

**GOVERNOR'S REPORT
ON THE**

**Feasibility Of Further
Realignments In
Executive Branch Agencies**

**TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF VIRGINIA**



House Document No. 8

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
DECEMBER, 1984**



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Office of the Governor

Richmond 23219

Charles S. Robb
Governor

December 31, 1984

TO: The General Assembly of Virginia

The 1984 General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 147, requesting "the Governor to study the feasibility of further realignments in Executive Branch agencies."

The report which follows responds to that request and offers a thorough analysis of the merits of further realignment. The recommendations contained in this report will be reviewed with members of the General Assembly so that those proposals which involve legislation can be carried forward in the 1985 Session.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Charles S. Robb".

Charles S. Robb
Governor of Virginia

CSR/dlt

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1
State Employment and Training Activities Study	
Overview	2
Findings and Conclusions	2
Recommendations	11
Environmental Management Services Study	
Overview	17
Findings and Conclusions	17
Recommendations	21
Agricultural Services and Regulatory Activities Study	
Overview	23
Findings and Conclusions	23
Recommendations	25
Administrative and Support Services for Small Agencies Study	
Overview	27
Findings and Conclusions	27
Recommendations	29
Regulation of Residential Facilities and Day Programs Study	
Overview	31
Findings and Conclusions	31
Recommendations	35
Executive Management Support Services Study	
Overview	38
Findings and Conclusions	38
Recommendations	43
Appendices	
Appendix A: Agency Contacts for Employment and Training . . .	A-1
Appendix B: Personal Interviews for Employment and Training . .	B-1
Appendix C: Interviews for Environmental Management	C-1
Appendix D: Agency Contacts and Other Interviews for Regulation of Residential Facilities and Day Care Programs	D-1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The six studies were conducted by staff from the Departments of Planning and Budget, Information Technology, and Economic Development, and the Council on the Environment under the general guidance and direction of John Dooley, Richard Wilkinson, Karen Washabau, and Al Neale.

State Employment and Training Activities Study

Neal Menkes - Study Director, Department of Planning and Budget

Lin Corbin-Howerton, Department of Planning and Budget
Marilynn Vaughn, Department of Information Technology
Russel Uzzle, Department of Planning and Budget
David Chu, Department of Planning and Budget
Glenn Butler, Department of Planning and Budget

Environmental Management Services Study

Robert Griffis - Study Director, Department of Planning and Budget

Keith Buttleman, Council on the Environment
Larry Hughes, Department of Information Technology
Jim McKean, Department of Economic Development

Agricultural Services and Regulatory Activities Study

Gerald Petersen, Department of Information Technology

Administrative and Support Services for Small Agencies Study

Stuart Gravatt, Department of Planning and Budget

Regulation of Residential Facilities and Day Programs Study

Catherine Clark - Study Director, Department of Planning and Budget
Elizabeth Kaplan, Department of Planning and Budget

Executive Management Support Services Study

Karen Washabau - Study Director, Department of Planning and Budget

John Dooley, Department of Information Technology
John Mahone, Department of Planning and Budget
Jim Mills, Department of Information Technology

The Governor's Report on the Feasibility of Further Realignments in Executive Branch Agencies

Stuart Gravatt, Department of Planning and Budget

INTRODUCTION

The Governor's critical reevaluation of state government resulted in the passage of major reorganization legislation by the 1984 General Assembly. In addition, the Governor identified six areas of state activity where further study was needed before actions could be recommended: state employment and training activities, environmental management services, agricultural services and regulatory activities, administrative and support services for small agencies in the executive branch, regulation of residential facilities and day programs, and management support services for the Chief Executive. These studies were authorized by House Joint Resolution 147 which required the Governor to report the study findings to the 1985 General Assembly. Detailed staff reports were prepared in each of the six subject areas and were reviewed by the Governor's Office and the Secretaries. This document summarizes those findings and conclusions, and contains the Governor's recommendations.

For each study, the responsible Secretary was identified and the objectives, issues and outcomes, affected agencies and programs, management, and project schedule were developed. The studies were prepared by staff from the Department of Planning and Budget and the Department of Information Technology (formerly the Department of Management Analysis and Systems Development), with assistance provided by the Department of Personnel and Training, the Department of Accounts, the Council on the Environment, and the Department of Economic Development.

The studies examined areas where the program activities of state agencies could be improved through the definition or redefinition of state policy, the realignment of programs, clarification of statutes, improvements in agency regulations and procedures, and increased efficiency in the administration of services. The principal objective of the recommendations which follow is to improve the delivery of services by state government. If implemented, these recommendations will help to achieve effectiveness, efficiencies and/or economies in a wide variety of state government activities.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES STUDY

OVERVIEW

Because of its complexity, the study is divided into two phases. The purpose of the first phase is to develop a system of complementary, cohesive and comprehensive state government policies for employment and job training services affecting the entire Virginia labor force. (For this study, labor force and work force are defined as persons ages 16-70 who are capable of working.) In order to accomplish the aims of the state policies, the purpose of the second phase of the study is to assess further possible realignment of state resources based on the findings of effectiveness evaluations.

For the purposes of the study, employment and training activities are defined as state services provided directly or indirectly to citizens that:

- teach, train or otherwise prepare individuals for work;
- place workers into jobs through such actions as job search assistance, job referrals and job development; and
- enhance productivity of experienced workers through specialized occupational training and advanced classroom education.

The study covers 13 state agencies that participate in programs and services related to employment and training activities; four-year institutions of higher education were excluded. (See Figure 1 on the next page.). During the 1984-86 biennium, these agencies will serve an estimated one million individuals, 420 public and private nonprofit agencies and 40,500 private sector employers. A total of \$2.2 billion has been appropriated for this time period and some 3,700 FTE positions have been authorized.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study examined the state's employment and training activities from three perspectives: trends which affect these activities, state policy governing these activities and existing programs and services.

Trends

The study identified four demographic trends which will affect Virginia's employment and training services:

- labor force growth rate is slowing;
- work force participation rates are increasing;
- labor force is aging; and
- educational levels are increasing but progress is not universal.

Figure 1

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES PROVIDED

AGENCY/PROGRAM	Intake/ Assessment	Job Counseling Job Search Assistance	Skill Training	Referral	Supportive/Other Services	Job Development	Job Referral and Placement Subsidized Employment	Follow-up	Administrative & Support Functions
<p>DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Probation and Reentry Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Adult Probation and Parole Services ◦ Community Based Residential Custody (Work Release) ◦ Correctional Enterprises (Agribusiness, Industrial Services, Printing and Reproduction, Warehousing and Distribution Services, Manufacturing Services, Automated Data Processing Services) ◦ Secure Confinement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Adult Security 	◦	◦	◦	◦		◦	◦		
<p>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ State Education Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ State Education Services for Instruction ◦ State Education Services for Vocational Education ◦ State Education Services for Adult Education ◦ Financial Assistance for Public Education (Categorical) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Financial Assistance for Instruction ◦ Financial Assistance for Vocational Education Instruction ◦ Financial Assistance for Adult Education Instruction ◦ Financial Assistance for Public Education (Standards of Quality) ◦ Employment Assistance Services (State Education Assistance) ◦ Employment Assistance Services (Local Education Assistance) ◦ Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Gifted and Talented Instruction 								◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦ ◦	

AGENCY/PROGRAM	Intake/ Assessment	Job Counseling Job Search Assistance	Skill Training	Referral	Supportive/Other Services	Job Development	Job Referral and Placement	Subsidized Employment	Follow-up	Administrative & Support Functions
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY ° Industrial Development Services ° Apprenticeship Training Promotion and Development										°
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION ° Instruction ° Basic Skills and Knowledge Instruction ° Occupational-Vocational Instruction			°							
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATIVE SERVICES ° Instruction ° Basic Skills and Knowledge Instruction ° Occupational and Vocational Instruction Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center ° Instruction ° Occupational-Vocational Instruction			° °			°		°		°
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES ° Employment Assistance Services										°

AGENCY/PROGRAM	Intake/ Assessment	Job Counseling	Job Search Assistance	Skill Training	Referral	Supportive/Other Services	Job Development	Job Referral and Placement	Subsidized Employment	Follow-up	Administrative & Support Functions
DEPARTMENT FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED Rehabilitation Assistance Services ° Restoration Services Vending Facilities, Snack Bars and Cafeterias Manufacturing				°°°		°	°°	°°	°°	°°	
DIVISION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT Industrial Development Services ° Industrial Employee Training											°
GOVERNOR'S EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING DIVISION Employment Assistance Services											°
REHABILITATIVE SCHOOL AUTHORITY Instructional Assistance for Instruction ° Basic Skills and Knowledge Instruction ° Occupational-Vocational Instruction				°°							
STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA Higher Education Academic Fiscal and Facility Planning and Coordination ° Academic Planning and Review Higher Education Student Financial Assistance ° Scholarships and Loans											° °

AGENCY/PROGRAM	Intake/ Assessment	Job Counseling Job Search Assistance	Skill Training	Referral	Supportive/Other Services	Job Development	Job Referral and Placement Substituted Employment	Follow-up	Administrative & Support Functions
VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM ° Higher Education Instruction ° Occupational/Technical Courses ° Remedial Instruction ° Community Education ° Industrial Development Services ° Industrial Employee Training			• • • •					• •	
VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION ° Employment Assistance Services ° Employment Services ¹			•					•	

¹ Skill Training - The VEC contracts training for dislocated workers with community colleges and assists veterans in obtaining on-the-job training placements.

These demographic trends will affect the state's employment and training activities in the following ways. Because fewer young people will be entering the labor force and be available for entry-level work, young job seekers will face less peer group competition in the search for employment. This should ease the need for government actions to train young people or to assist them in finding work. Conversely, because so much of tomorrow's work force is already working today, the need will increase for government employment and training programs which serve older workers. Educational institutions will be challenged by the influx of new, untraditional types of students and will have to reexamine the assumptions that determine who receives government assistance for education.

Because of the increasing numbers of working women, the demand for job training programs and for support services such as day care will rise. Also, since good day care is expensive and because many women are holding low-paying jobs, the state's role in regulating, funding and providing such services is likely to be substantially affected.

Because an increasing number of experienced and older workers will dominate the work force through the remainder of this century, state government employment and training services will have to become more attuned to the needs of these people.

Because the Virginia work force has better educational credentials than in the past, and because educational attainment is clearly linked with worker productivity, these increasing educational levels serve as an inducement for out-of-state businesses to locate in Virginia and for existing Virginia businesses to expand their operations. However, because educational achievements are not universal, employment opportunities may be restricted for some Virginians. Virginians who do not attain minimum educational credentials are less likely to be sought after by employers. Thus, the challenge to government is to identify students most likely to fail and to provide special services to improve their basic skills development.

The study identified three economic trends which will affect state employment and training activities:

- economy is shifting from manufacturing to services;
- new information economy is expanding as a source of high-paying employment opportunities; and
- most new jobs will be created in the service sector and only require minimal educational credentials.

These economic trends will affect the state's employment and training activities in the following ways. Because the manufacturing industry, while still important to Virginia, is no longer the predominant industry for employment opportunities, state government services in both economic development and education will have to meet the needs of an increasingly diversified economy.

In order to exploit the employment opportunities of the information economy, state government will have to concentrate on three areas: higher level education, small business development and technological research.

Because so many students do not pursue education beyond high school, and because so many new job opportunities do not require education above the high school level, state government must ensure that graduates have attained job-readiness, in both basic skills and knowledge as well as vocational-technical training before they finish high school.

Existing State Policy

In examining the adequacy of existing state policies, the study found five areas where major deficiencies exist.

First, there is a lack of comprehensive policy at the statewide level resulting in policy inadequacies at lower levels. The study found that policy for employment and training is needed at three levels--statewide, to set broad goals for agencies in the area of employment and training, and to direct and coordinate activities that transcend specific functions of government; Secretarial, to direct agency strategies and activities within functions of government; and agency, to reflect and interpret higher-level policy at the service delivery level.

Second, the state has not adequately defined its role in employment and training policy development in the past and the state's roles and policies have been determined by federal mandates. Because the state's policy role in employment and training activities has largely been determined by federal mandate, fragmentation and duplication at the federal level has contributed to this problem at the state level. However, the state has the ability to set policy responsive to the needs of its citizens and to coordinate divergent programs. It is essential that the state establish its role in employment and training through state policy, including determining the specific state populations in need of services, independent of federal mandates, and seeking to assert those priorities in state and federal programs. In examining the proper role for state government to play in employment and training, the study determined that there are four major responsibilities. First is the establishment of statewide policy direction, priorities, and goals for employment and training, based on assessments of both the population in need of services and occupations in demand. To carry out this task, the state is also responsible for the generation, compilation and analysis of needed data, including labor market information, and demographic, economic, and occupational trends at the local, regional, state, and national levels. The state's third responsibility is to coordinate employment and training services with other human services, and with economic development. Finally, the state is responsible for promoting job creation and encouraging economic development, particularly in times when natural business forces are insufficient to meet the needs of the economy or the labor pool.

Third, existing policies do not reflect an assessment of the emerging trends that will be impacting employment and training in the future. Existing state policies do not adequately reflect emerging trends in areas where such an assessment would be most important. Statewide policy is either too general to account for these factors, or tied to federal mandates and trends and the state has not made a commitment to using data which are available or to generate data which are unavailable. The degree to which Secretarial-level policy accounts for agency use or non-use of these data differs by Secretarial area. Where trends demand coordination between Secretarial areas, this is rarely accomplished in existing policy. Thus, the state needs to implement policies at the statewide, Secretarial, and agency levels to insure that those involved in employment and training incorporate an assessment of pertinent emerging trends in their employment and training activities (e.g. economic and industrial forecasts, population projections and estimates, and labor market and occupational trends).

Fourth, the state has not defined which state activities constitute employment and training and which, therefore, are subject to employment and training policy at each level. Statewide policy has failed to provide guidance to state agencies regarding which activities constitute employment and training. This is important because even the most comprehensive and cohesive policies will be rendered ineffective if agencies can pick and choose to which of their activities the policies will apply, and to which they will not. Many agencies were found to be confused about what programs fall within employment and training (e.g. offender work opportunities, adult education). Thus, the state needs a comprehensive definition of what constitutes employment and training, as part of a body of policy.

Fifth, the state has no comprehensive policy for encouraging the private sector to provide training and re-training opportunities for experienced and older workers. The state does provide these incentives in other areas. For example, the state tax system currently allows the depreciation of equipment and tax relief for capital investment. There is no similar provision for human investment on the part of firms. In light of the need for re-training in new career areas, incentive opportunities should be examined to encourage greater participation by individuals and employers in this area. As re-training of an existing labor force becomes increasingly important to employability, involvement of the private sector in this re-training also will become more important.

State Programs and Services

In examining state programs and services, the study made four significant findings.

First, most programs serve, either by providing direct client services or administrative support, special client populations. Eighteen of the state's employment and training programs deal with special client populations, and most of these programs are federally funded. A problem with this arrangement is that it encourages state agencies to operate under the assumption that, because federal recognition of a client group is rarely withdrawn, agency services should be cued to federal guidance and to the availability of federal appropriations rather than to the state's direction in meeting the employment and training needs of all citizens of the Commonwealth. Because of the major federal funding and authorization of services for special clients, state government options are somewhat limited. With the determination of which special clients are in need of targeting made in Washington, the state has less opportunity to allocate scarce resources to other special populations or to shift resources between recognized special population groups.

Second, the majority of state-initiated programs and state-generated dollars are targeted to employment and training activities related to education, industrial development, and public safety. Funding for programs in these areas represent 90 percent of the total 1984-86 appropriations for employment and training. Of this amount, the overwhelming majority of funds are earmarked for public education. The strong state involvement in education is particularly important in terms of employment and training because, first, it is through the educational system, specifically at the elementary and secondary levels, that all workers receive their instruction in the basic skills (e.g. reading, communicating, reasoning, computing, interpersonal relations, and personal work habits) and, second, it is the only training system which all workers must pass through, and it is responsive to state government direction and initiative. Because education is responsive to state government initiative and serves as the primary training system for all workers, it is the ideal juncture where state employment and training policy would be most effective in reaching the greatest number of people and ensuring worker productivity.

Third, the state's employment and training activities are fragmented and duplicative. The study identified two types of duplication:

- Identical services are provided by different agencies for the same client group. For example, DOE and VCCS provide remedial education to the same people; and
- Identical services are provided by different agencies for similar client groups. For example, DVH and DRS provide skill training, job development and follow-up services for special subgroups of the physically handicapped.

These findings indicate that agencies perform similar functions and provide similar services. This unnecessary duplication hinders effective use of state resources and does not maximize benefits to clients.

The study identified two types of service gaps as a result of fragmented programs:

- First, follow-up is not a consistent practice of all agencies that provide skill-training. This means that, in some instances, the effectiveness of skill training is not assessed.
- Second, coordination is poor between different agencies providing complementary, supportive services for the same clients. For example, there is no formal procedure for placing wards and inmates in apprenticeship programs if they complete their terms at DOC prior to completing apprenticeship training. RSA or DOC parole officers may or may not contact DLI for assistance in placing individuals in apprenticeship training.

Thus, the lack of coordination results in gaps in the services provided. Because agencies do not follow-up on their clients, they cannot determine if their services meet the needs of workers and employers.

Fourth, most state programs focus on job preparation and job entry. Although the overwhelming majority of Virginians who will be working in 1990 and 2000 are already in the labor force, most state program services are focused on job preparation and/or job entry activities as opposed to providing services that improve a worker's employability. Thus, the state will have to determine whether to continue to concentrate most of its attention on job preparation and job entry or to shift its resources to meet the needs of an aging work force confronting significant technological and economic changes in the workplace.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT for employment and training efforts shall be to enunciate a unified statewide policy direction, to establish firm and specific priorities, and to articulate clear, unified and achievable goals. Employment and training activities shall be defined as those state services that: teach, train, or otherwise prepare individuals for work; place workers in jobs; and enhance productivity of experienced workers.

Policies:

1. The Governor should provide statewide guidance to agencies on a regular basis concerning their employment and training activities, especially as they relate to other human service activities and to state economic development activities.

Approach:

The Governor should issue the needed statewide guidance through the planning and budget document containing his proposed goals, objectives and policies (budget guidance).

2. Secretarial-level direction to agencies should ensure the elimination of duplication and fragmentation of services.

Approach:

The Secretaries of Commerce and Resources, Human Resources, Education, and Transportation and Public Safety and the Chief of Staff shall meet regularly to resolve problems of duplication and fragmentation. Areas for examination should include:

- ° job preparation services provided by the Department for the Visually Handicapped and the Department of Rehabilitative Services;
- ° remedial instruction provided by all levels in public education;
- ° employer recruitment efforts at institutions of higher education and community colleges;
- ° job placement services to offenders;
- ° training services provided by the Department of Corrections for offenders; and
- ° apprenticeship placement services for ex-offenders.

The group should be chaired by the Chief of Staff and should report to the Governor by September 1, 1985.

3. Agencies shall ensure that policies governing employment and training programs are in concert with higher level policies.

Approach:

Upon issuance of the Governor's Budget Guidance, agencies should review their employment and training policies relevant to the higher level policy and make necessary revisions.

4. Agencies shall be able to demonstrate a return on their employment and training investment; to that end, agencies shall periodically determine results of their services and shall report on such results compared to costs as part of their budget submissions.

Approach:

The Department of Planning and Budget should, with assistance from the involved agencies, develop measures of successful outcomes for use in program reporting as part of the Commonwealth Planning and Budgeting System.

5. Agencies shall use available data to determine populations in need and occupational opportunities.

Approach:

The Department of Planning and Budget should, with the assistance of other data-gathering and data-generating agencies, ensure that needed data are available; this includes economic, physical, demographic, fiscal, and other data for localities, regions, and the state. To further this compilation of information, all state agencies that generate relevant data should provide it to DPB.

Agencies providing employment and training services should use this information to regularly assess the relevance of their programs to the labor market and to other relevant economic trends, as well as to project existing and potential client group size, and make needed revisions.

Agencies should provide to clients relevant information to serve as a basis for intelligent choices about career planning.

6. Agencies shall manage employment and training programs so that these services are in concert with and support state economic development efforts and other human service programs.

Approach:

Agencies should actively seek the involvement of the private sector in order to ensure relevance in employment and training efforts.

Agencies should identify and assess special populations whose needs may go beyond federal mandates so that state general fund dollars can be targeted to them.

Based on agency assessments, the Virginia Liaison Office and appropriate Secretaries, working with other states and national organizations (such as the National Governors' Association), should continuously seek to maximize state flexibility in implementing federal mandates on employment and training.

Agencies should identify and assess the human service needs of client populations and coordinate the delivery of appropriate services.

THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT in job preparation is to prepare a skilled workforce that meets the needs of the economy and achieves economic independence. Public education at all levels must recognize its role as Virginia's primary training system for all workers, and seek to prepare individuals for economic independence.

7. Public education agencies shall, insofar as possible, ensure that students have the basic communication and computational skills which will make them job-ready upon completion of their formal education. Responsibility for this rests with secondary schools for those who will not complete high school and those whose formal education is complete upon graduation from high school. Responsibility for those accepted to pursue a 2-year or 4-year college education rests with the institutions of higher education.

Approach:

The Board of Education should study the feasibility of including subject matter on job readiness to test student skills and knowledge in state-sponsored competency examinations.

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia should study the feasibility of instituting competency testing in basic computational and communication skills as well as job-readiness skills for rising juniors in state institutions of higher education.

8. Non-education agencies shall recognize that in job preparation efforts, the rudiments of basic skills and knowledge must precede specialized training and knowledge.

Approach:

Non-education agencies with job preparation responsibilities should ensure, through examination, that clients have mastered basic skills to the extent of their capabilities.

THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT in job entry is to match job-ready workers with available employment opportunities in order to promote individual economic self-sufficiency and to contribute to the economic growth of the Commonwealth.

9. Agencies shall coordinate job entry activities.

Approach:

Agencies responsible for job development and job placement services should coordinate their efforts in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and reduce any confusion or burden imposed upon private sector employers caused by multiple agency contacts.

The Department of Personnel and Training should study the feasibility of contracting with private sector personnel agencies to place clients of state employment and training services.

10. The Secretary of Commerce and Resources should assume primary responsibility for directing state government activities in job creation and job development.

Approach:

The Department of Economic Development should assume full funding, management and administrative responsibilities for the industrial employee training subprogram.

11. The Secretary of Human Resources should assume primary responsibility for directing state government activities in job placement.

Approach:

Under the authority of §§ 2.1-51.9 and 2.1-51.15, Code of Virginia, the Governor should consider the transfer of the Virginia Employment Commission from the commerce and resources secretariat to the human resources secretariat. Furthermore, legislation to merge the Governor's Employment and Training Division and the Virginia Employment Commission should be considered.

THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT in job security is to promote the upgrading and retraining of workers already in the labor force so as to ensure their continued employability and to enhance their productivity.

12. Agencies shall encourage incentives for human investment and identify and remove barriers to retraining and continuing education.

Approach:

The Secretary of Education should identify barriers to continuing education and the feasibility of removing such barriers, including full-time requirements in degree programs at the institutions of higher education.

The Secretary of Commerce and Resources, in concert with the Secretary of Finance, and others as needed, should examine the feasibility of providing incentives to individuals and private sector employers for retraining.

13. Agencies shall regularly assess the need to shift funding and programmatic emphasis so as to respond to the demands of emerging demographic and economic trends.

Approach:

Agencies should include this assessment in their Biennial Budget submissions.

14. Public education agencies shall prepare to meet the increasing demands for education by non-traditional students, without duplication or fragmentation of services. This policy works towards ensuring: that remedial education is only provided at the primary and secondary levels; that vocational education is only provided at the secondary and community college levels; and that adult basic and continuing education are provided at all levels.

Approach:

The Secretary of Education should prepare a recommended policy in consultation with representatives of affected public education agencies and should present such recommended policy to the Governor by September 1, 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES STUDY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the study is to determine the most suitable alignment of environmental management activities in state government. A suitable alignment is generally indicated where there is no significant duplication or fragmentation between agency programs or activities; where there are clear lines of accountability; and where there is easy access to agency programs and activities.

The environmental management activities reviewed in this study include: resource planning and coordination activities of the Council on the Environment; water quality resource management and regulatory activities of the State Water Control Board; water quality management, waste water engineering, and toxic substance, solid waste and hazardous waste control activities of the Department of Health; and air quality management activities of the State Air Pollution Control Board.

In keeping with the intent of HJR 147, the only component of the state's Land Management Program which the study examined was that operated by the Department of Health in its solid and hazardous waste activities. However, five other state agencies are involved in the Land Management Program (Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy; Department of Conservation and Historic Resources; Department of Highways and Transportation; Division of Motor Vehicles; and the Solid Waste Commission) and therefore have some involvement in areas related to the state's environmental management activities.

The study focuses on the feasibility of realigning environmental management agencies and does not consider consolidation of Secretarial responsibilities, operational efficiencies of agencies, or locational relationships of regional or substate districts. The issue of Secretarial responsibility was resolved by the 1984 Session of the General Assembly.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Of the four agencies whose programs were reviewed by the study, three report to the Secretary of Commerce and Resources (Council on the Environment, State Water Control Board, and State Air Pollution Control Board) and one reports to the Secretary of Human Resources (Department of Health). The respective Secretaries act as the overall coordinators of agency activities within their Secretariats and provide guidance to the agencies regarding the policies of the Governor.

For the most part, each of the four agencies has separate and discreet program responsibilities in environmental management activities. The Council on the Environment (COE) is Virginia's coordinating agency for environmental quality issues and policy. Its activities include assuring coherence and coordination among state environmental programs; coordinating state and federal environmental policy and overseeing the major project permit review

process; promoting environmental education and information activities; and advising the state's decision-makers on environmental policy and issues. The State Water Control Board (SWCB) functions in two major program areas: the water resource planning and management program, which includes floodplain management, groundwater planning and management, surface water planning, water management liaison, and water quality planning, and the water quality management and technical assistance program, which includes construction assistance, enforcement, investigation, permit issuance, and technical assistance and training. The Department of Health (DOH) is responsible for regulating sewage and wastewater disposal and regulating public water supply, and for managing solid waste and hazardous waste disposal. The State Air Pollution Control Board (SAPCB) is responsible for air quality planning which includes setting standards, issuing air quality permits, monitoring sources of air pollution, and enforcing the state's air quality standards.

The study found that, where the four agencies do have responsibilities in common program areas, they coordinate both formally and informally. Formal coordination includes memoranda of agreement which set out areas of responsibility and means of coordination between agencies, and joint issuance of regulations (e.g., SWCB and DOH jointly issue the state's sewage regulations). Informal coordination occurs through frequent interagency contact between both the state environmental agencies and their federal counterparts.

The study found, through its survey of agency clients, user groups and others in frequent contact with the environmental agencies, that the the four agencies' coordinative activities are not fully effective. The concerns of these parties are summarized below.

Environmental Organizations or Public Interest Representatives

For the most part, those surveyed saw no drastic problems with duplication or fragmentation among the agency programs except in the area of water quality where activities of the SWCB and DOH overlap, as in inspections and plan reviews. However, two major concerns were expressed. The first was the lack of an efficient state approach to managing the environment, which leads to problems in responding to "cross-media" pollution issues such as acid rain or groundwater policy. The second main concern was the confusion encountered by persons outside state government with the numerous agencies' responsibilities and, thus, accountability. Interviewees cited the lack of coordination between the agencies as the major cause of duplication and fragmentation.

Public Planning Organizations

The concerns of these organizations were expressed from a comprehensive environmental protection perspective. They indicated that citizens and local governments were hampered by the difficulty of knowing which agency is responsible for addressing specific, contemporary environmental issues, such as acid rain, the Chesapeake Bay, coastal zone protection, and uranium mining. Also, the accessibility of state government to citizens concerned

with a wide variety of environmental issues was described as inadequate because the organization of environmental management programs was too fragmented to provide unified responses to specific questions. Finally, the state's ability to protect environmental resources in a comprehensive manner was considered to be unlikely, if not impossible, with the existing fragmented resource management programs which seem inadequate to control pollutants moving from one resource to another.

These groups also felt that, under the current alignment, many new environmental issues cannot be readily assigned to one environmental management agency since the problems involved may cross the regulatory or resource planning authority of two or more agencies under two or more Secretaries. In addition, they suggested that certain environmental concerns will develop into major problems over time and that no coordinated state planning effort exists to address these types of problems.

Regulated Public Sector Representatives

This group, consisting of representatives of local governments and regional public service authorities, indicated that the existing environmental regulatory system works and that there are no major problems related to the alignment of these programs. However, they did cite inadequate coordination and some duplication in the joint responsibilities of DOH's waste water engineering program and SWCB's regulations pertaining to public sewage treatment works, particularly in the dual track approval processes for new facilities and in the inspections performed by the two agencies.

Regulated Private Sector Representatives

Those interviewed in this category included representatives of agriculture, consulting engineering, economic development, manufacturing, and utilities in Virginia. The overwhelming majority indicated that the existing environmental regulatory system in the state works well and that there are no major problems related to the current alignment of the environmental and public health protection programs. The most frequent recommendation made by the private sector representatives was not to change the existing alignment of the environmental management and public health agencies.

Using the findings from the interviews and from the analysis of the four agencies' programs, the existing alignment of environmental management activities was reviewed against five major criteria: duplication, fragmentation, accountability, accessibility, and coordination. The analysis found that, among the state's environmental management programs, the only duplication is in the water quality program. Both SWCB and DOH review and approve plans for waste water treatment plants, inspect waste water treatment plants, and conduct training programs for waste water treatment operators. However, duplication exists only in the inspection programs and not in the plan reviews and training programs.

The analysis found that individual environmental management programs in Virginia are not fragmented, with the exception of the waste water programs of DOH and SWCB. Problems initially perceived as resulting from fragmentation were found to be the result of deficiencies in the areas of accountability and accessibility.

The analysis found that there is a high level of accountability among the environmental management agencies. However, there are gaps in the coverage of certain environmental issues where there are no clear lines of authority and where there is confusion over which agency or agencies has responsibility. This gap arises most often on broad or cross-media environmental issues and on emerging environmental issues where, due to the newness of the issue, definite responsibility may not have been assigned. The study found that the state traditionally responds to these types of issues by organizing ad hoc groups of multi-disciplinary experts, rather than by creating new agencies or programs or combining existing ones. This has proven to be a reasonable approach and should be continued. At the same time, however, the state should use more fully the mechanisms it already has in place (the Council on the Environment and a Deputy Secretary for resource matters in the Commerce and Resources Secretariat) to prevent problems of fragmentation and lack of accountability from occurring.

The analysis found that accessibility to the environmental management agencies was not a problem. Rather, the problem is the lack of a focal point at the state level where environmental issues can be discussed and which serves as a clearinghouse for environmental information. While the state already has this focal point in the Council on the Environment, which is charged with acting in just such a capacity, recent budget cuts have curtailed the resources the Council devotes to public information activities.

The analysis found that coordination among and between the environmental management agencies is quite good. In virtually all areas where agency programs and activities have points of contact, formal or informal cooperative agreements have been developed to prevent overlap and duplication. The only area where these agreements have not been fully effective is in the waste water treatment programs operated by SWCB and DOH.

The analysis indicated that the current alignment of the environmental management agencies is basically suitable. Alternative alignments were evaluated only for the two problem areas identified in the analysis: first, the problem of the lack of an overall focal point for the coordination and development of state policy on broad environmental issues and, second, the duplication and fragmentation in the inspections of waste water treatment facilities by SWCB and DOH. The alternative alignment considered for correcting the lack of a focal point for state environmental policy and activities was the consolidation of all environmental activities into one agency. This alternative was rejected primarily because it offers little potential for improving service delivery or reducing program costs. The better alternative is to strengthen existing mechanisms already established in state government. The alternative alignment considered for correcting the

duplication and fragmentation in the waste water treatment programs was the merging of the waste water programs of SWCB and DOH. This alternative was also rejected because of minimal cost-benefits. The better alternative is to strengthen the cooperative agreements between the two agencies, particularly in inspection activities.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Council on the Environment shall play a stronger role in carrying out the intent of its legislation in coordinating overall environmental issues, developing a long-range planning capability, and providing a forum for environmental issues.
2. The Secretary of Commerce and Resources should use the recently authorized Deputy Secretary position to focus on the development of environmental policies, using the Council on the Environment in a planning and coordinating capacity.
3. The State Air Pollution Control Board, in recognition of its unique role and expertise, shall remain as an independent agency and shall not be aligned or merged with other agencies or programs. However, the General Assembly should consider the adoption of legislation which specifies the duties and responsibilities of the Board versus the duties and responsibilities of the agency staff.
4. The Department of Health and the State Water Control Board shall develop a common inspection report form for use by both agencies in inspecting waste water treatment plants. Furthermore, the two agencies shall develop legislation for consideration by the 1985 General Assembly which would consolidate the inspection of waste water treatment facilities.
5. The State Water Control Board, in recognition of its unique role and expertise, shall remain as an independent agency and not be realigned or merged with other agencies or programs. However, the General Assembly may wish to consider the adoption of legislation which specifies the duties and responsibilities of the Board versus the duties and responsibilities of the agency staff.
6. The Department of Planning and Budget shall evaluate the effectiveness of the state's Land Management Program participated in by the Departments of Conservation and Historic Resources; Mines, Minerals and Energy; Highways and Transportation; and Health, as well as the Solid Waste Commission and the Division of Motor Vehicles.

7. The Secretary of Commerce and Resources shall direct the renegotiation of all Memoranda of Understanding between the environmental management agencies and the agencies being consolidated in the Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy, and in the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources.
8. Consistent with the recommendations in A Review of Substate District Systems in Virginia State Agencies, the Water Programs Regions of the Department of Health and the State Water Control Board shall be evaluated by an interagency task force and the two agencies shall collaborate to develop a common set of boundaries.

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES AND REGULATORY ACTIVITIES STUDY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the study is to examine existing organizational and program alignments of four agricultural services and regulatory activities currently performed by state agencies, and to recommend realignments where appropriate. Realignment is appropriate when it eliminates duplication or fragmentation between agency programs or activities; when it establishes clear lines of accountability; and when it makes access to agency programs and activities easier.

The four activities reviewed in the study are agricultural product promotion and the regulation of milk, seafood, and bedding products which involve a total of thirteen state agencies. The major findings in each of these program areas are presented below.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Agricultural Product Promotion Activities

The study examined the marketing relationships between the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS), nine product commissions, and the Virginia Agricultural Foundation (VAF) as each undertakes agricultural product promotion, research, and education. The study found no duplication in the product promotion activities of these agencies, since each agency works in a well-defined area of product promotion. Because DACS has administrative relationships with the product commissions and the VAF and monitors their activities, the agencies have good working relationships and no substantial overlap in activities. However, the administrative relationships between DACS and the product commissions is poorly defined by the Code of Virginia and administrative practices vary among the commissions.

Milk Regulation

The study examined the interrelationships between the three agencies which regulate milk: Department of Health (DOH), Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS), and the Milk Commission.

The milk regulation activities of these agencies have been the subject of a number of studies over the last several years. Presently, there is a study being conducted by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and milk industry on milk regulations. This study is to be completed in mid January.

While these studies have been undertaken from somewhat different perspectives, the conclusions reached have been widely contradictory and inconsistent. There have been recommendations to consolidate inspection activities of DOH with DACS; to consolidate all dairy activities within DACS and retain the Milk Commission as an independent regulatory body within DACS; and to retain the current division of responsibilities among the agencies with

modifications to improve efficiency of operations. While the recommendations of these previous studies have been inconsistent, there does appear to be a basis for changes which would clarify responsibilities and increase administrative efficiencies.

Seafood Regulation

The study also examined the relationship between the shellfish sanitation program operated by the Department of Health (DOH) and the food inspection program for finfish operated by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (DACS). Under the current regulatory programs, both agencies inspect different operations in an estimated 31 plants which process both shellfish and finfish.

Four alternatives to the current split in regulatory responsibility were examined. The first is to assign DOH's inspection program of 31 shellfish processing plants to DACS. The disadvantages of this approach are that it would fragment regulation of shellfish sanitation and could have an adverse impact upon the highly-sensitive shellfish industry. The second alternative is to transfer DACS's finfish inspection program to DOH. The disadvantage of this approach is that it would require the shifting of additional regulatory activities to DOH; this is not the most cost-effective use of resources now appropriated to seafood regulation programs. Either transfer of regulatory responsibility will further complicate the inspection process, possibly to the detriment of the 31 plant operators.

The third alternative is to transfer the shellfish sanitation program, with its appropriated resources in dollars and employment level, from DOH to DACS. The advantages of this approach are that it would ensure the continuity of the entire shellfish sanitation program and would eliminate fragmentation in the current programs. Further, given the regulatory nature and the food aspects of the shellfish sanitation program, it is compatible with the mission and program of DACS.

The fourth alternative is to retain the separation of activities in DOH and in DACS, and require an interagency memorandum of understanding. The primary advantage to this alternative is that no statutory changes would be required.

Bedding and Upholstery Regulation

The study examined the regulation of bedding which involves both DOH and DACS. Several studies, dating back to 1970, have recommended the transfer of this function to DACS. Transfer was to have been effective July 1, 1972, but was never accomplished. While not documented, it appears that industry and political pressure stopped the transfer. Industry now appears amenable to locating all bedding regulation activities in DACS, which remains the best regulatory and organizational alternative for the state. Evaluation of the program's funding structure is also needed and could be undertaken concurrently with the transfer.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Agricultural Product Promotion Activities

1. The commodity commissions shall be continued and retain the mandatory assessment system to fund their research, promotion and educational activities.
2. The Virginia Agricultural Foundation shall be continued as currently organized and funded. It shall continue to receive administrative and support services from the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.
3. The General Assembly should consider the appropriateness of uniform commodity commission legislation which could include:

relationships of the commodity commissions to the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services;

periodic mandatory reassessments (every 5 years) of the need for a commission;

conditions that would determine the need for mandatory referenda of producers on proposed excise tax increases;

rules for determining the results of reassessments or referenda;

ex-officio membership (without a vote) on each commission of a Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services' representative designated by the Commissioner of each commission;

administrative support services provided to the commissions by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; and

establishment of requirements and procedures that will govern the administrative operations and oversight of the commissions including the authority of the Commissioner of DACS, uniform expenditure reporting, uniform project reporting and coordinating, and uniform fee structure for administrative and support services provided by DACS.

Milk Regulation

4. The Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the Department of Health and the Milk Commission shall work with the Virginia Dairymen's Association to develop legislation for consideration by the 1986 General Assembly. The legislation should consider the feasibility of the recommendations of the study to be completed in mid January for the Governor's Regulatory Advisory Board as well as regulation of milk quality by the industry from the farm to the distribution point, and for sampling of milk by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services or the Department of Health in the retail outlets. Further, such legislation should assume that the authority for the independent rate-setting of milk will be retained by the Milk Commission.

Seafood Regulation

5. The General Assembly should consider legislation which calls for the inspection of plants that process both shellfish and finfish, and any other shellfish facilities, to be performed by the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Such legislation would envision the transfer of existing Bureau of Shellfish Sanitation employees to DACS and the retention of shoreline inspection by the Department of Health.

Alternatively, in lieu of legislation, the General Assembly may wish to direct the execution of a joint agreement between the Departments of Health and Agriculture and Consumer Services to address shellfish inspection activities.

6. State and federal public health officials should continue to be responsible for the establishment and maintenance of pertinent standards and protocol as they relate to public health in the shellfish program.

Bedding and Upholstery Regulation

7. The General Assembly should to consider legislation which would either amend the bedding and upholstery law so that the responsibility for regulation is vested with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, rather than the Department of Health, or repeal existing statutes governing the regulation of bedding and upholstery.
8. The Department of Planning and Budget shall establish management guidelines for the operation of the programs funded by special funds which will: determine what constitutes excessive fund balances and prohibit their accumulation; provide fee stability over several years; and provide management with the latitude to handle fluctuating costs over which they have little control.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT SERVICES STUDY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of the study is to determine the most suitable method for providing administrative and support services to agencies in the executive branch with 25 employees or less. Currently, there is no consistent or standard approach to the provision of basic administrative and support services to these small agencies (e.g., some undertake all of these services for themselves and some contract with larger agencies to provide all or a part of these services for them).

Administrative and support services are defined as the budgeting, personnel, accounting, bookkeeping, and procurement/purchasing activities undertaken by an agency primarily in order to comply with state procedures or requirements. Although there is no clear division between administrative and support services carried out to meet statewide requirements and those undertaken to operate the agency's programs, certain administrative and support activities are required of every state agency, regardless of its size and function, whereas administrative and support services related to program activities may vary widely.

The study covers the 39 agencies currently in the Executive Department which have a maximum employment level of 25 or less and which were appropriated funds in the 1983-84 fiscal year (small agencies which were created or funded for the first time in fiscal year 1984-85 are not included in the study). The Governor's Office was also included because it functions as a small agency insofar as it traditionally receives outside administrative and support services. The study also examines the six supporting agencies which provided administrative and support services to small agencies in 1983-84 and which continue to provide these services.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The study found that the majority of small agencies received total or partial outside support for administrative and support services in 1983-84. There is no consistent factor or combination of factors which determines why an agency receives or does not receive outside support.

Receiving outside assistance saves the small agency both staff and dollar resources and becomes increasingly cost-effective for a small agency as it receives more services. These economies also occur for the supporting agencies, as their average cost for providing these services is lowest for those which serve a large number of small agencies. However, supporting agencies are either not reimbursed at all or are reimbursed inadequately for the services they provide to small agencies.

Central agency requirements which may be appropriate for large and complex agencies are frequently duplicative and excessive for small agencies. Consequently, central agencies should reduce to a minimum the requirements they impose on small agencies.

The working relationships between the small and supporting agencies are best when they operate in similar functional areas. Consequently, the supporting and small agencies should be in the same Secretarial area. In view of the Secretaries' policy responsibilities to their agencies, the arrangements between small and supporting agencies are most appropriately developed under the guidance of the agencies' Secretaries. The exceptions are the small agencies which fall under Statewide Elected Officials and those which are Secretarial offices: in view of the special nature of these offices, they should be grouped together under the same supporting agency.

Consolidation of administrative and support services for the offices under Statewide Elected Officials and the Secretaries' offices is necessary because: it will simplify the current fragmented system and give continuity to the provision of basic support services to these offices; it will assure confidentiality, accountability, and simpler reporting relationships between those providing the services and those receiving the services; and it will provide greater flexibility and responsiveness to the changing needs of these offices, thus resulting in more efficient administrative and support services for them.

A small agency necessarily relinquishes a certain amount of management control when another agency performs its administrative and support services. Although this has not created serious problems for the small agencies, they should plan their needs with the supporting agencies and inform them in advance of unusual workloads or special problems. The small agencies which currently perform their own administrative and support services generally do not want outside support because they fear that the concomitant loss of management control will adversely affect their program activities. Although this is a valid concern, certain outside services can be performed for every small agency which will not compromise program effectiveness and which will produce cost-savings. Loss of management control is also a concern to the supporting agencies, some of which have experienced problems in setting priorities, meeting deadlines, and balancing their needs against those of their small agencies.

Currently, there is no overall state policy governing the provision of services between agencies. Existing arrangements range from informal verbal understandings to memoranda of agreement which specify the services to be provided and the rates of reimbursement. None of these arrangements, however, adequately addresses the question of accountability between the small and supporting agency. Many of the problems currently experienced by small and supporting agencies can be eliminated by the establishment of state policy which clarifies issues of accountability and responsibility and which requires memoranda of agreement with certain minimum provisions between small and supporting agencies.

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Small agencies shall have some or all of their administrative and support services performed by an outside agency. At a minimum, all small agencies shall have their procurement and purchasing needs undertaken by an outside agency. However, small agencies shall be able to negotiate special procurement needs in their memoranda of agreement with their supporting agencies (e.g., procurement of everyday office supplies is undertaken by the supporting agency while procurement of special supplies is undertaken by the small agency). For all other administrative and support services, small agencies shall have flexibility in deciding which services are undertaken for them by an outside agency.
2. The Secretary of Administration and the Secretary of Finance should jointly direct the following agencies to report to them by June 30, 1985, on the potential for reducing central agency requirements to a minimum for small agencies: Department of Accounts, Department of Planning and Budget, Department of Personnel and Training, and Department of General Services.
3. The small agency and the supporting agency shall be in the same Secretarial function.
 - a. Current arrangements between small and supporting agencies within the same Secretariat shall be continued where they are satisfactory to both parties. Additionally, the Secretaries should direct the supporting agencies to provide procurement and purchasing services to their small agencies beginning in fiscal year 1985-86 where they are not now provided, and to evaluate the expansion of present levels of support in other areas as well.
 - b. The Secretary of Commerce and Resources should designate the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services to perform agreed-upon administrative and support services for the Milk Commission and the Virginia State Apple Commission.
 - c. The Secretary of Human Resources should assign an agency within his Secretariat to perform for the State Advocacy Office for the Developmentally Disabled the administrative and support services now being performed for it by the Department of General Services.
 - d. The Secretary of Education should designate an agency within his Secretariat to perform agreed-upon administrative and support services for the Commission on the Arts.
 - e. The Secretary of Transportation and Public Safety should designate an agency within his Secretariat to perform agreed-upon administrative and support services for the Commonwealth's Attorneys Training and Services Council.

- f. Under the Secretary of Administration, the only agencies available to provide administrative and support services to the small agencies in that Secretariat are central agencies. Consequently, an administrative and support unit which reports to the Secretary of Administration shall be established within the Department of General Services using existing resources consisting of 2.00 to 3.00 FTE. This unit shall provide agreed-upon administrative and support services to the State Board of Elections, the State Compensation Board, and the Office of Employee Relations Counselors. This unit shall also perform for the Commission on Local Government the administrative and support services now being performed for it by the Department of Housing and Community Development.
 - g. For reasons of confidentiality, accountability and efficiency, administrative and support services shall be consolidated for the Governor's Office, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the Virginia Liaison Office, and the six Secretarial offices. The administrative and support services for these offices shall be undertaken by the unit to be created within the Department of General Services that reports to the Secretary of Administration.
 - h. Each Secretary should be responsible for resolving any conflicts which may arise between the small and supporting agencies within his or her Secretariat.
- 4. Small agencies receiving outside administrative and support services shall negotiate a memorandum of agreement with their supporting agency each biennium, such agreement to set out the services to be provided, the basis for cost reimbursement, and each agency's contact person. If the agencies encounter differences which they are unable to resolve themselves, they shall request assistance from their Secretary.
 - 5. Provision shall be made for the supporting agency either to be reimbursed by the small agency for services provided, or to be budgeted sufficient funds to cover its costs. Reimbursement may be appropriate from small agencies supported by nongeneral fund revenues; budgeting of additional funds to a supporting agency may be appropriate when the small agency operates programs supported by general fund revenues.
 - 6. The Department of Accounts, the Department of Personnel and Training, the Department of Planning and Budget, and the Department of General Services shall develop necessary guidelines, by June 30, 1985, for agencies receiving/providing services which clearly state each party's accountability and responsibility in the areas of internal controls, compliance assurance and other financial reporting, personnel transactions, and accounting transactions. The guidelines shall reflect accountability and responsibility as defined by the Code of Virginia, opinions of the Attorney General, the Appropriation Act, and central agency regulations. Small and supporting agencies shall be required to use these guidelines in developing their memoranda of agreement.

REGULATION OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES AND DAY PROGRAMS STUDY

OVERVIEW

This study investigates the regulation of residential facilities and day programs by five state agencies: the Departments of Corrections (DOC), Education (DOE), Health (DOH), Mental Health and Mental Retardation (DMHMR), and Social Services (DSS). Because DOC, DOE, DMHMR, and DSS jointly administer the Interdepartmental Core Standards for Children's Residential Facilities (Core), that activity is also examined. The administration of the Uniform Statewide Building Code and the Virginia Fire Safety Regulations by the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is examined because these rules apply to every residential facility and nearly every day program in the Commonwealth.

The study has three objectives:

- ° To identify areas where overlapping regulatory authority result in duplication, fragmentation, and gaps within the current regulatory structure;
- ° To identify areas of regulatory activity which need clarification or procedural improvement in order to better focus accountability; and,
- ° To suggest alternative alignments for and levels of regulatory activities which have the potential to resolve identified problems of duplication, fragmentation, and gaps.

Although the five primary agencies regulate a wide variety of state, local, and privately-operated facilities and programs, this study examines only the regulation of residential facilities and day programs which provide some aspect of care, maintenance, and supervision to their residents or clients. Residential facilities are defined as places which provide services to clients who live there, generally for an extended period of time. Day programs provide services on a daily basis for all or part of the day, generally to clients on a regular basis over an extended period of time. Finally, this study does not address areas of regulatory activity where no problems were found.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The matrix on the next page (Figure 2) summarizes the relevant regulatory responsibilities of the five primary agencies. In addition, the matrix shows those types of residential facilities and day programs which must contend with more than one regulatory agency. The five agencies have, among them, at least 114 staff positions dedicated to the regulation of residential facilities and day programs. During the 1984-86 biennium, these agencies will spend approximately \$8 million to carry out their regulatory responsibilities.

Figure 2

REGULATION OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES AND DAY PROGRAMS

Type of Facility	Number Regulated	DOC	DOE	DOH	DMHMR	DSS	# Medicaid /Medicare	Exempted Facilities ^d			
								Federal	State	Local	Other
Juvenile Learning Centers	8	•a	•								
Secure Detention Homes	17	•	•								
Less Secure Detention Homes	9	•									
Community Youth Homes	26	•a				•					
Proprietary Schools											
Trade/Technical	72		•					•	•	•	•
Business	32		•					•	•	•	•
Handicapped Day	37		•					•	•	•	•
Handicapped Residential	16	•	•		•	•		•	•	•	•
State MI Hospitals	9		•	•			9				
State MR Facilities	5		•	•			5				
Psychiatric Hospitals	15		•	•	•		10	•			
MR Group Homes	60		•	•	•		9				
Group Homes for Mentally Ill	36	•	•		•a	•	0				
Community MI Centers - Psychiatric Units	3		•	•	•		2				
Residential Centers for ED	7	•	•		•a	•		•			
Sheltered Workshops		•b	•								
Residential Centers for MR	6	•	•		•	•		•			
Residential Substance Abuse Facilities	50				•	•		•			
Non-Residential Substance Abuse Facilities	59				•	•		•			
Psychiatric Units											
[in General/Special Hospitals]	22		•	•	•						
Hospices	3			•			3				
Nursing Homes	182			•			165	•			
[Combined w/Homes for Adults]	[37]			•							
Homes for Adults	333										
Adult Day Care Centers	25							•	•	•	•
Child Caring Institutions	9							•	•	•	•
Independent Foster Homes	0							•	•	•	•
Child Care Centers	683							•	•	•	•
Family Day Care Homes	152										
Family Day Care Systems	9										

NOTES:

- a Regulated through the Interdepartmental Core Standards for Licensure and Certification of Children's Residential Facilities (Core).
- b Certified for funding but not licensed by DMHMR.
- c These institutions do not accept government funds and therefore elected not to be licensed under Core
- d See text on Statutory Exemptions from Regulations.

Problems or deficiencies occur in seventeen areas of the state's regulation of residential facilities and day programs. These problems can be reduced or eliminated by corrective actions in one or more of three general areas. These are discussed below.

Statutory Uniformity

The existing regulatory system clearly has deficiencies which undermine the state's administration of residential facilities and day programs. Since the regulatory process gives the basic structure to the state's role in overseeing residential facilities and day programs, reforms in this area are the first step in eliminating problems in the programs.

No overall state policy governs the state's regulation of residential facilities and day programs. Consequently, the statutes of the four agencies which regulate the majority of these programs (DOH, DMHMR, DSS, and DOE) are inconsistent and contradictory with each other. This has created inherent inconsistencies in the regulation of residential facilities and day programs and placed major obstacles to the agencies' abilities to coordinate their regulatory activities.

Precedent does exist for the establishment of a uniform, state regulatory policy over a general program area. The General Assembly has enacted uniform policy to guide the regulation of professions and occupations. Much of that policy (§54-1.17, Code of Virginia) could be adapted to residential facilities and day program regulation. The Code states that regulation is to be imposed for the exclusive purpose of protecting the public interest only when:

- unregulated practice can harm or endanger the health, safety and welfare of the public and when the potential for harm is recognizable and not remote or dependent upon tenuous argument;
- the regulated area has inherent qualities that distinguish it from ordinary work and labor;
- the practice requires specialized skill or training and the public will benefit from assurances of initial and continuing ability; and
- the public is not effectively protected by other means.

A policy, such as this, which provides basic, uniform criteria for determining the appropriate level of regulation, is needed to form the basis of the state's regulation of residential facilities and day programs. Such a policy not only defines the appropriate role of the state in the area regulated but also provides the state with flexibility to deal with changing conditions in the regulatory environment.

The study findings also indicate that uniformity in all five agencies' enabling statutes is needed in other areas. These include: terminology and definitions of regulated entities, use of sanctions, appeal process, exemption and variance process, compliance determination, level and type of technical assistance to be given by the agencies to the regulated parties, duration of licenses, frequency of state inspections, and requirements for/amount of license fees.

In addition, the statutes should expand the sanctions available to four of the agencies to include intermediate sanctions, and should require that compliance determination be based upon performance standards. Establishment of an overall regulatory policy and of uniformity in the agencies' enabling statutes will eliminate unnecessary complexity in the current system and provide a reasonable and consistent basis to these regulatory activities.

Finally, the study notes that no statutory base exists for the Interdepartmental Core Standards for Children's Residential Facilities and that participation in Core by the four involved agencies currently is voluntary. As a result, the potential still exists for duplication and fragmentation in this area.

Interagency Coordination

The study finds that a large proportion of the deficiencies in the current system resulted from a lack of or poor coordination by DOH, DMHMR, DSS, DOE, and DOC. Coordination is a problem between the five agencies, with other state agencies, and with local agencies.

Although the absence of regulatory uniformity is a major impediment to interagency coordination, agencies necessarily place their major emphasis on management of their specific program responsibilities. Consequently, executive guidance is an essential aspect of the regulation of programs with interagency and intergovernmental components and the five agencies have not received specific and consistent direction or oversight from the Secretarial or Gubernatorial levels. Interagency and intergovernmental involvement will remain a characteristic of the regulation of residential facilities and day programs. For example, with the creation of the Department of Medical Assistance Services on March 1, 1985, oversight of Medicaid eligibility will be removed from DOH which will, however, retain responsibility for Medicaid facility certification. Consequently, specific direction and guidance should be given to these five agencies at the Secretarial level, with a corresponding commitment by these agencies to the resolution of problems arising from poor coordination of their regulatory activities.

Internal Management

The study finds that a number of deficiencies in the regulation of residential facilities and day programs were created by the regulating agencies themselves. For example, DSS's organizational structure makes communication between regional and central office licensing staff time-consuming and circuitous. The limited staff resources committed to licensing by DMHMR may limit that agency's regulatory effectiveness. Clearly, the agencies themselves must take responsibility for these kinds of deficiencies and must place high priority on the sound management and administration of these regulatory programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The General Assembly should consider amending the enabling legislation of DOH, DMHMR, DSS, DOE, and DOC to require an exemption process with appeals which could ultimately be made to each agency's board.
2. The General Assembly should consider amending the Administrative Process Act to require any agency whose regulations contain facility design requirements to provide those existing and proposed regulations to the Department of Housing and Community Development for review to identify conflicts with the Uniform Statewide Building Code and Virginia Fire Safety Regulations. Further, the General Assembly should consider amending the Code of Virginia to allow the State Building Code Administrator and state and local fire marshals the right to appeal decisions of local building officials on certificates of occupancy and change of use permits.
3. The Governor should issue an executive order establishing the Core process and setting forth the Secretaries' responsibilities for oversight and the specific agency responsibilities in the cooperative effort.
4. The Governor should direct the Department of Planning and Budget to evaluate two aspects of the state's regulation of residential facilities and day programs. A program evaluation should determine the appropriate level of technical assistance which regulatory agencies may provide to residential facilities and day programs. A second evaluation should examine the different approaches to compliance determination which currently are used by Virginia and other states and make recommendations for Virginia's regulatory programs. Both evaluations should be provided to the Governor by September 1, 1985.
5. The Secretary of Education should direct the Department of Education to consolidate the regulation of schools for the handicapped within the Division of Special and Compensatory Education. The Proprietary School Service should continue to regulate the trade, technical, and other commercially-oriented proprietary schools.

6. The Secretaries of Human Resources, Education and Transportation and Public Safety and the Chief of Staff shall meet regularly to resolve issues in the regulation of residential facilities and day care programs. Areas for examination should include:
 - appropriateness of current DOH, DSS, DMHMR, DOC and DOE statutes and regulations governing the license duration, number of inspections and requirements for fees;
 - methods for ensuring consistency between DOH, DSS, DMHMR, DOE and DOC regulations and inspections with building, fire and sanitary regulations and inspections; and
 - adequacy of DOC, DSS, DMHMR and DOE training activities for regulatory staff.

The group should be chaired by the Chief of Staff and should report to the Governor by September 1, 1985.

7. The Secretaries of Human Resources and Commerce and Resources should direct the negotiation of memoranda of agreement between the Department of Health and the Departments of Health Regulatory Boards and Commerce to assure that information on complaints is shared in a timely manner between the agencies. These memoranda should be negotiated by July 1, 1985.
8. The Secretaries of Human Resources and Education should direct DOH, DMHMR, DSS, and DOE to increase efforts to use information on changing populations in need and changing technology and service delivery methods to assess regularly the relevance of their regulatory programs to the environment in which they operate, and to project existing and potential client needs, and make revisions. By September 1, 1985 the agencies should report to their respective Secretary on their progress in developing and implementing internal processes to accomplish this end.

In addition, the Secretaries should direct that DMHMR, DSS, and DOE incorporate into their regulations a procedure to encourage regulated facilities to experiment with new methods of operation and new approaches to client services through the granting of variances/exceptions. The agencies should report on their progress by July 1, 1985.

9. The Secretary of Human Resources should:
 - direct DSS to issue guidelines to local departments of social services to assure that nursing home complaints received by them are referred to DOH. Further, the Secretary should direct DSS to monitor the local departments' adherence to these guidelines. Such guidelines should be in place by July 1, 1985.

- request the Attorney General to review the applicability of the amended Administrative Process Act (APA) to DSS's uniform variance policy which was adopted under prior APA, and to provide him the Attorney General's findings for resolution with the Board of Social Services.
 - ensure that DSS sets forth in its 1985-86 executive agreement a schedule for revising and reissuing its regulations and related materials in a timely manner.
10. The Board of Social Services should adopt regulations governing the placement by local departments of social services of clients in residential facilities and day programs with services appropriate to meet the clients' needs.
 11. The Commissioner of DSS should request an independent review of the agency's internal organizational and reporting structure and its staffing needs to determine appropriate organizational and reporting structures and staffing levels for residential facilities and day programs regulation. The Commissioner of DMHMR should request an independent review to determine whether DMHMR's licensing and inspection function for residential facilities and day programs is understaffed. These reviews should be provided to the Secretaries of Human Resources and of Administration and the Governor by September 1, 1985.

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES STUDY

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this study is to determine the most suitable alignment for providing executive management staff activities as defined in HJR 147. Objectives of this study are to identify and assess current alignments in executive management staff activities and to provide alternative alignments for consideration by officials within the Executive and Legislative Departments.

Staff available for project-oriented, special assignments in the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB), the Department of Accounts (DOA) and the Department of Information Technology (DIT) were examined. This study does not examine budgeting and personnel staffing since the majority of time spent by these staffs is in ongoing budget and personnel processes. The analysis of the Office of the State Internal Auditor in this report complements a more detailed study of that function, now being conducted by the Management Consulting Division of the Department of Information Technology.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Optimal placement of executive management staff functions is not a new issue in Virginia. In the last fifteen years, Virginia has considered and instituted several approaches to the placement of these functions.

Currently, the executive management functions of management consulting, policy analysis, evaluation, and internal auditing are located in three agencies under two Secretaries. Figure 3 depicts the functions, their statutory authority and missions, the number of classified staff assigned to each function, and the Secretarial and agency reporting relationships. The Management Consulting Division of DIT is the only unit in state government which conducts reviews of organization, management, operations or procedures from an agency-specific viewpoint, concentrating on detailed internal reviews of agency management practices at the request of an agency head or Secretary.

The mission of the Policy Section within the Department of Planning and Budget is to provide policy development and analysis and related staff support to the Governor and Secretaries. As such, the origin for all projects of that unit during the last three years has been predominantly the "Governor's Office," including requests of the General Assembly referred for analyses. No projects are performed at the specific request of agency heads, an important distinction when compared to the types of requests received by the Management Consulting Division and the State Internal Auditor.

FIGURE 3

AUTHORITY, MISSION, STAFFING AND REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS OF EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS

Executive Management Function:	<u>Management Consulting</u>	<u>Policy Analysis</u>	<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>Internal Audit</u>
Authority (Code of Virginia)	2.1-563.18	2.1-391	2.1-391	None
Agency Mission	Provide affordable technology and management information services to state agencies. As part of this mission, the Management Consulting Division provides management analysis services to the Governor's Office, Secretaries and state agencies to affect cost reductions, increase operational effectiveness and improve productivity and efficiency.	Provide analyses and related staff support to the Governor and Cabinet Secretaries so they may effectively manage the development and execution of the Commonwealth's two-year and multi-year operating plans.		Provide professional guidance and training to agency internal auditors in order to develop internal auditing in Executive agencies.
Number of Staff	14	6	7	7
Reporting Relationship ³	<pre> graph TD SA[Secretary of Administration] --> DIT[Director, Department of Information Technology] DIT --> DDMC[Deputy Director for Management Consulting] </pre>	<pre> graph TD SF1[Secretary of Finance] --> DDPB[Director, Department of Planning and Budget] DDPB --> DDREP[Deputy Director, Research, Evaluation and Policy] DDREP --> MP[Manager, Policy Section] DDREP --> ME[Manager, Evaluation Section] </pre>	<pre> graph TD SF2[Secretary of Finance] --> SIA[State Internal Auditor²] SIA -.-> DOA[Department of Accounts] </pre>	

²Reports programmatically to Secretary of Finance, but receives administrative support from Department of Accounts.

³Reporting relationships of Policy Analysis, Evaluation and Internal Audit effective 7/1/84; reporting relationship of Management Consulting effective 9/1/84.

Like the policy unit, the mission of the Evaluation Section of DPB is to provide analysis and related staff support to the Governor and Cabinet Secretaries. As such, the origin for assignments of projects has come from the Governor and the Governor's Secretaries. Although the evaluation unit is relatively new (1982), strong interrelationships have been developed with the budgetary, policy, research, and management consulting units.

The mission of the internal audit development program is to provide professional guidance and training to agency internal auditors to develop internal auditing in Executive agencies. Activities concentrate on: assistance surveys of internal audit programs and the needs of the agency; EDP audit assistance; peer reviews (assessments) of internal audit programs; training; technical audit assistance; and special audits and projects. Few projects of the Office of the State Internal Auditor appear to duplicate activities of other executive management functions.

Placement of Executive Management Functions in Other States

In order to assess potential organizational approaches to alignment of executive management functions in Virginia state government, comparative data from other states were collected. Forty-seven states and territories report a management analysis function similar to that being performed by DIT. The predominant placement of this function is within the budget or finance agency. Of the 47 states and territories reporting, 30 showed an organizational placement within the budget agency. These states differ from Virginia, however, in that the primary client of these units is the Chief Executive and not state agency heads.

Policy analysis units are generally located in the budget agency of the states. Of the 49 states and territories reporting such a function, 43 locate this function within the budget agency.

Like policy analysis, the evaluation function is commonly located in the budget office of a state. Of the 48 states and territories reporting such a function, 40 locate the evaluation function within the budget agency.

During the course of the separate study of internal audit activities now being conducted by DIT, nine states which appeared to have internal audit functions comparable to Virginia's were contacted. Of these nine, only Pennsylvania had a program which closely resembled Virginia's.

Alternatives

In the course of this study, a number of high-level state officials were interviewed to obtain the perspectives of people who routinely review results of analytical activities. Interviewees unanimously agreed that there is a need for objective and accessible analytical staff, however configured, to

provide the Governor, his Secretaries, and agencies with diverse, high-quality analyses in a timely manner. However, no two people agreed completely with an organizational alternative proposed by others. Alternatives suggested included the following:

- abolishing all functions;
- leaving all functions within existing organizations;
- consolidating all functions into a new freestanding organization; and
- consolidating the Management Consulting Division into the Department of Planning and Budget or another central agency.

What may be perceived by one individual as an advantage of a particular organizational alternative may be perceived by someone else as a disadvantage. For each organizational alternative identified in the report, the relative advantages and disadvantages are discussed.

Although no two interviewees proposed an identical organization plan, certain themes were common. The first common opinion is that analytical priorities need to be set by the Governor's Office and the Secretaries. (The Governor and his Secretaries currently determine all of the Policy and Evaluation Sections' analytical efforts, as well as two-thirds of those of the Management Consulting Division.)

Second, agency heads should have a resource available to them to conduct reviews of organization, management, operations, and procedures from an agency-specific viewpoint.

Third, there is consensus that a need exists to easily form multi-disciplinary special project teams capable of providing analyses of issues of concern to the Governor. Regardless of how these disciplines are organized, decision-makers clearly desire to have this capability made more readily available to the Governor.

Fourth, there is almost unanimous opinion that the Office of the State Internal Auditor should not be a part of the Department of Accounts, given its current mission and orientation towards providing advice, counsel and technical assistance for financial auditing and its capacity for conducting special audits for the Governor's Secretaries.

Finally, there is consensus that resources should be available when requested to perform the types of analyses needed. Several officials expressed concern that certain analytical resources were often unavailable when they requested certain analyses to be performed.

Conclusions

Based on comparative data from other states, there is no one best way to organize Executive management staff. Alternatives selected are influenced by the philosophy of the Governor and the legislature, the political and administrative environment, financial and constitutional considerations, and other related variables.

Within Virginia, current Executive management functions comprise a complex set of interrelationships. Agencies work with each other from time to time in joint studies and have participated in mutual development of policies and procedures by which state government is administered. Yet the primary functions of policy analysis, evaluation, management consulting and internal auditing remain fundamentally different in terms of scope, clients served and products produced.

For policy analysis and evaluation, studies generally relate to a broad-based statewide policy or budget concern of the Governor, the Secretaries and/or the General Assembly, and are not initiated at the request of an agency head. Policy and evaluation activities directly integrate into options available to decision-makers in the development and execution of the state budget process and the administration of state government. For these reasons, the most appropriate alignment of the policy and evaluation functions is for them to remain within the Department of Planning and Budget.

For the Office of the State Internal Auditor, the optimal alignment is a freestanding agency reporting to the Secretary of Finance. The internal audit function should not be consolidated with other Executive management functions given the need for the autonomy of this function. Further, establishing this new agency will send a clear message that Executive agencies should continue to upgrade their internal audit programs. Since the current statewide emphasis of internal auditing is in reviewing financial operations, the current reporting relationship to the Secretary of Finance is appropriate and should be continued.

Given management consulting's primary emphasis on conducting detailed reviews of agency organization, management, operations, and procedures which concentrate on assisting state agencies to improve management practices, the appropriate Secretarial reporting relationship is to the Secretary of Administration. However, within that Secretarial area, alternative alignments exist. The unit could report directly to the Secretary, remain a division within the Department of Information Technology, become a division within the Department of Personnel and Training, or become a division within the Department of General Services.

Location of the Management Consulting Division within the Department of Information Technology is the recommended option. DIT's current mission is to provide support services to other state agencies in such areas as systems development, computer services, and telecommunications. The management consulting function complements DIT's current efforts to employ technology in the operations and management of state agencies. The primary mission of the Management Consulting Division (improving general management of state agencies) is more akin to the role of DIT than it is to the functions of the Department of General Services or the Department of Personnel and Training. (Establishment of management consulting as a freestanding agency is not recommended because of the costs of creating another Executive Department agency with administrative and clerical support provided by another agency.)

Based on these findings and conclusions, the study makes the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Governor should introduce enabling legislation in the 1985 Session of the General Assembly to provide a statutory basis for the Office of the State Internal Auditor within the Finance Secretariat.
2. The Secretary of Finance shall take action to ensure that necessary administrative and support services are provided to the Office of the State Internal Auditor upon the creation of such an office.
3. The Policy and Evaluation Sections shall be retained within the Department of Planning and Budget.
4. The Management Consulting Division shall remain in the Department of Information Technology and continue to provide services to state agencies. The Secretary of Administration shall ensure that projects are consultative rather than evaluative in nature. Furthermore, those studies which originated with the Governor's Office or the Secretaries underway in the Management Consulting Division should be completed by no later than December 31, 1985.
5. The Governor should direct the Secretaries to request studies that are evaluative in nature or special analyses (e.g. policies, initiatives) from the Department of Planning and Budget.
6. The Secretaries of Administration and Finance should reissue the procedures dealing with the creation of central agency analytical task forces to address significant management and program problems identified by the Governor.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

AGENCY CONTACTS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

For the personal interviews, the responsible Secretaries were queried to obtain information about their ideas and concerns on employment and training activities. Also, administrative and program staff representatives chosen by the agency directors were interviewed. The intent of these interviews was to get additional information about program policies and services. A listing of agency contacts is provided below:

Agency Name	Contact	Title
Department of Corrections	Michael Beadles	Support Services Manager, Youth Institutional Services
	*Paul Broughton	Manager, Employee Relations Section
	Herbert Parr	Correctional Enter- prises Manager
	Carolyn Taylor	State Work Release Supervisor
	Lonny L. Thomas	Administrative Assistant, Adult Services
Department of Education	Ronald H. Chandler	Associate Director of Comprehensive Employment and Training Service
	*Dewey T. Oakley	Director of Vocational Program Services
	Ned K. Swartz	Supervisor of Research Coordina- ting Unit
Department of Labor and Industry	*Robert Baumgardner	Director, Apprentice- ship Training
	Eva Teig	Commissioner
Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation	*James Bozarth	Employee Relations Director
	Carol Singer-Metz	Director, Community Mental Retardation Services

* designated by Agency Head

Department of Rehabilitative Services	David Ziskind	Deputy Commissioner
Department of Social Services	*William L. Lukhard *Jane Clements	Commissioner State Employment Services Director
Department for the Visually Handicapped	Carter Hamlett	Director, Vocational Services
Division of Industrial Development	P. Scott Eubanks *Hugh D. Keogh	Director Deputy Director
Governor's Employment and Training Division	Carol Amato Louise Armstrong Susan Brewster *James Croswhite James Gargasz Russell Owens George N. Wade Patricia Walsh	Past Executive Director Employment Security Coordinator GJTCC Staff Assistant Assistant Executive Director Employment Security Coordinator Executive Director Employment Security Coordinator Employment Security Supervisor
Rehabilitative School Authority	*James Gaynor James K. Price	Director, Vocational Programs Superintendent
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia	*David Potter Larrie J. Dean	Coordinator of Academic Programs Academic Programs Coordinator
Virginia Community College	Linda L. Carr G. Fred Lemon Donald E. Puyear *Donald Reilly Elmo D. Roesler	Community College Planning and Evalua- tion Coordinator Industrial Training Coordinator Deputy Chancellor Industrial Training Director Planning and Evalua- tion Director

* designated by Agency Head

Virginia Employment Commission

Norman H. Boswell	Applicant Services Chief
Kirby Burch	Job Corps Coordinator
Ralph Cantrell	Commissioner
Estell H. Carter	Assistant State Coordinator, Dislocated Worker Program
Jeanette Christian	Supervisor, Counseling and Special Applicants
Richard W. Crossen	Manager, Finance and Office Services
William Dillon	Director, Job Service
Jane Finks	Manager, Staff Support
Barry R. Green	Chief, Management Support
Harold L. Kretzer	Assistant State Coordinator Dislocated Worker Program
*Robert G. Lawson	Deputy Commissioner
Jerry L. Lindsey	State Coordinator for Veterans Services
Richard Primmer	Trade Act Coordinator
Norma Quirk	State TJTC Coordinator
Art Quiroz	Assistant State Veterans Services Coordinator
Veronica Sadler	Methods and Procedures Analyst B
Robert Warren	Supervisor, Rural Services
Rosaline T. Wilson	Supervisor, Planning and Budget Unit
Jeffrey A. Windom	Deputy Director, Research and Analysis Division
James Wrenn	Manager, Petersburg Local Office

* designated by Agency Head

APPENDIX B

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

In addition to agency personnel, members of the legislature and certain collegial bodies were interviewed to gain insight as to the:

- types of entry-level skills most essential to employers,
- productivity of today's entry-level employees,
- results of current efforts at coordination among state agencies in the employment and training area, and
- development of future employment and training issues.

The persons interviewed are identified below:

Mr. Richard Dickerson
Jobs for Virginia Graduates/Dropout Reduction Program

Mr. Walter Craigie
Governor's Economic Advisory Council

Mr. John Roberts
Governor's Economic Advisory Council

Mr. Lloyd Noland
Governor's Economic Advisory Council

The Honorable Frederick Creekmore
House of Delegates

Mr. Edwin Joseph
Governor's Job Training Coordinating Council

The Honorable Elmon Gray
Senate

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEWS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Private Sector Representatives

- Virginia State Chamber of Commerce
Edwin C. Luther, Executive Vice President
- Virginia Manufacturers Association
Zachariah C. Dameron, President
- Central Virginia Industries
Dallas Wade, President
- Roanoke Valley Industries
Charles C. Vail, Director
- Virginia Petroleum Council
Kim Anderson, Executive Director
Frank Bedell
- Virginia Farm Bureau Federation
S. T. Moore, Jr., President
Keith Cheatham
- Virginia Forestry Association
Charles F. Finley, Jr., Executive Director
- Virginia Division of Industrial Development
William C. Robinson
- Virginia Electric and Power Company
Morris L. Brehmer
- Appalachian Power Company
Edward L. Kropp, Environmental Affairs Director
- Virginia Economic Developers Association
Danville Chamber of Commerce
Charles L. Pendleton, President
- Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern
James M. Strickland, Jr.
- Wiley and Wilson
Steve Shank

Public Sector Representatives

Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
John F. Kidd, Executive Director

Northern Virginia Planning District Commission
John W. Epling, Executive Director

Virginia Association of Counties
George R. Long, Executive Director

Virginia Municipal League
R. Michael Amyx, Executive Director

Virginia Municipal League
Environmental Subcommittee
14 Members (Met with and presented survey questionnaire and requested
comments on study)

Hampton Roads Sanitation District Authority
Mr. James R. Borborg

Southeastern Public Services Authority
Durwood S. Curling, Executive Director

Virginia Environmental Health Association
Mr. Garland Gobble, President
(Met with Executive Committee of Association at quarterly meeting)

Virginia Public Health Association
Mr. Paul M. Boynton, President

City of Salem
William J. Paxton, City Manager

Town of Appomattox
W. R. Britten, Jr., Town Manager

Town of Appalachia
Edward E. Brooks, Town Manager

Frederick County
John Riley, County Administrator

Environmentalists, Environmental Organizations and Public Interest Group
Representatives

Jeter M. Watson
Virginia Staff Attorney
Chesapeake Bay Foundation

Georgia Herbert
Director of Development
Piedmont Environmental Council

S. Ellen Farnham
President
Conservation Council

Timothy G. Hayes
Attorney
Virginia Chapter
Environmental Defense Fund

Thomas Evans, President
Virginia Bass Federation
Former President of Conservation Council

Gerald P. McCarthy
Executive Director
Virginia Environmental Endowment

Katherine Tucker
Trout Unlimited, Operation Respect

David Evans
Private Citizen

Patty Jackson
Lower James River Association

Members of Council on the Environment
Richard D. Robertson, Chairman
includes two citizen members:
Clifton Golden, Virginia Wildlife Federation
Marie Ridder, Environmentalist

League of Women Voters
State Natural Resources Committee

Mr. John Cone
President
Citizens Environmental Council of the Roanoke Area

APPENDIX D

AGENCY CONTACTS AND OTHER INTERVIEWS FOR REGULATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND DAY CARE FACILITIES

Department of Health

James B. Kenley	Commissioner
Edwin M. Brown	Deputy Director
Raymond O. Perry	Assistant Commissioner, Office of Health Planning and Resources Development
Sally Camp	Staff Assistant
Mary V. Francis	Director, Division of Medical and Nursing Facilities Services
Judith A. Price	Dietary Consultant/Training Coordinator
Connie L. Kane	Medical Facilities Consultant/Complaint Coordinator
Rodney L. Miller	Medical Facilities Consultant

Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

Joseph L. Bevilacqua	Commissioner
Howard M. Cullum	Deputy Commissioner
Joseph Avellar	Director, Quality Assurance
R. Brooks Traweek	Director, Office of Licensure
John D. Barrett	Assistant Program Director, Office of Licensure
Carol Singer-Metz	Director, Mental Retardation Services
Wayne Thacker	Director, Substance Abuse Services
David Fitch	Director, Children's and Youth Services
Karen Mallam	Director, Community Support Programs
Leslie Tremain	Mental Health Consultant

Department of Social Services

William L. Lukhard	Commissioner
Ray C. Goodwin	Deputy Commissioner
Carolynne H. Stevens	Director, Division of Licensing Programs
Nathan Douthit	Chief, Bureau of Program Development
Betty L. Lewis	Chief, Bureau of Program Operations
Lee P. Delledonne	Manager, Standards and Policy Unit
Douglas F. Abell	Former Staff Development Manager, Bureau of Program Development
Barry P. Craig	Coordinator, Interdepartmental Core Standards for Licensure and Certifi- cation of Children's Residential Programs
Caroline Smith	Assistant Coordinator, Interdepartmental Core Standards
Donna Baber	Regional Licensing Supervisor
Susan Hackney	Regional Licensing Supervisor
Jennifer Black-Gresham	Licensing Specialist

Department of Education

James T. Micklem, Sr.

Leslie G. Goode

Esther R. Shevick

Paul J. Raskopf

Charles W. Finley

Director, Special Education Programs and Pupil Personnel Services

Associate Director, Administrative Services

Supervisor of Administration for Private Schools and State Operated Programs

Core Monitor

Supervisor, Proprietary School Service

Department of Corrections

William E. Weddington

Edward W. Murray

Robert H. Sutton

James S. Jones

Rosemarie Bonacum

Lynwood O. Johnson

Jean B. Biscoe

Austen C. Micklem

Special Assistant to the Director
Deputy Director, Division of Youth Services

Assistant Director, Youth Community Programs

Administrative Assistant to the Assistant Director, Program Development and Evaluation

Certification Manager

Certification Specialist

Prevention Specialist (former Certification Manager)

Regional Administrator, Division of Youth Services

Other State Contacts

The Honorable Ralph L. Axelle, Jr.

Norma E. Szakal

Lelia B. Hopper

Barbara A. Newlin

Phillip F. Abraham

Jordan H. Goldman

Wilda M. Ferguson

William H. Peterson

Catherine P. Saunders

Martha N. Gilbert

Glenda K. Pleasants

House of Delegates/Chairman of the Governor's Regulatory Reform Advisory Board

Staff Attorney, Division of Legislative Services

Deputy Secretary for Human Resources (former Staff Attorney, Division of Legislative Services)

Project Team Leader, Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission

Special Assistant for Policy, Office of the Governor

Senior Counsel, Office of the Governor
Director, Department for the Aging

Supervisor, Long Term Care Unit,
Department for the Aging

Supervisor, Ombudsman Program, Department for the Aging

Director, Division for Children

Planner, Division for Children

Other State Contacts (Continued)

Jack A. Proctor	State Building Code Administrator, Department of Housing and Community Development
Howard H. Summers, Jr.	Chief Fire Marshal, Department of Housing and Community Development
Robert Goff	Chief Engineer, Fire Safety, Office of the State Fire Marshal, Department of Housing and Community Development
Bernard L. Henderson, Jr.	Director, Department of Commerce
H. Bryan Tomlinson, II	Director, Department of Health Regulatory Boards

Other Interviews

T. Frederick Allen	Administrator, Forest Hill Convalescent Center Richmond, Virginia
Bern Anderson	Clinical Director, Environments for Human Services, Inc. Richmond, Virginia
John Bryant	Executive Director, Environments for Human Services, Inc. Richmond, Virginia
Ann Bunch	Director, Finney Avenue Residence Suffolk, Virginia
Ellen Bussey	Director, Services for the Mentally Retarded Arlington Community Residences, Inc. Arlington, Virginia
Joseph Campbell	Assistant Superintendent, Henrico Juvenile Detention Home Richmond, Virginia
Dennis Chappell	Administrator, Lakewood Manor Richmond, Virginia
Peter Clendenon	Executive Director, Virginia Health Care Association Richmond, Virginia
Jack Gallagher	Director, Community Attention Home Charlottesville, Virginia

Barbara Jameson	Representative, Virginia Association of Homes for Adults Richmond, Virginia
John M. Markwood	Executive Director, Timber Ridge School Winchester, Virginia and President, Virginia Association of Independent Special Education Facilities (VAISEF)
David Marsden	Superintendent, Fairfax County Juvenile Detention Center Fairfax, Virginia
Paul McWhinney	Director, Charlottesville Residential Care Administration System Charlottesville, Virginia and Chairman, Virginia Community Residential Care Association (VCRCA)
John W. Nootz	Superintendent, Henrico Juvenile Detention Home Richmond, Virginia and Chairman, Virginia Council on Juvenile Detention (VCJD)
Ramon E. Pardue	Assistant Executive Director Saint Joseph's Villa Richmond, Virginia
Edna Paylor	Executive Director, Virginia Association of Non-Profit Homes for the Aging Richmond, Virginia
David Reeve	Superintendent, Chesterfield Detention Home Chesterfield, Virginia
Edward J. Smith	Director, Developmental Disabilities Services, Community Services Board Suffolk, Virginia
Mrs. G. W. Taylor, R.N.	Director of Nursing, Forest Hill Convalescent Center Richmond, Virginia

