

The regular meeting of the Petersburg City Council was held on Tuesday, January 7, 2025, at the Petersburg Public Library. Mayor Parham called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. The meeting video link is <https://petersburgva.new.swagit.com/videos/325158>.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present:

Council Member Charles Cuthbert, Jr.
Council Member Marlow Jones
Council Member W. Howard Myers
Council Member Annette Smith-Lee
Council Member Arnold Westbrook, Jr.
Vice Mayor Darrin Hill
Mayor Samuel Parham

Present from City Council Administration:

City Manager John March Altman, Jr
City Attorney Anthony Williams
City Clerk Tangi Hill

2. PRAYER:

Vice Mayor Hill led the opening prayer.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mayor Parham led the pledge of allegiance.

4. DETERMINATION OF THE PRESENCE OF A QUORUM:

A quorum was determined with the presence of the City Council members.

5. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:

- a. Data Center Presentation – Buddy Rizer, Executive Director, Department of Economic Development with Loudon Virginia Economic Development and Michael Zuraf, AICP, Director of Planning and Zoning in Stafford County

Mayor Parham entertained a motion to amend the agenda to hold the Public Hearing now; therefore, moving Item 8.a. Official Public Hearing – A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Option Agreement and Convey Property Upon Satisfaction of Terms.

Vice Mayor Hill made a amend the agenda to move the Public Hearing – Item 8.a. Official Public Hearing – A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Option Agreement and Convey Property Upon Satisfaction of Terms. Council Member Westbrook seconded the motion.

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

All members of the Council voted in the affirmative.

8. OFFICIAL PUBLIC HEARING

A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an

Option Agreement and Convey Property Upon Satisfaction of Terms

Mayor Parham declared the Public Hearing open for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Option Agreement and Convey Property Upon Satisfaction of Terms.

Barb Rudolph, 1675 Mt. Vernon Street, said, "Thank you Mayor Parham. I want to say thank you very much for the presentation. I believe Vice Mayor Hill or maybe Councilor Westbrook referred to it before. They were bringing it from something they got from VML. Anyway, it was very enlightening and helpful. But I think having seen that, it underscores the challenges and the opportunities and looking at what you've got here. I'm not reading it, but my memory test was the sale price is something like \$863,400, something like that. In other words, it's the assessed value of the land that you're proposing to sell. The second gentleman from Prince William talked about the huge increase in property values based on the desirability of land for data center building and so forth. I know at least one citizen that has been communicating with you with information about what kind of prices are out there when land is sold for data centers. I hope that you're taking it into consideration. I realize that selling something at the full assessed value is unusual when the policy has been to sell things at half. But even in this case, selling it at full value, I believe, as Mr. Curry's information showed that it's still far, far less than what the going rate is. I realize we're not Northern Virginia, but you know, you all, I mean, you're looking at this as an opportunity, and that's great. I mean, you're looking at this as a way to increase revenue in Petersburg, but part of that is the sale price, then what the value of the property becomes, and then you all be getting tax, taxable revenue from that. I urge you to reconsider the sales price. I'm not sure what the rush is with this. We heard a lot about data centers, but we're not hearing really about this particular plan and what this group is and what their background is. So, it just seems like it would benefit from a little bit of slowing down and more information. Thank you."

Sarah Witick, 22 Centre Hill Court, said, "Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Thank you for the presentations. I think there were a lot of very important issues that were brought up, especially with power lines. I know that where my parents live, they're dealing with that right now. It really does have a huge impact on the way a community feels. I'd also like to echo Ms. Rudolph's comments that maybe we need a little more information to make sure that we're dealing with one of those good data center companies and not one of those that is not responsive. There's a lot of information out there that data centers have a despite all the data that they process, have a hard time reporting the data about their own properties. The other question I think we need to think about is, you may remember, maybe eight years ago, nine years ago, there was a very bad drought in Virginia. People were asked to limit their water use. Residents were asked to limit their water use. I'd like you to think very clearly about how those choices are made when we're when we have limited water. Do the residents or the data center get that water first? We don't have a Potomac River here. We have an Appomattox River. I've walked across that Appomattox River without getting my feet wet in those drought years. I think that that is something that's very important to think about. Finally, with the noise, this summer the police station had an outdoor air conditioner unit. It's right across the street from my house, and even that one single, small air conditioner unit for the courthouses, that low frequency sound really makes it hard to sleep. Makes it hard to think. You can't get rid of the noise at all. And so, I think Councilman Cuthbert inquiry about how we actually measure noise and the impact of that noise on people is incredibly important to deal with. And so, I would just like to go back to Ms. Rudolph's point. We need to slow down. You need to inform the citizens of what the standards are for Petersburg before we go into any purchase price. This property is very close to one of our natural areas in Petersburg. We don't have a lot of green space left, and when you lose it, you lose it. Okay? I think we all love Legends Park, and I don't think that we want to spend our time in Legends Park with the constant drone or the view of a data center behind that. So, I think you need to slow down and share what you've learned. I appreciate this presentation. But we need to know where you guys stand and really make that maybe have a public information session so that we can really understand what your priorities are, what the citizens priorities are, and what our standards are, because I think Petersburg can actually do much better and learn from a lot of the mistakes of some of these other cities that we saw presenting today.

Seeing no other hands, Mayor Parham declared the Public Hearing closed.

Naomi Siodmok, Planning Director, addressed Council. She stated that the presentations regarding the data centers because Council requested it in November, after we had a first read and a public hearing on a proposed text amendment. She noted that the text amendment has yet to be adopted. Therefore, data centers are not legal in the City's code. She added that generally these meetings are work sessions. The first read and the public hearing was held, she wanted Council to consider to take action on the text amendment to make sure data centers are legal and regulated before approving a contract to sale property.

Attorney Anthony Williams recommended that Council consider what is in front of them. He addressed the public comment and concern of how fast Council is moving. He stated that this is just an option for Council. It is going to come back in front of Council and it's got to beat the satisfaction of Council in order for there to be an actual closing on the property. That is what the red provision that we added includes just exercising an option or selling a option, which may be exercised later after they satisfy that condition.

Mayor Parham entertained a motion to suspend the rules, to take action tonight.

Vice Mayor Hill made a motion to suspend the rules of Council to take action on the item. Council Member Westbrook seconded the motion. All members of Council voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mayor Parham entertained a motion to approve the text amendment to approve data centers in the City of Petersburg per Ms. Siodmok, the Planning Director's request.

Council Member Westbrook made a motion to approve the text amendment to approve data centers in the City of Petersburg per Ms. Siodmok, the Planning Director's request. Vice Mayor Hill seconded the motion.

City Manager March Altman stated that Council had the public hearing in November and then tabled it to have this discussion. He added that it would probably be helpful to have the text in front of Council. He said that Staff can have that for Council at their next meeting. He felt that the option agreement is simply an option to purchase property. The actual sale of the property has not been approved at this point in time. He asked City Attorney Williams to confirm that entering into the option allows the City to move forward with the due diligence that the developer needs to do on this project. When Staff presents the development agreement for the sale, the zoning ordinance and the option will be presented at that time.

Mayor Parham stated that the motion will be rescinded. Council Member Westbrook rescinded his motion.

Mayor Parham entertained a motion for consideration of the ordinance to authorize the City Manager to execute an option agreement and convey property upon satisfaction of terms.

Vice Mayor Hill made a motion to adopt the ordinance to authorize the City Manager to execute an option agreement and convey property upon satisfaction of terms. Council Member Westbrooks seconded the motion.

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Westbrook, Myers, Smith-Lee, Hill, and Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

- b. Petersburg's Community Forest Revitalization Program Review from the Green Infrastructure Center

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

7. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA (to include minutes of previous meeting/s)

- a. Minutes:
December 17, 2024 City Council Closed Session Minutes
December 23, 2024 City Council Special Meeting Minutes
- b. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of Acceptance and Appropriation of the Virginia State University Public Health Institute (VSUPHI) Health Disparities Grant
- c. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of Acceptance and Appropriation of the VDEM Emergency Management Performance Grant
- d. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of Acceptance and Appropriation of the 2024 Operation Ceasefire Grant Program for the Commonwealth Attorney's Office
- e. First Reading and Schedule Public Hearing for Consideration of Acceptance and Appropriation of the FY25 DMV Selective Enforcement Police Traffic Services Grant
- f. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of Acceptance and Appropriation of the FY25 DMV Selective Enforcement Alcohol Grant
- g. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of an Ordinance to Amend and Readopt the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Petersburg Pertaining to Providing Additional Flexibility for Placement of Sandwich Board Signs in Downtown Petersburg
- h. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of an Ordinance Recommending Revocation of Special Use Permit Granted to Michael and Nina Stanley to Operate a Stand-alone Used Vehicle Sales Lot at 1024 West Washington Street, Parcel ID 024270002 in the B-2, General Commercial District for Failure to Comply with Conditions of Approval
- i. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Amendment and Readoption of Chapter 50, Article II of the City Code Pertaining to Noise
- j. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of an Ordinance to Appropriate Funding for the Sports Training Facility (Fieldhouse) at Petersburg High School in the amount of \$1,900,000
- k. First Reading and Schedule a Public Hearing for Consideration of an Ordinance to Authorize the Refund of Taxes Erroneously Paid for Tax Parcel No.: 023150003

Council Member Myers stated that he will be abstaining from the vote.

Council Member Myers made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Council Member Westbrook seconded the motion.

There was no discussion regarding the motion.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, and Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: Myers.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

15. City Manager's Report and Special Reports

a. STARS Study Presentation

Mayor Parham announced the move up of Item 15.A Star Study Presentation with VDOT.

Ms. Liz McAdory said, "Good evening. My name is Liz McAdory. I'm with the Virginia Department of Transportation, and I'm here with Andy Nagle, who is our Consultant and our Project Manager. We're here to talk about the STAR Study, which is basically a transportation study that we've done on the Interstate 95 with Washington and Wythe Street, 85/95 Interchange and a little south of that. So, what I'd like to do is quickly go through sort of the background of what our STAR Studies do, why we do them, and talk about some of our build alternatives. Which basically means the different improvement opportunities that we've looked at and ranked and scored. Then we'd like to talk about the preferred alternative which basically means the set of improvements that has the greatest safety and operational benefit, and then some scheduling next steps and take any questions."

"So, the study itself is on the I-95 Corridor, it starts south of Crater Road at 460, which is Exit 50, goes up through the Graham Road and the 85/95 Interchange on through Washington and Wythe Street. Our study goes all the way to Exit 53. It includes 5 Interchanges, which has 32 ramps included as well as 34 Intersections, 20 of which are unsignalized and 14 with signals. I just want to mention our local and regional partners obviously we're the State Department of Transportation. We've been working closely with the City Staff of Petersburg as well as the Crater Planning District Commission and the Tri-Cities MPO."

"So, this study we were trying to identify and address transportation needs within the study area which I've described. As well as develop potential solutions. We want to evaluate the solutions and make sure they work and make sure they actually do address those needs. So, on the slide here is the different project needs by location, I mentioned I-95 Washington and Wythe Street Interchange which is Exit 52, we've identified needs there. We need to improve access and provide a gateway into Downtown Petersburg. We want to reduce congestion both on the interstate and the arterials. We want to improve safety at hotspots and by hotspots, I mean we've identified areas in the corridor that have higher than normal safety issues. We want to improve signage, which will also improve the driver expectations and also help build a gateway into the City. We want to provide multimodal connectivity and safety by multimodal, I mean bicycle, pedestrian, transit, anything non-vehicular. On Washington Street, specifically off of the interstate, we need to provide pedestrian and bicycle connectivity as well as safety, and then review the feasibility of converting both of those streets from one way into a two way. These are things that we've done, and looked at in the study. We're going to provide some results and then the third location I-85 and 95 Interchange that includes Crater Road which has two exits, 50 and 51. There are safety hotspots and congestion that exist, we want to reduce that. Then many of you know we've looked at this interchange many times before. We've always had these very big mega Project Solutions that are not really affordable."

"So, one of the main things we wanted to do especially at the 85/95 area is look at phasing those improvements or having smaller chunked improvements that are more affordable and can get funded. Now looking at the project needs through not necessarily location lens, but what the categories are. So, safety issues we have those along Washington Street, Wythe Street, Crater Road, and Graham Road. We have several intersections in those areas that the state does

evaluations for safety and ranking our safety issues statewide. Many of the segments on Washington, Wythe, Crater, and Graham do rank in our potential safety need. Also, there's capacity improvement needs on several of the ramps as well as roadway segments along 95. The way we know that is we look at future traffic based on development and population growth. In the future those segments are going to fail and be worse than they are today and then also the signage and wayfinding needs, we realize there's a lack of destination wayfinding. You may miss your exit and not have another chance to get off, so we want to do a signing plan that is a little up above and beyond what we normally do. So, it's a little more public friendly and we can also do landmark signage for attractions. What we're going to show you today are a suite of improvements that do the specific things that are listed on the slide. As I mentioned before addressing capacity constrained roadways, again, we look at existing conditions and then we add on the future growth. Both economically and population, to determine what the future conditions are going to be and that's what we're going to present to you and show you the proposed solutions for those. There is reoccurring congestion along the corridor and what that does is degrades your travel time reliability. People pick up on that and don't want to drive through the area."

"So, our recommendations are going to reduce that reoccurring congestion and improve the travel time reliability. Both on the 95 mainline but also on the city streets as well, in the immediate area. Then we're going to improve identified safety hotspots. I mentioned before that the state ranks spots within the areas statewide that have safety concerns. So, we want to improve those and then also access to and from Downtown Petersburg. As I mentioned before like with the signage plan and some of the exit changes we're proposing. So, this up here is just a schedule, we started this study back in January of 2023. Like I mentioned we do the existing conditions analysis which is basically us collecting data. Where is the traffic condition happening, where are the accidents, what type of accidents, why are they happening, etc. Then we layer on the economic development and population growth to come up with our future conditions and travel patterns. What we do is kind of throw potential solutions at everything and screen through those. Some things won't work, some aren't feasible, and others too expensive. We'll narrowed that list down to 2 or 3 and do what's called a Build Alternative Analysis. That's where we say if we do improvements, what is traffic going to look like in the future. We also have done two public outreaches, and we've actually done a public meeting here, and finally two outlying surveys to get public input, and right now which is where we are now, the implementation plan and reporting. We're finalizing the report and coming to you guys to let us know what's in it, get your input on it, and what the next steps would be. We've been working with like I said with the city and the Tri-Cities MPO, the next steps if these improvements are approved are to apply through what's called Smart Scale. That's the statewide largest transportation funding pot. So, we're developing materials for the city as well as for the Tri-Cities MPO to apply for these improvements. Since the Tri-Cities MPO are associated with the interstate, they're applying for these. Petersburg is applying for some other stuff that we're doing research on and I'm going to turn it over to Andy unless you have questions on what I've said thus far."

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Alright, thanks Liz. So, we're going to jump straight into the potential alternatives that were identified to address the needs that Liz stepped through. So, there was a comprehensive list as Liz mentioned, we brought everything to the table to consider to address those needs. So, we worked with the study work group that included the Petersburg staff, MPO staff, VDOT, and the study stakeholder based on the detailed traffic analysis and based on the public input received to identify those issues. So, there were really four main locations throughout the study area that we're focused on to address those needs. The first one is 95 and Washington Street, all the things that are crossed out are alternatives that were considered but not moved forward for a detailed analysis. So, I'm going to step through the two Build Alternatives that were carried forward and screened in more detail. So up at 95 and Washington Street, the partial cloverleaf interchange configuration was part of Build Alternative One. I'll step through in more detail what exactly that means here in a few slides. Moving down to the south

Northbound 85 to Northbound 95, Build Alternative One includes widening the ramp to the two lanes and carrying that further onto 95 to provide more merging distance. Southbound 95 at Crater Road, we looked at several options there but the Build Alternative One includes removing the Graham Road off ramp and then Northbound 95 at Crater Road. We looked at Build Alternative One removing and consolidating three of the Northbound ramps at location four. So, moving on to Build Alternative Two up at Washington Street, the single point Urban Interchange was identified to move forward. Locations two and three are actually identical between Build Alternatives One and Two. Then Location Four, we look at consolidating two of the ramps in the northbound direction.”

“So now I’m going to get straight into the details here and talk about the concepts and the needs that they’re actually addressing. So first starting up at 95 at Washington Street, this is the partial Cloverleaf Interchange option. So, both options at 95 Washington Street consolidate your interchange ramps along Washington Street and convert Washington and Wythe Street to two ways to provide better access into and out of Downtown Petersburg. So, in order to accommodate those movements along Washington Street, there are two new traffic signals that are proposed. One to accommodate Southbound 95 traffic and then one to accommodate Northbound 95 traffic coming on and off of Washington Street. Additionally, there’s a high number of Eastbound Washington Street vehicles leaving the City, heading to the north in both the morning and evening peak hours. So, to help address that movement, we’re proposing a loop ramp at that location to provide free flow movement to handle that traffic. I already mentioned the widening of the Northbound 85 to 95 ramp off to the right-hand side of your screen there, as part of the public outreach that we held in March. Just a few months ago we did receive public feedback about the previous concept showed the removal of the Bank Street ramp. So, between then and now, we looked at potentially adding that off ramp back in for Build Alternative One. The partial cloverleaf concept that you’re actually not we’re able to add that Bank Street ramp back in because it conflicts with that eastbound to northbound loop ramp. Also, a part of these improvements with the two-way conversion of Washington and Wythe Street we’d be providing better connectivity from the west side of 95 to the east side for pedestrians. Including sidewalks and upgraded crosswalks as well as ADA compliant infrastructure. So, one of the major needs that this improvement addresses is you see it out there today, southbound traffic coming off of 95 that went ahead westbound on Washington Street. There’s a stop sign that’s out there today, those vehicles stack up to the north approaching mainline 95, creating congestion safety issues. It exists out there today as we look out into the future, it’s just going to continue to get worse. This alternative widens that off ramp to two lanes and that ramp would be part of that traffic signal to allow the vehicles to flow. So off of that ramp and onto Washington Street, this alternative was found to operate acceptably on both Washington and Wythe Street.”

“The one thing to note as I transition to Build Alternative Two here in a second is one thing that separates Build Alternative Two is that in alternative one if you’re heading eastbound on Washington Street; leaving historical downtown area and you either want to head south on 95 or north to 95. Cars have to stack in the right turn lane because you have to turn right to head south on 95, or turn right to take the loop ramp to head north. So, because of that, there’s traffic that we do see longer queuing and longer travel times because of that condition, with a successive right-side ramp. Build Alternative Two at 95 and Washington Street, here is the single point urban interchange or the SPUI. Both of these concepts are consistent with what was presented during the March Public Outreach Meeting except for alternative two. Here we are able to add that Bank Street off ramp back into the concept, so the off ramp that is out there today, where if you miss exit 50 down at Crater Road, you don’t get off onto that collector distributor road. You’re able to get off at Bank Street here to access Downtown Petersburg. So, the SPUI concept maintains that off ramp to provide better access into Downtown Petersburg. This concept also includes the two-way conversion on of Washington and Wythe Street, another difference compared to the other alternative is that it just replaces and consolidates all the ramps to just one traffic signal along Washington street. So that one intersection on Washington

street is able to serve all traffic to and from both Washington Street as well as interstate 95, similarly provides your crosswalks, sidewalks, and ADA compliant infrastructure. Through the interchange and also widens the 85 to north to 95 off ramp. So, we are evaluating some potential intersection improvements at the off ramp to 95 and Bank Street because there are some existing sight distance issues as you're coming off the ramp and you're looking to the left, you have the overpass over 95. That makes it a little bit difficult to see to your left, so with maintaining this access here we're looking at a potential roundabout at that off ramp to better serve traffic. Making the northbound left to head west on bank street and because your left turns heading eastbound on Washington Street to head north is served by left turn lanes. You get better lane use on eastbound Washington Street, so this option operates better than Build Alternative One. Because of that, this table just provides the overall comparison between the two alternatives. Which led to the decision of the preferred alternative by the study stakeholders. So, both alternatives address that southbound to westbound congestion and safety issues. Alternative two operates better on Washington Street because it provides better on Washington Street because it provides better lane utilization in heading eastbound towards the interstate. Then in alternative two you're able to maintain that off ramp to Bank Street. Because of those reasons, Alternative Two the Single Point Urban Interchange was selected as the preferred alternative by the study stakeholders. So, I'll pause here because I know it's a lot of information. There's a lot being shown on the slide, and I just wanted to pause here, see if there are any specific questions."

Mayor Parham acknowledged Council member Cuthbert.

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Thank you Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Andy. I appreciate it and I know we all do. I was especially interested in the roundabout at Bank Street. Can you tell us more about that?"

Mr. Andy Nagle replied, "Yes so currently, if you're heading northbound on 95 and you get off at the ramp that takes you down into Bank Street, the geometry and how the roadway is currently designed, it directs you to head east on bank street. I believe there used to be a sign there that restricted the ability to make a left turn, the sign is no longer there. People make the left turn a lot because that provides that backdoor to Downtown Petersburg. So as part of this study, we're looking at a roundabout at that intersection to make that movement safer. to provide that better sight distance, to slow traffic down heading eastbound and westbound on Bank Street."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "But there's an elevation, its on a hill or slope, isn't it?"

Mr. Andy Nagle replied, "It's on a hill coming down, that's correct. So, there are some challenges there that we're working through and that's what we're just starting to look into that now."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Yeah, I like the idea. I'm just wondering if it's really feasible."

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Yeah so we're looking into a full-size roundabout but then also a potential what's called a mini roundabout. Which is able to handle lower traffic volumes and a lower footprint, so that's what we're looking into now. The pros and cons of each to minimize those impacts and also keep you know to the north of where that grade is coming downhill."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Thank you, is there any opportunity for a median strip on Washington or with that we could plants trees in and at the same time maintain on street parking on both sides. That may be way too much to ask for but tell me if that's the case it's way too much to ask for."

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Yeah, unfortunately that's the problem. I've got a slide on it here later on; but as part of this study, we did look at a plethora of different options on both Washington Street

and Wythe Street. In order to provide you know more landscaping, trees, more coverage, provide bike lanes while maintaining parking. Look at potential meeting options, the problem is just to accommodate the two-way conversion within the existing right of way and do all of those other things. It's not possible, so to eliminate to minimize any right of way impact, stay within the existing curb to curb, it just wasn't possible."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Turn to the bridge across I-95 at Washington Street. Please think about that with me, the existing bridge would be taken down, is that right?"

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "That's correct, there would be a new bridge that would be constructed to replace the existing one."

Council Member Cuthbert replied, "Could you make it wide enough to put kind of a jersey wall, between eastbound and westbound on Washington Street. We all see those signs on the highway that say bridge is ice before roads. If we had a jersey wall going down the middle of the new Washington Street bridge, that would prevent cross over traffic if somebody hit a sheet of ice and went into oncoming traffic. Is that possible?"

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Yeah, so let me clarify. The graphic that's shown on the screen here, the footprint over 95, that does include a median separating eastbound and westbound traffic. What I was referring to was off the screen here as we get west of Madison Street and east towards Crater Road. So, within the interchange footprint at 95, the orange that's shown on the graphic those are concrete median items."

Council Member Cuthbert replied, "Okay well good, you anticipated my concern and thank you doing so. Mr. Mayor, I don't have any other questions."

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Before I move on, we did receive some additional concerns that were raised by the public. Specific to alternative two I just wanted to hit on them really quick before we move further down to the south. One of the concerns that was raised was just the additional, what's about 500 cars that would be using the stretch of Washington Street between Jefferson Street and Market in the morning. That's true really under both of these alternatives that are shown here, when you compare them to the no build condition or doing nothing out into the future. So, I just wanted to note the importance of why the additional traffic on Washington Street is there. It's primarily because that access to 95 is shifted up to Washington Street. So, anyone who is currently today travel along with to get to 95, they now have to turn up to get to Washington Street to get to 95. So that's really driving that additional traffic there, but that 500 additional cars amount to about 5% of the total traffic. So that 5% is relatively low in the grand scheme of things. If we were to go out and collect traffic counts on back-to-back days on Washington Street, there's probably more than 5 to 10% of variability just from a day-to-day perspective."

"I also wanted to note that the operational results that we're seeing from the traffic conditions 30 years out into the future. These alternatives are able to accommodate that additional traffic. The additional growth that's expected in the downtown area, the other concern was related to just pollution, noise and traffic that would be concentrated specific to Washington Street because the access would be shifted there without any plans to increase the tree cover, to provide bikes routes or maintain parking from 95 to Market. That really was specific to the Washington Street corridor, I alluded to this earlier to your question Council Member Cuthbert, but we really explored everything that we could in order to fit median planting buffer strips along Washington Street while minimizing parking and to provide bike lanes. The cross section out there is just not possible to do with the two-way conversion, that is what led us to place the bike lanes or recommend the bike lanes along Wythe Street. So, Wythe Street throughout the entire corridor from Atlantic Street to the west to Bank Street to the east, we are proposing bike lanes to provide that bike connectivity the whole way through our study area. That keeps the bike traffic

off of the interaction between vehicles and trying to get to the interstate so they wouldn't have to travel through the ramps. There were much fewer parking impacts anticipated along Wythe Street as well. One of the other benefits to that two-way conversion is that speed was one of the main contributing factors to crashes along both Washington and Wythe Street. So, one of the project's primary goals with that two-way conversion, that reducing the number of through lanes that are out there along the corridor. It's really to reduce those speeds along the corridor, narrow the lane widths down as well to reduce speeds through the downtown area in order to provide a safer transportation network for all users, cars, peds and bikes."

Mayor Parham acknowledged Council Member Westbrook.

Council Member Westbrook said, "Thank you Mr. Mayor, two quick questions. I heard you say was a major question of mine, you said that this could be impacting traffic for the next 30 years. Was there any consideration for an off ramp or on ramp from I-85 into Sycamore Street while you're doing this study. Right there where it could be a major development, if you know Sycamore Grove, if you're familiar with that area."

Mr. Andy Nagle replied, "Correct, yeah so we did not look at direct access there primarily because of the interchange spacing to the east as well as to the west. That was another major challenge that we had with the Washington Street interchange, 85 and 85 as well as Crater Road is just the interchange spacing there. It's really hard to fit new ramps or new interchanges in there because of the required spacing from the federal highway administration."

Council Member Westbrook said, "So you're saying that you did look at that exit study, you're saying that its not feasible?"

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Correct, yes."

Ms. Liz McAdory said, "We got the inquiry that that was something you guys wanted us to look at. One of the things is FHWA, federal partners won't allow an access to a private access from an interstate to a private development. Then also they have specific spacing requirements that won't allow us to fit it in physically."

Council Member Westbrook replied, "In the second question again with the I-85, when you're traveling northbound and you're getting off right, you said you were going to eliminate that Graham Road exit. So, are you eliminating the off ramp to go south? How does that work?"

Mr. Andy Nagle said, "Yeah that's a perfect question for the next slide here, that's what I'm going to talk through in the next concept. Perfect segue here, moving down to the 95 and Crater Road interchange. This is a graphic that shows the conceptual plans for alternative one, the question right there was the removal of the southbound 95 off ramp. So, you can see down in the lower left-hand screen as you all know there's a very dangerous weaving condition for folks who are traveling northbound on 85 that are heading south to 95. That conflicts with folks who are coming southbound on 95 and want to get off to Graham Road. It's like 2 to 300ft there, which is very short for that system-to-system movement from 85 to 95. So, removing that Graham Road off ramp greatly increases that distance for people to be able to situate and get to the County Drive 460 interchange. So, removing that off ramp, those vehicles would travel further to the south and use the exit to County Drive or 460. Then we would be proposing new traffic control to signalized intersections there to help facilitate those movements. Then Winfield Road would be reconstructed as well, converted to a two way to connect Crater Road to 460, to allow those vehicles to get back up and access Crater Road and then so that's the southbound direction in the northbound direction for alternative one. This is we also refer to it as the full ramp consolidation, so similarly in the northbound direction there's a short weave as you're coming south on Crater Road to head north on 95. That would be eliminating that ramp as well as the northbound off ramp to both northbound and southbound Crater Road. So, there's three

northbound ramps and would be consolidated. You would access Crater Road by getting off at the first exit, exit 50 to County Drive. Then you would use that left turn to head north on Winfield to get back to Crater Road. So, in the northbound direction you're basically traveling the same amount of distance would just be a lot safer because it would be controlled by those traffic signals."

Mayor Parham acknowledges Council Member Jones.

Council Member Jones said, "Just not happy getting rid of any ramps, any exits. Cause it's going to affect people; it's going to affect our police and fire and their responses; our ambulances. These things were designed initially for people to get off while traveling to hit a store to travel through our city. Now we got them going past everything to get off of nowhere, just to get back on to nowhere. There's no fixing to this. You talk about what's dangerous, it's dangerous getting off of 95, getting on the Wagner Road. It's dangerous getting off of Crater Road, going to 95 south. Those are things we need to be focused on. But we want to get rid of ramps, I don't understand that. I don't like it and I think we need to look at it real hard because this City is growing. More businesses are coming and we got travelers coming in and going out. We want to get rid of ramps and send them further to Richmond, pretty much is what we're doing, or send them further past like we want to bypass Petersburg. I don't understand that but go ahead."

Mr. Andy Nagle replied, "Thanks for providing that feedback, we looked at a handful of concepts here to help better accommodate those southbound off ramp vehicles that take the Graham Road. Looking at potential loop ramps in the south west quadrants like the lower right around the King Avenue, label on the screen there unfortunately every other option that we are looking at had significant right of way impacts to those homes along the 9 to 5 corridor because those residences are built so close to the 95 corridor. So, what we are finding from our analysis results that like typically on average, that additional travel time would be around 1.5 minutes and in the worst-case scenario, 2.5 minutes of additional travel time on average. So, it's really the trade off between access directly to Graham Road versus the safety condition on southbound 95. Yeah, so build alternative two down at Crater Road here in the southbound direction, the discussion with the off ramp to Graham Road removal. That's identical to build alternative one, the difference for build two is really in the northbound direction. Build Alternative two maintains your northbound off ramp from 95 to Crater Road. So, the loop ramp right near the proposed traffic signal in the center of your screen there. This alternative would introduce three traffic signals as well just to facilitate the similar movements that I discussed as part of the previous alternative. This alternative does provide that more direct access for northbound 95 traffic, getting off to Crater Road. So that really summarizes the comparison between build alternatives one and two, as well as alternative two provides more direct access from 95 to Crater Road while removing and eliminating those weaves on both northbound and southbound 95. So alternative two was selected as the preferred alternative by the study stakeholders."

Council member Cuthbert said, "Mr. Mayor may I ask about the timeline, when are we going to have a ribbon cutting."

Ms. Liz McAdory replied, "So none of these improvements are yet funded, the next steps are if these improvements are approved if you guys want to move forward with them, the Tri-Cities MPO has already applied for the funding for these projects. Well step one of the application, we have a big funding grant application series for smart scale, which is I mentioned the biggest funding pot for transportation funding. They have a pre-application period and a full application period. They've already completed the pre-application period and have made it through phase one of the application process. The finalization of this study and getting a preferred alternative approved by you guys is required for Tri-Cities to move on to phase two of the application process. So, timeline realistically the first year of available funding is FY 28 and it typically if we

got funded in 28 it would probably be your average major capital improvement is six years from time of first year of funding.”

Mayor Parham said, “It depends on the next Hampton Roads bridge tunnel expansion or northern Virginia, highway expansion. Then typically our funds get gobbled up in that, so typically we won’t see it.”

Ms. Liz McAdory stated, “I’m glad you brought that up because we’ve already funded those two things. So now maybe the time is right, some smart scale is benefit cost scenario. So, we basically take your benefit score safety, congestion reduction, pedestrian access and divide that by the cost of the project. That gives you your ranking score statewide, so some of the things that Andy had mentioned by reducing the right of way footprint and maybe not doing the planter boxes but because we don’t have the space for it that keeps the cost down, which keeps the benefit score a little higher. That’s what we’re hoping to do this time.”

Mayor Parham said, “I think now we’re competing against the I-81 expansion, right?”

Ms. Liz McAdory said, “Yes a little bit of that is already funded for 81.”

Council Member Cuthbert stated, “Mr. Mayor when is the deadline by which this Council has to express what it wants?”

Mayor Parham asked VDOT if they need anything from Council.

Ms. Liz McAdory replied, “No, our deadline is August 1st, the City Staff has to upload a resolution of support.”

City Manager Altman, “We can have a resolution for you at your action meeting on July 16th.”

Mayor Parham thanks VDOT for their presentation.

Mayor Parham said, “All right, next back to Ms. Siodmok. Item C this was the rezoning, right?”

c. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Approve the Rezoning of Property Located at 303, 309, 315, 323, 419, and 431 West Washington Street from R-3, Two-Family Residence District and B-2, General Commercial District to RB, Office-Apartment District

Ms. Siodmok said, “That’s correct, thank you, Mayor and Council, Naomi Siodmok with the Planning Department. So today I’ll be presenting to you 2024 Rezoning O.1. This is a public hearing consideration of an ordinance to approve rezoning property at 303, 309, 315, 323, 419 and 431 West Washington Street. Some of which is going from B-2 some from R-3 to R-B Office Apartment District. So here again, is that request that I just read off for you. The background you can see here in January 2024 Council asked the Planning Commission to take this under consideration as a rezoning. The request was then brought to the Planning Commission for discussion on February 1st, a public hearing was held on April 4th, and they took action on May 2nd, so now it’s here before you. Here you can see the subject properties on West Washington Street near North Davis Street. They’re currently looking to be zoned RB; we have a mix of B-2 which is our Commercial District as well as a Residential Zone District. Here’s some pictures of those subject properties as well, and you can see the zoning map that I just mentioned. So, we have some residential zone property as well as commercially zoned property. With that in mind, the effect of the rezoning is those R-3 properties would be allowed to have additional uses than they have right now. So, they could have offices, clinics, studios, that could also be a little bit taller than they’re allowed to be right now as well. But for the B-2 properties on West

Washington Street, those commercial properties, they'll now be prohibited from having retail restaurant and entertainment. So, they'll lose uses, while some other properties will gain some uses. You can see a comparison of those uses right here too, that's similar to what I described. The Comprehensive Plan it was an interesting time, we had this case go before the planning commission during the old comprehensive plan. Now we have the new comprehensive plan. So based on the new comprehensive plan, I just wanted to share that the future land map really supported uses that are mostly in terms of schools, daycares, housing, places of worship and open space. That was really the focus of the revised comprehensive plan having that historic core neighborhoods identification. Future land use map that I was just talking about is seen right here, with a close up right here circled in red of those historic core districts that the plan supports more uses that are residential, school uses, daycare uses, and less on the commercial side. So, with that Planning Commission took into consideration all these factors and did make a recommendation of denial. The main reason for the denial was the lack of kind of continuity in the rezoning. The fact that only focus on is on a block of property informed our decision. Please let me know if you have any questions."

Mayor Parham said, "Okay, thank you next open up the floor for the public hearing for Consideration of Orders to Approve the Rezoning of Property located at 303, 309, 315, 323, 419 and 431 West Washington Street from R-3, Two Family Residence District and B-2 General Commercial District to R-B Office Apartment District. Any hands? Yes, one Ms. Witiak."

Sarah Melissa Witiak, 22 Centre Hill Ct. Ms. Witiak said, "I support the denial of this. I think that as we develop the City, those mixed use areas, we really need to protect the residential areas within that. Otherwise, we're going to end up with a bunch of doctors' offices on Centre Hill, or on Jefferson Street, for instance, because there's a lot of pressure over there as well. Centre Hill and Jefferson Street are pretty much an island unto themselves with this new plan. So, I think that by taking this step by denying this, I think we're setting a good precedent to protect some other residential areas. Thank you."

Mayor Parham thanks Ms. Witiak and closes the public hearing.

Council Member Cuthbert said, "I have a question for Ms. Siodmok, thank you Mr. Mayor. Ms. Siodmok are some of these properties zoned B-2? Which ones are those and how many houses, are there 3?

Ms. Siodmok said, "Yes, it's 2 or 3 can we get the presentation back up."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Can you go back, I just saw the three houses. I think they're three houses. Pressed brick 19th century that are now zoned B-2 which would permit general business."

Ms. Siodmok replied, "Correct."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Can you go back yet one more. Yes, in the upper left corner there, those three brick houses now are used for residential purposes. Which I certainly applaud, but the existing zoning allows a business there. So, for example a Dollar Tree, that's an example of what could go in place of these houses as a permitted use. Am I correct Ms. Siodmok?"

Ms. Siodmok said, "Correct the commercial uses would allow a restaurant."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Right so I understand the concern about greater protection, but I see this proposed zoning change as offering greater protection to this small historic area. By putting business use off limits for these three properties. I think it really frightens me when the only thing that stands between a Taco Bell and demolition of one of these three houses is the

Historic Zoning Ordinance. The Historic Zoning Ordinance can only hold off what I would consider to be inappropriate development. It could hold off demolition but it couldn't prohibit it."

Ms. Siodmok said, "It would be difficult to do something like a taco bell in that area. They would have to address, ingress, and egress and still meet the requirements of the local design guidelines."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "But as of the zoning ordinance itself and what it allows. It would allow a taco bell on this corridor of high traffic volume. So, I'm in favor of this proposal and I move that council adopt the resolution as proposed to our agenda packet."

Council member Jones seconds motion.

Mayor Parham declares the motion to second and asks Ms. Hill to begin roll call.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion was passed on a roll call vote.

b. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance to Approve Amending and Readopting Article 25 Supplementary Height, Area and Bulk Regulations, as Set Forth in the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Petersburg, to Introduce Design Standards for New Construction

Ms. Siodmok said, "Great, thanks Mayor. You said that so well. I'll move to the next slide. So, the background Staff was presented with a potential text amendment for the Planning Commission's consideration and so we took it to them for a conversation and they were interested in moving it forward for public hearing. The goal of this amendment is to encourage attractive and architecturally cohesive structures within the City by introducing architectural treatment standards for new construction. So, components of this, it will be requiring architectural themes for new projects if they have a special use permit or in other cases like a site plan requirement, it requires obscuring junction and accessory boxes obscuring mechanical equipment. Both of those have exceptions for industrial uses and then also meeting minimum standards for exterior materials. Architectural themes; so, I talked about it a little bit. Any site plan or special use permit or building permit will require that an applicant provide an architectural theme with their documentation. It could be written, it can be graphic, just a way to describe how it's consistent with Maybe the character of the area or consistent throughout the project. Obscuring junction boxes and accessory structures again, so this is if we have any sort of accessory structures in the public right of way. Anything at street level that would be required to be landscaped or architecturally treated in order to make them you know draw less attention and more visually appealing. Again, this does not apply to industrial districts and then mechanical equipment as well. Making sure that's obscured from the public view and again doesn't apply to industrial districts architectural material standards. It really just makes it clear that no building exterior shall have any materials that are inferior on any of the sides. In some cases, people develop structures that might be brick at the front and then they might have a less significant material on the side. So, this is really saying that we need quality on all sides of the structure when it's proposed. This doesn't preclude different materials, so we want that to be clear, they just need to be materials of good design for consideration. An exposed cinderblock and corrugated metal sheets are prohibited and architectural metal panels can be accepted. They're up to the discretion of my department and then new or remodeled buildings shall be consistent with the character of the area as well. So comprehensive plan considerations, it does state that existing architecture is one of our city's greatest strengths. So, we just wanted to take that into consideration while we're thinking about moving this text amendment forward.

Recommendation on May 2nd the Planning Commission did recommend the approval of this text amendment. Let me know if you have any questions or comments.”

Mayor Parham said, “Thank you, next we’ll open the floor for the Public Hearing on the Ordinance to Approve Amending and Re-adopting Article 25 Supplementary Height Area and Bulk Regulations as Set Forth in the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Petersburg. All right Ms. Witiak.”

Sarah Witiak, 22 Centre Hill Ct. Ms. Witiak said, “I did read the proposal and in one of them it stated that those mechanical structures must not be visible from street level. However, I think that should possibly be revised so that they are obscured from view from the buildings around. For instance, there’s some concern with Centre Hill and the courthouse and what will be seen out of those houses that are much higher. So, while it might not be visible from the street, those machinery will be visible from my bedroom window for instance. So, I think we need to think a little bit about that. If those new buildings do go next to an existing taller building, what are those residents having to look at either from above or directly across as well, not just from street level.”

Mayor Parham said, “All right seeing no other hands, this public hearing is closed. Next taking comments from members of council and entertain a motion at this time. Yes, Council Myers.”

Council Member Myers said, “Yes sir I move that we adopt the Ordinance to Approve Amending and Re-adopting Article 25 Supplementary Height Area and Bulk Regulations and Set Forth the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Petersburg to Introduce Design Standards for New Construction on pages 83 through 108.”

Mayor Parham replied, “All right, that’s a motion to approve Article 25. Council woman Smith-Lee?”

The motion was seconded by Council Member Smith-Lee.

Mayor Parham said, “All right Councilman Cuthbert.”

Council Member Cuthbert said, “Thank you Mr. Mayor. Ms. Siodmok, did you give the City Attorney this language for him to review?”

Ms. Siodmok said, “We did not, but I believe it originated from a while ago so I’m not sure if it was seen before it came to us.”

Council Member Cuthbert said, “Well I’m certainly going to vote to support this motion, but I think in the future it might be a good practice to ask the City Attorney to review changes to the zoning code for not only legality but ambiguity. There may be something that a legal eye could see, as ambiguous and a potential source of a dispute that could develop into a lawsuit that perhaps the lay eye might not see. So, Mr. Altman, I don’t know if you would take those thoughts of mine into consideration, I think it a stitch in time saves nine and all of that, maybe we can avoid a problem down the road completely. Thank you, Mr. Mayor I’m ready to vote.”

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion was passed on a roll call vote.

- c. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of Approving the Director of Public Works to Prohibit or Regulate the Stopping, Standing or Parking of Vehicles Upon Any Street or Alley, Not Expressly Regulated by an Ordinance of the City Council, by Causing Official Signs to be Erected Indicating the Restriction

Mayor Parham said, "Next move on to Item E which is a Public Hearing for Consideration of Approving the Director Public Works to Prohibit or Regulate the Stopping, Standing or Parking of Vehicles Upon Any Street or Alley, Not Expressly Regulated by an Ordinance of the City Council, by Causing Official Signs to be Erected Indicating the Restriction. Mr. Williams how are you?"

Mr. Williams said, "Good, good evening, Mayor, Council, City Manager. This particular item and the next item somewhat related. The code currently has and refers to the Traffic Transportation Safety Commission. Which has not existed from what I was able to gather since about 2012. All this is doing is just giving the Director of Public Works the ability to decide and make those decisions. For this particular item as it relates to stopping, standing, or parking the vehicles upon any street or alley not expressly regulated by the ordinance of City Council. So, all this does is basically updates the current code. So, to make those changes then and there not being any Traffic Transportation Safety Commission in existence, it's just kind of moves the Director of Public Works in that ability to be able to do that."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, thank you. I'll open up the floor now for the Public Hearing for Consideration of Approving the Director Public Works to Prohibit or Regulate the Stopping, Standing or Parking of Vehicles Upon Any Street or Alley. Ms. Witiak?"

Ms. Witiak said, "I think you have my address now. I do question one thing, because there currently is no active Traffic and Transportation Safety Commission in the City of Petersburg. I am wondering if that is because we have not filled positions and if so, we're putting more work on the Director of Public Works. Whereas that work should be done by Traffic and Transportation Safety Commission and so I encourage you to not approve this but instead hire people to do the work that needs to be done."

Mayor Parham said, "All right seeing no more hands, this public hearing is closed. Next Councilman Jones question."

Council Member Jones said, "All right Public Hearing for Consideration of Approving the Director of Public Works to Prohibit or Regulate the stopping, standing, or parking of vehicles upon any street or alley. Is the Director of Public Works here?"

Mr. Williams said, "No he is not here tonight."

Council Member Jones said, "Do you think he ran away? Did he quit Mr. City Manager?"

Mr. Williams said, "Maybe he got to many bullets last time."

City Manager Altman said, "I feel like you could handle this one this evening."

Council Member Jones said, "Okay, I don't see a purpose in this because you have places in this City where people are moving furniture in and out. They have to stop sometimes to and sometimes on the side. It's the only way they can stop and unload their furniture and there is something already in place for this. It's called impeding traffic and we got Police for that you know, so I don't see why we want to do this with Public Works with a Director who isn't even here. But we got cops that do that anyway. They're already doing this, if you're blocking traffic on any street or curb or anything, they're already taking care of this right here. So

where did this come from?"

Mr. Williams said, "Okay this came from me getting with the City Attorney about some parking spaces that we don't have line of sight on."

City Manager Altman said, "We have a sight triangle issue on some parking spaces coming out of a parking lot or next to city hall, can't see down the road and we've had some accidents. So, the need was in order to eliminate those spaces you would go to what was the transportation committee but we don't have one. So, we needed to have a mechanism in which we could address potential elimination of the parking spaces and this was the avenue that we chose. City Engineer works underneath and all the Traffic Staff work underneath the Director of Public Works. So that's why we put the authority in the hands of Public Works. Now Council wants to appoint the Commission, then you know that's the other route is appointed Commission. We needed the avenue to be able to address the issue and this was the avenue."

Council Member Jones replied, "I still got a problem with it cause you guys erect a sign for anything else you know and this seemed like an isolated event. There are so many blind spots in the City, you know I mean so many blind spots. As a matter a fact you go down North South Street, you got an auto repair shop that park its cars on the sidewalk, which is a code violation. Nobody's putting a sign up there."

Mr. Williams said, "So we've had our General Manager of Street Operations."

Council Member Jones replied, "Is he here?"

Mr. Williams said, "No, but I had him go out and I had him do a line-of-sight study. His recommendation was the same as my opinion, and that's not to say that the Director of Public works would do it without taking the time to look at it and ask our opinions and do studies."

Council Member Jones said, "So who's going to enforce this, somebody in Public Works?"

City Manager Altman replied, "Yes."

Council Member Jones said, "Under what authority can they write a ticket for somebody impeding traffic?"

Mr. Williams said, "We're not writing tickets."

Council Member Jones said, "So how are you going to make a move? You don't have the authority to do that."

City Manager Altman said, "What we're looking at here isn't writing a ticket. It's our ability to eliminate parking spaces."

Council Member Jones stated, "So why don't we have it as eliminating parking spaces instead of saying regulate stopping, standing or parking of any vehicles upon any street or alley. Why don't we just say eliminating parking spaces."

City Attorney Williams said, "Right now, the City can't create a parking space or remove a parking space because they have reference to this Commission in all of its existing ordinances. So, in order for the City to regain the ability to do that, they need to substitute something in that space. They can either create the Commission or assign it to the Public Works Director. The reason the title is what it is I believe that's just what the title was and the

City Code and he just copied it right out of there. Only thing he's doing is changing the Commission to the Director of Public Works, that's really all he's doing."

Council Member Jones said, "Okay last thing, so we want to do this but I just saw a slide that says streets was down 10 positions, utilities down 12 positions, that's 22 positions. Who's going to do it, again I'm asking who's going to do it."

City Manager Altman said, "So we have existing staff, we have the City Engineer. The Director of Street Operations. We have Staff that can go out and actually went out in this case and did an evaluation of the request and put forth a recommendation. When we got to the point of the recommendation, we couldn't take any action because we don't have the Commission. So, we have Staff that can do it, we may have many vacancies but it may not be in the positions that do the review. It may be in actual Streets where we've got our workers out in the streets doing work, but we have Staff to be able to do the evaluation that's not the issue. The issue is we can't take any action at this point in time because of the way the current code is written. We need to make the change in order for us to be able to move forward, to address any of the parking space issues that create a site triangle issue for us around the city. Right now, we're kind of stuck, and this is the avenue to take that action."

Council Member Jones said, "Is this a job where we could employ the youth for the city, 17 and older? Is that a division we can put the youth in?"

City Manager Altman said, "I don't think it's a position we could utilize the youth to do the actual evaluation, but you could train somebody so you could hire somebody in at Streets and train them to do the work certainly. However, I don't know that we're going to get anybody off the street if you will be coming out of high school, that understands the issues of the geometry of the road, the site triangle, the distance, the curvature, those things but that's something you could train somebody to do certainly."

Council Member Jones said, "That's all I have Mr. Mayor."

Mayor Parham said, "Alright, we're back from members of Council let's see is there any desire to move forward with consideration of approving the director of Public Works prohibit or regulate the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles upon any street or alley."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Mr. Mayor may I ask Mr. City Manager, do you want us to endorse to pass this ordinance?"

City Manager Altman said, "It would be very helpful for us to be able to move forward on some of these issues. Otherwise, I would implore you to appoint the Commission so we can take these items to them."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well I move that we adopt the ordinance as proposed."

Mayor Parham acknowledges Council Member Westbrook.

Council Member Westbrook seconds the motion.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Westbrook, Smith-Lee; No: Jones, Myers, Parham; Abstain: N/A.

The motion died on a roll call vote.

- f. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of Approving the Director of Public Works, In Lieu of Not Having a City Traffic Engineer, is Hereby Authorized to Temporarily Designate Parking Areas in Hazardous or Congested Places and to Temporarily Remove Parking in Any Emergency Situation. Permanent Removal of Parking Shall be Subject to the City Manager's Approval

Mayor Parham said, "Next is Item F a Public Hearing for Consideration of Approving the Director of Public Works, In Lieu of Not Having a City Traffic Engineer is Hereby Authorized to Temporarily Designate Parking Areas in Hazardous or Congested Places and to Temporarily Remove Parking in Any Emergency Situation. Permanent Removal of Parking Shall be Subject to the City Manager's Approval. Okay, Mr. Williams."

Mr. Williams said, "So this one is related, but it said, I know this is temporary. Let's see. All right. So, in this case, it says, in lieu of not having a City Traffic Engineer, which we don't have, and is hereby authorized to temporarily designate parking areas in hazardous or congested places and to temporarily remove parking in any emergency situation, permanent removal of Parking shall be subject to the City Manager's approval."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, so Mr. Williams, this is another one in which if we had a committee?"

Mr. Williams said, "Well, City Traffic Engineer, in lieu of not having the City Traffic Engineer, which we do not have. Someone has to do that in lieu of him, and then any kind of permanent change would be approved by the City Manager."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, I'll open the folder for the public hearing. This is consideration Approving the Director of Public Works In Lieu of Not Having a City Traffic Engineer is Hereby Authorized to Temporarily Designate Parking Areas as Hazardous to Congested Places and to Temporarily Remove Parking any Emergency Situation. Permanent Removal Parking Shall be Subject to the City Manager's Approval. Any hands in the public hearing for this item. All right, seeing none this public hearing is closed. Next, Councilman Cuthbert."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "I move to adopt the ordinance as proposed."

Mayor Parham recognized Councilman Westbrook.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Westbrook.

Council Member Jones said, "Yeah, I'm confused on this one too. I understand in lieu of not having a traffic engineer, but what I don't understand when we say temporarily designate parking areas in hazardous or congested places. One has those been identified, two and to temporarily remove parking in any emergency situation."

Mr. Williams said, "This is how the code reads. This is how the code reads. I just substituted people in place of what was currently already there. Like City Engineer. We don't have a City Engineer, so someone needs to do that, and then anything permanent, that would be the City Manager's approval."

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: Myers; Abstain: Jones.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

- g. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of Appropriation for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2024, and Ending on June 30, 2025, for the Grant ID-NG911-080-B (NG 911 Funding)

Mayor Parham said, "Next is Item G, A Public Hearing for the Consideration of Appropriation for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2024, and Ending on June 30, 2025, for the Grant ID-NG911-080-B (NG 911 Funding)."

City Manager Altman said, "Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council, what we have before you this evening is a public hearing so we can appropriate funding for a grant that we received for our 911 system. So, we need to have a public hearing in order for Council to appropriate the funding for this year, so we can move forward with the expenditures."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, open the floor now for the Public Hearing on Consideration of an Appropriation for Fiscal Year commenced July 1, 2024, for the Grant ID-NG911-080B (NG911 Funding). Any hands. Miss Rudolph."

Barb Rudolph, 1675, Mount Vernon Street. Ms. Rudolph said, "I'm just I was confused by and it's couple days ago, I looked at it, but in the agenda package, it seemed like there was a disconnect between the description and the amount. There was one, because there's two grants. There's this one and the next item, and one of them was like 300 that I don't remember the numbers. I wish I'd looked at it again today, but it was several \$100,000 and then the other one was less than but it seemed like the documentation in the package was the same for both of them, or something. I mean, it's just, I don't have any, I mean, I have no concern. Okay, there it says 303 I'm looking at this now. Thank you. But there was something in the backup to that had a different number on it, I believe, and that confused me. But, I mean, I have no issue. I'm not expressing any concern about appropriating this money. It was just confusing. Thank you."

City Manager Altman said, "So just to quickly address the concern. So, you're look, when you look at the packet, there was a page that had the 37,992 which is the other one, the other so we have two grants, both dealing with our 911, system upgrades, one for \$303,191.46 cent. That's the one before you now, then the next item will be the 37,992."

Ms. Rudolph said, "Yeah, but that's what? But one of them had the wrong back up."

City Manager Altman responded, "One of them didn't have the right backup. It was in the wrong place."

Ms. Rudolph responded, "Okay, well, that's I'm not crazy."

City Manager Altman said, "No ma'am, not at all."

Mayor Parham said, "Okay, seeing no other hands, this public hearing is closed next. I have discussion from the Council."

Mayor Parham recognized Councilman Myers.

Council Member Myers said, "I move that we adopt as written."

The motion was seconded by Council Member Westbrook.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

- h. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of Appropriation for the Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2024, and Ending on June 30, 2025, for the Grant Number CR-C01/06-23 (Emergency Medical Dispatch)

Mayor Parham said, Next is Item h, A Public Hearing for Consideration of Appropriation for Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2024, and Ending on June 30, 2025, for the Grant Number CR-C01/06-23 (Emergency Medical Dispatch)."

City Manager Altman said, "So again, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, this request is to budget and appropriate funds in the amount of \$37,922.40 so we can move forward with the implementation or emergency medical dispatch as part of our 911 system upgrade."

Mayor Parham said, "Okay, all right, up on the floor for the Public Hearing for Consideration of Appropriation for Fiscal Year Commencing July 1, 2024, and Ending, June 30, 2025, for Grant Numbers CR-C01/06-23, (Emergency Medical Dispatch). All right, seeing no hands, this public hearing is now closed. Next to go to discussion by members of Council."

Council Member Westbrook said, "I move that we accept the grant for the emergency medical fund dispatch as listed."

Mayor Parham recognized Council Member Myers.

The motion was seconded by Council Member Myers.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

- i. A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Purchase Agreement Between the City of Petersburg and Nuwave Development Towards the Sale of City-Owned Property at 4 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040035), 6 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040036), 9 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040045) and 12 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040039)

Mayor Parham said, "Next is Item I, A Public Hearing for the Consideration of an Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Purchase Agreement Between the City of Petersburg and Nuwave Development Towards the Sale of City-Owned Property at 4 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040035), 6 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040036), 9 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040045) and 12 Ross Court (Parcel 031-040039). Mr. Moore, good evening."

Mr. Moore said, "Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Mr. Garrett, if you'll go to the slides within the packet, please. We're asking do this public hearing for the sale of properties. Again, 4, 6, 9, and 12. I got a few summary slides. The offers have met the threshold for the properties of the 50%. There'll be no deposit. They will pay in full. They're going to build a one story, 2300 square foot. The anticipated cost, as the slide says. The time frame is 12 to 18 months. The real estate tax will be determined by the sales price and assessment of the properties. They need to accept about 15 to 20 jobs. Next slide, please see this project area, Ross court. I'm very familiar with it. My family members live here. Wonderful community. These four properties, if they would go up, there'd only be one more vacant property left that would complete this entire neighborhood. Next slide please. This shows you a little higher aerial. And then we would ask following the public hearing, as you consider approving this ordinance for the sale of these properties, the applicant and ask you would just, we'll just wait for the public

hearing.

Mayor Parham left the dais. Council Member Jones presided.

Council Member Jones said, "So, now I open the floor to the public for the public hearing. Any hands? Ms. Rudolph."

Barbara Rudolph, 1675 Mount Vernon Street. Ms. Rudolph said, "Some sometime, fairly recently, there was several meetings where there was a back and forth about the amount that we should be charging people when we sell city property and in for, you know, for quite a while, the amount has been 50%. I think that Councilor Jones has questioned that, possibly Councilor Cuthbert as well. But the issue was, are we kind of giving, giving these properties away in the current market? But I see it's, this is presented as if 50% is the amount, like that's, we only have to meet this low bar. I thought that the decision that was made was 50% might be, would be a low if there was some kind of reason that this property could that only this one buyer, this was like the only chance in the whole history of the world that this would sell, otherwise you'd be trying to get a higher percentage. So, I'm just wondering what's happened, because it's being presented as if there was never any kind of policy change, and I thought there was. Thanks."

Marlow Green, 301 Roth Street, said, "I'm just going to agree with Barb. I was here for that meeting where the threshold actually I thought it was like 70% or something. I know there was some dialog about that. So, you know, I want to make sure that if we made that change, that we ensure that any new developers to come into the Petersburg area are actually meeting the threshold requirement. Thank you."

Mayor Parham returned to the dais as presider.

David Best, 1127 High Pearl, said, "I think any property sold that belongs to the city, it should be for broadcasted for everybody, not just one individual or special individuals to be able to buy. It should be so everybody can buy, not just one individual."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, seeing no other hands, this public hearing is closed. Mr. Moore, first of all, answer some of those questions."

Mr. Moore said, "I can answer some of those questions. Well, first one at that meeting, the discussion was to up it to 75% and also create what they would call a catalyst project, entity, and that's going to come back to Council. That'll come next month, because that'll be tied into the increase in the real estate assessments. We've had issue before. We've had applications that have been put in the real estate assessments rated change, but the project went forward, so we're going to try to put language and send it to City Attorney so that he can look that over. The second question, as far as it being broadcast, the property list is out on the website. It's under Economic Development. So, it's not like it's a sale. It's not like it's a tax sale. Those properties are listed and it shows the ones that are under active consideration and the ones that are not.

Mayor Parham recognized Councilman Jones.

Council Member Jones said, "Real quick, I'm almost certain we passed that ordinance to say 75% and one of the fears was that we didn't come back and handle about a callous property. And this is one of those examples right there. Now I'm looking at this property, number four, Ross court. I mean number one, we're selling as a group, and we're asking, asking price is ridiculous for all of them, but there's one particular is offering \$1,800 and the anticipated profit is \$67,000, right? 67,800 minus that 1800 that's \$66,000 but the assessed value is \$3,000. I don't understand for the life of me, for somebody that's going to make \$60,000 while you can't

pay the full price of that lot? And this is what I'm talking about. This is City property, and we keep giving it away eventually, and I think my partner over here said it before we're going to give away the City, there's not going to be anything else to build on in this city. So, I want to pass the mic to Mr. Cuthbert, to Charlie, and let him tell his bid on it. But I don't think we should sell anything for under 75%, especially something this small, full price you can afford it full price."

Mayor Parham recognized Councilman Cuthbert.

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Thank you Mr. Mayor, and thank you, Mr. Jones. The way I always looked at this, and maybe I was wrong, is that this percentage we're talking about is the minimum that the prospective purchaser has to offer in order to get an audience before City Council. It's not the amount that Council is going to sell it for, but the prospective purchaser has got to offer at least this X dollars or X percent in order to get to the next step. And then Council can decide that the assessment's low, and then instead of 3000 it ought to be 6000 I mean, at least that's the way I've always looked at it. And maybe, maybe I'm the one who's out of step, and everybody else is marching to the right step. But any event, let me move beyond the price for a minute. Ms. Siodmok, do we know that these lots are buildable? They're really too small, unless there's some kind of applicable exception, I believe.

Ms. Siodmok said, "So these properties haven't been looked at for buildability yet from a zoning perspective. I did just take a look at some of them, even if they're less than that 50 what 50-foot lot width, if that's the only concern that there is, our code does allow single family homes to be built on non-conforming lots. Things that would have to be taken into consideration, though, is increased cost associated with being closer together with our allowable reduced setbacks as well, we can go down to three feet on each side, and there might be variances needed if they can't accommodate a driveway as well. So, there's some development considerations that would have to be taken a look at an additional review by the BZA might be needed as well."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well, I'm looking at the Petersburg Zoning Ordinance, Article 25 section. Not sure what the section number is, then Subsection 3.6 and it's that Subsection 3.6 that allows a lot to be built on even though it's smaller than the required minimum in terms of width and square footage. But that Section, 3.6 has got a sentence, a concluding sentence. However, this section, which is the section that allows the exception, you might say So this section that allows the exception will not apply if the lot or lots in question were contiguous to one another, sorry, contiguous to another lot of lots of record owned by the same person at the same time, the more restrictive regulations became enforced. Has that determination been made Ms. Siodmok?"

Ms. Siodmok said, "That determination has not been made. We'll take a look at that language when they submit for development. Um. What would take into consideration, because it's saying, if it was owned at the time of the more restrictive regulations coming into force. So, I think that would be the key language that would take a look at. I would definitely want to make sure I'm in agreement with the Zoning Administrator before I make an interpretation."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well, let me try that again, because I kind of stumbled over it a little bit. But it says, however, this section, which grants the exception, will not apply if the lot or lots in question were contiguous to another lot or lots of record owned by the same person at the time the more restrictive regulations became in force. And as I understand your answer, that determination has not been made. Am I correct?"

Ms. Siodmok responded, "Correct?"

Council Member Cuthbert said, "So, it seems to me that what we got to do in order to make sure that these lots really are buildable, that we're selling to somebody for the purpose of

building on them. We don't want to mislead the poor guy, and he buys the lot from us at some price, and then we say, whoops, you can't build on it. So, I move that we table this matter until our business meeting in July. I would ask Mr. Altman in the meantime, if the Zoning Administrator or the Director of Planning, or whoever the appropriate person is, make this determination that's defined in the last sentence of this Section 3.6 and report the findings back to us. It may well be that the lot is buildable. I'm not trying to block a construction. I just want to be fair to the buyer and make sure that the buyer doesn't get stuck buying a lot that he thinks he can build on when we come along at perhaps a later date and say, whoops, you can't build on it. So, I move that we table this matter until our business meeting in July. Mr. Altman, if you would ask staff to make that determination and report back to us at that business meeting in July,

City Manager Altman responded, "We certainly can do that."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Okay, thanks. So, Mr. Mayor, that's my motion to table until our business meeting in July."

The motion was seconded by Councilman Jones.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

j. A Public Hearing on June 18, 2024, for the Consideration of an Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Purchase Agreement Between the City of Petersburg and J.C. Bynum Construction LLC Towards the Sale of City-Owned Property at 741 Blick Street, Parcel ID 031- 240016

Mayor Parham said, "Next is Item J, which is a Public Hearing on June 18, 2024 for the Consideration of an Ordinance Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Purchase Agreement Between the City of Petersburg and J.C. Bynum Construction LLC Towards the Sale of City-Owned property at 741 Blick Street, Parcel ID 031-240016. Mr. Moore."

Mr. Moore said, "Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. We're here for the sale of property at 741 Blick Street. Next slide, please. Price offered for the property. It meets the bottom threshold. Again, the threshold is just to bring to Council again. This is supposed to be paid in full 12 months. The real estate tax to be determined upon the property sale, 15 to 20 jobs created. It's pretty much standard. Next slide, please. This shows the project area off of Blick Street. Next slide please. And we ask you to consider this ordinance. This was originally part of a project area that had been pre-approved, approved earlier. And I'm going to ask Ms. Coleman to get up and speak a little bit through the public hearing.

Ms. Coleman said, "Hello, Mr. Mayor and Members of City Council. Good evening, City Manager. Originally, when I first came before City council to purchase the properties back on Shore Street, between Shore Street and Wilson and Bowling Street, Blick Street was supposed to have been included in in that project. We are now building on number seven and eight, and Blick Street is on the corner. For us, I can't speak for other developers. For ours, our project, we're building luxury houses. So, our houses come with brick foundations, large concrete driveways. So, our cost to build is a is a lot more than maybe someone else's. I know for us, it has been helpful to the buyers, for us to be able to purchase the property at the 50% or lower rate, because with that, we're able to offer closing cost assistance. The house that we will be closing at the end of month, that young lady is from Petersburg and did not have any money for a down payment and closing

costs. We were able to pay her down payment and closing costs. And if you ride down Shore Street, I think that one that I we're building now at 524 actually is the most stunning one that I have built. It has nine-foot ceilings, tray ceilings in her dining room. The concrete driveway is actually more of a 60 foot. It's a two-car front and back. So, we are working to complete that project. This particular lot on Blick Street was supposed to have been included with our properties that we had obtained back in, I think, in 2019 and this will finish the street, and there are some other developments in the area as well. Does anyone have any questions?"

Vice Mayor Hill was present on the dais.

Mayor Parham said, "All right, thank you. Ms. Coleman. We're going to open up the floor now for the public hearing. All right, Ms. Marlow Green."

Marlow Green, 301 Roth Street, Ms. Green said, "Just real quick. And I probably should have made this comment last time. I just want to make sure, as we have, these developers are coming in to purchase properties. They're actually building these homes, not for rent, because we've been like a renter's city for so long. I'm hoping we can bring more families into the City of Petersburg. I think obviously a lot of homeowners value their properties more than some renters. Not saying every renter is like that, but I think we really want to focus on as these developers are coming in and ensuring that they're actually properties for resale and not for rent. That's my only comment. Thank you."

Barb Rudolph, 1675 Mount Vernon Street. Ms. Rudolph said, "Thank you again. I'm not sure every property sold is a catalyst. Thank you, Mr. Moore, for reminding me from the other meeting, but it just doesn't seem probable to me. And I thank Ms. Coleman for reminding us that she bought all those properties in 2019 because that's back, I think, before we even had the 50% threshold. So, I don't remember if she may have bought those properties for \$5 apiece. She bought quite a few properties at one time. I recall, in more recent times, I think she had to come back and get a special extension from the City in order to continue working on to make construct on some of the sites that she had. I think when she came to the last meeting, I believe, and shared something about a house she completed. I don't know how many houses have been completed and how many are in the works? I didn't, I couldn't really tell from the conversation, but it just, I'm just saying the history has been checkered, and the properties, the many properties that she bought, I don't think they've all been developed. And again, you all gave an extension in order to make that happen. So, then I see that the 50% was like \$3,700. So, if you made it 75% what's that going to add another \$1,800 and something. That's going to make the difference between somebody being able to buy this fabulous house with nine-foot ceilings that's going to be built? I mean, just a lot of disconnects here. We just heard about a house being built that the young lady who bought it, is from Petersburg, didn't have any money and could barely afford to buy it. But then we're developing the houses with the brick foundations and the nine-foot ceilings. I'm not passing judgment on whatever anybody's plans are, but there's just a lot of, I just think there's a lot of BS being strewn around, to be very blunt about it. Thank you."

Lisa Walden, 301 Oak Hill Road. Ms. Walden said, "Good evening, everyone. Again, I think it's a beautiful thing to see the improvement of homes and things in the in the city of Petersburg as I travel through. However, this is an LLC. It's a nonprofit organization, and I'm in total agreement with we need to raise the threshold for City property being brought. Again, open it enough with communication so everyone can have an opportunity. As in the City, if they choose to. In regards to you, ma'am, I think it's a wonderful thing that you're doing. But a nonprofit, there you're not well commercial, there are also grant fundings that you receive. So, with that said, you all are giving away property as well. These individuals, if they're business minded, would have the sense to get grant fundings for our City

because we are considered a plight or blight City. Okay, so consider all of that when you all are making your financial decisions about giving away the City property, please. Thank you."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, seeing no more hands this public hearing is now closed. Next go to Councilman Myers."

Council Member Myers said, "I don't know how to do this, Mr. Mayor. You know, I sit up here and I listen to City Council and yes, I support that. There needs to be a raise. We need to raise the cost of what we sell our property for. But at some point, when you have folks that are coming here, that are improving our neighborhoods, and when I moved here, everything was dilapidated, everything Washington Street, Wythe Street, everywhere. I tore down 140 houses. Thanks to everyone on this Council and those who are before me, the neighborhoods were ridiculous, and y'all want to sit here and talk about pennies on the dollar. Now let me explain about a building over there Wythe and Union Street imploded on itself because you didn't want to sell it to the developer who was going to put \$50 million into the building, and so it cost the City how much? \$290,000 to tear it down. This is the kind of stuff that you don't think about. And when we're talking about commercial nonprofit, whoever profit is, whoever profiting, they're putting their money into the development of our neighborhoods. And when you want to talk about who got a nine-foot ceiling, or whatever you got, think about how you living. You got nine-foot ceilings in your house. So, if anybody else want a nine-foot ceiling, they can have it. I don't care if I hear the shit on Clean Sweep tonight or not, but the fact of the matter is, is that everybody deserves an affordable, safe place to live. And if you have someone coming here to develop the City of Petersburg. You should be happy that they're here, because nothing was done 20 years ago, 30 years ago and 40 years ago. And let me tell you, in 2015 we went through our struggle, those folks came out of the woodworks and started to help Petersburg to sustain itself and rebuild our City. So, when you're sitting around here bitching about what it's going to cost to sell a piece of property. I'd rather give it away. If somebody's going to put a 5,000 50,000 or \$10,000 house on there, and the city is now recovering any losses it has had for the last 20, 30, 40, 50 years. These properties have not made a dime and has cost you the taxpayer, \$300, \$400, \$500 for every lawn that's being cut out there that is City owned property, and you wonder why we sell it for pennies on the dollar. Thank you."

Councilman Jones said, "I feel everything he's saying, but I'm going to disagree with a lot of it, because 20 years ago, won't nobody developing. We're not getting a dime off of this property today. We didn't get a dime yesterday, and ain't nobody cutting no grass, nowhere in the City, especially in these properties. We just went out that other day. So, we know we can't say this stuff, you know, and claim that grass is getting cut, claim that it's costing taxpayers money. It's not costing taxpayers money. What's costing us money? We giving this stuff away. I'm looking at that says City revenue from the sale, it says zero from everything that we had up here so far, zero. But we selling it, but we not get anything off it. Now, I'm not against the seller property. I'm not against anybody having a house to live in. I'm not against ownership. But what I am against is somebody telling somebody to pull ourselves up by the bootstraps when they ain't got no boots to put on. What I am against is us sitting here voting on this thing. Young lady, the same thing stands for you to stand for that man back there. We need to make sure we crossing our Ts. Ms. Siodmok. Same thing over Did you check this property, is it buildable? The same thing. That's all we asking, the same thing. But if it's pennies on \$1 I ain't giving nothing away. The City done gave too much away already, too much away."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Moore, I see that all of Council sees that on page 190 the recommendation of the Department of Economic Development is not that we adopt that we sell this property, but that we consider an ordinance authorizing the sale of the property. Why? And you may well be right, I'm certain. I just

want to know your reasoning. What is your reasoning for not recommending it, but just saying, consider it?"

Mr. Moore replied, "Well, consider it, since you had already been a part of an approved development, but this is more of a clerical issue. I think she explained that this was originally one of the properties that she thought she had bought but had not. So, this is more of a clerical administrative adjustment. So added to the existing project site. You already been approved. Yes, sir."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "You recommend that we do sell this? Is that correct?"

Mr. Moore replied, "Yes, sir. It would be part, considered part of the existing projects that she's working on."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "I understand. All right, well, thank you, Mr. Mayor, is it appropriate to make a motion at this point?"

Mayor Parham replied, "Yes, it is. Councilman Cuthbert."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Thank you. I think Councilman Jones made a good point, and we don't know whether this lot is buildable or not. It is only 42 feet wide. No determination is."

Mr. Moore said, "Yes, if I may, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Cuthbert, yes. This has been reviewed and it is buildable, sir."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well, you know what the language is, is. However, this section will not apply if the lot or lots in question were contiguous to another lot, or lots of record owned by the same person at the time, the more restrictive regulations became in force. Has that determination been made? I would think that would take a title search."

Mr. Moore replied, "A title search has not been done by my office, sir. Well, have we done so?"

Council Member Cuthbert said, "I don't think this determination has been made."

Mr. Moore said, "She's saying that she does not own the property."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well, I can understand. I'm not blaming her, and maybe title search is not the right word, but I kind of think it is. And I think not only do we need a title search, but we need to have the history of when the more restrictive regulations became enforced, to use the language of this sentence. So, any event, I'll let the Department of Planning and the City Attorney struggle with that language. But I think we need a determination that this lot is, in fact, buildable before we sell it to somebody who is planning to build on it."

Ms. Siodmok said, "So that sentence states that it applies to contiguous lots owned by the same person. So, since she doesn't own the adjacent lot, that that section would not apply. Max, the Zoning Administrator, already took a look at this property and made the determination that it's a buildable lot."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "But we don't know whether this lot was of record, owned by the same person at the time the more restrictive regulations became in force, because we don't even know when the more restrictive regulations became enforced. And if we don't know that point in time. Then we don't know whether this lot, whether this lot was

owned, whether this lot was contiguous to a lot that was owned by the same person back in the day when the restrictions.

Council Member Myers said, "What are we doing here? The City of Petersburg owns the lot. Are you going to restrict the city?"

Council Member Cuthbert replied, "Yes, it would restrict any property owner."

Council Member Myers said, "I don't want to say what I want to say, but anyway."

Council Member Cuthbert stated, "I think this determination has got to be made."

City Attorney Williams said, "What I would suggest is that when, when we convey properties like anyone that owns properties, we include a due diligence period within which the purchaser can determine whether or not the lot is buildable or feasible for their desired use. When you go down the path of we're going to pre review it. We're going to do the title examination. We're going to determine what you might contemplate using it for. We're undermining that to the point where you'll never be able to sell a lot. Yes, it may require a title examination. Yes, it may require a determination that the lot is usable for whatever use the prospective purchaser wants to put it to. But that's why you have a due diligence period. And if they determine that it's not usable for what they want to build it, build on it, fine, if they purchase it, nonetheless, they may just want to buy it for, you know, to have a lot. I own an unbuildable lot in Frederick County, and it's just you own it, but it's not for the City to go through that process for every single lot when you got 400 lots. So, my recommendation is she wants to buy it, and there are potential issues. She's got 180 days under the due diligence period to determine whether or not she wants to proceed with it."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Let's play that through. Let's say we sell it, and she doesn't bother to make the determination, and she applies for a building permit and then we issue it. We just gutted this restriction."

City Attorney Williams said, "Now the determination made when they issued building permit that it's appropriately zoned, they won't issue it, and if, if they do, then it's on us."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Well, it's going to be on us, unless somebody does a title search and compares it to the date of the change."

City Attorney Williams said, "Which the prospective purchaser will and should do with every purchase, not the seller."

Council Member Cuthbert said, "But not only just do a title search, but also compare the ownership of this lot that we're talking about selling and any contiguous lot as at the time that the zoning change gets goes through. I mean, this, this is not this is not easy to do, but we just put in blinders on and ignoring the restriction."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, at this time we have a motion on the floor. Councilman Cuthbert is that what it was?"

Council Member Cuthbert replied, "Yes, I have a motion to continue this until our business meeting in July, at which time the Department of Planning will report to us as to whether or not this lot is, in fact, buildable. "

Council Member Myers said, "All right, it's buildable."

Mayor Parham said, "All right, we have a motion. Okay, okay, Mr. Myers, hold on. There's a motion on the floor. Is there not a second? If there's not a second, the motion dies for

lack of a second. Next Councilman Jones.”

Council Member Jones said, “I just want to make a counter motion because zoning said it was buildable. She said it went through the things that the other property did not go through, and because of the due diligence that the City Attorney just mentioned, is on her in 180 days, whether she do everything she's supposed to do. Now the building official and all that stuff falls on us and the City Manager. So, I want to make the motion to go ahead and because it's been checked out by Ms. Naomi, to go ahead with the sale of this property.

The motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Hill.

Mayor Parham called for the roll call.

Council Member Cuthbert said, “Well, hold on, Mr. Mayor, at what price? Let's have a little discussion. What price are we selling? We determined. Have there been any discussion about the price.”

Mayor Parham responded, “That is in the actual ordinance authorizing the City Manager.”

Vice Mayor Hill said, “\$3,750 which is 83% of total assessed value.”

Council Member Cuthbert said, “So we're not requiring full assessed value.”

Mayor Parham said, “She offered 83%.”

Council Member Myers said, “Now she is given 83% so got problem with that, too. Now you get more than what she's asking for.

Mayor Parham said, “All right, all right. There's a motion and a second at this time. Ms. Hill will you please call the roll.”

Council Member Jones said, “Thank you for offering the 83% because everybody else want to take and you really want to make things happen. So, I want to say thank you for that, and let's keep it at 83% if we can. Thank you so much.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Hill, Parham; No: N/A; Abstain: Myers.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

Council Member Myers said, “Mr. Mayor. Let me say this. Sheila, I want to say to you, thank you. If folks don't know what that place looked like over there on Shore Street, before they need to go ride through there, it sets an example in Ward Five. So, thank you very much.

Mayor Parham left the dais. Vice Mayor Hill presided over the meeting.

Vice Mayor Hill said, “If there is no more discussion. Good evening, everyone.

9. **PUBLIC INFORMATION PERIOD:** A public information period, limited in time to 30 minutes, shall be part of an Order of Business at each regular council meeting. Each speaker shall be a resident or business owner of the City and shall be limited to three minutes. No speaker will be permitted to speak on any item scheduled for consideration on the regular docket of the meeting at which the speaker is to speak. The order of speakers, limited by the 30-minute time period, shall be determined as follows:

- a) First, in chronological order of the notice, persons who have notified the Clerk no later than 12:00 noon of the day of the meeting,
- b) Second, in chronological order of their sign up, persons who have signed a sign-up sheet placed by the Clerk in the rear of the meeting room prior to the meeting.

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Stacey Phelps.

Vice Mayor Hill said, "I just was informed that you're not a resident or business owner of the City."

Lee Artz said, "I'm an attorney, and I'm speaking on behalf of Stacy Phelps, who has filed a."

Vice Mayor Hill said, "Hold up. Hold up. I need to get legal advice from our City Attorney. "

City Attorney Williams said, "Yes, Mr. Vice Mayor, Mr. Artz, as I understand, is not a resident or business owner of the City, as required by Section Four of the Rules for the Public Comment Period. And I believe he was getting ready to say that he's speaking on a matter that is in current litigation in the Petersburg Circuit Court as such, under Section Four, he's not eligible to speak in front of Council as he's not a resident or a business owner."

Vice Mayor Hill informed Mr. Artz that he could not speak.

Mr. Artz asked "Even if it is on behalf of a owner of a business."

Vice Mayor Hill further addressed Mr. Artz by saying that Mr. Phelps could come up and speak because he is a resident of the City, but he could not. He said, "If we have pending litigations, no, you can't see speak, sir, I'm sorry. I'm Sir, you cannot speak. I just, I mean, you can speak, but you can't speak at that, at that at that podium, Sir, sir, sir, sir, sir, sir, sir. Mr. Phelps, you can speak sir. Mr. Phelps, you can speak sir, sir. So, we can't entertain you, I understand. But if he wants to speak, he can."

Stacy Phelps, 2477 Crater Road. Mr. Phelps said, "Mayor and I talked to Councilman Jones. I addressed the issue that you, that you told me to address about their moving their cars and cutting the water off. I did all that. Okay, thank you."

Vice Mayor Hill said, "Okay, so noted. Thank you."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Barb Rudolph.

Barb Rudolph, 1675 Mount Vernon Street. Ms. Rudolph said, "I didn't really come to talk about this, but since Councilman Myers wanted to make it personal. I'm not sure why. I'm sorry if I offended anyone. The slide said 50%. I'm only going by what's in the agenda package. I'd also like to mention that I've lived in Petersburg for over 44 years continuously. I've lived in three different Wards. My husband and I have renovated seven different properties. We've probably added somewhere between a half a million to a million dollars in value, in Real Estate Assessment value, to the City. So, I don't feel like I'm just sitting in my house lording it over everyone, or whatever the implication was. Now about what I came to talk about. This is June 18, and July 1 is coming quickly. We will be under a new refuse collection contract, but we don't know what that is, and we don't know what it's going to cost. I did see that in the budget that they budgeted \$300,000 more in expense for that. But I don't know what that means or what that was derived from. I think you'll recall that back in early January, you directed the City Manager to end participation in the Central Virginia Waste Management Authority, and Mr. Altman then communicated that to CVWMA to withdraw. You also got a letter from Waste Management Authority advising you that it would be a problem if you did an emergency procurement. I talked about this back in April. Well, I don't, and I don't think it has to do with the staff. I think somewhere there must have been a delay that was directed because there was finally an RFP issued on May 24 which ended up, I believe, that it was changed once, but it closed on June 12, so that leaves less than three weeks from the closing date to when a new contract is in place. So, that hardly gives an opportunity to anyone other

than Meridian to make up an offer or a proposal to collect refuse in Petersburg. It's ideally, you'd be setting up a level playing field, but by starting late, it ensures that no other provider is going to be able to have the trucks, the employees, the carts, or any of that in place. So, I think at the very least, if you all are going to inform citizens that there's going to be when we get our next new fancy utility bill, that it's not going to say \$20 it's going to say something more. I think if you tell people what that amount is and start priming people to understand it, it might be, it ought to go down a little bit better. I mean, I understand that the price will go up. I'm not going to stay here, sit here and claim that it's still going to cost \$20 after, you know, so many years have gone by since it was negotiated and set but I do think that the lack of information combined with the appearance that there's been preferential treatment toward the current contract holder based on possibly some favoritism from certain members of Council, I commented on that before. I won't repeat it. But I do think that it's important to be open about this, because it affects everyone, the people in the nine-foot houses, the people that live in tents, if they if they have trash collection. So, think about that. Thank you."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Kerra Stephens.

Kerra Stephens, 226 Rolfe Street. Ms. Stephens said, "Hello. This is my first meeting. So, this has been very eye opening. I just purchased on Pocahontas Island. Purchase, yes, ma'am, thank you on my birthday. So, it was like Memorial Day weekend. It was a birthday gift to myself. So, I'm new and I've been working in the area of Fort Lee, and I've been commuting back and forth. So, I'm happy to have purchased a home, and I'm enjoying my area. There are just a few things I've noticed. So, with the trail being there, and I've walked it, and I'm country, so I love to fish. It's been dumping, and I feel like it's not being maintained. Well, it's not being maintained. I guess it's the Historic Appomattox Trail, and it's a lot of brush. So basically, instead of a trail, it's like a path, like the aisle in between the chairs is becoming very, very tight, and people are dumping items. So just recently, someone just threw a whole large tree, they chopped up off their truck and just threw it there. So that's just forestry they're throwing. They also throw trash. And then the City isn't maintaining any grass or dumping of the trash cans there. And this is a park, and that's public area, so I don't want to feel uncomfortable going down to walk or to visit, and then I go on the Colonial Heights side, and that one is kept and ours isn't okay. I'm an auntie of like, six. I always have them. Usually on the weekends, we all go down there, or we'll go walking. I try to keep them active. It's not like a playground park, but it's something. And they don't mind fishing with me, but we don't feel comfortable now, and I'm like, I just moved here, so that has kind of been my obstacle. So among the people coming to dump or not maintaining, like the grass, cutting the path, the trash there, the small pavilion area, and people in the community do clean. But what can we get from our city to do, so to speak, any maintenance, anything to come out there? That's one of the trees that got dumped this week. That's on it, yeah. And then that's the path where all the vegetation. So, like the path is very large, but all the vegetation has grew up from the trees now. So, you don't really have a walk area."

Vice Mayor Hill instructed Mr. Randall Williams to take care of her concerns.

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Marlow Green.

Marlow Green, 301 Roth Street. Ms. Green said, "I'm wait till he pulls up my presentation, and newsletter, preferably before that it starts. I never use all my time. So, if we could pause real quick until you pull it up. Okay, all right. So cool. This is the Pocahontas Island newsletter. Going forward, Pocahontas Island Historic District will always create a monthly newsletter, or just mainly what's going on in the island to keep the City Council informed. One of the things as mentioned here as it relates to the dumping incident that happened some months ago. Hats off to Chief Christian, sorry, because we were able to actually pursue this gentleman. Went to the Commonwealth Attorney to make sure she was going to go after him, and so he' has now been charged. He goes to court on July 19. The other item here is the Jared House. I spoke with Council Member Cuthbert, along with Mr. Altman regarding potential sources of funds. I think Mr. Altman is going to meet with Cameron Foundation this month to see what they could do about that. Other dates on here, we just had a very successful community meeting. I think we had about 25 people there. We had dinner, you know, some camaraderie. It was really nice. But I'm gonna go ahead and move forward to the next few pictures and things.

Alright? So, we can make that smaller or open it up. We could just maybe back off the 100% Yeah, all right. So, we can just shift to the next sheet, all right. So, I'm just going back over the initiatives that were laid out before City Council on April 16. Initiative number one, to me, is low hanging fruit, and I have heard no one from the Island has heard anything from the City Engineer as relates to the bridge assessment. As you can see there, there's a gap. That is the only gap that is under the bridge. Not sure why that exists. I am just an accountant. Some you know, like I said, I would defer to the City Engineer to take a look at that. Initiative number two, the reroute of the heavy trucks. All we requested was for a VDOT Study to be performed on Fifth Street, Johnson, Jenkins and Bridge Street, to just get an understanding of where those trucks are coming from to ensure we don't impact on the neighborhoods when we start thinking about where that road should go. We can go to the next sheet. I got a minute. So next sheet, item number three, or initiative number three, I had Mr. John Jarrett here. These meetings are public period time takes too long to get to, so he had to go and handle some family matters. However, we still ask them for the adaptive reuse study for the Jarret House. We would love to see that be a museum for Pocahontas Island, mainly given the history of the Island. Item number four, Roper site cleanup from the City of Petersburg. We really want to get this on a maintenance schedule, same as the Appomattox River Trail, so that way people come over and actually maintain those items; such as the City owned property at 343 Magazine, that I had to complaint on, the Appomattox River Trail, Roper site, any City owned property on Pocahontas Island. We just want to put it on a maintenance schedule. Just as an FYI, I did see some City guys doing some work by the Roper site today. I just thought that was coincidental, because the meeting was today, but it was still fine, and we want things to get done. So, you know, just wanted to bring those items to Council. I will start emailing the newsletter to Council as well. Thank you. “

Vice Mayor Hill recognized David Batts.

David Batts, 1127 High Pearl Street. Mr. Batts said, “I got a real issue with the City Council, because I think it's sick that the City Council gave this hotel \$2.2 million to finish the hotel. When the average person round here losing houses, I mean, the average person to work for the City can't even afford a house. And just like if I got a building or house that I can't finish. The City Council ain't gonna give me the money to finish it. I mean, that's crazy. How can you sit here and tell somebody that you gave somebody \$2.2 million and all the deals that y'all done did with these hotels down on Washington Wythe Street? That's a prime example. I mean, it's just crazy to say that y'all gave somebody \$2.2 million and then you crying about money here, there, everywhere. I'm seeing where's the logic of trying to finish a hotel for somebody else. That don't make sense at all. I mean, look at the City worker that that you didn't want to you give the Fire Department a raise, give the Police Department raise, but you didn't want to give the rest of the guys a raise, and they really need it. They make less than the Fire Department and Police Department, I mean, but tell somebody that y'all gave somebody \$2.2 million and you won't even do nothing about the infrastructure. I've been down here. Y'all have yet to do anything about the drainage problem, but you gave somebody \$2.2 million to finish the hotel. If they didn't have the money to finish, they supposed to sold it, or do whatever else. I mean, that's what, that's what y'all do to everyday people. This was a predominant Black City. Black people don't get that kind of help. I got property that I can't even get a loan to fix. And that's a slap in the face to all black people.”

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Cheryl Brown.

Cheryl Brown, 1860 Westover Avenue. Ms. Brown said, “Councilman Cuthbert inspired me to ask you all for some help on an issue that I'm having with applying for positions. The last session, you had a dialog with Mr. Altman about some monies that may be used for positions that are available. And Mr. Altman's response was, people are not applying, and I can't make people apply for jobs. So, I kind of had an issue with that response, in that there are so many people that apply for positions that don't get responses. There are currently positions on the website that date back to 2020. Some best practices I would love your help on is, one, to respond expeditiously to candidates beyond an auto reply. Two, if applications that are over 30 days, could you remove it from the site? Because it's wasting people's time to apply for positions that you have no intentions of filling. Respond with the yes, a no, or maybe or you need further input. Remove or refresh job announcements, if positions are not filled within 60 days.

Try to not use language that is kind of insulting to the citizens, that people are not interested in working or nobody is applying, because when you use the term nobody, that's kind of not true. That's a false narrative. You had asked also, what can we do to compare with surrounding societies that don't seem to have a problem with hiring? We could offer first right of refusals to City citizens of Petersburg. Offer sign on bonuses and motivational incentives. I know we have job fairs, but we can do a little bit better with responses, by respecting people's time and intelligence. Respond to phone calls and even if you don't have an answer, work to get the answer and get back to people within a week. Exercise integrity. Keep your word to the citizens as an official. Be honest and transparent in hiring. If you're not interested in hiring, please take the positions off. There shouldn't be no positions listed for four years on the site. It's just wasting the citizen's time. People are qualified in the City, overqualified for some. Most of those positions require high school degree and a bachelor's degree, and we are rich with institutions of higher learning as the people and in the City are more than qualified. So, I thank you for bringing that up about the positions, and please consider readjusting somethings. Thank you."

Hearing no other, Vice Mayor Hill ended the Public Comment Period.

10. BUSINESS OR REPORTS FROM THE MAYOR OR OTHER MEMBERS OF CITY COUNCIL:

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Cuthbert.

Council Member Cuthbert said, "Two things. One, I have a Ward meeting at Pocahontas Chapel the day after tomorrow. So, Thursday at 5:30pm on Witten Street. Be delighted to see each and all of you here attending that meeting. We're going to talk about the Jarrett House, and we're going to talk about rerouting the truck traffic. Two of the things that Ms. Marlow Green talked about as well. The City Managers could be with us and will have a report for us on both those topics. I'm looking forward to it. Thank you, Mr. Altman. It's really wonderful when you go out and you walk what's being proposed. I mean, you see all kinds of stuff that you can't appreciate just by looking at the agenda packet. So, Councilman Jones and I, I guess it was yesterday, Monday. Time does fly, and sometimes it drags. But in any event, it was yesterday and it was hot, and we walked Ross Court. A lady came over to us and said, "You know, I'm on a fixed income, and my assessment just increased 94%. I really don't know what I'm gonna do." That's why I tried to do something with the tax rate tonight. But in any event, the realization I had while walking Ross Street is that it is really congested, even though it's a very short little street. I wondered whether there was a way to make it less congested. If you look at the very end of the street, there's somebody's backyard there. It's the backyard of a house that fronts on Burn Street. I'd like us to consider extending Ross Street into that backyard and building a cul de sac, so that the people on Ross Court can turn around and get back out. It's fairly wide enough for two cars side by side. So, I don't know how to get some traction on that idea. Maybe we need to talk about it in a work session, Mr. Altman. It looks to me like there is a way to make life a lot more pleasant and easy for the people on Ross Court, if we could put a cul de sac at the end. It would like everything in life, there's a tradeoff. Somebody is going to lose some backyard if that proposition is pursued. But I think the greater number of people would benefit if we could put a cul de sac at the end of Ross Court. So, we'll talk about that, I hope at some future time, not too far in the in the future. I do think it's a worthwhile idea. I would invite anyone who is concerned about what I'm talking about to go to Ross Court, and imagine what it would be like if there was a cul de sac at the end of Ross Court, and how much that would help the traffic flow and also public safety. It would give, I mean, a big fire engine coming down Ross Court. I don't know how you get back out. I guess he'd have to back up, and would hope they would back straight. In any event, those are my comments, Mr. Vice Mayor. Thank you very much."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Westbrook.

Council Member Westbrook said, "Yes, for the sake of time, I'll be very quick tonight. Thank you, Mr. Williams and Public Works, for cutting the brush on Defense Road. I did speak with Mr. Williams, and hopefully the brush coming in and out of Ramblewood on Banister Road will get looked at as well. But thank you for Mr. Williams for all he does to make sure the City is running well. Thank you for

everybody that does have passion and speaks positively and sometimes even negatively on how you feel about the direction of the City. I feel like we need all perspectives on the table so that we can continue to move the City forward. It's not always going to be peaches and cream, but as long as we can talk amicably and debate and I think things will get working on positive favor. This is Men Health Month, June. Hopefully you can support your men in your life to go out, to get tested, prostate cancer, blood pressure, just do your normal checkup if you don't already do it all the times of the year. And then quickly, there was a scheduled Ward meeting for Ward Seven on Thursday, but that has been postponed. So, there is no Ward meeting on Thursday. It will be announced at a later date. Thank you very much."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Myers.

Council Member Myers no report.

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Smith-Lee.

Council Member Smith-Lee said, "Just a few things. I just want to just say thank you to Richard Harris, Jim Reed, and Steve Stinson about all the issues that I'm having in Ward Six. I call them and they get on it. I just want to let them know how much I appreciate what they do to try to keep Ward Six safe and and cleaned up. Thank you. Oh, yeah. Um, next Friday is the wake of my godfather, Colonel Porsche Taylor. It will be at Good Shepherd Baptist Church at 6pm and the funeral is Saturday, June the 29th at Good Shepherd Baptist Church at noon. Thank you."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Jones.

Council Member Jones said, "Well, I'm glad. That you all stayed for this long, probably the longest Council meeting I've had since I've been here. Yeah, I know, but I want to, I want to just say thank you to people that want to make a difference in the City. I know you hear us fighting, fuss about certain things. I just want things to be done right. The best way we can do it right. I think all of the departments are trying to make, think they mean, well. However, there's some gaps that we find out at the last minute, but we can fix that. You know, like you have Public Works, you have Economic Development, you have Zoning Planning. When we're selling property, sometimes things don't get to them. Sometimes things don't get to you. I think that's what we discovered tonight. We want it all to least communicate and say, "Hey, we straight over here. Go ahead on with the sale." You know, with all due respect with the Councilman, with everybody that is up here, there's no harm intended. But I try to piss y'all off on purpose, because I want to push the button. I want to push you to your limits. You know, I want to push y'all to your limits. You know, I just told Naomi, I appreciate her, because she got up here, and I grilled her real hard, and she maintained a calm face and just went on with the flow. And I appreciate that out of any Department Head. And I want to talk about the Department Heads, the ones that's here. I always see Economic Development, and not that you probably have a choice, but you're always here. The rest of you guys is always here. My man right here, Randall, always here. He's here more than his boss is here. I know I'm giving that man a hard time, but I'm gonna keep giving him a hard time till he sits here. The Chief is here. Everybody's here. I just want to say thanks, but I do want to say this before we go, Mr. City Manager, can you direct your people to visit Mr. Phelps. In all honesty, he did do exactly what we asked him to do up here the last time he came. So, he can resubmit his paperwork and do it the proper way to bring it back up to us. That's why he was here today. It is in litigation? Okay, we'll talk about it then. Also, when we have the next meeting in July, there's a Code Section 15.2-1505, that says the locality may require, by ordinance that the Chief Administrative Officers, Department Heads, Deputy Department Heads, and his Executives or Assistants of the locality reside within the boundaries of the locality. I bring that up because we got a lot of people that don't live here that's in key positions. The first part of it said, we can't do it for regular employees, but we can ask our Department Heads. So, I'm not asking now, but in the next meeting, we're going to, after the study is done, to implement that with the study.

City Manager Altman asked, "After the class and comp?"

Council Member Jones replied, "Yes, you know. Just giving you a heads up."

City Manager Altman said, "We will be in position with the class and comp. The plan is to present that to Council at your retreat."

Council Member Jones said, "And anybody that's already a Department Head and don't live here, we give them a reasonable amount of time to make that change. They deserve to look at the same things that we look at every day traveling through this City, but we see it. A lot of times, the people that don't live here only see the exit coming in here and exit leaving out of here. They only see the other stuff that we see on a daily basis if they get a complaint. Just giving you a heads up. I want to say thank you to the City Manager, because I put a lot on him to press his buttons and all of us up here, man, I just want to say, I appreciate everybody. This is going to be a hard road, but we're moving forward. We're moving forward. I'm going to keep talking till they hit zero, because last time, they had nothing to say. So, I want to say thanks to Bill Atkinson. You know, I'm on the award show now, so, but thank everybody that came here. We appreciate y'all. I appreciate you, Mr. Batts, because you're exactly right. Before we go, please, we did not give \$2 million to that hotel, please put that word out on put some more education out on what we did. Bill already corrected it on online. We need to make sure our citizens know so they won't be misled, you know. But that's all I got."

Council Member Smith-Lee said, "He forgot Paul is always here, Paul Mullins, Brittany Flowers, Joanne Williams and Ella."

Council Member Jones said, "I said everybody. They're hiding back there, but I see you."

Council Member Smith-Lee said, "Mary."

Council Member Jones said, "The mic, man, back there."

Vice Mayor said, "Okay, okay."

Council Member Smith-Lee said, "Police Officers. I think we all tired."

Vice Mayor said, "Okay, everybody's here. We thank everybody for being here. Moving right along. My comments are basically that we the City is moving in the right direction. Let us continue to speak positivity about the City. You know, I know we do have our challenges. I understand that, but every City have their challenges. It's amazing that other people can see the beauty in what we've done outside of the City, but some of our some of us, can't see the beauty in what we've done in this City. I've said this many times, it's like, if you have something in your house, let's say a deficiency in your house somewhere. Let's say if you have a hole in the wall. And then you get used to looking at that hole. And then then when your friends come in and say, man, you know, you got a hole in that wall, and that hole has been there for a while. But then once you patch it up, you get used to it being patched. So, it's one of those things, whereas we got to continue to push our City, continue to talk positive about our City, because if you don't talk positive, nobody else will. When I go to other cities, they always talking about the amazing job that we have done. They remember us being in the news, and they remember our economic struggles and all of that. They remember all of that, but they see where we are now. So, I just wish that we as citizens of Petersburg, I'm not just talking about administration, talking about citizens of Petersburg. Yes, we have our challenges, but let us continue to support one another as a Council. As the Council support you all, you all support us. You all hold us accountable. We're going to hold you accountable. A lot of times when we go in situations the resident hadn't done their part, and everybody always want the hook up or something like that, you know. We can't always do that."

11. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA:

*There are no items for this portion of the agenda.

12. FINANCE AND BUDGET REPORT:**13. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:****14. NEW BUSINESS:**

- a. Approval of Change Orders for the Southside Depot Project, in the Amount of \$294,940.78, as a Result of Change Orders for the Project Exceeding 25% of the \$2,281,441 Original Contract Price

Vice Mayor Hill said, "Item number 14, Approval of Change Orders for the Southside Depot Project, in the Amount of \$294,940.78, as a Result of Change Orders for the Project Exceeding 25% of the \$2,281,441 Original Contract Price, page 210 to 308."

Mr. Williams said, "So the City policy basically says that when we have a project such as this, and when the change order reach 25% of the contract price, that Council has to approve them. So, I have the contractors for the South Side Depot Project here to go over where they are currently, as well as why and how they reached that threshold. We've got change orders. Gerrit, if you will pull up the actual before you get to the project, Garrett, can you go back to the actual?"

Vice Mayor said, "Okay, the next time we do presentations like this, and they're going to be slides, we need to put this early up in the agenda. Okay, so, and no, I'm not fussing at you. I'm saying this to the City Manager. I'll speak to the Clerk and the Mayor about it too."

Mr. Williams said, "We can scroll to the next page."

City Manager Altman said, "What we have this evening is the request for Council's approval of a change order of \$294,940.78, which is the amount of that exceeds the 25% of the original contract for \$2,281,441 for the South Side Depot Project. Yes, the change order is necessitated by, I believe it's the cupola we're dealing with here. The structural issue that we found that we didn't have a structural member supporting the cupola. We had to take extreme measures to put in a steel beam, raise the cupola up an eighth of an inch, a quarter of an inch at a time, to get it level again. So, what we're requesting this evening is Council's approval of a change order in the amount of \$294,940.78. That's, that's all we're asking for this evening."

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Myers.

Council Member Myers said, "I saw the scroll up. I saw 42 up here. Is this 42 change orders or is this number 43?"

Mr. Williams responded, "No. Their numbering system is different from the City's number system."

Council Member Myers responded, "So how many change orders have we had at this building? And I'm not asking them, I'm asking you. Like I said, how many change orders have we had at this building?"

Mr. Williams said, "Okay, I'll tell you right now. Here you go. I want to say 37 change orders."

Council Member Myers said, "I don't know if anybody in here understands that. Can you come to the mic? I can't hear you from back there."

Eric Medkiff, the project superintendent for SRC, addressed the Council. He said, "A bunch of the smaller change orders were rolled into the larger change orders, or into a single change order. So, it's 25 total that were issued by the City. So, when you're seeing number 41, 42, that's our proposed change orders. That's just our numbering system. There were a

number of those that were not issued. Those were just things like when the roof was redone on the building. Those were not done through us. Those were done through the City, through Facility Management, just for example.”

Council Member Myers said, “So how many did you say you had?”

Mr. Medkiff said, “It's 25 total that were issued, 25 total that were handled.”

Council Member Myers said, “How many changes that have been? How many change orders? How many change orders have there been before they came on board? When did you start?”

Mr. Medkiff responded, “November 1, 2022.”

Council Member Myers said, “Okay, and how many change orders were there before then? I mean, I asked that question for a reason.”

City Manager Altman said, “I would say, Mr. Myers, I don't know how many change orders.”

Council Member Myers said, “There was a contract before you that's not relevant to us. Can you go to the mic? I can't hear you sitting down. This is strictly from when they started the project. They obviously they discovered some things that hadn't been done correctly, but that they had to fix from the previous contractor. They don't have anything to do with it. They bid the job. Then this particular package, here goes over some of the more expensive change orders of things that they ran into. So that's why they're here to answer any questions and to discuss. They're 85% complete with the project.”

Vice Mayor Hill asked Council Member Myers if he was finished.

Council Member Myers responded, “Yeah, because nobody answered my question.”

Vice Mayor Hill recognized Council Member Jones.

Council Member Jones said, “You know this goes back to what Mr. Batts was saying about giving money to people that we wouldn't give to anybody else. Now, \$2.2 million was what they bided on. And we're saying we're having 25 change orders or 35 it don't matter that's still high on a project this small. We're saying we're going back because we got to get some engineers to lift up a floor and all that. I know I understand my job correctly. When you're doing this project, this construction, you get a you get an engineer, beforehand, a structural engineer. You check everything out then. Why are we waiting for the 26th change order beats me? Then we're taking this money on a historic building and modernizing it to look like something we just built. And that's against everything that we stand for in historic area.”

City Manager Altman said, “The building actually has to comply with the National Park Service Historic Preservation design guidelines as part of the revitalization of that building. So, we're not making it look new. There's an approved plan. That plan was put in place years ago, and we're implementing it, but we have to restore it. So, one of the things that this contractor inherited was we had a contractor that came in and put conduit all up and down the existing walls. This did not meet the historic preservation design guidelines. They had to come in and remove all that out from the start. Those are the issues that we have. What I will say, though, is this is like any old house. When you open up a wall and you find something structural, we have to fix it. So that's kind of where we're at with this. With the cupola, literally, one of the corners was hanging in the air with no structural support, and it was cock at an angle. So, we had to put a bracing in there to support that. Some of that is a result of the repair work that was done years ago when the tornado came through and it messed up the roof and the cupola. It just wasn't repaired correctly, and then you have structural

damage because water got in. So, there's a lot going on here, and we understand the concern with the number of change orders. I'm concerned with the number of change orders. We're kind of at this point where we've opened it up. We found the problem, and now we got to fix it. So, this is where we're at."

Council Member Jones said, "So there was no structural engineer to look at this building and check it. There was nobody to check the last construction company that made all these mistakes. Now we got this construction company here that's finding the mistakes to fix it. If we say no, we're going to begin another construction company to probably put the mistakes back. This is a money pit, and it's costing us. It's a money pit, and I don't even see what, how we're going to get any money back from it. Once it's up and running. We'll have a few meetings here and there. We're not going to get \$2 million back. I know that much. \$4 million because that's what you're asking for now, two more million."

City Manager Altman said, "They're asking for \$294,940.78. The City entered into an agreement with the National Park Service some years ago to utilize and restore Southside Depot as a visitor's contact station for the National Park Service in the City. So that's how we're proceeding forward. We're not proceeding forward with the renovation, with the thought of selling it. The thought is we're proceeding forward with the renovation so the City can utilize it along with the National Park Service. As we have tourists come into Old Town and create and have an opportunity for a visitor's contact station, and also an educational opportunity for people who come here."

Council Member Jones asked, "Why we not asking the National Park Service for this money?"

City Manager Altman replied, "Well, the agreement was years and years ago. We made a commitment at that point in time to move forward with the renovation."

Council Member Myers said, "Marlow they gave us money and there were 40 change orders before this man came on board. That's why I say how many change orders. But nobody could tell me that. So, somebody is asleep at the wheel, and I'm kind of tired of it. So we get a project manager to know what the hell he doing or else."

Mr. Williams responded, "They've done very good work and have found deficiencies."

Council Member Myers said, "This is what they found. This has been since 2015 and today is 2024."

Mr. Williams said, "No, I'm talking about 2022 when they started."

Vice Mayor Hill said, "So Council, what is your pleasure?"

Council Member Myers said, "I guess I move that we provide the appropriation."

The motion was seconded by Council Member Cuthbert.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Myers, Westbrook, Smith-Lee, Hill; No: Jones; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

b. Resolution to Amend the Procurement Guidelines in Accordance with the Use of Construction Management Contracts Per 2.2-4382 of the Code of Virginia with Respect to Design-Build or Construction Management Contracts

Vice Mayor Hill introduced Item Number 14 b A Resolution to Amend the Procurement Guidelines in Accordance with the Use of Construction Management Contracts Per 2.2-4382 of the Code of Virginia with Respect to Design-Build or Construction Management Contracts on pages 309 to 319.

City Manager Altman said, "Mr. Vice Mayor and Members of Council. This is a section of the procurement manual that we currently don't have. We need Council's approval of the resolution to be able to add that into the purchasing manual so we can utilize the ability to have construction management or design building construction manager at risk projects. So, this simply allows us, by adopting the section of the state code, if I remember correctly, Mr. City Attorney, that allows us to then utilize those forms of procurement which we do not provide for currently in our procurement manual."

City Attorney Williams said, "Right. You had some references in there previously to construction management contracts, but it was very old. So, this is just an update to enable them to use that tool for procurement."

Vice Mayor Hill said, "Okay. Council, what is your pleasure?"

Council Member Myers asked, "And where is this at?"

Mr. Williams responded, "Farmer Street."

City Manager Altman said, "Well, it's for us to utilize it on any type of property."

City Attorney Williams said, "It is for any property. But that is the project that prompted them to want to add, this was the suggestion that they try to use it on that property initially."

City Manager Altman said, "Hire someone, a contractor to do design, build for us. We don't have that currently in that ability in the code. We consulted well first. I tried to take the liberty that Council gave me to amend the purchasing manual, but the city attorney said it was a little bit outside that authority. So, we're here this evening so Council can give us the authority to amend the code by adopting the rules."

Council Member Myers asked if this was to put out an RFP to hire a contractor.

City Manager Altman said, "We could use design build. We could hire a contractor to do design build workforce. Yes, sir."

Council Member Myers said, "Chief do you want to come up her and say something. I mean, I need, I need some clarity. I'm holding you all up, and I apologize. You know, I want to go home. I got to let the dogs out. I need some clarity on this Farmer Street property. Where are you, Chief with this? Is this going to provide you with everything that you need."

Chief Christian said, "As far as the building of the restructure. So right now, as far as I'm aware, the building is in the process of being gutted out, and there's no design at this point."

City Manager Altman said, "So the proposed amendment would allow us to streamline the process at Farmer Street to get a contractor in to work with. Then the contractor could also provide the design aspect of it. We don't have that ability now. This will help us streamline

that process, move the project forward quicker. What we're asking for is the amendment to the purchasing manual. It's not specifically for Farmer Street. We're asking for the ability to amend our purchasing manual to allow us to use design, building construction management contracts to do the work. We will come back to you with a price for Farmer Street later. This just allows us to move forward with putting a bid out quickly in a manner that we can't do now under our procurement."

Council Member Myers said, "But Mr. City Manager, you have on here 400 Farmer Street. It doesn't say anything about anywhere else."

City Manager Altman said, "Yes, that is there. This is one of the projects that, if we do this, it will help us with. But it isn't specifically just for this project. That probably shouldn't have been there. It should have been that we recommend Council approve the resolution to adopt to allow us to do it, not specifically. We're not asking for a recommendation for Council to adopt something specifically for Farmer Street. We're asking for Council to adopt a resolution referencing 2.2-4843.82 of the Virginia Code making that reference in amending our purchasing manual to allow us to use design, build."

Council Member Myers said, "City Manager. The thing says recommendation. The Department of Public Works recommends that City Council approves the resolution to benefit the 400 Farmer Street Police Headquarters, renovation as well as other capital projects in the future. Yes, I get that."

City Manager Altman said, "Correct. It would be the adoption."

Council Member Myers said, "I am asking specifically, how much of this is this going to be used on Farmer Street; and what is the cost to finish up Farmer Street?"

City Manager Altman said, "So this will allow us to use this on Farmer Street and potentially other projects. We're working on the final cost of what we're trying to do at Farmer Street to bring that to Council."

Council Member Myers asked, "And where are we with that? What is the quote right now?"

City Manager Altman said, "Well, the quote really just depends upon the level of what finishes we want in the building. We're working through that with the Chief to get that to a manageable number."

Council Member Myers said, "Okay, I want to go home. I know you're probably not going to answer my question, but I asked you. What is your current quote? Randall, what is your current quote?"

City Manager Altman said, "It's anywhere between 10 to \$20 million."

Council Member Myers said, "Okay, that's what I thought."

City Manager Altman said, "Anywhere in between there. So, we're trying to come to a compromise to be able to get the Chief what he needs, but get him in there at the cheapest price."

Council Member Myers said, "And if we approve this, is this going to support you getting a better finish?"

City Manager Altman replied, "Yes."

Council Member Myers said, "Quote."

City Manager Altman replied, "Yes, sir."

Council Member Myers said, "What you have just quoted us, correct?"

City Manager Altman said, "Yeah, that's definitely the hope. Yes, sir."

Council Member Myers said, "All right, then I moved to adopt this recommended resolution."
The motion was seconded by Council Member Cuthbert.

Vice Mayor Hill called the roll in the absence of the Clerk.

On a roll call vote: Yes: Cuthbert, Jones, Westbrook, Myers, Smith-Lee, Hill; No: N/A; Abstain: N/A.

The motion passed on a roll call vote.

15. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT AND SPECIAL REPORTS:

a. STARS Study Presentation

This item was discussed before Item c under 8. Official Public Hearings.

16. BUSINESS OR REPORTS FROM THE CLERK:

No report was provided.

17. BUSINESS OR REPORTS FROM CITY ATTORNEY:

No report was provided.

18. ADJOURNMENT:

The City Council adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Adopted: February 18, 2025.

APPROVED:



Mayor

ATTEST:

