



**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**  
*Office of the Commissioner*

Anthony Conyers, Jr.  
COMMISSIONER

October 1, 2007

**TO:** The Honorable Timothy M. Kaine  
Governor of Virginia

The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Chairman  
House Appropriations Committee


The Honorable John H. Chichester, Chairman  
Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable H. Russell Potts, Jr., Chairman  
Senate Education and Health Committee

The Honorable Phillip A. Hamilton, Chairman  
House Health, Welfare and Institutions Committee

The Honorable Marilyn B. Tavenner, Secretary  
Health and Human Resources

Mr. Richard D. Brown, Director  
Department of Planning and Budget

**FROM:** Anthony Conyers, Jr. 

**SUBJECT:** Report on the Statewide Expansion of Community Action Services in Virginia

The report contained herein is submitted pursuant to Item 340 L of the 2007 Appropriation Act which directs the Virginia Department of Social Services in coordination with the Virginia Community Action Partnership (VACAP) to prepare a report and make recommendations concerning the appropriate level, location, and cost of providing community action services to unserved areas through either expanding the service areas of existing community action agencies or encouraging the creation of new community action agencies.

Beginning in January of 2007, the Virginia Department of Social Services held a series of five meetings with existing community action agencies and the executive director of VACAP to discuss the federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to the designation of expanding or new community action agencies, the possible cost of expanding community action services throughout the state, and how expansion could and should occur. In addition, the department held numerous meetings and discussions with the executive director of VACAP in preparing and finalizing this report. The implementation of these recommendations should ensure that all low-income citizens have access to services and programs that are designed to address local needs and service gaps with the goal of eliminating the causes and conditions of poverty in Virginia.

AC:lrn  
attachment

# **Report to the Virginia General Assembly**

## **Statewide Expansion of Community Action Services in Virginia**

**Virginia Department of Social Services  
October 1, 2007**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>REPORT MANDATE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>VIRGINIA’S EXISTING COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FUNDING OF VIRGINIA’S EXISTING COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF VIRGINIA’S EXISTING COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NEED FOR EXPANSION OF VIRGINIA’S COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>MANDATE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COORDINATION WITH THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY ACTION PARTNERSHIP .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL AND LOCATION OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>THE POTENTIAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PROVIDING SERVICES IN UNSERVED AREAS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>TIMETABLE FOR PHASING IN ADDITIONAL SERVICES WHERE APPROPRIATE AND NEEDED.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>THE MOST APPROPRIATE METHOD OF PROVIDING COMMUNITY ACTION SERVICES IN UNSERVED AREAS. ....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>APPENDIX A – CURRENT LISTING OF VIRGINIA COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES</b>	
<b>APPENDIX B – MAP OF COMMUNITY ACTION COVERAGE IN VIRGINIA</b>	
<b>APPENDIX C – FUNDING NEEDED FOR UNSERVED JURISDICTIONS</b>	

# **Report and Recommendations for the Statewide Expansion of Community Action Services in Virginia**

## **Executive Summary**

Virginia is one of only three states in the nation that does not have statewide coverage of community action programs and services. With 30% of local jurisdictions (counties and cities) in Virginia unserved, 42 jurisdictions and the 175,773 low-income persons (2000 Census) who reside there do not have access to a comprehensive menu of services and programs designed to address the causes and conditions of poverty, support local community and economic development efforts, and provide their low-income citizens with opportunities to build assets and become economically self-sufficient.

This report describes a two-year plan for expanding community action programs and services into jurisdictions currently unserved by community action agencies at a cost of \$6.6 million. Of that total cost, \$2.2 million in additional funding will be needed in year one of the biennium (July 1, 2008), with an additional \$4.4 million needed in year two of the biennium (July 1, 2009.) It is estimated that statewide expansion of community action agency services will over time leverage an additional \$30 million per year in other federal, state, local, and private resources that will result in an additional 29,000 low-income citizens being served each year by Virginia's community action network.

It is important to note that unless additional funding is earmarked for this purpose, then expansion of community action services into all 42 unserved jurisdictions would result in a 30% reduction in the existing network's Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) contract amounts. This would in turn lead to significant reductions in and/or the elimination of essential services and programs currently being provided by that network.

# **Report and Recommendations for the Statewide Expansion of Community Action Services in Virginia**

## **Report Mandate**

2007 Appropriations Act, Item 340L states:

*The Department of Social Services shall work in coordination with the Virginia Community Action Partnership to review areas of the Commonwealth that are not currently served by a community action agency and make recommendations concerning the appropriate level and location of additional services to be provided through either expanding the service area of existing community action agencies or encouraging the creation of new community action agencies. The department shall also examine the potential costs associated with providing service in unserved areas and recommend a timetable for the most appropriate method of providing community action services for unserved areas that may exist. The department shall report its findings no later than October 1, 2007 to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance Committee and House Appropriations Committee, the Chairmen of the Senate Education and Health Committee and House Health, Welfare and Institutions Committee, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, and the Department of Planning and Budget.*

## **Background**

On August 20, 1964, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which established a national network of federally supported community action agencies (CAAs) with a primary mission of eliminating the causes and conditions of poverty in the United States. With the passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Congress passed and President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Act which required that states provide direction and oversight to local community action agencies. In response to the passage of the CSBG Act and to establish a legislative framework for Virginia's network of local community action agencies, the Virginia General Assembly passed and Governor Robb signed into law the Community Action Act of 1982.

## **Virginia's Existing Community Action Network**

As of today there are 26 local CAAs in Virginia providing services to 93 local jurisdictions within the Commonwealth. See Appendix A. Twenty-two of Virginia's CAAs are private non-profit organizations with the remaining four existing as public CAAs, meaning they are units of local government. The four public CAAs are clustered in Northern Virginia and serve single jurisdictions. All but two of the private non-profit CAAs serve multiple jurisdictions, anywhere from two to ten counties and cities.

Private non-profit CAAs typically use their CSBG contract funds to cover the agencies' core operating expenses; to maintain their financial management and human resource systems; and to leverage other federal, state, local government, and private sector funding sources to administer programs and services that address unmet needs and service gaps within the local communities they serve. On the other hand, public CAAs typically either subcontract with existing local non-profits to provide services or utilize these funds to provide only a limited menu of services.

Virginia's network of CAAs has provided a wide array of services to low-income families and communities for 40 years. Community action agencies are unique in that there is no boilerplate menu of programs and services that they provide. Instead, local CAAs provide the programs and services that are necessary to address the causes and conditions of poverty within each community they serve. Each local community action agency completes an annual assessment of needs and service gaps that exist within the communities it serves, establishes service priorities, researches innovative and effective program designs, administers programs and services that address those critical needs, and evaluates program outcomes to ensure that services are effective. As a result CAAs are very entrepreneurial and able to quickly respond to changes that occur in local communities and economies.

Community action agencies are also unique in the tri-partite structure of their governing boards. One-third of each CAA's governing board is composed of elected public officials; not less than one-third represent low-income individuals and families; and the remaining members are leaders and members of business, industry, labor, religious and faith-based groups, law enforcement, education, and other community and civic organizations. This unique board structure brings together local government officials, low-income persons, and members of the business community and the private sector to develop, plan, implement, and evaluate programs that are responsive to the needs of the communities served and effective in addressing the causes and conditions of poverty.

### **Funding of Virginia's Existing Community Action Network**

During SFY2006, Virginia's local CAAs received CSBG contract funds totaling \$14,222,978, including \$9,032,619 in federal CSBG funds, \$1,750,000 in state general funds, and \$3,440,359 in federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funds. During SFY2006, Virginia's CAAs leveraged this \$14.2 million in CSBG contract funding into \$107.3 million of other federal, state, local government, and private sector resources, a ratio of \$7.56 for every \$1.00 of contract funding. In addition, volunteers contributed 740,012 hours of service to CAAs, which based on data from the Virginia Employment Commission's Economic Information Services Division, is valued at an additional \$13.9 million in services. As a result, CAAs not only work to address the causes and conditions of poverty, but also contribute significantly to economic growth and development and the quality of life within the communities they serve.

## **Accomplishments of Virginia's Existing Community Action Network**

Equally impressive are the results or outcomes achieved by Virginia's CAAs.

### Partial List of Outcomes/Results Achieved by Virginia CAAs During SFY2006

- 7,694 low-income children and their families received Head Start services from programs administered by 21 Virginia CAAs.
- 3,582 safe and affordable housing units were improved or preserved through new construction, weatherization services, home repair, and housing rehabilitation programs administered by 23 Virginia CAAs.
- 1,509 individuals received volunteer income tax preparation assistance resulting in over \$831,000 in federal and state tax credits, including Earned Income Tax Credits.
- Over 32,000 households were provided with emergency assistance in the form of fuel, utility, and rent/mortgage payments.
- 17,915 individuals were provided with emergency food.
- 1,898 families were provided temporary emergency shelter.
- 863 children were served by before and after school child care programs administered by 11 Virginia CAAs, services that enabled their parents to obtain or maintain employment.
- 1,331 families were provided counseling, assistance, and protection against domestic/family violence.
- 2,900 ex-offenders were provided counseling, case management, employment services, and emergency assistance as they were released from Virginia prisons.
- Over 2,000 low-income and first generation youth participated in Project Discovery programs administered by 18 CAAs, services designed to prepare and secure admission to post-secondary educational institutions.
- 841 at-risk youth participated in programs designed to improve their social, emotional, and academic success.
- 867 partnership agreements with other community organizations were executed by Virginia CAAs in order to improve or maintain effective community service delivery systems and prevent duplication of services.

## **Need for Expansion of Virginia's Community Action Network**

Virginia is one of only three states (Florida, North Carolina, and Virginia) in the nation that does not have statewide coverage of community action services and programs. Thirty percent of Virginia's local jurisdictions (42 counties and cities) do not have a community action agency. See Appendix B. These 42 jurisdictions include a total of 175,773 citizens with incomes at or below 125% of the federal poverty guidelines (annual income of \$25,813 for a family of four). The expansion of community action services to these jurisdictions will not only address the unmet needs of these low-income families, but can also be expected to leverage over time an additional \$33 million per year in new federal, state, local, and private sector resources, while generating significant economic benefits to the economies and governments within these jurisdictions.

## **Mandate**

The 2007 Appropriations Act directed the Virginia Department of Social Services to work in coordination with the Virginia Community Action Partnership to make recommendations for expanding community action services to those jurisdictions that are currently unserved. The Act directs the Department to make recommendations concerning (1) the appropriate level and location of additional services to be provided through either expanding the service area of existing CAAs or encouraging the creation of new CAAs; (2) the potential costs associated with providing services in unserved areas; (3) a timetable for phasing in additional services where appropriate and needed; and (4) the most appropriate method of providing community action services in unserved areas that may still exist.

## **Coordination with the Virginia Community Action Partnership**

Beginning in January of 2007, the Virginia Department of Social Services held a series of meetings (January 17, February 2, and March 16) with the Virginia Community Action Partnership (VACAP) and CAAs in Virginia that are interested in expanding community action services into unserved areas of the state. During these meetings the group discussed federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to the designation of CAAs, the projected cost of expanding these services, the funding formula that would apply to the expansion, and how expansion could and should occur.

On April 13, 2007, and June 14, 2007, the Department again met with VACAP and this time the entire community action network in Virginia for further discussion of these issues and to reach agreement on the recommendations contained in this report. Additionally, the Department held numerous meetings and discussions with the Executive Director of VACAP in preparing and finalizing this report.

During these meetings and discussions, Virginia's CAA network reached consensus on the following points: (1) expansion of community action services to the entire state would benefit not only low-income residents in unserved communities, but also the entire community action network in Virginia; (2) in order to accomplish statewide coverage of community action services, priority should be given to the expansion of existing CAAs, after which the process should be opened to all organizations; and (3) sufficient funding must be appropriated to ensure the existing network would not lose funding and be forced to reduce services in the communities already being served. In response to these discussions, the Department has developed a two-year plan and timetable for providing CAA services in unserved areas.

While Virginia's network of CAAs strongly supports the concept of statewide expansion of services, it is also deeply concerned about the potential impact a reduction in funding would have on the existing network and the services it provides, if additional funding is not earmarked by the General Assembly for this expansion. Virginia's community action network has worked very hard over the last forty years to develop a wide array of services and programs that are effective in providing low-income families with opportunities to move out of poverty, build assets, and become more self-sufficient. Therefore, some members of the network are reluctant to support any plan for



statewide expansion that might result in a reduction in their funding and force existing CAAs to eliminate or reduce the programs and/or services they currently administer.

## **Recommendations**

The recommendations that follow are predicated on several basic principles. Section 2.2-5407 of the *Code of Virginia* lays out a process by which the Governor of Virginia designates new or expanded CAAs to operate within the Commonwealth. The federal Community Services Block Grant Act (Public Law 105-285), and Virginia's Administrative Code (22 VAC 40-901-40 et seq) establish priorities for designating CSBG eligible entities in unserved areas.

The first priority for extending services to an unserved area would involve the expansion of services by an existing community action agency, preferably one whose current service area is contiguous to the unserved area(s). If an existing CAA is unwilling or unable to expand its services into the unserved area(s), then the second priority would be to designate another private non-profit organization that is geographically contiguous to the unserved area and already providing related or similar services. And finally, if no private non-profit organization is identified or determined to be qualified, then a unit of local government can be designated to serve unserved area(s).

Another underlying principle of the Department's recommendations is that private non-profit organizations tend to be more entrepreneurial, provide a wider array of services, and are better able to leverage their CSBG contract funds than is generally true of units of local government. A final underlying principle is that an existing CAA that is effectively governed, professionally managed, and that already has a tri-partite governing board structure in place is in a better position to assess unmet needs and service gaps in the unserved area, and better able to identify and leverage the funding needed to provide services and programs than another non-profit with a related but less specific mission.

### **(1) The appropriate level and location of additional services to be provided.**

Thirty counties and 12 cities are currently unserved by CAAs. Unserved counties include Augusta, Bath, Chesterfield, Clarke, Culpeper, Dinwiddie, Essex, Frederick, Gloucester, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, Highland, King George, Lancaster, Mathews, Middlesex, Northumberland, Page, Prince George, Prince William, Rappahannock, Richmond, Rockingham, Shenandoah, Spotsylvania, Stafford, Warren, Westmoreland, and York. Unserved cities include Colonial Heights, Fairfax, Fall Church, Fredericksburg, Harrisonburg, Hopewell, Manassas, Manassas Park, Poquoson, Staunton, Waynesboro, and Winchester.

As discussed earlier, the menu of services and programs offered by CAAs is driven by local needs, conditions, and existing resources. For this reason, no two CAAs in Virginia provide an identical menu of services. As a result, the appropriate level and location of additional services to be provided in these unserved areas will be driven by local conditions, unmet needs, and service gaps, and constrained only by limited financial resources and agency capacity. Expansion of services into unserved areas would provide an existing CAA with a number of challenges. The CAA would need to identify and leverage additional financial resources in order to address the unmet needs that exist in the expansion areas. The CAA would also need to

expand its governance, planning, program management, financial management, and possibly its human resource systems.

As a result, it is critical that existing CAAs who expand into unserved areas receive an additional allocation of CSBG contract funding. These additional funds will enable the CAA to assess local needs and service gaps, to leverage the additional financial resources that will be required in order to provide a comprehensive menu of services in the unserved area(s), and to expand the CAA's capacity to provide those additional services effectively by enhancing its infrastructure and management systems. Without additional funds earmarked for the expansion of community action services, funding would have to be diverted from existing CAAs and would result in the reduction and/or elimination of essential services already being provided.

Since a significant portion of the state is currently unserved, the Department anticipates that statewide expansion cannot be fully achieved only by expanding the service areas of existing CAAs. It is very likely that other private non-profit organizations or units of local government will need to be designated as new CAAs to achieve statewide coverage. While expanding the service areas of existing CAAs certainly presents them with a set of challenges, the creation of a new CAA presents additional challenges. In addition to the ones already outlined above that an existing CAA would face, the designation of another private non-profit organization as a new CAA would necessitate amending the agency's mission, vision statement, and even its organizational structure. It would also need to substantially alter its governance structure to ensure it has a tri-partite governing board. The receipt of additional federal dollars could also trigger an entire array of federal regulations and reporting requirements with which other non-profits, particularly small ones, have little or no knowledge, experience, or capacity to address. As a result, the Department expects that there will be a substantial need for technical assistance to organizations seeking to be designated as new CAAs.

Because services provided are driven by local unmet needs and conditions, it is difficult to estimate the types and levels of additional services that would result from statewide expansion. It is possible, though, to estimate the number of low-income persons these services might impact. During SFY2006 Virginia's network of CAAs provided services to approximately 118,000 persons. According to the 2000 census, 713,317 persons with incomes at or below 125% of poverty reside in the jurisdictions currently being served. Based on this data, during SFY2006 Virginia's network of CAAs provided services to 16.5% of the low-income persons residing in the jurisdictions they served. With 175,773 low-income individuals residing in unserved jurisdictions, we can estimate that an additional 29,000 persons per year would receive community action services once statewide expansion is completed.

In summary, the level and location of additional services to be provided in the unserved areas will be a function of local needs and service gaps, the level of additional funding provided to the expanding or new CAA, and the capacity of the expanding or new CAA to provide needed services effectively. Given time to leverage additional financial resources, to build community support for the agencies' missions, and to increase the agencies' capacities to provide these additional services, we estimate that statewide expansion of these services will result in an additional 29,000 low-income Virginia citizens per year being served.

**(2) The potential costs associated with providing services in unserved areas.**

As previously discussed, the level and scope of CAA services to be provided in unserved areas will be a function of local conditions, the needs of low-income residents in that community, gaps in existing services, and the level of additional funding designated for services in that unserved area. Therefore, it is all but impossible to estimate potential costs of expansion by relating it to the specific services that might be provided, as those services will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Since the average CAA in Virginia uses each dollar of its CSBG contract funding to leverage \$7.56 in other federal, state, local, and private funding, it could be expected that over the course of a number of years, expanded CAAs or new CAAs would be able to achieve that leveraging ratio too. It would be fair then to view CSBG contract funding as “seed” money, enabling the CAA to assess local needs and service gaps, to maintain effective management systems, and to leverage and secure additional resources for the services that will ultimately be provided.

In Virginia, increased CSBG contract funds are allocated to the existing network of CAAs in accordance with the following allocation formula, described in the Appropriations Act: 75% based on the low-income population (125% of the OMB Poverty Guidelines), 20% based on the number of local jurisdictions served, and 5% based on the square miles in the agency’s service area. Since the allocation of CSBG contract funding is predominantly based on the service area’s low-income population, the estimated cost of expanding CAA services into unserved areas is based on the following two assumptions:

- a. Funding levels in expansion jurisdictions should be equitable to funding levels in jurisdictions already being served when adjusted for the size of the low-income populations that reside in each; and
- b. Funding for the expansion of CAA services should not result in a reduction of services or reduced funding of the existing network

Based on these two assumptions, the estimated cost of expanding CSBG services to the 42 jurisdictions currently unserved by CAAs will total \$6.6 million, including \$2.2 million during the first year of the biennium and an additional \$4.4 million during the second year. See Attachment C.

**3) Timetable for phasing in additional services where appropriate and needed.**

This report embraces a two-year timetable for expanding community action services throughout the State of Virginia.

During Year One, existing CAAs that are interested and willing to expand services into those areas and that have the capacity to do so will work to lay the foundation for those expansions. These CAAs will hold discussions with local government officials; business, church, and civic leaders; and low-income individuals and families who reside in the unserved areas to share information about community action, to begin assessing local needs and service gaps, and to develop a plan for expanding services there. The goal of these discussions is to secure the support of local decision makers in the form of a resolution approved by the Board of

Supervisors or City Council that requests the Governor designate the existing CAA to provide services in that new jurisdiction.

Based on discussions with Virginia's existing community action network, it is estimated that resolutions can be secured from about half of the 42 unserved jurisdictions by June 1, 2008. Those CAAs who have secured local resolutions and whose requests to expand have been approved by the Governor will have those previously unserved jurisdictions added to their service areas effective July 1, 2008, and will be awarded whatever expansion funds are earmarked for that purpose using the existing allocation formula. Based on this estimate, additional CSBG contract funding totaling \$2.2 million will be needed by July 1, 2008.

During Year Two, the Virginia Department of Social Services will seek to complete the statewide expansion of services into those localities still uncovered by an existing CAA as of July 1, 2008. This could be accomplished by issuing a Request for Proposal to existing CAAs, to other private non-profits providing related services in the jurisdictions still unserved, and to units of local government in those jurisdictions. Whatever proposals are received will be evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the Administrative Code, 22 VAC 40-901-40 et seq. Those organizations submitting responsive and responsible proposals and who demonstrate the capacity to provide CAA services will be submitted to the Governor for approval effective July 1, 2009. We estimate that an additional \$4.4 million will be needed by July 1, 2009, to complete the statewide expansion of CAA services into the remaining unserved jurisdictions and to sustain the expansion that occurred during Year One.

**4) The most appropriate method of providing community action services in unserved areas.**

The process of designating new or expanded CAAs begins within the local jurisdictions and communities that will be served. After assessing unmet needs and service gaps and building community support, the organization would seek the endorsement of the appropriate county board of supervisors or city council in the form of a formal resolution. The organization would then submit that resolution to the Virginia Department of Social Services for review by the Secretary of Health and Human Resources and the approval of the Governor.

Both federal statutes and state regulations governing the designation of organizations to provide CAA services in unserved areas require that priority be given to expanding the service areas of existing CAAs. The two-year timetable outlined above is consistent with those requirements. It provides the Commonwealth with the opportunity to accomplish this expansion by using those most ready and able to provide these services effectively, namely existing CAAs. And finally, it also provides a methodology for completing statewide expansion into those jurisdictions in which it is not possible or likely that an existing CAA can expand.

**Other Recommendations**

In developing this two-year plan for the statewide expansion of community action services, the Department has identified two related issues concerning how funds are allocated or distributed to CAAs in Virginia that should be addressed.

Virginia's SFY2008 Appropriation Act, Chapter 847, Item 340.A.1. states "All increased state or federal funds distributed to Community Action Agencies shall be distributed as follows: The funds shall be distributed to all local Community Action Agencies according to the Department of Social Services funding formula (75% based on low-income population, 20% based on number of jurisdictions served, and 5.0% based on square mileage served), adjusted to ensure that no agency receives less than 1.5% of any increase."

- (a) The Department recommends that this formula be revised by deleting the requirement that funding be "adjusted to ensure that no agency receives less than 1.5% of any increase." The Department has found that this 1.5% minimum encourages the formation of small agencies and functions as a disincentive to small agencies who might consider expanding their service areas.

Throughout the 40-year history of community action in Virginia, the Department has found that while multi-jurisdictional agencies have tended to prosper and to develop innovative and effective solutions to poverty within the communities they served, those agencies that served only a single or perhaps two jurisdictions have often struggled to merely survive. Private non-profit organizations that truly thrive need a funding and client base of sufficient size to support an effective infrastructure and to maintain effective management systems, particularly the capability to assess community needs, to research innovative solutions that address these needs, and to secure additional funding and develop well-thought-out plans for implementing innovative programs and services they design. CAAs that serve only a single or even two jurisdictions lack that funding and client base and often struggle to maintain effective management systems while lacking the resources needed to research, design, plan, and secure funding for innovative, effective solutions to poverty.

If the 1.5% minimum is removed from the Appropriations Act, CAAs that are considering expanding and organizations seeking designation as new CAAs will be encouraged to seek multi-jurisdictional or regional strategies for addressing the causes and conditions of poverty in the areas they serve.

- (b) The Department also recommends that after statewide expansion of community action services has been completed, the methodology for distributing or allocating funds to CAAs be re-evaluated and perhaps revised. The funding formula cited above in Chapter 847, Item 340.A.1. applies to "all increased state or federal funds." This has resulted in a two-tiered method of allocating community action funding, with existing or level funding allocated on an historical basis, while the amount of increased funding is distributed according to the allocation formula. Over the years this has led to discrepancies in the funding of CAAs, with some receiving less than they would if the formula was applied to all of their CSBG contract funding and with others receiving more. In addition, when local community action allocations are "historically based," funding levels are not responsive to changes in population and demographic shifts that occur over time as reflected in each census. This issue should be re-examined later in order to ensure federal and state CSBG contract funding and appropriations are distributed in a manner that predominantly reflects the size and/or needs of the client base to be served.

## **Conclusion**

The statewide expansion of community action services will ensure that all of Virginia's low-income citizens have access to services and programs designed to address the causes and conditions of poverty regardless of the jurisdiction in which they reside. Similarly, the statewide expansion will also bring into all of Virginia's local jurisdictions additional federal, state, and private resources – resources that contribute significantly to the economic health of these communities and that provide increased economic opportunity to the low-income families that reside in those communities.

Virginia's community action network has a 40-year history of effectively addressing many of the most challenging issues and problems that local communities face. Whether it is the need for safe, affordable child care for the children of Virginia's working poor; addressing domestic and family violence; giving low-income children a head start at succeeding in local schools; the need for safe, affordable housing; addressing the issue of homelessness; helping ex-offenders to re-integrate into their communities thereby avoiding re-incarceration; or any number of other difficult issues, Virginia's CAAs have a history of designing and implementing effective community-based and collaborative solutions to these and other problems.

CAAs also bring together all members of the community including local government officials; business, industry and other private sector leaders; and low-income residents themselves to find local solutions to local problems. Virginia's CAAs are good neighbors, seeking to find collaborative responses to these challenges, responses that are effective and avoid duplication in services and programs. CAAs make a significant contribution to the quality of life in Virginia and to the economic development and growth of local communities while providing opportunities to Virginia's low-income families to become more self-sufficient.

The statewide expansion of community action services in Virginia is truly an investment in the Commonwealth's economic vitality and quality of life.

**Appendix A**  
**Current Listing**  
**Virginia Community Action Agencies**  
**July 1, 2007**

Agency Name	Jurisdictions Currently Being Served
Alexandria City, Office of Community Services	City of Alexandria.
Arlington County Department of Planning, Housing and Development	Arlington County.
Clinch Valley Community Action	Tazewell County.
Eastern Shore Area Agency on Aging & Community Action Agency	Counties of Accomack and Northampton.
Fairfax County Department of Family Services	County of Fairfax.
Fauquier Community Action Committee	Fauquier County.
HOPE Community Services, Inc.	Counties of Amelia, Buckingham, Cumberland, Lunenburg, Nottoway, and Prince Edward.
Loudoun County Department of Family Services	Loudoun County.
Lynchburg Community Action Group	Counties of Amherst, Appomattox, Bedford, and Campbell. Cities of Bedford and Lynchburg.
Monticello Area Community Action Agency	Counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Louisa, and Nelson. City of Charlottesville.
Mountain Community Action Program	Counties of Bland, Smyth, and Wythe
New River Community Action, Inc.	Counties of Floyd, Giles, Montgomery, and Pulaski. City of Radford.
Office of Human Affairs	Cities of Hampton and Newport News
People, Incorporated	Counties of Buchanan, Dickenson, Russell, and Washington. City of Bristol.
Pittsylvania County Community Action Agency	Counties of Henry and Pittsylvania. Cities of Danville and Martinsville.
Quin Rivers Agency for Community Action	Counties of Caroline, Charles City, King & Queen, King William, and New Kent.
Richmond Community Action Program	Powhatan County. Cities of Petersburg and Richmond.
Rooftop of Virginia	Counties of Carroll and Grayson. City of Galax.
Rural Areas Development Association	Counties of Lee, Scoll, and Wise. City of Norton.
Skyline Community Action Program	Counties of Greene, Madison, and Orange.
Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project	Counties of Isle of Wight and Southampton. Cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach.
STEP, Incorporated	Counties of Franklin and Patrick.
The Improvement Association	Counties of Brunswick, Greenville, Sussex, and Surry. City of Emporia.
Total Action Against Poverty in the Roanoke Valley	Counties of Allegheny, Botetourt, Craig, Roanoke, and Rockbridge. Cities of Buena Vista, Clifton Forge, Covington, Lexington, Roanoke, and Salem.
Tri-County Community Action Agency	Counties of Charlotte, Halifax, and Mecklenburg.
Williamsburg/James City County Community Action Agency	James City County. City of Williamsburg.





## Appendix C

### Funding Needed for Unserved Jurisdictions July 1, 2008

Unserved Jurisdictions	Funding Needed
Augusta County	\$155,600
Bath County	\$50,300
Chesterfield County	\$307,200
Clarke County	\$50,000
Culpeper County	\$109,900
Dinwiddie County	\$93,200
Essex County	\$60,400
Frederick County	\$127,400
Gloucester County	\$100,500
Goochland County	\$60,500
Hanover County	\$114,000
Henrico County	\$393,800
Highland County	\$46,300
King George County	\$56,300
Lancaster County	\$68,200
Mathews County	\$43,600
Middlesex County	\$60,600
Northumberland County	\$67,000
Page County	\$103,000
Prince George County	\$83,300
Prince William County	\$328,500
Rappahannock County	\$48,200
Richmond County	\$56,100
Rockingham County	\$178,900
Shenandoah County	\$110,200
Spotsylvania County	\$133,700
Stafford County	\$119,400
Warren County	\$98,500
Westmoreland County	\$92,100
York County	\$86,600
Colonial Heights City	\$50,700
Fairfax City	\$60,000
Falls Church City	\$40,100
Fredericksburg City	\$85,100
Harrisonburg City	\$223,300
Hopewell City	\$103,400
Manassas City	\$75,900
Manassas Park City	\$42,300
Poquoson City	\$40,600
Staunton City	\$92,200
Waynesboro City	\$86,900
Winchester City	\$97,300
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,400,100</b>

