

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
March 12, 2015

Members (Alternates) Present

Parker C. Agelasto.....City of Richmond
Daniel Arkin.....City of Richmond
Jonathan T. Baliles.....City of Richmond
Karin Carmack.....Powhatan County
Steve A. Elswick.....Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover.....Henrico County
Kathy C. Graziano.....City of Richmond
Russell J. Gulley.....Chesterfield County
Jimmy Hancock.....Henrico County
James M. Holland.....Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle.....Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek.....Hanover County
David A. Kaechele.....Henrico 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
Faye O. Prichard.....Town of Ashland
Randall R. Silber (A).....Henrico County
Carson Tucker.....Powhatan County
David Williams, Vice Chairman.....Powhatan County
Robert Witte.....Henrico County

Members Absent

Timothy M. Davey.....Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....Hanover County
Daniel A. Gecker, Treasurer.....Chesterfield County
Michelle Mosby.....City of Richmond
Tyrone E. Nelson.....Henrico County
Frank J. Thornton.....Henrico County
C. Thomas Tiller.....New Kent County
Arthur S. Warren.....Chesterfield County

Others Present

John Amos RRPDC Legal Counsel
Brian Davis Capital Region Workforce Partnership
Jodi Deal Richmond Suburban News
Kim Hynes Central Virginia Waste Management Authority

Staff Present

Robert A. Crum Executive Director
Jo A. Evans Assistant Executive Director
Julie H. Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal Planner
Billy Gammel Planner
Chuck Gates Manager, Community Affairs
Barbara Jacocks Director, Planning
Jin Lee Senior Planner
Dan Lysy Director, Transportation
Leigh Medford GIS Coordinator
Kathy Robins Senior Planner
Greta Ryan Senior Planner
Randy Selleck Principal Planner
Jackie Stewart Manager, Special Projects
Sarah Stewart Senior Planner
Peter M. Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator
Chris Wichman Senior Planner

Call to Order

Chairman Peterson called the regularly scheduled March 12, 2015 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:05 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 changes to be made to the agenda. There were no changes noted, and Chairman Peterson said the agenda will be 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

Chairman Peterson said he would like to briefly recap last month's meeting and how it fits into the series of meetings that are exploring the economic vitality and health of the Region. He reminded members that they have heard presentations on entrepreneurship and toured the Virginia Bio-Technology Research Park, where the Board also received a presentation from VCU President, Dr. Michael Rao; a representative from the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond provided information on regional economics and human capital; and during last month's meeting, Virginia Secretary of Commerce and Trade, Maurice Jones, offered information on initiatives underway in the state regarding economic and workforce development.

Chairman Peterson said some of his take-aways from last month's meeting were comments made by Secretary Jones indicating that 13 of the top 20 employers in the state of Virginia are in the public sector. Also, Virginia ranks 48 out of 50 with regard to state economic growth. The Secretary also projected that about 50 – 60 percent of jobs created in the future will not require a four-year degree but will require some type of post-secondary certification or training. It was also mentioned that one of the perceived strengths of the Richmond Region is its ability to cooperate and collaborate, which played a pivotal role in attracting Tranlin to Chesterfield County.

Chairman Peterson said the ultimate goal of discussing the economic health of the Region is to assess where the Region is at this time. This assessment will lead to the development of regional indicators to measure the assessment. The regional indicators will form a basis for a presentation to members of the Capital Region Caucus in June.

Today's meeting will include a presentation by Mr. Brian Davis, Director of the Capital Region Workforce Partnership.

Mr. Crum added that when Secretary Jones spoke about Tranlin coming to Chesterfield County, the Secretary noted there were only three site-ready locations in the state that met Tranlin's requirements.

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.

Mr. Crum said he would like to report that staff has been working with the City of Richmond's planning department to advance a land use analysis along the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route. The City's planning department has indicated it has some resources to provide to the RRPDC in exchange for staff's assistance with this analysis. Mr. Crum said he will provide updates as this project moves forward.

Mr. Crum reminded members that staff was previously authorized to submit an application to the federal government to have the Richmond Region designated as a Manufacturing Community by the Investing in Manufacturing Communities Partnership. The value of the program would be to have a federal liaison appointed to assist with applying for grants from twelve federal agencies. These grants could be used on infrastructure projects, workforce development, etc., that would in turn encourage more manufacturing jobs in the Region.

RRPDC staff partnered with the Crater PDC, the Commonwealth Center for Advanced Manufacturing (CCAM), and the University of Virginia to apply for this designation. Ten communities were recognized and the Richmond Region was just outside of the selected communities. The application period has been reopened and the Region is being encouraged to reapply. Mr. Crum said staff is researching this opportunity with the same partners to see if the application will be in the Region's best interest. Mr. Crum said updates will be provided on this effort as well.

Mr. Crum reported that when Barbara Nelson was recruited by the US Department of Transportation to head up its port program, a void was opened up within the RRPDC with regard to multimodal transportation planning. Mr. Crum introduced Mr. Chris Wichman, who was recruited from the Hampton Roads PDC. Mr. Wichman is working in the Transportation Division and will be very active with the TPO Board and committees. He will be picking up some of the projects Ms. Nelson led, such as work with the Port of Richmond and other multimodal freight issues.

Mr. Crum said many Board members have had an opportunity to work with Mr. Randy Selleck, a Principal Planner in the Transportation Division. Mr. Selleck has been the project manager for the TPO's Long Range Transportation Planning efforts. He has been recruited by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation to work on the passenger rail study (Richmond and Washington, DC) and will be leaving RRPDC later this month. Mr. Crum said he'd like to thank Mr. Selleck for all the work he's done on behalf of the RRPDC/TPO and would like to wish him well in his new position.

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.

Mr. C. Peterson said he would like to go back to the information Mr. Crum presented on working with the City of Richmond. He noted that Hanover County has just completed working on its Comprehensive Plan, and Mr. C. Peterson asked what the RRPDC is doing to develop a combined, overall view of the Comprehensive Plans from each of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Crum noted that as part of the rotating technical assistance projects that RRPDC staff completes each year with the larger jurisdictions, RRPDC staff worked with Hanover County staff to assist with some of the county's Comprehensive Plan update. As for what the agency is doing to bring together the information, Mr. Crum pointed out one of the maps on the wall in the meeting room. This is a regional future land use map and is a composite of all future land use maps from each of the local comprehensive plans. Mr. Crum said that there are also examples of the various regional data layers that staff has collected – utilities, environmental, transit, forecasted growth areas, etc. This information is provided to the local staffs so everyone is aware of what is going on in neighboring jurisdictions.

Mr. Crum said the regional Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) also considers many of these regional planning initiatives and what each jurisdiction is doing with regard to land use. Mr. Crum emphasized that local land use remains at the local level. RRPDC staff tries to bring this information together to provide to all local staffs for their information and use in local planning efforts. Mr. C. Peterson thanked Mr. Crum for the information.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Peterson asked if there were questions on any of the Consent Agenda items.

- A. Meeting Minutes – February 12, 2015
- B. Financial Reports – January 2015
- C. Virginia Coastal Zone Management Grant Authorization
- D. Rural Transportation Planning Grant Authorization
- E. 2015 Virginia Community Development Block Grant Priorities Endorsement

Chairman Peterson noted that items C – E are fairly routine as they occur annually; however, he asked Mr. Crum to briefly review those items for the benefit of new members.

Mr. Crum said these grant funds are set aside for the agency's use to help offset operating costs. The first item is a grant offered through the Coastal Zone Management Program. The funds are used to work with local environmental staffs on issues such as the Chesapeake Bay storm water requirements, TMDL requirements, and environmental regulations. Staff facilitates an environmental roundtable to which local staffs are invited in order to share information and best practices on how to meet the regulations in a cost-effective manner. This is a \$30,000 grant that is matched with an equal amount of local in-kind staff services.

The next grant provides Rural Transportation Planning funds that staff uses to assist with rural transportation planning in those localities with areas outside of the TPO study area boundary (portions of the Counties of Charles City, Goochland, Powhatan, and New Kent). The total amount of this grant is \$58,000 per year and is matched with \$14,000 of local in-kind staff services.

The final item is one that the state of Virginia requires of PDCs each year. Each year PDCs must establish priorities for project types that fall under the state's Community Development Block Grant program for non-entitlement communities. In the Richmond Region, these localities are the Town of Ashland and the Counties of Charles City, Goochland, Powhatan, and New Kent. The project rankings are included in the agenda book under Tab 7. The top three priorities all relate to economic development and job creation.

Mr. Crum noted that these consent items for the Region have been recommended for approval by the Executive Committee.

Ms. O'Bannon requested that the February 12, 2015 meeting minutes be approved separately from the other four items on the Consent Agenda.

Chairman Peterson said based on Ms. O'Bannon's request, approval of the Consent Agenda will be considered with two separate motions – one motion to approve the February 12, 2015 meeting minutes and a second motion to approve Consent Agenda items B – E.

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

On motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Ms. Kelly-Wiecek, Item A on the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously with Ms. O'Bannon and Ms. Prichard abstaining from the vote as they were not present at that meeting.

On motion made by Mr. C. Peterson and seconded by Mr. Williams, Items B – E on the Consent Agenda were approved unanimously.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to bring before the Board.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Central Virginia Solid Waste Management Plan

Chairman Peterson asked Mr. Crum to introduce the first speaker.

Mr. Crum said he believed most members know Ms. Kim Hynes, who is the Executive Director for the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority (CVWMA). When Ms. Hynes has spoken to the Board previously, it was typically to ask for approval of an amendment to the Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) related to a specific application. Today, however, is an opportunity to take a look at the larger picture with regard to what CVWMA is doing in terms of updating the SWMP, to understand the lay of the land, and to provide an opportunity for members to ask any questions or provide feedback to Ms. Hynes.

Ms. Hynes thanked members for the opportunity to speak with them today about the SWMP. She noted that she has provided additional information at each member's seat. She said she wanted to share information on the five-year update to the SWMP as well as information on activities to celebrate CVWMA's 25th anniversary.

Ms. Hynes noted that many of the Commission members have been involved with CVWMA from its inception in 1990. She said CVWMA is celebrating 25 years of regional collaboration. She said CVWMA was created under the Virginia Water and Waste Authorities Act. There are 13 jurisdictions in the CVWMA service area, including all nine of the RRPDC jurisdictions. Four additional jurisdictions located within the Crater PDC's region are also served by CVWMA. Service is provided to over 1.1 million residents and covers an area of 2,500 square miles. CVWMA is governed by a 20-member board whose members are appointed by the local governing bodies.

Ms. Hynes provided information on a mandate passed by the General Assembly in 1998 which required solid waste plans to include recycling – at least 25 percent of the waste stream. With this mandate in mind, Ms. Hynes said it made sense for the regional local governing bodies to work together to meet the requirements for recycling. Ms. Hynes provided a chart that showed the rate of recycling compared to the state mandate requirements from 1991 through 2013. This information is collected from recycling processors and the results are reported to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Ms. Hynes noted that the Richmond Region has the highest recycling rate of any other region around the state.

The solid waste planning regulations (9VAC20-130) require that:

- each planning unit (or individual locality) is required to develop and maintain a Plan
 - CVWMA is the designated plan holder (solid waste planning unit) for the regional Plan
- 20 year plan; updates required every five years
- addresses source reduction, reuse, recycling, resource recovery, incineration, and landfilling
- estimates of solid waste generation based on projected population
- plans to meet the recycling mandate
- amendment process – major vs. minor (capacity change); public hearings, review by CVWMA board; if approved, then to RRPDC and Crater PDC for approval; last step to DEQ

Ms. Hynes said they are required to update the SWMP every five years for a rolling 20-year period. The update process was outlined as:

- collaboration between member jurisdictions and CVWMA
- input from localities – letter and survey sent to Chief Administrative Officials in March 2014; all responded
- CVWMA staff prepared updates
- CVWMA Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the update and offered input
- CVWMA board approved the update on July 18, 2014
- submitted to DEQ on August 20, 2014; no formal response has been received; DEQ indicates there should be no significant changes to what was submitted

Ms. Hynes outlined major updates and revisions to the SWMP:

- planning period 2014 – 2034
- population figures – estimates from Weldon Cooper Center through 2035
- waste generation rates, per EPA, set as 4.38 pounds per person per day
- legislative changes to recycling mandate since 2003
- existing solid waste management system updated and revised table of landfills
 - reorganized, converted all capacity to tons
 - included total permitting capacity and remaining capacity (per DEQ report)
 - cleaned up Section 4 and updated locality
- locality input (surveys)
- amendment process remains as is

Ms. Hynes provided information that listed each of the landfills, their location, permitted capacity in tons, and remaining capacity in tons as of January 2014. There are five sanitary landfills in the Region; the Springfield Road facility is scheduled to close this year.

Mr. Crum asked if there was a timeframe for when the remaining capacity will be reached for each of the Region's landfills. Ms. Hynes said it will vary from landfill to landfill

depending on the daily intake volume. The DEQ estimates a statewide limit of about 25 years of capacity left if each landfill reached capacity simultaneously.

Ms. Hynes showed a chart that listed the disposal capacity of the sanitary and CDD landfills in the Region as well as the disposal capacity of landfills in the state that are outside of the CVWMA region.

Mr. Williams asked about the status of the Cumberland County landfill as it is listed as not yet active. Ms. Hynes said the landfill was built by Republic during the height of the economy in 2006-2008. As waste generation has dropped off since then, the landfill has not been opened. She said the landfill has been permitted so it could open at any time.

Chairman Peterson confirmed the capacity and needs as illustrated on the chart provided by Ms. Hynes. She said the figures provided were correct. Chairman Peterson asked if there is a significant amount of local waste that is taken outside of the state. Ms. Hynes said medical waste goes out of the Region, and this is the largest portion. She said unless the waste is considered hazardous, most of it remains in the state.

Mr. C. Peterson asked what materials are taken at a CDD landfill. Ms. Hynes said those landfills take only construction demolition debris (CDD). Sanitary landfills take in municipal waste. CDD materials can also be disposed of in sanitary landfills.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that construction debris disposal bags are available at hardware stores for citizens to use when doing home remodeling projects.

Ms. Hynes said that Lunenburg County recently sold its landfill to a private company in Petersburg, so this is another location that could be used by this Region.

Another consideration is that Virginia is the number two importer of solid waste, which is about 25 percent of the waste managed in Virginia. Based on the current rate of disposal at landfills within and outside of the Region as well as the anticipated waste reduction and increased recycling efforts, disposal capacity is adequate for the next 20-year SWMP period.

Chairman Peterson asked if there was a magnitude number for the amount of imported waste. Ms. Hynes said that according to DEQ, about 25 percent of the total waste processed in the state comes from outside; this is distributed to different areas around the state. The bulk of what is imported goes to landfills just outside of the Region. Chairman Peterson asked if the remaining capacity at local landfills included the imported waste. Ms. Hynes said she did not have information on how much imported waste is placed in the local landfills. DEQ does not report this information by landfill and considers that information proprietary. She said she can try to get the information from DEQ.

Ms. Hynes provided information on some of the SWMP locality input during 2014 as the SWMP was being updated:

- increase recycling and diversion efforts

- landfill/disposal/trash collection
- yard waste / pet waste
- new methods for HHW management
- increase connection between storm water and solid waste management

Ms. Hynes pointed out that CVWMA will only accept #1 and #2 type plastics for recycling at this time. She said there has been some interest in recycling the other types of plastics and hopes that CVWMA will be able to accept those other types soon. This applies also to the waxed food cartons like those used for milk and juice.

Mr. Kaechele asked what happens to the other types of plastic that are placed in the recycle bins. Ms. Hynes said the majority of that plastic will be landfilled. She said if all types of plastic are collected more #1 and #2 types are received by default. CVWMA's contractor is working to upgrade its material recovery facility to add sorting capability in order to receive other types of plastic.

She also listed services provided by CVWMA through contracts with private sector vendors. Jurisdictions may select the services they'd like to offer to their residents. Ms. Hynes said all services are contracted out to private vendors in order to offer more competitive pricing for the jurisdictions.

Ms. O'Bannon asked who is contracted locally to take care of these services. Ms. Hynes said local contractors include TFC, E-Waste Technologies, and Tri-City.

Ms. Hynes provided information on how CVWMA's recycling efforts have increased over the years. She said 64 percent of recycled materials is yard waste and 35 percent is comprised of paper, cans, and bottles. Through CVWMA programs, approximately 2.5 million tons of materials have been recycled over 25 years. Region-wide, that number grows to over 11 million tons. The curbside recycling programs serve over 275,000 households around the Region. There are 30 drop-off recycling sites around the Region, and CVWMA now offers large carts for recycling. Residents can sign up for recycling perks that allow points to be awarded each time one of the large carts is picked up. The points can be redeemed at local retailers.

Ms. O'Bannon said she learned that from a survey provided to residents a few years ago, the primary reason they participated in recycling programs was due to peer pressure. If their neighbors recycled, then they would as well.

Ms. Hynes said the recycling carts hold about four times the amount of materials than the bins hold. She said these large carts are easier to move to the curb.

Ms. Hynes said that last year CVWMA negotiated an early renewal of the contract with the curbside recycling vendor for a lower rate and will receive a rebate for every ton of material that is collected at the curb.

Mr. Williams asked if the \$4 million in rebates from the sale of recyclable materials provided by CVWMA to participating localities is a total for a certain time frame. Ms. Hynes said this is the total over the past 25 years.

Mr. Glover asked about the cost per month to localities. Ms. Hynes said that cost is \$1.80 per household per month less the \$20 per ton rebate. Mr. Glover asked what is CVWMA's total budget. Ms. Hynes said the budget is about \$14 million. She said most of this is for programs in which the localities participate. Mr. Glover asked if the curbside recycling program would support about 45 percent of the budget, based on the rate Ms. Hynes quoted earlier. Ms. Hynes said the curbside recycling program is about \$5 million region-wide. She said the contractor cost is passed on to the localities based on the rate per participating household and the volume collected.

Mr. Glover asked what makes up the remaining portion of the budget. Ms. Hynes said all of the programs generate revenue, such as the trash collection program in four jurisdictions (Ashland, Hopewell, Colonial Heights, and Petersburg). There are nine convenience centers around the Region as well that generate revenue.

Ms. Hynes said that CVWMA operates a call center and offers education and outreach to the jurisdictions. The call center was added in 1999 and handles about 52,000 calls and 4,200 emails per year.

Mr. Glover asked if any of the recycle vendors used incineration for the items that cannot be recycled. Ms. Hynes said incineration is not used to the best of her knowledge. She said this has been considered over the years and some of the sites that use incineration have been toured by CVWMA staff. She said it was not considered a cost effective method for the size of this Region.

Ms. Hynes invited members to attend celebratory events over the course of the year to celebrate the CVWMA's 25th anniversary. The first event will be on May 2 with the Richmond Kickers. Another event will be planned in the September/October time frame. On the actual anniversary date, December 11, 2015, there will be a special CVWMA board meeting.

Mr. Padgett asked which state is the number one importer of waste. Ms. Hynes said that would be Pennsylvania, which has a \$2.00 surcharge on each ton of solid waste collected. The surcharge funds are put back into their recycling program.

Mr. Kaechele asked what is done with the yard waste that is collected. Ms. Hynes said this is processed into mulch or a similar product.

Chairman Peterson thanked Ms. Hynes for her presentation.

B. Capital Region Workforce Partnership

Chairman Peterson asked Mr. Crum to introduce this speaker.

Mr. Crum said that Mr. Brian Davis is the Director of the Workforce Partnership and staff believes information he can provide will be a good follow-up to the information Secretary Jones discussed last month regarding workforce preparation.

Mr. Davis said he has a degree in planning and spent the first ten years of his career in local government as a planner before entering the workforce development arena at the state level. He noted that he worked with the Virginia state government for about ten years and decided he wanted to return to the local level. Most recently he headed the workforce development efforts in Lynchburg before coming to Richmond. Mr. Davis said he would provide an overview of the Partnership and the work done by that organization. He said since he's been at the Partnership, he's spent a lot of time reviewing how things have been done in the past and what can be changed to improve services.

Mr. Davis said the Capital Region Workforce Partnership (Capital Region) and its Resource Workforce Board were created under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), which was passed by the US Congress in 1998. It was implemented in Virginia in 2000 (Public Law 105-220; 20 CFR Part 652). This will be replaced by the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act on July 1, 2015.

Mr. Davis noted that the agency is given the responsibility to oversee a federal program and oversight of the public workforce system to improve product delivery to citizens and employers. The agency supports businesses and employers as well as job seekers and existing workers and youth. The agency was created to have a customer-centric approach.

The Capital Region is one of 15 local workforce investment areas in the state. The Capital Region is second in the amount of funding received. Hampton Roads receives the most funding. The funding formula is based on unemployment excess and unemployment poverty. Mr. Davis said in this Region, the poverty rate is the biggest driver.

At the state level, the workforce areas are governed by the Virginia Workforce Development board. These members are appointed by the governor and provide policy direction. Workforce areas in the state operate under the auspices of the US Department of Labor. Funds come to the Commonwealth and flow through the Virginia Community College System, which is the fiscal agent for the state.

Mr. Davis provided an illustration to show the system of governance for the local workforce area. A joint powers agreement was made between eight jurisdictions. Henrico County has served as the Capital Region's fiscal agent since 1998. The local governments in the workforce area have liability for the use of these federal funds. There are three workforce centers in the Capital Region – Chesterfield County, City of Richmond, and in eastern Henrico County. There is a youth services program administered by four school districts.

The local elected officials consortium is comprised of one local elected official and one alternate appointed from each jurisdiction. This group meets every other month. This

group appoints members to the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) and maintains authority for the local budget.

The WIB has a 42-member board of directors as dictated by federal legislation. The composition of the WIB must be as follows:

- majority must be from the business sector
- 2 community based organizations
- 2 economic development representatives
- 2 education representatives
- 2 organized labor representatives
- “one stop partner” representatives (12 persons from public agencies)

The new legislation eliminates the need for the “one stop partner” representatives. The WIB meets quarterly and sets policies and develops initiatives to advance work and the strategic plan.

There are Standing Committees that meet more frequently. These are:

- executive
- finance
- program planning and development
- quality assurance
- youth council

The “one stop partners” must have a written agreement with WIB on how their services will be coordinated locally. These partners include:

- Virginia Employment Commission
- Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services
- community colleges
- adult education
- Job Corps
- Native American organizations
- Department of Social Services (state requirement)

An annual allocation of funds is received in three program funding streams to oversee the WIA Title 1 Program: adult (18 and over), dislocated worker (unemployed), and youth (14-21, low-income, barrier to success). The Richmond Region localities contribute funding in addition to the federal funds. Mr. Davis also provided a list of eligibility requirements in order to receive the funding.

Mr. Davis said the Capital Region provides assistance in its workforce centers to those looking for jobs. The services are intended to be delivered in a tiered system:

- core services (available to anyone without eligibility)

- intensive services (requires enrollment)
- training services (only available after core and intensive services are offered)

The Youth Program is focused primarily on those who are not attending school, typically between the ages of 17 – 21. This is a very difficult population to reach and engage. Services that can be offered include:

- tutoring
- alternative secondary school services
- summer employment opportunities
- paid and unpaid work experiences
- occupational skills training
- leadership development opportunities
- adult mentoring
- comprehensive guidance and counseling
- supportive services
- follow-up services

Some services provided to businesses include:

- recruitment and hiring assistance
- job fairs
- use of facilities for hiring events and interviews
- training funds
- labor market information
- information on tax and other incentive programs
- assistance with downsizing and layoff situations

Mr. Davis reviewed some of the outcomes achieved over the past year:

- total of 2,401 individual customers served
 - 292 low-income youth with at least one barrier to success
 - 2,109 low-income adults and dislocated workers
- 96 total businesses served
 - 38 returned for more than one service

Each year, the Capital Region negotiates performance levels with the federal government. The areas on which the Capital Region is graded are:

- Did they get a job?
- Did they keep a job?
- average wages
- credential or certificate earned (area added by the state)

In FY13, 73 percent of those served were placed into employment; 90 percent of those persons retained their jobs. The average annual wage was \$27,306. Those earning a credential or certificate totaled 45 percent. The Capital Region either met or exceeded rates in all four of these areas.

In the Youth Program, the areas are:

- placed in job or postsecondary education
- literacy – numeracy gain
- earned a degree or certificate

Again, the Capital Region exceeded performance rates.

In the year ahead, Mr. Davis indicated the new federal legislation will be implemented. Some of the benefits to the new legislation will be more flexibility in service design and ease of serving employers. All current service provider contracts will be re-bid per procurement requirements. Mr. Davis said this will be an opportunity to re-vamp the customer service experience. He also noted that the state will be requiring that more of the federal funds be used on training services.

Mr. Davis said he will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Pollard asked how young people who drop out of school can be engaged. Mr. Davis said it is difficult to reach those who are not in school. Contact with local social services offices can assist in reaching out to the youth to engage them in some type of program. Some of the youth are not suited to classroom training and efforts are made to get these youth involved in some type of on the job training.

Mr. Williams asked if the workforce centers offer one stop shop type services. Mr. Davis said that is the approach taken in the centers. Mr. Williams asked how outcomes are tracked through public agencies that make referrals. Mr. Davis said this is a challenge. JLARC completed a study on the workforce development system in the state. Over \$400 million comes into the state for various workforce development programs. The challenge is that not one agency has the authority to manage those funds. This requires a lot of relationship building. Another challenge is that each agency is graded by different means.

Mr. Williams said he was pleased to see the good results numbers provided.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that in one recently opened call center in Henrico County, the manager told her many of the employees hired already had good computer skills. She asked how it was determined which skills are needed for available jobs. Mr. Davis said employers have specific needs and in most cases, there are not the right applicants to meet those needs. The challenge is that needs are unique to each employer. It's difficult to get a large number of people work-ready when each situation is different. These needs are in flux continually. The Capital Region will need to go to each employer to find out what skills are needed. It may be that applicants will need to be trained in core skills that will

eliminate some barriers and allow them to be ready to go to the next step once they are hired.

Mr. Elswick asked about the best way to connect with those students who drop out of school. Mr. Davis said the Capital Region relies heavily on referrals from other agencies. He said most schools will not share information on those who drop out of school. Primarily, contact is made through some type of social service agency the family has contacted for assistance. Mr. Elswick asked if Mr. Davis could try to establish a direct link to schools.

Mr. Padgett asked if there was a website that can be accessed for more information. Mr. Davis said the website is resourceva.com.

Mr. Holland noted that efforts should be made to engage former inmates, by working with local sheriffs, to help them get employment.

Chairman Peterson thanked Mr. Davis for his presentation and encouraged members to contact Mr. Davis offline with additional questions.

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 10:40 a.m.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director

Ken Peterson
Chairman