



IMPROVING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF HAMPTON ROADS

The Hampton Roads Regional Structure Project

Recommendation to create a

Regional Services Review

Prepared by the Future of Hampton Roads, Inc.

October 2006

HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL STRUCTURE PROJECT

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP 1C

HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL SERVICES REVIEW FUNCTION

Contents

1. Transmittal Letter.....1

2. Study Group Task.....2

3. Recommendations:

- a. Use a functional name.....3
- b. Review existing documents.....3
- c. Focus on independent agencies.....3
- d. Consider sector reports.....3
- e. Exclude certain agencies.....4

4. Sounding Board.....4

5. Annexes

- A-1 Participants in the Study Group.....5

October 31, 2006

HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL STRUCTURE PROJECT
Study Group 1C
Regional Services Oversight Board

1. Transmittal Letter

To the Steering Committee:

The Study Committee which developed this report consisted of John Hadfield, Chair, Lonnie Bell, Doyle Hull, John Kuplinski, and Nancy Munnikhuysen. The task of the Study Committee was:

- (1) To identify the types of “regional” services (including naming the specific agencies where possible) to be reviewed,
- (2) To identify the types of documents to be reviewed,
- (3) To identify and design a “sounding board” for the work of the Study Committee

The Study Committee met on three separate occasions to complete its work with a majority of the committee members present at each meeting. Input was also received from Art Collins (HRPDC) by helping to identify regional service agencies that currently exist and by suggestions as to which types of service providers should be considered. The Study Committee concluded that the list could be inexhaustible, but also concluded that some agencies are more easily reviewed than others; that the review focus should be on public or quasi-public agencies.

The members of the Study Committee would be pleased to answer questions on the report’s content, its deliberations and its reasons for the specific recommendations.

Respectfully Submitted,

John S. Hadfield

2. Study Group Task

Study Group 1C was charged with providing detailed recommendations in support of the following proposals in the Hampton Roads Structure Project's draft *Report No.2 – Transforming the Regional Structure*:

“1.5 In addition to its present functions, the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission should be charged with assisting the [proposed] Hampton Roads Metropolitan Council to monitor the activities of the various independent regional authorities, boards, and commissions.

“1.51 The Planning District should perform the oversight function by establishing a Regional Services Oversight Board within its staff to receive and evaluate annual reports and audit reports of regional governance entities.

“1.52 The annual review would be summarized in a report to the Metro Council and local city councils and county boards of supervisors. The report would include appropriate recommendations.

“1.53 The reports generated by this process would serve as input to the periodic regional visioning process of the Hampton Roads Partnership along with other studies and statistics provided by the Planning District staff.” (pp. 11-12)

The Study Committee was tasked to consider the concept of a regional review of various public services providers which would evaluate their individual and collective contributions to the regional vision for the benefit of the mayors and chairs on the proposed Metropolitan Council. The group was asked to consider the types of information to be reviewed, the types of service providers to be reviewed and to initiate a list of the specific agencies to be reviewed. The Study Committee was also asked to identify a “sounding board” to review its work.

3. Recommendations

a. Use a Functional Name. As the work is to be performed by Planning District Commission staff and does not involve intervention in the management of any of the entities reviewed, the title “Regional Services Oversight Board” is too imposing, sounding too much like control. The name should be changed to “Regional Services Review Committee” or simply “Regional Services Review.”

b. Work with existing documents. The reviews should involve reading and summarizing the content of the agencies’ existing and recurring documents rather than any sort of investigative or audit procedure. The creation of new documents would be an imposing and unnecessary extra burden. The entire concept is to assure that the activities of diverse regional agencies comport with a regional strategic vision for adequate service delivery and financial integrity. Existing reports and documents can provide that insight. The following documents would be reviewed:

- Financial Audit Report
- Planning Document(s)
- Annual Report of Accomplishments

c. Focus primarily on independent regional agencies. Among the agencies which should be the easiest to review are:

- Southeastern Public Service Authority
- Peninsula Public Service Authority
- Hampton Roads Sanitation District
- Public safety agencies as a group, including
 - the three Regional Jails
 - EMS providers
 - Local police departments
 - Local fire departments
 - Local jails
- Hampton Roads Transit Authority
- Economic development agencies, including
 - Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance
 - Local industrial or economic development authorities
- Hampton Roads Sports Authority
- Workforce Investment Boards

d. Consider sector evaluations. The Hampton Roads Partnership may be expected to provide for the evaluation and strategic planning for the region’s most important economic clusters. However, the HRPDC’s review function might be called on by the Metropolitan Council to prepare studies of the service performance of both public and private entities in the following important sectors because they add so critically to the competitiveness of the region and/or to the quality of life:

The Port of Virginia, including VPA, NIT, and related organizations

Public and Private Higher Education

- Christopher Newport University
- College of William & Mary
- Norfolk State University
- Old Dominion University
- Thomas Nelson Community College
- Tidewater Community College
- Hampton University
- Virginia Wesleyan College Regent University

Cultural agencies

- Cultural Alliance of Greater Hampton Roads
- Museums and other attractions
- Tourism groups

Redevelopment & Housing Authorities and other agencies that contribute to the stock of housing

Water supply planning agencies

- Western Tidewater RWA
- James City County Services Authority
- Local government Utility departments

Hospitals and other private healthcare providers

- Chesapeake
- Maryview
- Obici
- Riverside
- Sentara

Airport Authorities

Private transportation providers

- Norfolk Southern
- CSX
- Greyhound Bus Line
- Trailways

e. Certain entities may be excluded. An important category of agencies about which the members of the Metropolitan Council would be expected to be informed because they participate in them as board members are:

- Planning District Commission
- Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Hampton Roads Partnership

4. Sounding Board

The Study Committee concluded that the sounding board for its work should be the same as for the proposed Hampton Roads Metropolitan Council.

Annex A-1**Members of the Study Group**

John Hadfield, Chairman
Executive Director
Southeastern Public Service Authority

Alonzo Bell, Sr.
Director of Leasing
Randolph Real Estate Services

Doyle E. Hull
Senior Vice President (ret.)
Sovran Bank

John Kuplinski
Superintendent
Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail

Nancy L. Munnikhuysen
Chief of Communications
Hampton Roads Sanitation District