

**RICHMOND REGIONAL PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 9, 2016**

**Members and Alternates (A) Present**

Parker C. Agelasto.....	City of Richmond
Chris Archer .....	Henrico County
Timothy M. Davey .....	Chesterfield County
Richard W. Glover .....	Henrico County
Mike C. Gray.....	City of Richmond
Gloria L. Freye .....	Chesterfield County
Leslie Haley.....	Chesterfield County
Wayne Hazzard (A).....	Hanover County
Susan Lascolette .....	Goochland County
Floyd H. Miles, Acting Chairman .....	Charles City County
Larry Nordvig.....	Powhatan County
Patricia S. O'Bannon.....	Henrico County
W. Canova Peterson .....	Hanover County
Edward W. Pollard .....	New Kent County
Randy Silber (A) .....	Henrico County
George Spagna .....	Town of Ashland
Frank J. Thornton .....	Henrico County
Carson Tucker .....	Powhatan County
Randy Whittaker.....	Hanover County
Christopher Winslow.....	Chesterfield County

**Members Absent**

Jonathan T. Baliles .....	City of Richmond
Tommy Branin .....	Henrico County
Karin Carmack .....	Powhatan County
Steve A. Elswick .....	Chesterfield County
Evan Fabricant.....	Hanover County
Kathy C. Graziano, Treasurer.....	City of Richmond
Jimmy Hancock.....	Henrico County
James M. Holland.....	Chesterfield County
Dorothy Jaeckle, Vice Chairman.....	Chesterfield County
Angela Kelly-Wiecek .....	Hanover County
Michelle Mosby.....	City of Richmond
Tyrone E. Nelson, Secretary.....	Henrico County
Rodney Poole .....	City of Richmond
C. Thomas Tiller.....	New Kent County

**Others Present**

John Amos ..... RRPDC Legal Counsel  
Blair Blanchette ..... Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Cyane Crump ..... Historic Richmond  
Katherine O'Donnell..... Richmond Region Tourism  
Mark Olinger..... City of Richmond  
Joanne Simmelink..... Chesterfield County

**Staff Present**

Martha Shickle ..... Executive Director  
Julie Fry ..... Executive Secretary  
Sulabh Aryal..... Senior Planner  
Anne Darby ..... Senior Planner  
Billy Gammel ..... Senior Planner  
Chuck Gates ..... Manager, Community Affairs  
Barbara Jacocks ..... Director of Planning  
Jin Lee ..... Senior Planner  
Josh Mallow ..... Planner  
Barbara Nelson ..... Director of Transportation  
Greta Ryan..... Senior Planner  
Will Sanford ..... Intern  
Sarah Stewart..... Senior Planner  
Peter Sweetland ..... Finance and Contracts Administrator

**Call to Order**

Acting Chairman Miles, called the regularly scheduled June 9, 2016 RRPDC meeting to order at approximately 9:10 a.m. in the RRPDC Board Room. He asked Ms. Lascolette to lead members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

**A. Certification by Commission Executive Director of Meeting Quorum**

Ms. Shickle, RRPDC Executive Director, reported that a quorum of members was present.

**B. Request for Additions or Changes to the Order of Business**

Acting Chairman Miles asked if there were any requests to change the agenda or order of business. No requests from members were received and Acting Chairman Miles indicated the agenda would stand as presented.

### **C. Open Public Comment Period**

Acting Chairman Miles opened the public comment period, noting that if anyone wished to address the members, to please come to a microphone and provide his or her name, locality of residence, and if appropriate the name of any organization being represented. Acting Chairman Miles asked that any citizen speaker please limit comments to three minutes, and organizations should limit their comments to five minutes.

As there were no requests from the public to address members of the Board, Acting Chairman Miles closed the public comment period.

Acting Chairman Miles said that he will continue to close the Public Comment Period quickly if no one asks to be recognized to speak. He said he respects members' time and likes to keep the agenda moving along.

### **D. Approval of May 12, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

Acting Chairman Miles presented the minutes of the May 12, 2016 to members for their consideration on behalf of Mr. Nelson, who could not attend today's meeting.

Acting Chairman Miles asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the minutes. There being none, Mr. Peterson moved for approval of the May 12, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lascolette. There was no additional discussion and the minutes of the May 12, 2016 meeting were approved unanimously as presented. Ms. O'Bannon abstained from the vote as she was not in attendance during the May 12, 2016 meeting.

### **E. Acceptance of April 2016 Financial Report**

Acting Chairman Miles presented the financial report for April 2016 on behalf of Ms. Graziano who could not attend today's meeting.

Acting Chairman Miles said if there were no questions or corrections, he would ask for a motion to accept the April 2016 financial report for file as presented. Mr. Spagna so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Nordvig. There was no further discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

### **F. Acting Chairman's Report**

Acting Chairman Miles reported that during this morning's Executive Committee meeting, members voted to recommend to the full Commission that current officers be elected to continue in their positions through FY17 as discussed by members during last month's meeting:

Chairman: Floyd Miles, Charles City County  
Vice Chairman: Dorothy Jaeckle, Chesterfield County

Treasurer: Kathy Graziano, City of Richmond  
Secretary: Tyrone Nelson, Henrico County

Acting Chairman Miles said that if there is no objection to this slate of officers or to the procedure by which they will continue in these positions during FY17, he would ask for a motion to elect this slate of officers as presented to serve in the positions indicated. Mr. Tucker so moved and the motion was seconded by Mr. Thornton. There was no discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

Acting Chairman Miles indicated that officers will be sworn into office during the July 14, 2016 meeting.

### **G. Executive Director's Report**

Ms. Shickle brought members' attention to the staff activity report, which is included in the agenda book under Tab 3 and details key projects being advanced by staff on behalf of the localities.

Ms. Shickle said she would like to call members' attention to three items in this month's report.

The region's jurisdictions participate in a regional hazard mitigation plan that also includes all jurisdictions within the Crater PDC. Funding has been awarded from the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) to update the current hazard mitigation plan. Ms. Shickle noted that jurisdictions are required to have a current hazard mitigation plan on file with FEMA in order to receive federal funds following a natural disaster. RRPDC and Crater PDC staffs will be working together to update the current plan, which will cover all jurisdictions in both regions. She said updates are on schedule to prevent any type of lapse in the plan. There is a match for this grant; however, this cost is being covered by member dues.

Ms. Shickle reminded members that last year they authorized the submission of a renewal application for funding under the Coastal Zone Management Program. An update is included in the staff report on how these funds are used by the PDC, as an example, to support the GroundworkRVA Program.

Finally, efforts are ongoing with the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). A brief update on the MTP is also included in the staff report. Ms. Shickle said if members need any additional information on the MTP, staff members from the Transportation Division are available to provide that information or to answer any questions.

She said staff will be happy to address any questions on any of the items included in the report.

Mr. Nordvig asked if the PDC pays dues to belong to the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) and if so, he asked what benefits the agency receives.

Ms. Shickle said NADO dues are \$2,000 per year; however, as RRPDC joined in mid-year, dues paid for the calendar year 2016 were prorated to approximately \$800. She said the affiliation with NADO allows the agency to have access to programs, through NADO's Research Foundation, to identify best practices from around the country in implementing programs and efficiencies in those programs. She said there is also an opportunity for peer learning on operational efforts and program development, such as how to integrate a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) into an MTP. She said there has been a big push lately by NADO to make sure that planning is not done in silos and for information on how agencies can leverage opportunities is shared.

Mr. Nordvig asked if NADO provided any type of lobbying services. Ms. Shickle said there is an advocacy branch within NADO. She said efforts are being shifted to do less policy lobbying at the federal level and more advocacy at the regulatory level. She said this will enable agencies such as PDCs to know how to better work with regulatory staffs in developing regulations that will better serve the agencies. She said an example would be how the PDCs can work with the USDA and the rule making changes happening with the Farm Bill, as well as things that are happening with Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), with regard to transportation, and the Economic Development Administration (EDA) for assistance in helping communities meet their economic development goals.

Before continuing with the agenda, Acting Chairman Miles said he would like to introduce a new member this morning – Mr. Mike C. Gray, who is the new Citizen Representative from the City of Richmond. Acting Chairman Miles welcomed Mr. Gray to the Commission and invited him to take an active part in the discussions.

## **II. CONSENT AGENDA**

Acting Chairman Miles noted there are two items on the Consent Agenda this month:

- A. Authorization for Executive Director to File and Execute an Application for Federal Financial Assistance from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to Continue Funding for a Position to Support Regional Emergency Management Planning
- B. Authorization for Executive Director to File and Execute an Application for Federal Financial Assistance from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security for Funding to Conduct a Regional Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)

Acting Chairman Miles asked Ms. Shickle if she would provide a brief summary of each item.

Ms. Shickle said that Item A is an annual renewal application to support the agency's Emergency Management planning position. She said this position supports the Central

Virginia Emergency Management Alliance (CVEMA), which includes 26 jurisdictions. The Alliance coordinates emergency response and planning for these jurisdictions. Item B is a new application to benefit CVEMA through completion of a Regional Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA). The Assessment is a priority for CVEMA. Staff has structured the request so that if the application is successful, staff would be able to pursue the THIRA in conjunction with the hazard mitigation plan update. A request for proposals has been issued for a consultant to support the hazard mitigation plan update and, if the THIRA funds are awarded, the consultant would also assist with the THIRA. Using the same consultant for both tasks will offer a more efficient use of the funds.

Acting Chairman Miles said if there are no questions, he would ask for a motion to approve the two requests.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification that these are two separate projects. Ms. Shickle said that was correct. Ms. Lascolette asked if the funds would go to the consultant or stay in the agency. Ms. Shickle said funds from Item A are a renewal of funds to support the Emergency Management Planner position within the RRPDC. Funds from Item B will be used to complete a project – the assessment of threats – that would be led by a consultant. Ms. Shickle said approximately five percent of the grant funds from Item B would be paid to the RRPDC as an administrative fee, but the bulk of the grant funds would be used to pay the consultant. While it is hoped that the THIRA funds would be renewed at some point, it is not an annual grant award.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification that the funds for Item B are from a grant that will be used to pay for a consultant. Ms. Shickle said that was correct. Ms. Shickle added that the threat assessment helps to identify risks for the CVEMA communities and what mitigation strategies may be needed to address those risks as part of a preparedness plan.

Mr. Winslow asked when the THIRA would need to be updated. Ms. Shickle said the CVEMA has never completed a THIRA before as it is not a requirement of the hazard mitigation planning program. It can be considered an enhancement for preparedness planning. Ms. Shickle said ideally, the THIRA would be updated every five years along with the hazard mitigation plan. However, she did not think this would be the case as funds may not be available every five years.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if any of the jurisdictions had completed a THIRA. Ms. Shickle said not on this scale. She said she knew each of the jurisdictions did their own localized preparedness planning. CVEMA determined it would be more efficient to have the assessment done at a regional level as weather incidents don't follow jurisdictional boundaries.

Ms. Lascolette asked for the amount of each grant. Ms. Shickle said she did not have that information at hand but would see if staff can find out. Mr. Gates added that he could offer information on the difference between a THIRA and a Hazard Identification Risk Assessment (HIRA). He noted that most of the region's large localities complete a HIRA

on a routine basis. A THIRA is a much more in-depth analysis of threats, including both natural and manmade. As an example, a THIRA will identify such things as chemical plants in the region and the potential threats the chemicals might present. If the region was still part of an Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) region, the THIRA would be required. He said there is a regional benefit to performing a THIRA so all emergency management planners and responders know of all risks and threats within the regions.

Mr. Gates added that the RFP was developed in cooperation with emergency management directors from Henrico and Chesterfield Counties as well as the City of Petersburg.

Mr. Peterson asked staff to remember that some members are not familiar with all of the acronyms that are used and cautioned staff to limit their use. Mr. Gates apologized and brought members' attention to their agenda, which lists the full name of the THIRA.

Ms. O'Bannon noted that she is on ~~the~~ Henrico County's (correction made by Ms. O'Bannon during the 7/14/16 meeting) Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) which was established in response to the Bopol (India) chemical plant explosion several years ago, killing thousands of Bopol residents. The federal government determined that localities should identify the location of all chemical and similar plants within their regions – SARA Title 3 (Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act). Henrico County developed a computer program which is in use by Henrico County fire departments to identify any chemicals or other hazardous materials that may be in burning buildings. Henrico County has also taken steps to identify all truck traffic that goes through the county. If trucks are not clearly identified when they carry explosive materials, they can be fined.

Ms. O'Bannon added that "threat" refers to terrorism. THIRA is completed by many of the large jurisdictions as they are urbanized areas. Fire departments need to have such programs in place to be able to identify risks and threats. She noted that during a study conducted a few years ago in conjunction with the PDC, it was determined that one of the biggest threats for the region would be a bomb placed at Acca Yard due to its proximity to I-95 and I-64 and rail tracks, which could be a major transportation disruption if a bomb exploded at that location.

Ms. Shickle said she would like to respond to Ms. Lascolette's question regarding the funding amounts for each of the grants. For Item A, the amount is \$100,000, which is for the Emergency Management Planner position at RRPDC and associated costs to support CVEMA. The amount of the request for Item B is \$37,000.

Ms. O'Bannon asked which grant is required in order to receive FEMA assistance. Ms. Shickle said the Hazard Mitigation Plan update is what is required to be in place in order to receive FEMA assistance.

Acting Chairman Miles asked if there were additional questions on the Consent Agenda items.

Mr. Winslow asked if by having the THIRA completed, the region would have opportunities for any other assistance during disasters. He said he would be supportive of having the THIRA completed in any instance, especially given the climate in which everyone lives now with terrorist threats becoming the routine.

Ms. Shickle said she believes that by having the THIRA in place, she can't say that more funding opportunities will be available, but without it there would be less information to put into a grant application.

Ms. O'Bannon said that the computer program that has been installed in all Henrico County fire trucks was made possible through a grant because of a THIRA having been completed in the county.

Mr. Nordvig noted that when a Consent Agenda is used in Powhatan County, it's reserved for things that are routine and require no discussion. Today's Consent Agenda resulted in a lot of discussion, and he wondered if this is how Consent Agendas are normally handled at the PDC.

Acting Chairman Miles said that in most cases, the Consent Agendas are for routine items as Mr. Nordvig described. In this case, however, he felt that more information on this particular grant application was needed before members could take a vote on whether or not to approve the application.

Mr. Peterson moved that the Consent Agenda be approved as presented; the motion was seconded by Ms. Lascolette. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

### **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **A. Conflict of Interest Financial Reporting**

Acting Chairman Miles asked Mr. Amos, RRPDC legal counsel, to provide this information to members.

Mr. Amos noted that just after the first of the year, the Virginia Conflict of Interest and Ethics Advisory Council (Council) issued an advisory opinion that PDC members are subject to the same reporting requirements as all other state officials with regard to reporting conflicts of interest and financial situations. He said this sparked discussion on what effects this opinion would have on the RRPDC.

Mr. Amos said most of the RRPDC members are elected officials and are already filing the required statements and reports with their home jurisdictions. Mr. Amos said he and Mr. Gates met with the attorney who issued the opinion to find out what responsibility the RRPDC had with the filing of these statements. Since most Commission members are already filing the required statements, there is no need to file duplicate statements. The

law does require that Commission members file the statements in the jurisdiction in which the primary office is located, which is the City of Richmond for the RRPDC.

By issuing the opinion, the Council was trying to eliminate the need for duplicate filings. On May 6, 2016, Governor McAuliffe signed a bill that consolidates where elected officials must file these reports. The law still requires that if the local government in which the principal office is located requires, then the reports would also need to be filed with the City of Richmond. Mr. Amos said that RRPDC staff is not going to take an active role in the filing of the reports; this will be left up to the jurisdiction making the appointments and their attorneys. Mr. Amos said RRPDC has no requirement to accept or file the statements. He said if any members have questions regarding the reports/statements, the questions should be forwarded to the appropriate jurisdiction's attorney.

Mr. Amos said that citizens who are appointed to serve on the Commission and are not elected officials, will be subject to submitting the reports to the City of Richmond if the City calls for them. RRPDC staff is considered an agency coordinator, meaning that the only obligation required of the RRPDC is to keep a list of Commission members which staff already maintains. If the City of Richmond or the Council requests a listing of Commission members, the RRPDC Executive Director could furnish that list as the agency coordinator.

Mr. Amos said there was a second question as to whether RRPDC staff needed to file the same conflict of interest and financial disclosure statements. This has never been a requirement of staff and Mr. Amos said he did not see a need for RRPDC staff to file the statements.

Mr. Amos said members should discuss this requirement with their jurisdiction's officials if they have any concerns about needing to file the statements. He said there is a fine for non-filing. Mr. Amos said to reiterate, there is no need for duplicate filings if members are currently filing with their home jurisdictions.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification on whether Mr. Amos was referring to the conflict of interest form or to the statement of economic interests form. Mr. Amos said it would be whichever form her home jurisdiction requires her to complete as an elected official.

Mr. Peterson asked if it was mandatory for citizen representatives to file these statements and reports. He said if this is mandatory, he feels that it will severely limit citizen involvement. Mr. Amos said the Council is aware that the requirement may limit the number of citizens who are willing to serve on such boards and commissions, but it is a requirement. Mr. Amos said he would recommend that the citizen representative contact the jurisdiction's attorney for advice.

Mr. Agelasto said the City of Richmond has over 40 boards and commissions. The Richmond City Council appoints hundreds of its residents to serve on these boards and commissions each year. Each appointee is required to file the statements if it is determined they will be involved with any expenditure of funds. If tax payer funds are not spent, then

the financial interest statement is not required. He said as an example, if a citizen is appointed to serve on the Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT) which allocates Comprehensive Service Act (CSA) funds, the member is required to file. The City Clerk coordinates all of the filing requirements. In conjunction with the City Attorney, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) training is provided to all appointees. Mr. Agelasto said all appointees understand the requirements and the fact that the requirements must be enforced.

Mr. Amos said the only question left unanswered by the Council was whether RRTPO and members of associated RRTPO committees were required to file the statements. He said that because RRTPO is a federally designated organization, it is not believed, at this time, that RRTPO members are required to file any of the statements. The Council is currently reviewing this question. Mr. Peterson pointed out that all RRTPO voting members are elected officials.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. Regional Forum Series: City of Richmond – The Riverfront Plan**

Acting Chairman Miles asked Mr. Agelasto if he would introduce this morning's speaker.

Mr. Agelasto said the City of Richmond is pleased to present information on the Riverfront Plan to members this morning. One of the Capital Region Collaborative's (CRC) identified priorities is the James River. The Downtown Plan was adopted in 2009 and the Riverfront Plan was adopted in 2012. City Council has begun to allocate funds for the Riverfront Plan. Consultants have been brought in to assist City staff, led by Mr. Mark Olinger.

Mr. Olinger is the Director of Planning and Development Review with the City and the lead staff for the Riverfront Plan. One of the projects – the T. Tyler Potterfield Dam Bridge – is nearing completion. Mr. Potterfield was with the City's Planning Department for many years and worked diligently on the Riverfront Plan to make sure historic assets were considered in the Plan.

Mr. Agelasto said the City has reengaged with developers (VHB) to work on the east end of the Plan, toward Rocketts Landing. He said Mr. Olinger has provided great leadership and will soon begin working on updates to the City's Master Plan.

Mr. Olinger thanked members for the opportunity to present information on the Riverfront Plan to them this morning. He said he'll provide an overview of the Plan to show that it's not just a recreational plan but an economic development plan as well that can use the river and development around it as a resource.

The Downtown Plan included seven focus areas:

- variety and choice
- traditional city

- green
- river
- urban architecture
- history
- mixed-income

One of the direct recommendations of the Downtown Plan was to complete a detailed plan for the approximately 2.5 miles (800 acres) along the river in and around downtown Richmond. One of the guidelines of the Riverfront Plan is to guide future direction of downtown on both sides of the river – one river, one city, one riverfront system. Mr. Olinger said there is a north bank and a south bank to the river that should be joined.

Aspects of the Riverfront Plan include the following:

- systems approach to the Plan
- future development
- connections to the river
- water access
- creating pivotal places
- riverfront character
- reverberative impact
- single, unified, cohesive system

Mr. Olinger noted that there will be a stop on the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system at Stone Brewery where people can access the river. He also pointed out that there are currently many barriers that make it difficult for people to access the river.

On the north end of the Plan area – the T. Tyler Potterfield bridge – there was a need to connect the two banks of the river. There are 17 acres at the old Reynolds Plant in Manchester that will be reconnected by reopening streets that had been closed around the plant. The bridge is scheduled to open in October of this year. There is also interest in using the flood wall as a back drop for green spaces and parks.

Mr. Olinger said one of the things that is being studied is how to go under the 13th Street bridge to get to the canal. Discussions will be held with the Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority (RMTA) on how to accomplish a pedestrian tunnel.

Long-term, Mr. Olinger said the City would like to work toward making Mayo's Island into a space that will be just as popular as Brown's Island.

Significant improvements will be made along Main Street to Nicholson Street. A portion of Dock Street will be removed for installation of a roundabout with a goal of putting vehicles back onto Main Street. This will allow for the creation of more access points to the river.

There are three levels of priorities for the Riverfront Plan. The Potterfield Dam Bridge is the first priority project. The end of the bridge on the south bank will offer handicapped access and a connection to the SunTrust Bridge.

Mr. Olinger ended his presentation by noting there are diverse activities and responsibilities that require coordinated governance, from oversight and implementation to operations, management, and programming. He thanked members for their attention and said he'd be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Peterson asked if there were any plans for the south bank of the river near the downriver portion of the Riverfront Plan. Mr. Olinger said some work has been done by Exxon on that side of the river. He said property would need to be acquired and improvements made to Maury Street. He said he didn't see that the approach to the City from that area would be a high value trip. He said he felt an effort should be made to improve the access from the interstate and along Maury Street. Another issue to consider is the low density of the area. Mr. Olinger said the City has this area on its radar but is not sure how to approach it.

Mr. Agelasto added that not every inch of the riverfront needs to be programmed. He said he sees the area Mr. Peterson is referencing as a passive area. Public Utilities is more interested in putting that area under conservation easement to protect the James River Park System. Mr. Olinger said as the area along the river makes its turn around, it will be interesting to see if any of the properties downriver will also begin to show improvements that will allow access and/or trails.

Ms. O'Bannon said in the very early days, the river was just considered a means of transportation and most of the development was industrial with access for boats/ships to carry cargo. She asked if the City is trying to convert these areas of the river into conservation areas. Mr. Olinger said the downriver portion of the Plan is not being considered as a conservation area. He noted that Shiplock Park is considered in the conservation easement. Improvements are being made now to the Intermediate Dock to allow tour ships to dock there. There will still be a working element of boats coming into the city. Mr. Olinger said a lot of the downriver area is in the floodplain. In trying to convert the river from a mode of transportation into an amenity takes effort and creative thinking.

Ms. O'Bannon said she believes the Plan is a good one. Mr. Olinger said since the opening of the Capital Trail, the dynamics of the area along the riverfront have changed. If people can get from point A to point B easily, they will take advantage of the opportunity. Mr. Olinger said the City would like to make river access easier and offer more opportunities to access the river.

Mr. Nordvig said while he feels that it's important to have green space around the river, he also feels that there should be space for other development such as restaurants. He said he thought the development should be done with "live, work, play" in mind. Mr. Olinger showed a slide that pinpointed all potential development parcels. He said the challenge between the Manchester Bridge and 17th Street is the flood wall and the Norfolk Southern

rail track. It will be difficult to have direct river access in this area. In the Manchester area, development needs to get above the flood wall level in order to view the river. Mr. Olinger said the City hopes to be able to create places that will offer river views from heights above the flood wall. There are similar challenges on the north bank. Mr. Olinger said there is currently an available restaurant space with river access near the Troutman Sanders building and he's not sure why the space remains vacant. Stone Brewing will have a bistro and currently there are the Boat House and Conch Republic restaurants. Mr. Olinger said where there can be the type of development Mr. Nordvig suggested, the City is trying to accomplish the development. The City is trying to balance floodplain and green space as well as challenges in developing in a floodplain along with associated costs. Meals tax revenue from the Boat House and the Conch Republic is substantial.

Mr. Glover noted that originally, when development was considered along the river, it was thought that on the Richmond side there would be retail development while residential development would be on the Henrico side. He said he feels that the residential development has taken place but the retail has not.

Ms. O'Bannon said she is aware of a restaurant on pilings that is being planned near the Huguenot Bridge. Parking will be underneath the restaurant. She suggested this might be a possibility in Richmond.

Mr. Glover asked if the Chesapeake Bay Act has had any impact on the Riverfront Plan. Mr. Olinger said conversations have been held with public utilities on impacts but he can't answer the questions specifically. He said he would think that if there were concerns, these would have been brought forward and addressed.

Mr. Glover said in the early 1990s, there was a significant cost to develop around the canal due to regulations. Mr. Olinger said the cost is still significant. He said he is aware of long-term utility plans in the area as well as other challenges. In the discussions that have been held, none of the Plan has been impacted.

Mr. Agelasto said much of what is being planned will be an improvement under the Chesapeake Bay Act. As an example, the Lehigh Cement plant was all impervious surface and now the plan is to convert it into a greenway. On the south bank, terraces will be created along the flood wall that will incorporate wetlands as the green space moves down the bank to the river.

Mr. Davey added that the Riverfront Plan has been the foundation for the Regional Rivers Plan developed by the James River Association (JRA) as a result of work completed by the CRC. He said the Riverfront Plan was instrumental in showing what can and cannot be accomplished. One of the metrics JRA will put into the Regional Rivers Plan is restaurant seats that overlook the river as a way to measure whether progress is being made. Mr. Davey said he believes JRA will agree that more restaurants that overlook the river are needed.

Mr. Olinger said getting above the flood wall will be paramount in achieving that goal. He noted that a particular type of construction will be required to accomplish the needed height.

Acting Chairman Miles asked if there were any other questions. There being none, he thanked Mr. Olinger for his presentation.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

Acting Chairman Miles asked if there was any other business to bring before members. No other business was identified.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

As there was no additional business to bring before the Board, Acting Chairman Miles adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:20 a.m.

---

Martha Shickle  
Executive Director

---

Floyd H. Miles, Sr.  
Acting Chairman