

RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting
July 14, 2016

Members and Alternates (A) Present

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Chris Archer	Henrico County
Timothy M. Davey	Chesterfield County
Steve A. Elswick	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Mike C. Gray.....	City of Richmond
Kathy C. Graziano, Treasurer.....	City of Richmond
Gloria L. Freye	Chesterfield County
Jimmy Hancock.....	Henrico County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek	Hanover County
Susan Lascolette	Goochland County
Floyd H. Miles, Chairman.....	Charles City County
Tyrone E. Nelson, Secretary.....	Henrico County
Larry Nordvig.....	Powhatan County
Patricia S. O'Bannon.....	Henrico County
W. Canova Peterson	Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard	New Kent County
Randy Silber (A)	Henrico County
George Spagna	Town of Ashland
Carson Tucker	Powhatan County
Randy Whittaker.....	Hanover County
Christopher Winslow.....	Chesterfield County

Members Absent

Jonathan T. Baliles	City of Richmond
Tommy Branin	Henrico County
Karin Carmack	Powhatan County
Richard W. Glover	Henrico County
Leslie Haley.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman.....	Chesterfield County
Michelle Mosby.....	City of Richmond
Rodney Poole	City of Richmond
Frank J. Thornton	Henrico County
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County

Others Present

John AmosRRPDC Legal Counsel
Kate Anderson Powhatan County
Blair Blanchette Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Patrick Bradley..... City of Richmond
Chelsea Hartman.....Chesterfield County
Larry Land Virginia Association of Counties
Chris LloydMcGuire Woods Consulting
Janet Prevost-White City of Richmond
Shaun Reynolds Powhatan County
Charles Robideau Citizen, Chesterfield County
Joanne Simmelink.....Chesterfield County
Myra Smith Leadership Metro Richmond
Keith White..... Henrico County

Staff Present

Martha Shickle Executive Director
Julie Fry Executive Secretary
Sulabh Aryal.....Senior Planner
Anne DarbySenior Planner
Billy GammelSenior Planner
Barbara Jacocks.....Director of Planning
Jin LeeSenior Planner
Barbara Nelson Director of Transportation
Phil Riggan Planner
Sarah Rhodes.....Principle Planner
Jackie Stewart.....Manager, Special Projects
Sarah Stewart.....Senior Planner
Peter Sweetland Finance and Contracts Administrator

PLEASE NOTE: The recording device malfunctioned and the first portion of the meeting was not recorded; minutes are written based on staff notes.

Call to Order

Acting Chairman Miles, called the regularly scheduled July 14, 2016 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:05 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. He asked Mr. Nordvig to lead members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum

Ms. Shickle, RRPDC Executive Director, reported that a quorum of members was present.

B. Installation of FY17 Officers

Ms. Shickle asked each of the incoming officers present to stand and take the oath of office. Those being sworn into office, having been duly elected by the RRPDC Board during the June 9, 2016 meeting, were:

Chairman: Floyd Miles, Charles City County
Treasurer: Kathy Graziano, City of Richmond
Secretary: Tyrone Nelson, Henrico County

Ms. Jaeckle, who was elected to serve as Vice Chairman, could not attend today's meeting and will be sworn into office by Ms. Shickle at a later date.

Members offered their congratulations to the new officers with a round of applause.

C. Request for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business

Chairman Miles asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business. No requests from members were received and Chairman Miles indicated the agenda would stand as presented.

D. Open Public Comment Period

Chairman Miles 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 Miles asked that any citizen speaker please limit comments to three minutes, and organizations should limit their comments to five minutes.

Mr. Charles Robideau, a citizen of Chesterfield County, was recognized by Chairman Miles. Mr. Robideau said the he didn't know which body to bring his comments before and had already spoken before the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization's (TPO) Board.

I am Charles Robideau, resident of Midlothian, Chesterfield County.

Eight years ago, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization produced a transit plan that envisioned a system linking Richmond with four of the seven counties in the Planning District – Chesterfield, Henrico,

Hanover, and New Kent. That study's Executive Summary ended with a "Call to Action":

'To move ahead will require the cooperation and coordination of all the jurisdictions in the region. The public, the planning bodies, and elected officials will need to adopt the vision of a transit future. They will need to agree...on a level of public support and seek the necessary legislation from the General Assembly to establish a Transit Authority or similar institutional structure with a dedicated and predictable source of funding.'

Since that call was issued in 2008, not one of these steps toward a regional transit system has been addressed. Nor has that study's judgment that 'GRTC in its current form is not an effective institutional structure to fund and operate a truly regional transit system.'

Along with its candor, the 2008 study exhibited another rarity in current discussions of public issues: a regional approach, in which each jurisdiction helped frame a transit plan that could benefit all. In today's scenario, the City of Richmond, through GRTC, is creating a system – the BRT Pulse – only for itself, in the hope that counties, after seeing the system in action, will want to be connected. If at that time, the counties demurred, it would be Richmond's problem to pay for operations and upkeep of a system it might not have needed to supplement the system it already possesses.

When GRTC and the city applied for the \$25 million federal TIGER grant to fund the Pulse, they submitted letters of endorsement from Richmond civic and political leaders, touting the Pulse as the catalyst of a regional system.

'This important project represents the foundation segment of a regional BRT system and is a product of regional collaboration,' Gov. Terry McAuliffe wrote U.S. Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx in April 2014.

So far, the only regional collaboration in the Pulse project has been Chesterfield County's status as half owner of GRTC – a position it has used only to keep GRTC buses out of Chesterfield County – and Henrico's subsidy of a GRTC connection to the Willow Lawn Shopping center.

Three years ago, Mayor Dwight Jones's Anti-Poverty Commission proposed a regional system to help residents of the metro area to reach jobs. That transit plan now shares shelf space with the MPO's 2008 study. Now the Richmond Regional Transit Vision Plan is being developed by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit, under the auspices of the Region Transportation Planning Organization. The 'Vision' plan is to be

part of the TPO's Plan 2040, to be implemented sometime during the next 25 years.

For myself, I no longer hope that I will see a transit system in the Richmond area. I still hope that my kids will. And I hope that you will pull it off.

[Mr. Robideau provided the above comments to staff in written form for inclusion in the meeting minutes.]

Chairman Miles thanked Mr. Robideau for his comments.

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

E. Approval of June 9, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Chairman Miles asked Mr. Nelson to present the minutes of the June 9, 2016 to members for their consideration and action.

Mr. Nelson asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the minutes. Ms. O'Bannon noted that on page 7, the minutes show that she is "...on the Local Emergency Planning Committee..." She said that each jurisdiction has such a committee, and she asked that the minutes be changed to clarify that she is on Henrico County's Local Emergency Planning Committee. Ms. Fry thanked Ms. O'Bannon for that correction and noted it would be made prior to the minutes being filed.

There being no other corrections or comments, Mr. Holland moved for approval of the June 9, 2016 minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Bannon. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the June 9, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously as corrected.

F. Acceptance of May 2016 Financial Report

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Graziano to present the financial report for May 2016.

Ms. Graziano said if there were no questions or corrections, she would ask for a motion to accept the May 2016 financial report for file as presented. Mr. Peterson so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Holland. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

G. Chairman's Report

Cancellation of August Meetings

Chairman Miles indicated that traditionally the August Commission meeting is cancelled unless agenda items are identified that need to be brought to members' attention. He said

that to date, no such items have been identified. Unless members have items they wish to discuss in August, Chairman Miles said the Executive Committee is recommending that the August 11, 2016, RRPDC Executive Committee and Commission Board meetings be cancelled.

Ms. Graziano made a motion that the August 11, 2016, RRPDC Executive Committee and full Commission Board meetings be cancelled unless agenda items that need to be brought forward are identified. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek seconded the motion. Chairman Miles asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Mr. Nordvig asked if an item is identified that needs to be brought to the Executive Committee whether the August meeting could be held in order to discuss the item. Chairman Miles said if an item is brought forward to Ms. Shickle's attention, she can consult with the Chairman to see if the item needs to be brought forward in August or if the item could be discussed in September. Mr. Nordvig said he was not sure if Powhatan County would have anything to bring forward, but if it did, he would contact Ms. Shickle.

There was no additional discussion on the motion to cancel the August 11, 2016 meetings and the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion of FY17 Meeting Topics and Format

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to lead this discussion.

Ms. Shickle reported that during her regular meetings with all of the jurisdictions' CAOs and Managers, there has been discussion on the development of Commission meeting agendas. She said that while all of the CAOs and Managers agreed that the Regional Forum Series had been informative, they suggested that the jurisdictions be allowed to select when they would like to make presentations to the RRPDC Board. They felt this approach would allow for a more timely discussion on some issues instead of having to wait until their turn if the alphabetical rotation continued to be followed.

Ms. Shickle noted that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, members endorsed the more flexible approach. She said staff wants to continue to bring value to the meetings and to be able to align staff presentations that could augment what is being presented by the jurisdictions. Ms. Shickle reported that Smart Beginnings has asked to be on the September meeting agenda in order to discuss their efforts with school readiness as the new school year begins. To date, no other requests have been received. She asked if members had any other suggestions on the format of future meetings.

Mr. Elswick said he would suggest that the CAOs and Managers be invited to speak on what they see as regional issues. Mr. Peterson pointed out that as there are nine jurisdictions, if each CAO and Manager spoke, their presentations would take up an entire year. He asked if Mr. Elswick meant that they should all be invited to attend the same meeting or if two or three would be invited to speak at the same meeting.

Ms. Lascolette said that she believes each local Board of Supervisors guides the work of their jurisdiction's CAO or Manager.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said that in Hanover County's case, the CAO has a very good grasp of what issues are regional in nature, and she believed the CAOs and Managers could offer information on what they see as regional issues and regional challenges. She said she saw this approach as replacing the Regional Forum Series presentation of a specific project.

Mr. Nordvig said he thought being more flexible in the schedule, allowing jurisdictions to be proactive or reactive to certain issues, would be a good approach. He suggested that schedules could be drawn up each quarter.

Ms. Lascolette said she thought topics that allowed more questions and discussion would be a better approach, like a workshop.

Mr. Nordvig said he agreed that more of an opportunity for interaction would be preferred instead of only listening to a presentation.

Mr. Peterson said he felt that the Regional Forum Series offered an opportunity for each jurisdiction to interact offline on the topics that were discussed.

Ms. Lascolette said she thought the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees might be a better forum for discussion of regional issues or issues that are specific to the large and small localities.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek agreed that it may be a good time to bring back the Large and Small Jurisdictions Committees as they had not been called to meet in at least two years.

Ms. Shickle said that when the jurisdictions were scheduled to make a presentation, RRPDC staff would reach out to the Executive Committee member, who would in turn contact the appropriate locality staff member for topic development. She asked if staff should work with the CAOs and Managers first.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she thought it would be a good idea to discuss the feedback given today with the CAOs and Managers. She said they might be able to identify projects with multijurisdictional impact.

Ms. O'Bannon said she would like to hear a discussion on interoperability as this does reach across all jurisdictions. She said all of the emergency management departments in the region already coordinate efforts.

Ms. Shickle said staff will discuss today's feedback and develop an approach to take to the CAOs and Managers for their input. She said she's heard today that there should be more flexibility in scheduling the presentations and that the alphabetical rotation should no longer be followed.

Mr. Fabricant said that given all of the recent national concerns regarding safety, he would like law enforcement to be invited to make a presentation on how they are working together to ensure the safety of the region's citizens.

Ms. Shickle said the RRPDC's work efforts do support readiness in the region by way of the Central Virginia Emergency Management Alliance (CVEMA). She said the Alliance is staffed by emergency management personnel from across the region who collaborate across boundaries on such issues.

Mr. Fabricant said he thought the region should strive to be a model for cooperation with regard to safety.

Ms. Shickle noted that the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) also offers a framework for such cooperation and collaboration.

Chairman Miles thanked members for their feedback.

Appointment of FY17 Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees

Chairman Miles noted that the RRPDC Bylaws allow him to make appointments to Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees with concurrence of the Executive Committee. Executive Committee members provided that concurrence during this morning's meeting and the listings of Standing and Ad-Hoc Committees are provided for members' information under Tab 3.

Mr. Agelasto said he would like to point out that Ms. Graziano will be serving in her role as Treasurer only until December, as she opted not to run for reelection to City Council. He said the new year will bring many new faces to City Council and thus to the RRPDC. He said he'd like to thank Ms. Graziano for her service.

H. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 4 and details key projects being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities. She said that as staff works to reformat the report so that it more closely follows the agency's work program, she would appreciate feedback from members on how the report can be changed to better meet the needs of members.

Ms. Shickle said during the September meeting, staff will be bringing forward a revised agency Personnel Policies manual for members' review and action. She noted that the agency's current manual had not been updated since 2003. In conjunction with the Human Resources Roundtable, which is staffed by representatives from each of the jurisdictions' human resources departments, RRPDC staff has been working to bring the manual up to date. A draft copy of the updated manual will be provided to members prior to the September meeting.

Also during the September meeting, as stated previously, Smart Beginnings will make a presentation to members on school readiness in the region.

Ms. Shickle said there are two key projects that she'd like to emphasize this morning. There are handouts at each member's seat with detailed information on the projects – Coastal Zone Management and SMART SCALE Project Selection. She asked Ms. Nelson to provide more information on one of the SMART SCALE projects.

Ms. Nelson said that a handout on SMART SCALE is at each members' seat for their information. She said SMART SCALE is the new name for HB 2, which established a prioritization process to evaluate transportation projects by specific factors and directs the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to use the process to inform project selection for the Six-Year Improvement Program.

During the first round of project selection, which ended in June, 22, projects in the Richmond region received funding through two grant sources – one totaling \$121.2 million and the second totaling \$19 million. The second phase of project selection opens on August 1 and concludes on September 30. Ms. Nelson noted that staff is working with each of the jurisdictions to assist with the identification of projects to submit for funding.

Ms. Nelson said that she is bringing this to members' attention today because a formal resolution to endorse one of the proposed projects – Completion of the 30-mile gap in capacity investment in I-64 corridor between Bottoms Bridge and York County in the Hampton Roads region (portion of the project located outside the TPO boundary) – will be brought to members during the September meeting. Ms. Nelson reported that endorsing resolutions will be required from the RRPDC and TPO, as well as the Hampton Roads PDC/TPO. These endorsing resolutions will be included with the SMART SCALE application to fund the project; the application will be due prior to the September 30 deadline. Additional details are outlined in the handout provided.

Ms. Lascolette asked if the 30-mile gap was related to the I-64 widening project. Ms. Nelson said that was correct.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if a recommendation was needed from the Board today. Ms. Nelson said she is presenting the information to members today for their information only and that no action is required. In September, a resolution to endorse the project will be brought to members for their consideration and action. Ms. Nelson noted that each of the local jurisdictions may also submit an endorsing resolution in support of the project.

Ms. O'Bannon pointed out that the regional jail is located in New Kent County and that the I-64 widening project will be important to accessing the facility.

There was no additional discussion and Chairman Miles thanked Ms. Nelson for her presentation.

II. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Miles noted there are two items on the Consent Agenda this month:

- A. Memorandum of Understanding between the Town of Ashland and RRPDC for a Special Assessment for Planning Assistance to Complete an Update to the Town Parks and Recreation Master Plan (Tab 5)
- B. Extension of Service Agreement with the City of Richmond for the Bus Rapid Transit Connectivity and Land Use Analysis Project (Tab 6)

He asked if anyone would like to pull these items from the Consent Agenda for further discussion.

There was no request to remove either item from the Consent Agenda and on motion made by Ms. O'Bannon and seconded by Ms. Graziano, the Consent Agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business to bring before members.

NOTE: At this time, the recording mechanism began to function and minutes from this point forward are based on that recording.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. GO Virginia Update – Chris Lloyd, McGuire Woods

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle to introduce the speaker.

Ms. Shickle said that Chris Lloyd, with McGuire Woods Consulting, was asked to provide an update on the GO Virginia legislation to members as a follow up to the presentation they received earlier in the year. Mr. Lloyd has been involved with the GO Virginia initiative since its inception.

Mr. Lloyd thanked members for the opportunity to speak with them today. He said he sees this initiative as an exciting opportunity for the state and for the Richmond region. He said that the GO Virginia initiative will help the communities within the region address some of the economic challenges they are facing.

Mr. Lloyd noted that Virginia is currently at 3.8 percent unemployment statewide, which is one of the lowest rates the state has ever had. However, beyond the topline numbers, Virginia is not fairing well. Last year, Virginia had the 48th slowest growth rate in the country. The state is now ranked 34th. Virginia has fallen again in the CNBC rankings for the best states in which to do business.

Mr. Lloyd said typically Virginia recovers more quickly than the rest of the country following recessions. The recovery following the 2008 recession has been much slower due to the cuts in military spending. Only two regions in the state have recovered all of the jobs that were lost during the recession – Northern Virginia and the Richmond region. During the recession, Virginia’s job losses were mainly in the high salary professional sector. These jobs have been replaced by lower salary professional jobs. This in turn has an effect on the state’s economic growth.

Ms. O’Bannon said that she believed the reason for Virginia’s budget shortfall is because state income was overestimated. Mr. Lloyd said the formula for calculating anticipated income for the state has been altered due to the shortfall.

Mr. Lloyd noted that the GO Virginia legislation did pass during this year’s General Assembly. There were two pieces of legislation:

- Growth and Opportunity Act: HB 834/SB 449 creating the Virginia Growth and Opportunity Board and Fund; 24-member board consisting of appointees made by the House, Senate, and Governor
- Collaborative Jobs Act: HB 846/SB 459 creating revenue sharing opportunities for localities when jointly pursuing economic development projects allowing localities to receive a portion of state personal income taxes

General Assembly budget action set aside the following funding sources:

- \$35.95 million: GO Grants (\$5.5 million in FY17; \$30 million in FY18; \$450 thousand for staff)
- \$1 million: incentives for finding efficiencies
- \$97.5 million: research, labs, and equipment
- \$2.35 billion: bond package
- \$12 million for Virginia Community College System (VCCS) credentials effort

Mr. Lloyd showed a map that illustrated the proposed nine GO Virginia regions as developed by members of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions (VAPDC). It has been recommended that the Richmond Regional PDC join with the Crater PDC to form one of the regions. These regions are required by the legislation. Each region will have its own regional council to oversee the distribution of funds to qualifying projects. The majority of members in each council will be from the private sector.

The regional impacts of GO Virginia are anticipated to be as follows:

- \$500,000 to each Regional Council for organizational activities, planning, and skills gap analysis
- \$2,199,753 per capita grant allocation in FY 18 (14.66 percent of statewide population)
- \$4 million per year available to all schools from the Virginia Research Investment Fund

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the next steps for GO Virginia, noting that the law went into effect on July 1. Appointments are being made currently to the GO Virginia Board. Of the 24 members who are to be appointed, nine have been appointed, which includes two from the Richmond region. The 24 members must have a majority from the private sector (14); ten are from the House of Delegates, three from the Senate, and three of the Governor's Cabinet members.

It is anticipated that the Board will meet in late August or early September to set regional boundaries. There will be a public comment period prior to the boundaries been set. There is a deadline of October 15 to set the guidelines and procedures for allocation of funds. During the first quarter of 2017, regional councils and support organizations will be certified. The initial organizational grants are expected to be awarded during the second quarter of 2017.

Mr. Lloyd said there are four potential roles that the RRPDC can play. The first is as a convener to bring together regional leaders to form the regional council. Second is as an administrator to provide back office support to the regional council.

Ms. O'Bannon pointed out that there are several organizations already working on these activities and initiatives, such as the Capital Area Workforce Development Board. She asked if any of the organizations could morph into the regional council. She said there are other groups such as the Greater Richmond Partnership (GRP) and Chamber RVA that also have workforce efforts underway.

Ms. Shickle said that she has been in conversations with Denny Morris (Crater PDC), Kim Scheeler (Chamber RVA), and Barry Matherly (GRP) to discuss what existing structures could be used as the regional council. She said as guidelines are not out yet, no firm recommendations have been made; however, the conversations are leaning toward seeing what established organizations could take on that role under the guidelines.

Ms. O'Bannon said there is no need to create another layer or organization.

Ms. Shickle said this has been the same feeling expressed by other PDCs. She said there is a desire to incorporate what is already being done into the new initiative.

Mr. Lloyd said the legislation does stipulate that there should be no duplication of effort.

Mr. Fabricant said in the previous presentation heard by the RRPDC Board, it was emphasized that no tax dollars would be used in the GO Virginia initiative. He said it seems from what Mr. Lloyd is saying that there is a lot of state funding being used. Mr. Lloyd said the legislation stipulated that no new taxes would be required to fund GO Virginia. He said the misstatement that no tax dollars would be used has been addressed and corrected. Any funding coming from the General Assembly is to be matched by the private sector. Mr. Lloyd said many PDCs have endorsed the initiative.

Returning to the roles that PDCs can play in the GO Virginia initiative, the third role is as an implementer to manage programs that encourage regional collaboration. Finally, there is the role of informer to help educate the public about the problem and to get them involved in the solution. He said RRPDC can take action now to determine who will be appointed to serve on the regional council and to begin identifying regional projects.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that the Workforce Investment Board has about 50 members that are primarily from the private sector.

Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she has heard previously that there was not supposed to be any duplication of effort and no creation of new and overlapping boards. She said she also heard that the investment of staff was to be minimal. Now she's seeing that half a million dollars is being set aside to support the regional councils. She said one of her concerns is that there is a perception that there is no regional collaboration and that GO Virginia is to make sure there is regional collaboration. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said there is already regional collaboration among the jurisdictions in efforts that may not be flashy or capture headlines. She said there is meaningful work being done every day that impacts the citizens of the region, such as access to clean water and emergency services. She said this work adds to the foundation of the region to help create jobs. Ms. Kelly-Wiecek said she'd appreciate a more positive message from those involved with GO Virginia as they travel around discussing the initiative.

Mr. Lloyd said there is already GO Virginia messaging about current regional cooperation efforts. He said he feels there is less regional cooperation around economic development efforts.

Mr. Agelasto said he feels that there are instances where there could be more regional cooperation such as additional members to GRP or the Richmond Metropolitan Transit Authority.

Mr. Winslow asked if the \$500,000 allotment to the regional councils is an annual award. Mr. Lloyd said this is for the first year and there may be some funding for the second year. It is anticipated that the percentage of funds the regional councils are allowed to keep once funds begin to flow for projects would be used to maintain the efforts.

Mr. Holland said he is concerned that there will be another layer of bureaucracy. He said he feels that many of the efforts are best left to the localities to determine where work and/or funding is needed. He said he thought efforts should be focused on bringing down the cost of college or the rehabilitation of aging school buildings. Localities have been working on closing skill gaps as they can when funding is available. Mr. Holland said there should be more effort to drive efficiencies to better serve the needs that have already been identified.

Mr. Lloyd said these concerns are also central in the GO Virginia legislation.

Ms. Lascolette asked if Mr. Lloyd's presentation could be shared with members. Ms. Shickle said that staff would send the presentation out to members.

Mr. Peterson said Hanover County hosts a Governor's School that emphasizes Continuing Technical Education (CTE) in order to focus on providing a path to obtain the job skills credentials that Mr. Lloyd spoke of earlier. He said he's having a difficult time seeing the benefit of GO Virginia when so many of the initiatives it lists are already underway.

Mr. Lloyd said the funding is available for localities to use to build on what is already being done in those communities.

Ms. O'Bannon said several years ago a grant was received by the Workforce Investment Board which was used to fund job training through Goodwill. She said there are already organizations that know their skills gaps and could use the funds to offer job training. Mr. Lloyd said the regional councils will have the flexibility to use the funds in ways that will be most beneficial to the regions.

Ms. Lascolette asked if membership on the regional councils will be a majority of private sector appointees who will be determining how public funds will be spent. Mr. Lloyd said that was correct, along with those members who are appointed from the public sector.

There were no additional questions, and Chairman Miles thanked Mr. Lloyd for his time.

B. Water Quality: Clean Water Act Implications for Local Waters and the Chesapeake Bay

Chairman Miles asked Ms. Graziano if she would introduce the speaker for this agenda item. Chairman Miles noted that the presentation is being made at the request of the RRPDC Environmental Technical Advisory Committee (EnvTAC).

Ms. Graziano introduced Mr. Pat Bradley, who is the Water Quality Manager for the City of Richmond. His responsibilities focus on compliance related issues for the wastewater plant, combined sewer system, stormwater utility, and drinking water. Ms. Graziano noted that each of the jurisdictions is struggling to meet the Clean Water Act requirements. Mr. Bradley holds a BS degree in biology from the State University College at Plattsburg (NY) and an MS in biology from the University of Texas (Arlington).

Mr. Bradley noted that he has also worked for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Throughout his career, his focus has been on the Clean Water Act (CWA). He said the CWA lists what needs to be done to ensure clean water but does not offer any implementation tactics. The CWA provides a regulatory framework for water quality standards and total maximum daily loads (TMDL). He noted that a handout was provided that lists all of the acronyms associated with the CWA.

Ms. O'Bannon asked what MEP – Maximum Extent Practicable – means. Mr. Bradley said he'll cover this later in the presentation but basically there is no set definition for the

term. It's a primary requirement that must be met in a main sewer system but has not been further defined.

Mr. Bradley provided a timeline of how the CWA evolved from the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 through the current Wet Weather Quality Act (2000).

The CWA provides a lot of authority to the EPA, expectations for the states, and requirements for localities. The objective of the CWA is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's water. Interim goals included the following:

- the elimination of all discharges by 1985
- by July 1, 1983 achievement of water quality to provide protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife; provide for recreation in and on the water for swimming and fishing
- control toxic discharges

Mr. Bradley noted that pollutants were not to be discharged unless authorized by a permit or a part of the CWA. Permits are required for all point sources discharging pollutants into waters of the U.S. If there is a violation, the fine is \$37,000 per day per violation.

States are required to set water quality standards that must be approved by the EPA. The goals of water quality for a waterbody are designated uses, water quality criteria, and anti-degradation policy. If water quality standards are not met, the state imposes a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) which establishes a plan for meeting the water quality standards. The TMDLs can include wasteload allocations to set permit limits.

Permits typically contain technology-based effluent limits (TBELs) which are performance based and do not require a specific technology. Permits can also include water quality based effluent limits (WQBELs) which are set to protect water quality standards.

Mr. Bradley offered definitions of point source and non-point source discharges:

- point source: discharge from a discrete point (ditch, drain, etc.) into U.S. waters and are regulated under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
- non-point source: runoff that is not a point source or from a voluntary program

Mr. Bradley said that an amendment to the CWA in 1987 designated that stormwater – Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) – would be considered a point source.

NPDES stormwater regulations as required by the EPA have been set as follows:

- from MS4s
 - Phase 1 – large and medium localities (Henrico, Chesterfield)
 - Phase II – smaller localities (all remaining)

- from industrial activity
 - stormwater discharges from construction sites
- “as designate” discharges
- stormwater and combined sewer overflow (CSO)

Mr. Bradley provided a map that showed the MS4 localities in the Richmond region and briefly reviewed Section 402 of the CWA dealing with MS4s. He noted that as long as a locality or company is operating within any permit they may have, they are not in violation of any other part of the CWA. Mr. Bradley said there is an effort to clarify permits to make them more specific.

In summary, Mr. Bradley said the state establishes water quality standards. TMDLs are used with regard to protecting the Chesapeake Bay by limiting the different types of discharges and sediment. Permits are required for wastewater treatment plant and stormwater discharges. He noted that permits change every five years. Stormwater is primarily addressed via management plans.

Ms. O’Bannon asked if the overall goal to achieve clean water to increase the crab population in the Chesapeake Bay. Mr. Bradley said that could be stated as the goal, but the primary goal is to have fishable, swimmable waters.

There were no other questions and Chairman Miles thanked Mr. Bradley for his presentation.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Miles asked if there was any other business to bring before members. No other business was identified.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Chairman Miles adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:40 a.m.

Martha Shickle
Executive Director

Floyd H. Miles, Sr.
Chairman