Mary Ball Washington Regional Council
GO Virginia Region 6
www.govirginia6.org

Interview Panel Meeting
Monday, May 4th, 2020
10:00AM – 1:00PM
Virtual Meeting
Please Join the Meeting Here: https://www.gotomeet.me/GOVARegion6
To Join by Phone: (571) 317-3129 **Access Code:** 941-561-405

AGENDA

Call to Order	William Beale
Introductions	Jennifer Morgan
Public Involvement	William Beale
Approval of Minutes December 9, 2019 February 10, 2020	William Beale
Presentation of Commercial Kitchen at Hull Springs Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan
Presentation of Westmoreland Workforce Training Center Expansion Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan
Presentation of MPA Working Waterfront Product Development Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan
Presentation of Fredericksburg Regional Industrial Facilities Authority Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan
Presentation of Fredericksburg Regional Alliance Industry Cluster Analysis Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan

Presentation of MP Seafood and Agriculture E-Marketplace Development Staff Report Applicant Interview Panel Discussion	Jennifer Morgan
Adjournment	William Beale

Mary Ball Washington Regional Council

GO Virginia Region 6

www.govirginia6.org

Interview Panel Meeting

December 9, 2019

Rappahannock Electric Cooperative, Woodford, VA

MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: Billy Beale, Chair; Bruce Davis; Steve Goodall; Ann Lewis

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Kate Gibson, GWRC; Jennifer Morgan, GWRC; Neal Barber, Community Features

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Liz Povar, Middle Peninsula Alliance; Jerry Davis, Northern Neck PDC; Lisa Hull, Northern Neck PDC; Jackie Davis, Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board; John Holden, Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism; Theo Zotos, Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Beale called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Liz Povar, Middle Peninsula Alliance (MPA), entered a letter on behalf of the MPA's Chairman, Travis Moskalski, to the Council to be submitted to the record in regards to the Northern Neck Workforce Training Feasibility Site Selection Study. Ms. Povar wanted to inform the Interview Panel that the application language does not include the Middle Peninsula, there are no business support or letters of support from Middle Peninsula localities, and recommends bringing in letters of support from businesses and Middle Peninsula localities if this project is going to explore the entire Rappahannock Community College region.

PROJECT INTERVIEWS

The Interview Panel met with Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism, who presented on behalf of the project applicant, the Industrial Development Authority of Stafford County Virginia (dba Stafford Economic Development Authority) and developed a recommendation for the full Regional Council. Staff presented to the Interview Panel their comments and concerns on the project application and Mr. Beale asked questions of the applicant about what the specifics that their project would complete.

The Interview Panel met with the Northern Neck PDC, who presented on behalf of the project applicants, Northern Neck PDC, Rappahannock Community College, and the Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board. Staff presented to the Interview Panel their comments and concerns on the project application and Mr. Beale asked questions of the applicant about how the applicant would include the Middle Peninsula in their project, what current workforce training is being done at the community college and how this would build on that, and expanding performance metrics.

DISCUSSION

After conducting the interview, the Interview Panel discussed the recommendation to the Regional Council.

The Interview Panel recommended deferment of the Stafford County Cyber & Smart Tech Entrepreneurial Development Program until the February meeting for applicant changes to be made.

Mr. Beale motioned to accept this recommendation and Mr. Davis seconded the motion. All were in favor and none opposed.

The Interview Panel recommended deferment of the Northern Neck Workforce Training Feasibility Site Selection Study until the February meeting for applicant changes to be made. Mr. Beale motioned to accept this recommendation. Mr. Goodall recused himself from the vote due to his involvement on the Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board. Mr. Davis seconded the motion. All were in favor, with Mr. Goodall abstaining.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer Morgan, Economic Development Coordinator
George Washington Regional Commission

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
MARY BALL WASHINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL
INTERVIEW PANEL
February 10, 2020
Rappahannock Community College
Glenns, Virginia

MEMBERS PRESENT AND VOTING: Billy Beale, Chair; Stephanie Heinatz; Steve Goodall; Ann Lewis

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Kate Gibson, GWRC; Jennifer Morgan, GWRC; Neal Barber, Community Features

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jerry Davis, Northern Neck PDC; Lisa Hull, Northern Neck PDC; Jackie Davis, Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board; Dr. Shannon Kennedy, Rappahannock Community College; John Holden, Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism; Theo Zotos, Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism; Tom Snyder R!OT; Lewie Lawrence, Middle Peninsula PDC; Tom Swartzwelder, King and Queen County.

CALL TO ORDER
Mr. Beale called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
None.

PRESENTATION OF FREDERICKSBURG CYBER AND SMART TECH APPLICATION
The Interview Panel met with Stafford County Department of Economic Development and Tourism, who presented on behalf of the project applicant, the Industrial Development Authority of Stafford County Virginia (dba Stafford Economic Development Authority) and developed a recommendation for the full Regional Council. Staff presented to the Interview Panel their comments and concerns on the project application and how the applicant improved their project from their previous presentation to the Council. Mr. Beale asked questions of the applicant about what the specifics that their project would complete. Mr. Beale asked the applicant if they would come back before the Executive Committee or Council six months into their project and present their findings thus far and clarify in their application that R!OT was a consultant to the applicant conducting the market analysis. The applicant was amenable. Ms. Lewis moved to make the following recommendation to the Regional Council:

- Recommend approval of the Fredericksburg Cyber and Smart Tech application with the contingency that the applicant presents to the Executive Committee or Council six months into their project and present their findings thus far and clarify in their application that R!OT was a consultant to the applicant conducting the market analysis.

Mr. Goodall seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATION OF THE NORTHERN NECK WORKFORCE TRAINING FEASIBILITY STUDY APPLICATION
The Interview Panel met with the Northern Neck PDC, who presented on behalf of the project applicants, Northern Neck PDC, Rappahannock Community College, and the Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board. Staff presented to the Interview Panel their comments and concerns on the project application and how the applicant improved their project from their previous presentation to the Council. Ms. Lewis asked if classes would be held in the Middle Peninsula and the applicant said probably not. Mr. Beale asked how the site selection study would differ from the currently funded Northern Neck site characterization study and the applicant clarified that this characterization would be

specific to training site and building requirements. Ms. Lewis moved to make the following recommendation to the Regional Council:

- Recommend approval of the Northern Neck Workforce Training Feasibility Study application.

Ms. Heinatz seconded the motion. The motion passed with Mr. Goodall abstaining.

Presentation of the King and Queen Telework-Business Incubator Center
The Interview Panel met with the Middle Peninsula PDC and King and Queen County. Staff presented to the Interview Panel their comments and concerns on the project application. The applicant stated that they wanted the Council to approve the project but defer referring the project to DHCD until the fall. Ms. Lewis asked the applicant what the sustainability of the project would be after GO Virginia funds were expended. Mr. Beale and Ms. Heinatz asked why not all localities in the Middle Peninsula PDC footprint supported this project. Mr. Beale asked the applicant if they knew how many jobs were created and maintained at the high paying level set by GO Virginia by the original Small Business Development Partnership. Mr. Goodall moved to make the following recommendation to the Regional Council:

- Recommend deferment of the King and Queen Telework-Business Incubator Center application with the applicant updating their project timeline to match construction timeline, share within the application examples of the previous Small Business Development Partnership program creating jobs at the higher wage level set by GO Virginia, and explain the sustainability beyond the grant funding.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Jennifer Morgan, Economic Development Coordinator
George Washington Regional Commission

DRAFT

Staff Review: Commercial Kitchen at Longwood Hull Springs

Application Submitted: 3/27/2020

Summary of Application

The Northern Neck Planning District Commission is requesting a $50,000 grant to support a $100,000 project to conduct a feasibility study for a commercial kitchen located at Longwood Hull Springs in Westmoreland County. The scope of the study will include the operations, business model, and space plan with equipment specifications for a commercial kitchen with a canning/food preservation component, and culinary arts training through RCC. Should the results of the study indicate that a commercial kitchen establishment would be feasible in the Northern Neck, the idea is to co-locate the facility in the dining hall at Longwood Hull Springs for food preparation for resident students and faculty members. Added to the commercial kitchen function, culinary arts instruction by Rappahannock Community College (RCC) at that facility would address a gap in local adult workforce training.

The project applicant, Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC), is partnering with Rappahannock Community College (RCC), Longwood University Foundation, Westmoreland County, and the US Department of Agriculture-Rural Development. A management team would consist of the NNPDC, Longwood Hull Springs/Longwood University Foundation, two Northern Neck stakeholder businesses, and Rappahannock Community College. Longwood University will participate in the study by providing plans, access to property, and participation on the management team. Rappahannock Community College will participate on the management team, provide information regarding the demand for culinary arts training, and curriculum. USDA-Rural Development will provide the match funding for the project. USDA-RD will be consulted as a technical advisor to the project, as the agency has expertise in its role as grantor for a similar undertaking in South Hill.

The project is being matched $50,000 cash by the US Department of Agriculture-Rural Development. Of the project budget of $100,000, $92,00 will be for consultant fees and $8,000 will be for indirect costs of project administration. Letters of Support have been received from Dug In Farms, LLC; Longwood University; Rappahannock Community College; and Westmoreland County.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES
d. Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e. Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f. Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	YES
g. Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least equal to the requested GO Virginia grant?	YES

h.	If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	N/A
i.	Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects seeking administrative approval.)	YES
j.	If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	N/A
k.	Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	YES

Staff Considerations

The project does not currently meet the minimum threshold requirement of at least two participating localities. The applicant needs at least another participating locality to meet this requirement. Staff recommends the applicant work with the other localities within the region who would benefit from having a commercial kitchen near their locality to form a project management team that demonstrates meaningful participation in the project.

Pending is a letter of partnership from Northumberland County.

A staff concern is the lack of demand indicators for this project. There is only one attached letter of demand from a local business as to why a commercial kitchen would be beneficial in the region. Staff suggests the applicant engage the local economic development offices and chambers to see if there are additional businesses within the region that would benefit from a commercial kitchen in Westmoreland County that would be willing to support this project.

Please see letter from Dana Boyle, Garners Produce.

Staff recommends the applicant detail in their application what will be examined in the feasibility study to determine if a commercial kitchen is viable at Hull Springs to strengthen their performance metrics.

Please see application narrative question #3 for the components to be included in the study. The information obtained in the feasibility study will determine viability.

Council Review Team

The two members of Council who reviewed this application shared staff's concerns on increasing the number of participating localities, defining what the demand for a commercial kitchen in the Northern Neck is, and detailing what would be examined by a consultant to determine profitability and implementation costs of this project.

They felt there was a lack of a business concept in what the commercial kitchen would be. They want to see a deeper understanding of what the commercial kitchen would be used for in the project overview. These members also felt that $100,000 was too much money to complete the scope of this study. They'd like to see a cost analysis of why this level of funding is needed. They'd also like to see potential customer interviews or letters of support for people using the kitchen.

Please see YouTube video with Garner's Produce at a commercial kitchen facility in Prince Edward.

Staff Review: Westmoreland Workforce Training Center Expansion

Application Submitted: 3/27/2020

Summary of Application

Westmoreland County is requesting a $250,200 grant to support a $500,400 project to expand the course offerings at the Westmoreland Workforce Training Center, the current site for the previous GO Virginia Grant of Welding Training. The expansion will include the additional course offerings of Pipe Welder; Web Developer; Cybersecurity Specialist; Accounting Book-keeper/Clerk; Commercial Truck Driver (CDL - A); CNC Machinist; CompTIA Linux+; Billing and Coding Specialist; Project Management Specialist; CompTIA Advanced Security Practitioner; and Certified Network Associate. The project has a goal training 340 people total with 294 credentials awarded. The project anticipates 75 individuals will receive jobs over the next three years directly from this project.

The project applicant, Westmoreland County, is partnering with the Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC), Rappahannock Community College (RCC), and Bay Consortium Workforce Development Board, Inc. (WDB) to be the project management team and oversee the project.

The project is being matched $250,200 by Westmoreland County through the purchase of the building. Of the project budget of $250,200, $241,200 will be for instructor costs and $9,000 is for equipment upgrades. Letters of Support have been received from Richmond County; Lancaster County; Northumberland County; Total Machine, LLC; Omega Protein; Waterway Guide; and Rappahannock Community College Workforce Development.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES
d. Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e. Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f. Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	NO
g. Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least equal to the requested GO Virginia grant?	YES
h. If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	N/A
i. Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects seeking administrative approval.)	YES
j. If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	N/A
k. Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	YES

Staff Considerations

The project does not currently meet the minimum threshold requirement of at least two participating localities. The applicant needs at least another participating locality to meet this requirement. Staff recommends the applicant work with the other localities within the Northern Neck PDC or the localities in which the companies of Total Machine, LLC (King George, County), Waterway Guide (Middlesex County), and Omega Protein (Northumberland County) that have written letters of support for this project are located in, to form a project management team to oversee the execution of these additional classes at this site to demonstrate meaningful participation by two or more localities on this project, either financially or in-kind.

Northumberland County (letter of partnership pending) will be the second locality in this project.

The GO Virginia State Board states, projects that lead to a new or expanded obligation to the State will be less successful than those that can be sustained through federal, private or local funds. Funding for positions at state-funded entities such as the community colleges should only be considered where a non-state source of funding to sustain those positions can be identified. The majority of this project budget, is to pay instructor salaries to teach classes offered by RCC. Staff recommends that the applicant diversify their budget with purchasing of equipment, software, course materials, etc, to match the recommendation of the State Board.

The budget has been updated to include descriptions of course materials and consumables needed for the new courses. However, the bulk of the costs are for instructor costs. The Virginia Community College System does not provide seed money for new or expanded courses or programs. Positions funded through GO Virginia will be sustained by tuition revenue from students, not state funds. Students, whether self-pay or funded through federal programs like WIOA, will ensure sustainability.

Staff is concerned about the additional courses offered by this program. Versions of some of these courses are currently offered by RCC either virtually or at their Warsaw Campus. This application does not demonstrate the additional demand for these courses to be offered beyond the current capacity of RCC. To strengthen this application, staff recommends the applicant detail why offering additional courses at the WWTC would add value to the workforce in the region and benefit businesses.

RCC serves a 12-county service region, covering a vast geographic footprint. Transportation is a significant barrier for many of the citizens in the region served by the College. RCC has two campuses and several sites to meet the needs of the community. Strategically-placed sites ensure that the population is adequately served, with a goal that no citizen needs to travel more than 30 miles to attend a community college. One way to ensure access is to provide courses virtually. Unfortunately, this does not work for all citizens because of the lack of broadband in spots in all of the counties in RCC's service region. Additionally, not all students can be successful in an online format. Lack of technological skills is another barrier. The programs proposed to be offered at the Montross site fill a need for area businesses and are not replicated in a face-to-face format in close proximity.

The timing of this application is a concern. The Northern Neck Workforce Training Feasibility Study was approved by the Region 6 Council on February 10, 2020. This study will examine current and future workforce needs and the requirements for undertaking appropriate training to meet the available jobs of today and in the future in the Rappahannock Community College footprint. This study has yet to

begin and is set to list recommendations of training programs that are of high demand in the region. Staff recommends the applicant detail how offering these classes meets additional demand beyond the capabilities of RCC current course offerings and how it will frame the workforce training study.

The feasibility study is to identify long-term workforce needs and planning for the future. The study will take months and of course, has not yet begun. These training needs in the Westmoreland Workforce Center Expansion project are immediate. In fact, the need for this type of training has only increased because of the pandemic and the significant rise of dislocated workers.

Staff recommends the applicant expand their performance outputs and outcomes section to demonstrate the success of each of the training programs. Staff suggests that outputs should include: # of students trained by each program; # of upskilled employees (showing if they had a job and then were "upskilled" by this program); # of credentials awarded; % of students in program that receive credentials. Outcomes should include: # of businesses served; # of new jobs created by the companies that will hire the students (requires tracking after they leave the training and into their new jobs); average wages of jobs created. These metrics are recommended by DHCD to track program success. Staff is available to work with the applicant to create tracking mechanisms for each of these metrics.

Agree to this.

The applicant is missing the in-kind contribution form detailing the $250,200 building acquisition from Westmoreland County.

Form will be sent later.

In Question #4 the applicant states they will request funding twice per year to cover training costs and equipment upgrades. The budget has no mention of equipment upgrades. Staff recommends matching the budget to show equipment upgrades or removing this sentence.

Equipment upgrades are for IT-related items to improve connectivity at the site. The current infrastructure is not designed to accommodate the number of technology-related courses to be offered at the site.

Council Review Team
Two members of Council reviewed this application and agreed with staff's comments around increasing locality participation on this application. They both see this as a strong opportunity for the region and want to see more participation from benefiting localities.

They were concerned about offering additional training classes through RCC if there is currently a GO Virginia funded study to determine what additional classes need to be offered by RCC to meet employer demand. They want to know how the applicant knows these classes need to be offered if they study has not been completed or why the study was necessary if the applicant knows these classes need to be offered.

They want to know more about the sustainability of funding instructor salaries after the grant. If the grant is fully funding these costs, what will happen after the funds have expired.

They'd like to see what additional equipment this grant will be funding with the $9,000 for equipment upgrades.

Staff Review: MPA Working Waterfront Product Development

Application Submitted: 3/27/2020

Summary of Application

The Middle Peninsula Economic Development Resource Organization (DBA Middle Peninsula Alliance) is requesting a $98,000 grant to support a $205,985 project to study the initial validation of the legitimacy of use of waterfront properties in the Middle Peninsula as distributed research test beds necessary to support the Region 6 Water-Based Economy strategy, leading to higher-paying jobs in this new business cluster. This project will provide a real time demonstration and result in actionable data and recommendations that informs the Middle Peninsula Alliance and its partners about the operational advantages and barriers for rural waterfront site usage for research purposes, and will also result in data that is useful to companies who are developing products or services that address recurrent flooding. The project will inventory waterfront properties that are suitable for companies who work in the resiliency cluster to test their products on and grow their businesses by understanding what barriers are currently impacting companies from accessing those sites. Furthermore, the project will examine what characteristics are necessary to retrofit these sites for business expansion use.

The project applicant, the Middle Peninsula Alliance, is partnering Gloucester County Economic Development Authority, the Town of Tappahannock, and Essex County, Mathews Land Conservancy, Hull Springs, the Commonwealth Preservation Group, Museum Resources and Building Resilient Solutions.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES
d. Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e. Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f. Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	YES
g. Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least equal to the requested GO Virginia grant? h. If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	YES N/A
i. Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects seeking administrative approval.) j. If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	YES N/A
k. Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	YES

Staff Considerations

Staff concerns center around demonstrating how this project will lead to an implementation project that will lead to higher paying jobs. There is no clear line of sight in this application on how this study will lead to a project that will have a direct ROI for the region.

- **See page 2**
- **MPA Note: This specific ECB is intended to inform and provide useful knowledge to Virginia Sea Grant as it submits and is hopefully awarded a Competitive Fund project (with GO Virginia Region 5). There is not an intention by the MPA to submit a separate implementation project because it is supportive of, and has offered to be involved with, the VASG Competitive Project in any way that VASG determines the MPA has value.**

Staff is concerned with the lack of regional cooperation within this grant. There is little meaningful cooperation amongst those who have submitted letters of support to this project. Staff would like to see a management team with members of the localities and businesses supporting this project to ensure regional cooperation.

- **See page 4 and page 12**
- **MPA note: after submission of the original application the MPA again reached out to its corporate partners, to Virginia Sea Grant, to the Middle Peninsula Public Access Authority, to the Mathews Land Conservancy, and to Hull Spring in Westmoreland County. Significant additional feedback was received from Virginia Sea Grant, from the corporate partners, and from Mathews Land Conservancy and has been incorporated into this revised application. Of importance, after discussion with Virginia Sea Grant, it has informed the MPA that it is not supportive of this application (see page 12 for reasons cited). No response was received from the Middle Peninsula Public Access Authority. This revised application also clarifies that the management team originally recommended does include locality partners as well as Virginia Sea Grant and the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission. The Mathews Land Conservancy and Hull Spring also offered staff to serve on this Advisory Committee.**

A concern for staff to ensure that the MPA Site Characterization study identifies the use of the properties in this study appropriately. Staff will work with the applicant to ensure the results of the MPA Site Characterization study are reflected in the contract of this project, in terms of project outcomes.

- **See page 2**
- **MPA Note: after submission of the original application, the MPA received a letter from Draper Aden (engineering firm conducting the MPA Site Characterization study); the letter is attached to this revised application and confirms that when completed, the Site Characterization Study will recommend that research and test beds are a highly-recommended use of the MPPAA portfolio of sites.**

The application is missing project milestones and drawdown schedule template, performance metrics template, and letters of support from industry partners.

- **See attachments**

Council Review Team

Two members of Council reviewed this project and mainly agreed with staff's comments on areas of improvement with this application.

The Council members stated they'd like more clarity around what this application is trying to accomplish in this study through a detailed step-by-step breakdown of each point to be examined in the study.

- **See pages 4&5**
- **MPA Note: The ECB project as revised now clarifies specific elements of the deliverables that will benefit 1) the MPA Region in its economic development value proposition; 2) can benefit VASG thru a small scale demonstration project using a rural waterfront site; and 3) will benefit the corporate partners by enabling data collection that validates test methodology, a necessary step to product development.**

They'd like to see more clarity around how this study will be used to create higher paying jobs in the region and what these jobs are.

- **See page 2**
- **MPA Note: This specific ECB is intended to inform and provide useful knowledge to Virginia Sea Grant as it submits and is hopefully awarded a Competitive Fund project (with GO Virginia Region 5). There is not an intention by the MPA to submit a separate implementation project because it is supportive of, and has offered to be involved with, the VASG Competitive Project in any way that VASG determines the MPA has value.**

They'd like a more detailed budget on what the project funds will be used for or what the consult will be paid for.

- **See attached budget**

Project Name: Fredericksburg Regional Industrial Facilities Authority

Application Submitted: 3/27/2020; Resubmitted with Updates 4/22/2020

Summary of Application

The Fredericksburg Regional Alliance is requesting a $16,500 grant to support a $22,000 project to form a Regional Industrial Facilities Authority (RIFA) for the City of Fredericksburg and the counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford. Project funds will be used to hire a legal firm to create the RIFA formation as outlined in Va. Code Section 15.2-6400-6416.

Project partners include the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance, the City of Fredericksburg and the counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES
d. Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e. Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f. Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	YES
g. Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least equal to the requested GO Virginia grant? h. If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	YES N/A
i. Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects seeking administrative approval.) j. If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	YES N/A
k. Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	N/A

Staff Considerations

The application is missing a 1-2 page Executive Summary, any feasibility studies or demand documentation, a project milestones and drawdown schedule, a performance metrics document, letters of commitment from the localities, and a budget showing project revenues and how they will be expended.

The applicant updated their application to include all missing documentation.

Council Review Team

Two Council members reviewed this application and both felt this was an incomplete application. They wanted to see all the required attachments to fully understand who supported the project.

> The applicant updated their application to include all missing documentation.

They want to ensure that this project will not become a "put it on the shelf" effort and will be utilized by the localities. They suggest the applicant discuss what potential this effort has to be approved by the localities and when it will be utilized.

> The applicant states in their application, pg 13, the Fredericksburg region has approximately 115 total sites being marketed for economic development purposes. Over 50 of those properties are over 50 acres, which means they are able to host large economic development projects that result in a high number of jobs and wages that are typically higher than the region's prevailing wage. Only two of 115 total properties are classified as "Tier 4", both of which are under 15 acres. However, the Fredericksburg region has at least 12 sites that can be classified as "Tier 2.5" to "Tier 3". In addition, the Fredericksburg region is the only region in Virginia with two "mega sites" (sites greater than 1,000 acres). Both of these categories of sites have the most opportunity to benefit from a RIFA.

They want the applicant to discuss how this project timeline and administration will not be impacted by the current economic situation.

> The applicant has informed staff that this will be discussed with individual Boards of Supervisors on a case by case basis.

They'd like the applicant to incorporate the law firm's scope of work into the application to detail what they are proposing to do.

> The applicant has added this information under Question 2 and included the full Scope of Work from the law firm, attached to the application.

Project Name: Fredericksburg Region Industry Cluster Analysis

Application Submitted: 3/27/2020; Updated 4/22/2020

Summary of Application

The Fredericksburg Regional Alliance is requesting $32,520 of a $45,000 project to complete an updated study of the clusters of interrelated industries in the region. The study will identify the regional groupings of industries that are interconnected because of factors such as supplier-buyer relationships, available labor pool, and other local expertise. This will show which industry clusters are prioritized in this sub region and enhance them.

Project partners include the Fredericksburg Regional Alliance, Germanna Community College, WJ Vakos, Transurban, the City of Fredericksburg and the counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES
d. Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e. Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f. Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	YES
g. Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least equal to the requested GO Virginia grant? h. If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	YES N/A
i. Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects seeking administrative approval.) j. If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	YES N/A
k. Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	N/A

Staff Considerations

Staff's primary concern with this application is the lack of demand documentation for why forming a cluster analysis how doing this deeper dive will lead to the creation of higher paying jobs within Region 6's industry clusters. Staff recommends the applicant explain in their application how this deeper dive around the target industry clusters will attract new businesses to the region and help grow the existing business economy. Furthermore, the applicant should explain how this differs from the region's Growth and Diversification Plan in identifying the region's priority industries in their application.

> The applicant has addressed this through documenting how this project will benefit businesses in the region to expand their current efforts based on updated information.

The application is missing a 1-2 page Executive Summary, any feasibility studies or demand documentation, a project milestones and drawdown schedule, a performance metrics document, letters of commitment from the localities, and a budget showing project revenues and how they will be expended.

> The applicant has addressed these concerns by providing all documentation.

Council Review Team

The two Council members who reviewed this application both commented on the number of missing documents from this application. They wanted to see this information to help them understand the application.

> The applicant has addressed these concerns by providing all documentation.

They agreed this application would benefit from detailing why this study is necessary beyond the region's Growth and Diversification plan. They'd like to see what level of detail this plan will examine and why it is necessary to grow the region's economy.

> This applicant has stated that this project will go 2 levels deeper into industry data than what is covered in the Growth and Diversification Plan.

They want to see what actions were taken from the 2013 study, what jobs were added and businesses brought to the area, and what major changes have happened since the original study to warrant an update.

They'd like a budget breakdown of why a meeting will cost $3,500.

> The applicant has discussed with staff that this project will be presented to business leaders, press, and regional economic development organizations through an event to highlight the findings of the data. The applicant does not currently know a breakdown of the event costs, but based on previous events, estimates the above cost.

Staff Review: Middle Peninsula Seafood and Agriculture E-Marketplace Development

Application Submitted: 4/30/2020

Applicant: Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority

Grant Type: Economic Resilience and Recovery (ERR) Fast Access

Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Aquaculture/Seafood/Commercial Fishing/Marine Industries

Localities Covered: Essex County, Gloucester County, King and Queen County, King William County, Mathews County, Middlesex County, Town of Tappahannock, Town of West Point, Town of Urbanna.

Partners: MPCBPAA, MPPDC, Consociate Media and Marker 9, Phondini, King and Queen County, Mathews County, Essex County, Gloucester County, Town of Tappahannock

GO Virginia Request: $79,000

Match: $39,500

Total Cost: $118,500

Summary of Application

The Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority requests funding to customize an app called FIshLine to help connect seafood producers with those who want to purchase local seafood. GO Virginia funding will be used to customize the apps, purchase the app subscription to sell seafood, social media website for ordering outside the app, pre buy church and foodbanks, and marketing of the new app. This project focuses on actional strategies that expand and build capacity to support seafood businesses in Region 6.

The project applicant, is partnering with the Middle Peninsula PDC to provide a cash match, Consociate Media to provide cash and in-kind marketing, Marker 9 to provide cash and in-kind marketing, Phondini the app providers, and the localities. The Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission will serve as grant and project manager for the Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority (MPCBPAA). The MPPDC will coordinate with the Local Government Administrators representing the six counties and three towns as the project advisory team, with additional representatives from the MPCBPAA, Marker 9 apparel company, Consociate Media, and their downstream connections to multiple local seafood companies across the Middle Peninsula.

The project is being matched $39,500 cash and in-kind by the project partners to provide marketing services, purchasing of food, and customizing the app.

Threshold Review

THRESHOLD – *required criteria to be considered for GO Virginia funds*	
a. Does the applicant demonstrate capacity to manage the grant?	YES
b. Does the project align with GO Virginia strategies?	YES
c. Does the project carry out the goals/objectives of the Region 6 Economic Growth & Diversification Plan?	YES

d.	Does the project contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the creation of higher-paying jobs for the region?	YES
e.	Does the project address, either directly or indirectly, businesses that receive more than 50% of their revenue from out of state?	YES
f.	Does the project have at least two participating localities, political subdivisions, or public bodies corporate and politic?	YES
g.	Does the project have non-state source(s) of revenue at least 50% to the requested GO Virginia grant?	YES
h.	If no, is there a fiscal distress or unique economic opportunity justification for the reduced match? (In no instance will the match be less than half of the requested GO Virginia grant request.)	N/A
i.	Are the participating localities contributing at least 20%, or $50,000, whichever is greater, of the required match? (Not required for Enhanced Capacity Building Projects or Fast Access grants seeking administrative approval.)	YES
j.	If no, does the project demonstrate the ability to benefit the majority of the region or region(s) and that the benefitting localities were approached but unable to financially contribute to the project?	N/A
k.	Is the project sustainable after GO Virginia funds?	YES

Staff Considerations

Staff is concerned about tracking the impact of this grant. Staff recommends that in 6 months and 1 year, the applicant report to the Council the following:

- How many buyers were added to the app?
- How many people purchased goods?
- Number of jobs created
- Number of existing jobs sustained
- Number of existing businesses expanded
- Marketing statistics in terms of # of people reached

Staff is concerned with how this product will engage with companies to have them sell their product. Staff would like to see in the application a target number of businesses subscribed to the app. The line of sight to maintaining high-paying jobs is unknown.

Staff would like clarification around the role of the MPCBPAA and the MPPDC as the “market maker” in this project. How will this role facilitate better connection between the seller and the buyer through the app.

Budget Questions

- Who receives the Project Administration funding?
- What does the line item “pre-buy church and foodbanks” mean?

Documents Missing

- Letter of Commitment from Consociate Media and Marker 9

GO VIRGINIA

VIRGINIA INITIATIVE FOR
GROWTH & OPPORTUNITY
IN EACH REGION

Project Title: Commercial Kitchen at Hull Springs

- Applicant: Northern Neck Planning District Commission
- Localities Covered: King George County, Lancaster County, Northumberland County, Richmond County, Westmoreland County
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Manufacturing
- Type: Enhanced Capacity Building
- GOVA Funds Requested: $50,000
- Matching Funds: $50,000
- Total Cost: $100,000

Project Overview

- The Northern Neck Planning District Commission would like to conduct a feasibility study for a commercial kitchen located at Longwood Hull Springs in Westmoreland County. The scope of the study will include the operations, business model, and space plan with equipment specifications for a commercial kitchen with a canning/food preservation component, and culinary arts training through RCC.

- Should the results of the study indicate that a commercial kitchen establishment would be feasible in the Northern Neck, the idea is to co-locate the facility in the dining hall at Longwood Hull Springs for food preparation for resident students and faculty members. Added to the commercial kitchen function, culinary arts instruction by Rappahannock Community College (RCC) at that facility would address a gap in local adult workforce training.

- The project applicant, Northern Neck Planning District Commission (NNPDC), is partnering with Rappahannock Community College (RCC), Longwood University Foundation, Westmoreland County, and the US Department of Agriculture-Rural Development. A management team would consist of the NNPDC, Longwood Hull Springs/Longwood University Foundation, two Northern Neck stakeholder businesses, and Rappahannock Community College.

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- Two minimum localities
  - Staff has not received an additional Letter of Support from a locality. The applicant has stated a letter is pending from Northumberland.
- Lack of demand indicators
  - The applicant provided two letters indicating demand and one YouTube video

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application

Project Title: Westmoreland County Workforce Training Center Expansion

- Applicant: Westmoreland County
- Localities Covered: Lancaster County, Northumberland County, Richmond County, Westmoreland County
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Manufacturing, Professional, Scientific and Technical Services, and Information
- Type: Implementation
- GOVA Funds Requested: $250,200
- Matching Funds: $250,200
- Total Cost: $500,400

Project Overview

- Westmoreland County would like to expand the course offerings at the Westmoreland Workforce Training Center, the current site for the previous GO Virginia Grant of Welding Training.
- The expansion will include the additional course offerings of Pipe Welder; Web Developer; Cybersecurity Specialist; Accounting Book-keeper/Clerk; Commercial Truck Driver (CDL - A); CNC Machinist; CompTIA Linux+; Billing and Coding Specialist; Project Management Specialist; CompTIA Advanced Security Practitioner; and Certified Network Associate.
- The project has a goal training 340 people total with 294 credentials awarded. The project anticipates 75 individuals will receive jobs over the next three years directly from this project.

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- Minimum Two Participating Localities
  - Letter of Partnership pending from Northumberland County
    - Level of partnership not defined; goal of GO Virginia is to create regional partnerships in a meaningful way
- How does this project build capacity beyond the classes already offered? Will all of these classes be face-to-face at the Montross site?
- What is the current training to jobs gap in these jobs?
- Number of Students Receiving Jobs
  - 340 people trained, 294 credentials awarded, but only 75 jobs created
- Majority of budget towards salaries that would create a new state obligation with sustainability using tuition after grant.
- Current Northern Neck Workforce Study

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application

Project Title: Middle Peninsula Working Waterfronts Product Development

- Applicant: Middle Peninsula Alliance
- Localities Covered: Essex County, Gloucester County, King and Queen County, King William County, Mathews County, Middlesex County, Town of Tappahannock
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Aquaculture / Seafood / Commercial Fishing / Marine Industries
- Type: Enhanced Capacity Building
- GOVA Funds Requested: $98,000
- Matching Funds: $107,985
- Total Cost: $205,985

Project Overview

- The Middle Peninsula Alliance would like a grant to study the use of waterfront properties in the Middle Peninsula as distributed research test beds necessary to support the Region 6 Water-Based Economy strategy, leading to higher-paying jobs in this new business cluster.

- This project will provide a real time demonstration and result in actionable data and recommendations that informs the Middle Peninsula Alliance and its partners about the operational advantages and barriers for rural waterfront site usage for research purposes, and will also result in data that is useful to companies who are developing products or services that address recurrent flooding.

- The project will inventory waterfront properties that are suitable for companies who work in the resiliency cluster to test their products on and grow their businesses by understanding what barriers are currently impacting companies from accessing those sites. Furthermore, the project will examine what characteristics are necessary to retrofit these sites for business expansion use.

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- How is this project not duplicative of VASG Region 5 and Region 6 project in development?
- How does this project benefit more than one business testing on sites?
- Advisory Board consists of VIMS, VAGS, RCC, MPPDC, and WIB all of whom have not written letters of support
- No letter of support from Middle Peninsula Public Access Authority to conduct research on sites

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application

Project Title: Fredericksburg Regional Industrial Facilities Authority Agreement

- Applicant: Fredericksburg Regional Alliance
- Localities Covered: City of Fredericksburg, Stafford County, Caroline County, Spotsylvania County, King George County
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Manufacturing
- Type: Enhanced Capacity Building
- GOVA Funds Requested: $16,500
- Matching Funds: $5,500
- Total Cost: $22,000

Project Overview

- The Fredericksburg Regional Alliance is requesting funding to form a Regional Industrial Facilities Authority (RIFA) for the City of Fredericksburg and the counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford.
- Project funds will be used to hire a legal firm to create the RIFA formation as outlined in Va. Code Section 15.2-6400-6416.

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- Engagement from all localities

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application

Project Title: Fredericksburg Regional Alliance Cluster Analysis

- Applicant: Fredericksburg Regional Alliance
- Localities Covered: City of Fredericksburg, Stafford County, Caroline County, Spotsylvania County, King George County
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Manufacturing
- Type: Enhanced Capacity Building
- GOVA Funds Requested: $32,250
- Matching Funds: $12,750
- Total Cost: $45,000

Project Overview

- The Fredericksburg Regional Alliance is funds to complete an updated study of the clusters of interrelated industries in the region.
- The study will identify the regional groupings of industries that are interconnected because of factors such as supplier-buyer relationships, available labor pool, and other local expertise.
- This will show which industry clusters are prioritized in this sub region and enhance them. The study will analyze at 4 digit NAICS Code Level.

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- How will this report benefit businesses within the region?

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application

Project Title: Middle Peninsula Seafood and Agriculture E-Marketplace Development

- Applicant: Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority
- Localities Covered: Essex County, Gloucester County, King and Queen County, King William County, Mathews County, Middlesex County, Town of Tappahannock, Town of West Point, Town of Urbanna
- Growth and Diversification Plan Strategy Area (s): Aquaculture/Seafood/Commercial Fishing/Marine Industries
- Type: Economic Resilience and Recovery (ERR) Fast Access
- GOVA Funds Requested: $79,000
- Matching Funds: $39,500
- Total Cost: $118,500

Project Overview

- The Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority requests funding to customize an app called FIshLine to help connect seafood producers with those who want to purchase local seafood.

- GO Virginia funding will be used to customize the apps, purchase the app subscription to sell seafood, social media website for ordering outside the app, pre buy church and foodbanks, and marketing of the new app. This project focuses on actional strategies that expand and build capacity to support seafood businesses in Region 6.

- The project applicant, is partnering with the Middle Peninsula PDC to provide a cash match, Consociate Media to provide cash and in-kind marketing, Marker 9 to provide cash and in-kind marketing, Phondini the app providers, and the localities. The Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission will serve as grant and project manager for the Middle Peninsula Chesapeake Bay Public Access Authority (MPCBPAA).

Staff Concerns and Applicant Responses

- Staff is concerned with how this product will engage with companies to have them sell their product.
- Staff would like to see in the application a target number of businesses subscribed to the app. The line of sight to maintaining high-paying jobs is unknown.
- Staff would like clarification around the role of the MPCBPAA and the MPPDC as the “market maker” in this project. How will this role facilitate better connection between the seller and the buyer through the app.
- Budget Questions
  - Who receives the Project Administration funding?
  - What does the line item “pre-buy church and foodbanks” mean?

Applicant Q&A and Discussion

Vote

- Please remember to state your name before making a motion
- We need a first and second of the motion and then a role call vote
- Options for Voting
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board as submitted
  - Approve the application for submission to the State Board with conditions or at a lower funding level
  - Request the applicant modify the application for action at a future meeting
  - Deny the application