

Ellen F. Robertson, Chair
Council Member 6th District

Jonathan T. Baliles, Vice Chair
Council Member 1st District

Kathy Graziano, Member,
4th District, Member

Charles Samuels, Alternate,
2nd District, Member



Steve Taylor
Council Policy Analyst

Bill Echelberger
Council Budget Analyst

Land Use, Housing & Transportation Standing Committee Staff Report & Supplemental Information

March 22, 2016



Land Use, Housing & Transportation Standing Committee Table of Contents

Staff Report.....	Page 3
Staff Analysis of Committee Legislation.	Pages 4- 9



Lou Brown Ali
Council Chief of Staff

Richmond City Council

The Voice of the People

Richmond, Virginia

Office of the Council Chief of Staff

STAFF REPORT

March 22, 2016

The last Committee meeting was held on February 16, 2016

Presentations, Reports and Discussion Items at the February Meeting

- Bob Steidel, Director DPU - Preventing water contamination in the City of Richmond

Expected Presentations, Reports or Discussion Items at the March Meeting

- David Green, CEO of GRTC – CareVan Ridership and Costs

Board Recommendations/Actions

- Alexander Rawls, Boards and Commissions Administrator

Next Committee Meeting

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for April 19 at 3:00 P.M.

SUMMARY OF PAPERS

- 1. Ord. No. 2015-33 (Patron – Ms. Trammell):** To rename the building located at 900 East Broad Street and known as “City Hall” as “L. Douglas Wilder City Hall.”

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

This proposal names Richmond City Hall at 900 East Broad Street after L. Douglas Wilder.

L. Douglas Wilder served as Mayor of Richmond from 2005-2009. He is first person elected directly by the voters as mayor under the current City Charter and at least since the 1948 City Charter. Previous mayors were indirectly elected and chosen by the Council. Notably, Mr. Wilder is a native of the City and is the first African-American elected Lt. Governor of Virginia and the first African American elected governor of any State.

Section 26-7 through 26-10 of the City Code expresses guidelines on naming public facilities and streets. The general preference of the policy is to only name facilities after someone who has been deceased for 5 years. However; the City Council and Mayor, have at times found it appropriate to name City-owned streets and facilities for historic and honorific reasons such as in the cases of the naming Louise Caine Park, Toler Furniture Road, First Freedom Center Alley, the Manchester Courts Building, Joe Brooks Boulevard, and the T. Tyler Potterfield Memorial Bridge.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. Does the proposal create any costs for changing the name of the building to officials operating their offices such as stationery and signage?

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact is anticipated. There may be nominal costs associated with changing signage and stationery but those exact costs are not known. Council Staff has previously been informed by Administration Staff that costs of signage is absorbed in DPW’s operating budgets for naming or re-naming City streets, alleys, and other facilities.

PUBLIC WORKS

- 2. Ordinance No. 2015-199 (Patron: Ms. Robertson and Mr. Agelasto):** To amend City Code §§ 38-156, concerning the abatement of certain refuse, litter and weed control violations, and 86-44, concerning the times and places of collection for bulk items, brush and loose leaves, for the purposes of requiring the Chief Administrative Officer to waive certain fees for the abatement of certain violations, requiring the Director of Public Works to provide written notification of the date on which bulk items are scheduled for collection, and prohibiting the placement of bulk items for collection on or near a public right-of-way more than 48 hours before the date scheduled for collection.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

Ordinance No. 2015-199 makes several changes to the City Code related to bulk pickup and abatement of dumping:

- §38-156 Requires the waiver of administrative fees after a written determination that the responsible party did not cause the unlawful accumulation. This written determination is appealable to Circuit Court.
- §86-44 Requires the Director of Public Works to provide a date for requested bulk pickup of refuse.

Prohibits placement of items scheduled for bulk pick-up on or near a public right-of-way for collection more than 48 hours before the scheduled collection date.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. While the City already engages in code enforcement the actual payments received in relation to the amount billed is not tracked and is, therefore, unknown. Under existing code provisions, violations are assessed the actual cost of abatement plus a \$100 administrative fee in the event abatement action by the City is required.
2. The advanced scheduling can be accomplished with the existing administrative systems.

Fiscal Impact:

The proposed change will alter operational procedures, which will result in a cost change. Due to the lack of collections data, the revenue impact cannot be determined.

- 3. Res No. 2016-R017 (Patron:Agelasto):** To establish a policy of the Council that the Council will appoint no person to the Board of Commissioners of the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority to more than two consecutive full terms.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

This legislation limits all persons to no more than two consecutive terms as a Commissioner on the Board of Commissioners of the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority (RRHA). Currently, there are no limits to the number of terms a Commissioner can serve on the Board. The City Council appoints Commissioners to the Board of Governors of RRHA.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. How many current members would no longer be eligible to serve on the Board in the near future?

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

RRHA

2. **Res. No. 2016-R017 (Robertson, Newbille and Agelasto)** To amend Res. No. 2003-R230-2004-R18, adopted Jan. 12, 2004, as previously amended by Res. No. 2010-R141-173, adopted Nov. 8, 2010, which established a procedure to be followed before the Council appoints a tenant representative to serve on the Board of Commissioners of the Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority, to modify the procedure.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

The paper amends the current process of appointing a tenant representative to the Board of Commissioners of RRHA so that the Richmond Tenants' Organization (RTO) must provide 6 nominations to fill a vacancy in the tenant representative seat within 60 days of notice that a vacancy has occurred, to the City Council's LUHT Committee. The legislation further provides that if the RTO fails to nominate a replacement to fill the vacancy with a recommendation within 60 days of receiving notice from the City Clerk Council may proceed to fill the vacancy without a nomination from the RTO.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. What process will Council use to fill the vacancies if there is no nomination?
2. Are there any other organizations or neighborhood associations that should be considered for potential nominations of tenant representatives?
3. How does the RTO choose nominees?

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

4. **Ord. No. 2016-080 (Mayor Jones)** To authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to accept a gift, valued at up to \$75,000, from the Friends of Allen Avenue Common of

materials, construction, and other services needed to complete improvements to the southeast Allen Avenue median.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

The legislation authorizes the CAO to accept a gift of improvements that are valued at \$65,000 from the Friends of Allen Avenue Common (FAAC) that redeveloped the southeast Allen Avenue median. The City Code requires that gifts to the City that are valued at more than \$25,000 require Council approval to be accepted.

In 2014, representatives from the FAAC and Enrichmond approached the DPR about improving the southeast median which had become an unkempt green space. The Administration's O&R indicates that other impacted City agencies, DPW and DPU, have no objections with the City accepting the improvements.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. Will any portion of the improvements require expenditure by the City for upkeep?
2. Will the FAAC and/or Enrichmond maintain the any grass, trees or plantings?

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact is anticipated?

5. **Ord. No. 2016-081 (Mayor Jones)** To authorize the Chief Administrative Officer to accept a gift, valued at approximately \$61,591, from the Friends of Jefferson Park of fitness trail equipment for the purpose of replacing existing fitness trail equipment of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities located on the grounds of Jefferson Park at 1921 Princess Anne Avenue.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

This paper authorizes the CAO to accept a gift of improvements from the Friends of Jefferson Park. The improvements are valued at \$61,591. Gifts to the City of more than \$25,000 in value require approval of City Council.

The gift consists largely of fitness equipment which will replace equipment installed in the early 1980s. That equipment is worn out. The Friends of Jefferson Park received an award from Bon Secours in the amount of \$51,591 and an award from an anonymous donor for \$10,000, which will be used to purchase a nine station fitness package.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. Will any portion of the improvements require expenditure by the City for upkeep?
2. Are the friends of Jefferson Park expected to maintain the equipment and fitness stations?

Fiscal Impact:

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

6. **Res. No. 2016-R019 (Mayor Jones)** To request the Virginia Department of Transportation to amend the street mileage inventory for the City of Richmond.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

The resolution is required to support the City application to request that VDOT amend the street maintenance mileage inventory for the City. This is required for localities that maintain their streets so that they can qualify for state financial assistance in maintaining roadway under the program. Pursuant to Va. Code Section 33.1-41.1. Localities that maintain their own streets are entitled to a street maintenance payment from the state based on the actual moving lane mileage (MLM). The State's street maintenance payment to the localities is based on moving lane miles (MLM) which is the number of lanes that public can travel on each direction (except turning and parking lanes). Currently, the City receives funds for about 1,859. An inventory of City lane miles indicate that the City may be eligible for funding for another 47 moving lane miles. VDOT requires that all changes to the inventory be submitted by April 1, 2016 with a supporting local governing body resolution.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. Will there be additional inventories that may find addition roadway that may qualify for VDOT support in the near future?
2. Can the application be amended if more qualifying roadway is discovered?

Fiscal Impact:

The Administration's O&R explains that failure to approve the resolution could cost the City approximately \$405,000 in VDOT funding.

7. **Res. No. 2016-R018 (Newbille)** To support the Broad Street Buss Rapid Transit project.

Summary of Ordinance/Resolution and Background:

The resolution reflects Council's support of of City Council for the Bus Rapid Transit project with the expectation that the GRTC will: 1.) study routes, intra-community connectivity strategies, and mechanisms that will ensure greater transit-connectivity to the route from neighborhoods, commercial corridors, and areas in the City not adjacent to the planned route; 2.) solicit input from the public regarding such studies; 3.) propose connectivity strategies; 4.) and report the findings of such studies to Council that GRTC can implement.

Staff Analysis and Questions:

1. Can GRTC brief the Council on how it will conduct the study requested?
2. Has GRTC gathered information that will help it conduct the studies during the study phases leading up to BRT's approval?

Fiscal Impact:

There is no expenditure or revenue impact of the proposed resolution. The \$7.6 million City costs of the BRT project are covered by Appropriations in the City's 2016-20 CIP.

Prepared by: W. Echelberger & S. Taylor

Date: March 18, 2016