peterson thanked Ms. O'Bannon for that recommendation.

There were no other requests and the agenda was accepted as presented.

C. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Peterson opened the public comment period, noting that if anyone wished to address the members, to please come to a microphone and provide his or her name, locality of residence, and if appropriate the name of any organization being represented. Chairman Peterson asked that any speaker please limit comments to three minutes.

As there were no requests from the public to address members of the Board, Chairman Peterson closed the public comment period.

D. Chairman's Report

1. Recognition of State and Federal Legislators

Chairman Peterson said he would like to recognize a member of the General Assembly who was in attendance. He introduced Delegate Lee Ware, who represents the 65th Virginia House District. Also in attendance today are Mr. Lloyd Lenhart, representing Congressman David Brat's office as well as Mr. Sam Louis Taylor and Mr. Eldon Burton, both representing Senator Mark Warner's office. Chairman Peterson thanked them for their attendance.

Mr. Holland said he would like for members to thank Delegate Ware as well as all of the legislators who serve the Region and state for their service. Members joined in a round of applause in thanks.

2. Recognition of Outgoing RRPDC Executive Director

Chairman Peterson said he would like to take a few moments to recognize the outgoing Executive Director, Mr. Robert Crum. Chairman Peterson reminded members that about

a month ago, Mr. Crum provided notice of his resignation in order to accept the position of Executive Director with Hampton Roads PDC.

Chairman Peterson read excerpts from a resolution of appreciation that lists some of Mr. Crum's accomplishments from his tenure with RRPDC:

A Resolution of
The Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
in Honor of
Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Recognizing his Service for the Richmond Region of
the Commonwealth of Virginia

Whereas, Robert A. Crum, Jr. has capitalized on his experience as an insightful planning professional and consensus-builder to steadfastly lead the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission as Executive Director since September 2008; and

Whereas, Mr. Crum has devoted his time and talents to redefine the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission as a reliable, data-driven resource and energetic advocate for collaborative leadership in the Richmond Region; and

Whereas, Mr. Crum played a critical role in shaping the Region's vision that strives to balance the needs of the community with the challenges of the Region's diverse localities;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission takes great pleasure in recognizing the many contributions of Robert A. Crum, Jr. to the Richmond Region; and

Be it further resolved, that the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission herewith expresses its deepest gratitude and appreciation to Mr. Crum and sincerely wishes him continued success in future endeavors.

Adopted this 11th day of June, in the year 2015, by the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission.

Chairman Peterson asked if there was a motion to adopt the resolution. Mr. Fabricant so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Tucker. There was no additional discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

Members thanked Mr. Crum with a round of applause as Chairman Peterson presented him with the framed resolution.

Chairman Peterson said the Commission would also like to present a small gift to Mr. Crum as well. He said he's gotten to know Mr. Crum pretty well in working with him over the past year. Chairman Peterson said the agency is losing an excellent Executive Director and person. Chairman Peterson said Mr. Crum is one of the most admirable persons he's worked with over the years, and on behalf of the Region, Chairman Peterson said he wanted to wish Mr. Crum all the best in his next position.

Mr. Crum said he'd like to thank everyone seated around the table for the opportunity to work on their behalf. He said he'd also like to thank the staff. Mr. Crum said the RRPDC staff is very committed to the Region, and it's been his pleasure to work side by side with them. He said he's looking forward to continued working relationships and friendships.

Chairman Peterson noted that Mr. Crum will be in the office through Monday, June 15.

3. Update on Appointment of Interim Executive Director and Search for Permanent Executive Director

Chairman Peterson said Ms. Barbara Jacocks, Director of Planning, has been appointed as Interim Executive Director. Chairman Peterson said Ms. Jacocks will also continue to perform her current duties while she is serving as Interim Executive Director.

Chairman Peterson said the Executive Committee provided direction that contact be made with each of the nine RRPDC member jurisdictions to see if they would be willing to provide human resource assets to form an in-house Search Committee. Each of the jurisdictions indicated they would all be willing to provide human resource support for this effort.

An organizational meeting of the Search Committee took place on June 5. Chairman Peterson said he and Vice Chairman Williams attended this meeting. During the meeting, it was agreed that the Search Committee will follow a process similar to what was used by the Greater Richmond Partnership in its recent search for a new president. This process will set up a Search Committee, staffed by a representative from each of the jurisdiction's human resource departments, and will work to advertise and then to identify potential candidates. Once candidates have been identified, they will be screened by the RRPDC Personnel and Operating Policies Committee in order to select candidates for interview. The candidates will be interviewed by the Executive Committee and a recommendation for hire will be presented to the full RRPDC Board for consideration and action.

Chairman Peterson said it is anticipated by using this in-house approach, considerable time and funds will be saved. He said this is a great example of regional cooperation. Chairman Peterson said the group brings a high level of energy to the process and understands the sense of urgency in finding a permanent replacement for Mr. Crum.

E. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Crum brought members' attention to the 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.

F. Environmental and Intergovernmental Reviews

Chairman Peterson asked Mr. Crum to provide information on this item.

Mr. Crum said RRPDC staff contacts partner agencies to ask for comments regarding each review and then compiles the comments to return to the appropriate reviewing agency. This report is provided for members' information only and requires no action. He said these are provided to members to inform them of the work being done by RRPDC staff in cooperation with local staffs as part of the statutory requirements for the agency and to let members know about development activities in their neighboring jurisdictions.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Peterson asked if there were questions on any of the Consent Agenda items. He noted that the Consent Agenda has been recommended for approval by the Executive Committee.

- A. May 14, 2015 meeting minutes
- B. April 2015 financial reports

Ms. O'Bannon requested that each item be voted on separately as she was not in attendance at the May meeting and will abstain from voting on the minutes.

Chairman Peterson asked if there were any other comments regarding the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Holland made a motion that the May 14, 2015 meeting minutes be approved as presented. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek seconded the motion. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried. Ms. O'Bannon and Mr. Miles abstained from the vote as they were not present during that meeting.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek made a motion that the April 2015 financial report be approved as presented. Mr. Holland seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to bring before the Board.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of FY16 Officers

Chairman Peterson said the following slate of officers has been endorsed by the RRPDC Executive Committee:

Chairman:	David Williams	Powhatan County
Vice Chairman:	Dan Gecker	Chesterfield County
Treasurer:	Floyd Miles	Charles City County
Secretary:	Kathy Graziano	City of Richmond

This slate of officers follows the established, agreed upon rotation of jurisdictions to serve as officers. Chairman Peterson asked if there were any nominations from the floor. There being no other nomination, Chairman Peterson asked if there was a motion to elect officers for FY16 as presented.

Mr. C. Peterson so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Tucker. There was no additional discussion and the motion was carried unanimously.

B. Revised Lease for RRPDC Office Space

Chairman Peterson asked Mr. Crum and Ms. Evans to provide information on this agenda item. Chairman Peterson reminded members that the primary fixed cost for the agency is the amount paid in rent. What will be presented to members is a proposed restructuring of the lease that represents a potential savings of tax payer dollars for the agency. Many meetings have been held with the landlord over the past six months. Chairman Peterson said he believes what will be presented today is the best possible revision of the lease that will strengthen the agency financially and retain an anchor tenant in the building.

Ms. Evans said the lease information is included in the agenda book under Tab 5. There is one correction that will not change any of the base information. At the top of page 2, in the table, the last column should be corrected by changing the amount listed from \$236,961.34 to \$258,503.28. The notation of "11 months" should also be struck. The action that members will be asked to take after the presentation will be to approve the revised lease as corrected.

Ms. Evans said the Executive Committee was provided an overview of the revised lease during a closed session held at last month's meeting. Members of the Executive Committee directed staff to have the information turned into a lease document, which was then reviewed by both RRPDC legal counsel as well as the landlord's legal counsel.

Ms. Evans provided a timeline of the current lease:

- lease signed in December 2006 at a rate of \$16.50 per square foot with a 3 percent escalator

- occupancy taken in July 2007
- additional unused space subleased to Leadership Metro Richmond (LMR) in February 2011
- return of \$32,000 in unused tenant improvement funds to the agency in December 2012
- review and research of alternate options began in late 2014
- current lease ends in August 2017

Ms. Evans pointed out that the timing is right to begin to look at alternatives as the end of the current lease is two years out. By giving notice to the landlord that a Request for Proposals (RFP) may be released for the agency to secure a real estate agent to look for alternative space, the agency gained some leverage with the landlord. The market is now starting to trend up. Rent expense is the second largest expense for the agency, at 13 percent of the agency's budget.

Ms. Evans reported that in November 2014, it was determined that if the agency could enter into successful negotiations with the landlord, that would be the most advantageous approach to take instead of using agency funds for an RFP. The RRPDC Executive Committee directed staff to conduct an informal search to see what other options for office space may be available while also initiating discussions with the landlord. The Executive Committee further directed staff to look in all areas of the Region, noting that if space outside of the Richmond City limits was identified, the office location requirement in the Bylaws could be addressed at that time.

Staff identified six sites that met the needs of the agency with ample parking and ease of accessibility. Those sites were located in the following areas of the Region:

- central business district
- Manchester
- Moorefield Commons
- Parham Road/I-64
- Brookfield
- Scott's Addition

Ms. Evans said these sites had per square footage rates in a range of \$15.00 - \$21.00. She noted that when contact was made with the real estate agents representing these site to arrange visits, the sites had already been leased, further illustrating the market strengthening and the high turnover.

In discussions with the current landlord, focus was placed on the following:

- meaningful expense reduction in the short term – FY16-FY17
- return to market rate
- reassess space needs
- shorter lease extension period

The proposal being presented to members today includes the following points:

- no rent in the months of July 2015; July 2016; and July 2017 (total of \$83,814)

- tenant improvement funds to be returned
 - October 2015 and April 2016 - \$72,158 total
 - improvement funds balance remaining for agency use of \$32,070
- rate reduction beginning May 2016 to \$18.00 per square foot (decrease of \$2.90 for 15 months)
- 3 percent annual escalator beginning August 2017
- space reduction of 2,092 square feet in August 2017 (end of LMR sublease)
- five year extension through October 2022

In the short term, FY16-FY18, the agency will realize a savings of \$222,239.

Ms. Evans also provided information of long-range savings in addition to the changes to the square footage rate changes in FY16-FY18. She also provided information on funds that will be saved by not relocating the office space.

Ms. Evans said that concluded her presentation. Chairman Peterson asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Fabricant asked if any consideration had been given to purchasing a building. Ms. Evans said if an agreement had not been reached with the landlord, purchase options may have been considered.

Mr. Fabricant said he understands the need for the agency to reduce expenses, but the revised lease will prohibit any other relocation considerations until October 2022. Ms. Evans said the agency had been prepared to purchase a building in the late 1980s but the transaction was never completed. She said she did not believe the agency was set up financially to take on the purchase of a building. The agency's financial structure would need to be readdressed through policy changes.

Chairman Peterson said another concern at the beginning of the negotiations was that the original ten-year lease period was too long and a shorter lease term was desired. Another concern is that the agency is currently paying above market rate, and there was a need to bring the rate down to be more in line with current market rates. The total amount of potential savings to the agency is about \$700,000 to \$800,000.

Chairman Peterson said if there are no other questions, he would ask for a motion to approve the revised lease for the RRPDC office space, dated June 11, 2015, and authorize the RRPDC Chairman and Executive Director to execute the revised lease, as presented with the noted correction, with Woods End LLC. Mr. Tucker so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Poole.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek pointed out that the Executive Committee discussed the lease thoroughly during last month's meeting.

Mr. Poole said that as someone who works in commercial real estate, he believes what is being presented is the result of a successful negotiation.

Mr. Holland said he also agrees that staff did a good job with the negotiations. He asked where Scott's Addition is located. Ms. Evans said this is near the location of the Diamond ball park.

There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

At this time, Chairman Peterson recognized Mr. Holland. Mr. Holland said he would like to introduce Ms. Selena Cuffee-Glenn, who is the new Chief Administrative Officer for the City of Richmond. Members welcomed her to the meeting and invited her to attend as her schedule allowed.

C. RRPDC Regional Indicators

Chairman Peterson said the Indicators Project began about a year ago when it was determined that it would be advantageous for the Region to be able to benchmark itself to peer regions in order to know what areas need to be improved. The Indicators Project was begun to establish a baseline in certain measurable areas. The Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) is also partnering in these efforts.

Chairman Peterson said the RRPDC was formed by state statute to promote the orderly and efficient development of the physical, social, and economic elements of the planning district by planning, encouraging, and assisting governmental subdivisions to plan for the future. He said, basically, the RRPDC's goal is to make a better region through planning.

In order to determine how to be a better region, Chairman Peterson said it's important to know a starting point and to measure progress toward being better. Chairman Peterson said this is the basic premise behind the Indicators Project.

Many of the Region's competitors are already benchmarking themselves and are using the Richmond Region as one of those benchmarking points. Chairman Peterson said it will be beneficial for the Region to collect data and compare it to peer regions in order to gauge the health of the Region. He said this point was driven home to him when he read an article that noted Richmond is falling in business rankings. Chairman Peterson said there was no data for him to access in order to find out why the Region was falling in these rankings.

Chairman Peterson said everyone has a common interest in making sure the Region is positioned to compete effectively in today's market place in order to provide a better quality of life for its citizens. In order to know what needs to be done to improve the Region, baseline data is needed on where the Region stands now. Chairman Peterson said having this data will allow the Region to adjust policies, legislation, funding, and independent resources. Future data will then allow the Region to see where it has made improvement and to know what work still needs to be completed.

The RRPDC is in a unique position to be able to collect and analyze data that can be provided to various constituent groups such as the CRC, local governments, General Assembly members, Congressional delegations, nonprofits, and other groups and

organizations that may provide funding. This knowledge will allow decisions to be data-driven. Chairman Peterson said he hopes the Indicators Project will lead to better policies, legislation, and decisions going forward and improve the allocation of scarce resources to best influence outcomes.

Chairman Peterson said the Indicators Project is just beginning with today's inaugural rollout. The number and nature of the indicators will evolve over time as it is determined how relevant they are going forward.

Chairman Peterson said Mr. Crum and Ms. Jacocks will provide more information on the Indicators Project. He asked if there were any questions.

Ms. O'Bannon pointed out that Henrico County has been providing county-specific information of this type over the last several years in a publication called "Trends." She said the County uses the information in this publication in its planning processes.

Mr. Crum said he'd like to start with some background information. The CRC went through a strategic planning process, receiving input from about 9,000 of the Region's residents and partners. Regional work groups were formed around the priorities that were identified during the planning process. In addition, the RRPDC developed and produced a regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS). With all of these efforts and participation in the Greater Richmond Chamber's InterCity Visits, it became apparent that a Regional Indicators Project, to show how the Richmond Region compares as a whole to peer regions, was something that was needed in order to track the strategies that will be implemented to move the regional priorities forward.

Mr. Crum said he wanted to thank the key foundations that provided funding to begin the Indicators Project. He asked Ms. Susan Davis, from The Community Foundation, to stand. Mr. Crum said The Community Foundation originally came to the RRPDC with the idea that the RRPDC should host the Regional Indicators Project. Mr. Robert Dortch, from the Robins Foundation (representing Ms. Kelly Chopus), was recognized. The Robins Foundation has also contributed funding for the Indicators Project. Mr. Crum thanked both Ms. Davis and Mr. Dortch for their support. Both organizations are members of the CRC and are helping to provide progress around other efforts. Members thanked Ms. Davis and Mr. Dortch with a round of applause.

Ms. Jacocks provided information on how the vision for the Indicators Project was set. She said the vision began with the identification of regional priorities through the CRC public input process and the CEDS process. Aspirations in seven different priority areas have been set through work group meetings and the formation of action teams. In order to work toward the aspirations, Ms. Jacocks said work will need to begin from the ground up.

The RRPDC assists in developing change agents to identify leading indicators. Information presented today will cover data behind lagging indicators.

Mr. Crum said the process for progress and measurement will flow around the indicators from the aspirations to benchmarking that will lead to strategies, actions, and measurement/analysis. Setting benchmarks is where the process stands now.

It was determined that it would be appropriate to use some of the same peer regions used by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond and Richmond's Future. These can be changed if needed as the process moves forward. The regions selected are:

- Hartford, CT
- Louisville, KY
- Memphis, TN
- Austin, TX
- Jacksonville, FL
- Raleigh, NC

These same six peer regions were also used for benchmarking during the CEDS process.

Mr. Crum said when comparing one region to another, Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) are used. The Richmond MSA includes the entire RRPDC region as well as the Tri-Cities/Petersburg area and north to Caroline County.

Ms. Jacocks provided charts illustrating the types of geographical data that has already been collected, including population and employment as well as existing land use. Within the RRPDC footprint, 36 percent of land is developed and 64 percent is undeveloped.

The pattern of population growth in the RRPDC Region was also illustrated from 1939 through 2010. The Region has grown by about 700,000 people over the past 70 years, or about 15,000 per year. In looking forward to the year 2040, it is anticipated that population will be at about 1.4 million. Job growth and economic growth will need to expand similarly to accommodate the growth in population.

Ms. Jacocks provided charts that showed how the population age segments have changed over the last 30 years within the Richmond Region in the following age brackets:

- Greatest Generation
- Silent Generation
- Baby Boomers
- Generation X
- Millennials

Ms. Jacocks said this information is helpful in knowing how each generation is replacing itself and what can be done to attract specific age groups into the Region. The median age in the Richmond Region has increased from 33 years of age in 1990 to 37 years of age in 2010.

Mr. Crum reported that about 70 indicators were developed by a CRC work group. During today's presentation, the discussion will focus on lagging indicators, or those that will require the most consistent work and strategy over time to improve.

From that larger list, the seven indicators that will be discussed today include:

- per capita income
- median household income
- income distribution
- employment gains/losses
- poverty rates
- age composition of population
- educational attainment

Indicators that will be added between now and the end of the year include the following:

- housing affordability (ownership/rental)
- James River Park visitation trends
- obesity
- physical activity
- tourism visitation/spending
- modes of transportation usage
- average commute time
- traffic congestion levels
- high school graduation rates

Mr. Crum provided information on how the Richmond MSA compares to each of the peer regions in the first set of seven indicators.

Per Capita Income: The Richmond MSA is tracking fourth as compared to the other six peer regions, at \$30,304.

Mr. Glover asked why Hartford had been selected as one of the peer regions. Mr. Crum said it was felt that this Indicators Project should be consistent with benchmarks used by other organizations in the community. He said this peer region can be reassessed if it appears Richmond is not really competing with Hartford in the selected indicator areas.

Mr. Gammel added that the peer regions were selected because they had similar sizes and economies.

Median Household Income: Richmond also ranks fourth with regard to this indicator, at \$58,577 per household.

Average Annual Wages: Wage trends for the Richmond Region are now below the national and state trends, when they were above both in 2002. Compared to the peer regions, the Richmond MSA ranks third at \$49,295.

Ms. O'Bannon said she felt this indicator should also be paired with cost of living. Mr. Crum said this can be an additional follow-up point for later in the year.

Employment Year-over-Year Change and Unemployment Rate: Compared with the peer regions, the Richmond MSA ranks fifth during the 2013 2nd quarter to 2014 second quarter time period, showing job gains of 1.5 percent.

The Richmond MSA ranks fourth among the peer regions in the unemployment rate, at 5.1 percent. In looking at employment trends for the Richmond Region, the Region has been

below the national average from 2004 through January 2015. However, the Region has remained even with state trends during the same time frame.

Population Without a High School Diploma (or equivalent): The Richmond MSA workforce (ages 25-64) ranks last as compared with the peer regions, at 11.8 percent. Hartford is at 8.3 percent.

Mr. Holland asked if this included those without a GED. Mr. Crum said it does include GED.

Ms. Jaeckle asked if this could correlate with the number of residents who have lower paying jobs. She said it would also be interesting to know the breakdown of age brackets for this indicator.

Mr. Arkin pointed out that the MSA includes areas south and north of the Richmond Region. He asked whether using only regional data would put the Region in a better position.

Mr. Crum said some of the data is limited by source – Census, American Community Survey, etc. He said while he appreciated the points being raised by Mr. Arkin, it was important to note that the MSA also includes areas that are more vibrant. Mr. Crum said this may not completely offset those areas that are less vibrant, but as the data is averaged out, what is being presented is a fairly accurate indicator of how the Richmond Region compares.

Chairman Peterson agreed that the points raised by Mr. Arkin are valid. He said what is being presented today is just the first look at a few indicators. As the work continues, more data in each of the indicators will be collected to allow additional segments to be created and analyzed.

Poverty Rate: At the MSA level, Richmond ranks second at 11.8 percent. Poverty at the regional level is very concentrated. Mr. Crum provided a map illustrating that the highest poverty is concentrated on only one percent of the land area. As the degree of poverty decreases, a broader area of the Region is included, indicating the need for a regional approach to poverty.

Mr. Crum said some of the indicators presented today can be tracked annually, while others can be tracked every three to five years, based on data sources. There are several community partners also collecting data, and the RRPDC is positioning itself to be the hub for this data collection.

Mr. Crum said while not drawing any real conclusions on what has been presented today, it appears that the Region is tracking on par with the peer regions in the following areas:

- per capita income
- median household income
- jobs
- unemployment rate

Areas where more attention is needed are the following:

- average annual wage
- high school diploma attainment
- poverty

Mr. Crum said as additional indicators are added, they should be tracked in the same manner – those that are on par with the peer regions and those that need additional attention.

Going forward, Mr. Crum said staff will identify the “readiness” status of each indicator data set and then advance each indicator data set. A framework for analysis will be created. Other options for communicating this information to the community at large will also need to be explored, such as development of a website, an interactive dashboard, a detailed analytical report, and/or a scorecard.

Mr. Crum said staff will provide quarterly updates to the RRPDC Board. In-depth reviews will also be provided to the CRC for additional guidance. A review of the status for each indicator will be provided to each of the CRC action teams and topic experts. There will also be continued coordination with funders.

Chairman Peterson said he would like feedback from members on which of the identified indicators, from the larger list, they would like to see advanced or if there are any other indicators that should be added to the list. He said if members think of any ideas after the meeting, please email those to Ms. Jacocks.

Mr. C. Peterson said he feels that cost of living needs to be added.

Mr. Holland said he felt information on new business startups and capital investment should be included.

Mr. Agelasto said employers should pay a living wage in order to bring those living in poverty out of their situations. He said paying a living wage will also impact the unemployment rate.

Ms. O’Bannon said workers need to be provided with the skills needed for available jobs. She said most of the jobs available require computer skills, which many older job seekers do not have. She provided an example of how GED testing is now completed online, and those persons seeking a GED who are older cannot complete the testing because they don’t have the appropriate computer skills. Job seekers without computer skills are not qualified for the higher paying jobs because they don’t have the needed skills.

Chairman Peterson said if there is a way to collect data on that issue, it can be added to the listing.

Mr. Fabricant said he would be interested in knowing the number of single parent households, especially those living in poverty. Mr. Crum indicated that data is already available.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she would like to see data on broadband access. She said this is a real issue, especially in the rural communities.

Mr. Arkin said the indicators should be grouped into larger headings, so that similar indicators are listed together. He said many of the indicators fall under the realm of local governments. He said he would like to see how well regional bodies, such as the RRPDC, are tracking with regard to making regional decisions.

Chairman Peterson said the fact that there are various consumers and groups who can use this data was taken into consideration. He said the data can be used by local governments or even members of the General Assembly.

Mr. Arkin asked if there are any indicators that are truly regional with data that is collected at a regional level versus the local level. Chairman Peterson said data can be separated by those levels.

Mr. Gecker said he wanted to clarify that the reason for focusing on these indicators is so there can be policy changes that will in turn improve how the indicators track. Mr. Crum said that was correct. Mr. Gecker said many of these indicators have been addressed more broadly by other organizations, such as the Mayor's Anti-Poverty Commission. He said another topic that has been discussed recently is transit accessibility, but this is not on the initial target list of indicators. Mr. Gecker said a study on segregation was recently published showing that the Region is currently more segregated now than in the past. That issue is also not listed. Mr. Gecker said he feels that the indicators should be more independent in order to be addressed more easily.

Mr. Crum said when transit is addressed it will be by modes of transportation. Mr. Gecker said the Brookings study was on accessibility to transit. Mr. Crum said the accessibility measures used in the Mayor's Anti-Poverty Commission report were developed by RRPDC staff. Mr. Crum said that will be addressed and he feels that wording needs to be changed to better reflect what will be measured.

Mr. Crum said he appreciates all of the suggestions and noted that staff will need to research sources of data for what has been brought forward. If there is data available and if these ideas can be benchmarked against peer regions, then they can be included.

Mr. Gecker said many of these measurements will need to be brought down to the local levels. He noted that a few years ago, RRPDC forecast that the population in the City of Richmond would decline, and as a result, plans were made by the RRPDC and the TPO based on that forecasted decline. Mr. Gecker said he feels the Region will benefit if population is steered toward the city center. He said he'd like to see measurements that will lead to policy decisions through the TPO that will impact the regional road network.

Mr. Gecker said he didn't see that the measures will be geared to address policy implications. Some of the measures should deal with locational issues within the Region and not just the broader regional issues.

Mr. Crum thanked Mr. Gecker for his comments. Mr. Crum said staff strategically chose to start at a regional level. Staff has data that goes to the local levels as well as to neighborhood levels. Showing the more detailed data can be a next step in the process.

Chairman Peterson said this will not be the last time the indicators will be brought to members for discussion. This is an inaugural rollout. He asked members for their consensus on if this is the type of work RRPDC staff should be undertaking.

Mr. Agelasto said it may be helpful to know if there are other state or national pieces of legislation that are impacting these types of indicators. Chairman Peterson said in the past, General Assembly members were engaged in January to bring to them the legislative requests of the Region. This timeframe was too late to have any real impact. It was determined that the timeframe should be moved to June in order to allow adequate time for data to be presented to the regional legislators to use to develop legislation. Chairman Peterson said this process may develop into a joint work session with legislators to discuss the data and potential legislation. Follow-up with legislators on how they used the data to develop legislation will also be helpful.

Mr. Gecker said he feels there are too many indicators. He said there should be a list of high-level indicators, such as per capita income, to benchmark against peer regions. A smaller list of indicators that can be influenced would also be appropriate. There are indicators on the larger listing that are already being addressed, such as water quality, food deserts, etc.

Chairman Peterson said focus should be given to those indicators that can be influenced with policy decisions. He noted that there are three indicators that need more attention out of the seven presented today. Chairman Peterson said he agreed that a focus group of indicators should be limited.

Ms. Jacocks said she felt this lays a good groundwork for discussions during the July meeting – to look at what the RRPDC can do best as a regional entity to help local governments and partners move forward.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Peterson asked if there were other items to bring before members for discussion. No items were identified.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Chairman Peterson adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:00 a.m.

Barbara V. Jacocks
Interim Executive Director

Ken Peterson
Chairman