

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION  
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE 10<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
2400 Washington Avenue-  
March 9, 2010  
3:00 p.m.

---

PRESENT: Joe S. Frank; Madeline McMillan; Sharon P. Scott; Tina L. Vick; Joseph C. Whitaker; Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; and Herbert H. Bateman, Jr. ----- 7

ABSENT: None ----- 0

OTHERS PRESENT: Neil Morgan; Stuart Katz; Mabel Washington Jenkins; Alan Archer; Cynthia Rohlf; Allen Jackson; Wanda Pierre; Florence Kingston; Carol Meredith; Sam Workman; Lisa Cipriano; Stephen Hawks; Chad Pritchett; Dana Dickens; Darryl Gosnell; Jerry Clark; Dwight Farmer; John Carlock; Camelia Ravanbakht; Roy W. Cherry; Jacqueline L. Jones; Jerri Wilson; Joe Lawlor; and Jennifer Walker

I. Hampton Roads Partnership Update

Mr. Neil Morgan, City Manager, reminded about the agreement reached by City Council to reserve time, during a Work Session, on a quarterly basis, to receive information from regional organizations that the City was affiliated with. To begin the process, he invited representatives from the larger regional organizations (Hampton Roads Partnership; Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance; Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization; and Hampton Roads Regional Jail) to offer an overview, to include their mission and purpose. City Manager Morgan stated other regional organizations could be covered in the future. City Manager Morgan advised this Work Session was not about the budget, but City Council would be dealing with funding requests from these regional agencies and others. He introduced Mr. E. Dana Dickens, III, President and CEO, Hampton Roads Partnership, to provide an overview of the Hampton Roads Partnership.

Mr. Dickens invited City Council and City staff to the Hampton Roads Partnership's (HRP) Regional Day, scheduled for May 6, 2010. He stated Governor Bob McDonnell was tentatively scheduled to be the guest speaker.

Mr. Dickens reported the mission of the Hampton Roads Partnership (HRP) was to provide leadership to focus on strategic issues that improved the competitive position of Hampton Roads in the global economy. The HRP's job was to make Hampton Roads as attractive as possible to entice businesses to the region. Economic development was sometimes seen as a win/lose situation; however, it was a win/win situation because the entire region would benefit.

Mr. Dickens reported the HRP was a unique public-private partnership of community leaders, formed in 1996, to look at major indicators for economic prosperity and an enhanced quality of life for the Hampton Roads region. The group recognized that Hampton Roads was behind many competitive regions, i.e., Richmond, Raleigh, Durham, and Charlotte, in per capita income, and gross regional product. The partnership included the chief elected officials of seventeen Counties and Cities of the region, and key leaders from business, education, military, and non-profit organizations.

Mr. Dickens noted the Hampton Roads gross regional product increased from \$40 billion in 1996 to \$76 billion in 2009.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired how the gross regional product compared to the gross national product (GNP). City Manager Morgan replied the gross regional product did not increase or decrease as fast as the GNP, and indicated Hampton Roads was more stable due to the large amount of government employment. Mr. Dickens replied Hampton Roads had outpaced the GNP over the past several years. He stated Hampton Roads per capita income had increased from \$34,663 in 2004 to \$39,000 in 2009. Hampton Roads had the fastest growth rate among Virginia metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) since 2000.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether the above figures were on the HRP's website. Mr. Dickens stated the figures were on HRP's website.

Mr. Dickens noted the Department of Defense (DOD) federal spending had increased from \$10.30 billion in 2000 to \$18.86 billion in 2009.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether direct DOD spending included contract spending for supplies and equipment with companies such as Canon. City Manager Morgan replied such spending would be included if it included a direct payment to Canon.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether impact aid for schools and students was included in DOD spending in Hampton Roads. City Manager Morgan replied impact aid would be part of the overall total.

Mr. Dickens stated there were many assets and opportunities in Hampton Roads. He stated, the more the region aligned its assets, the stronger the region would be. It was all about competition with neighbors across the country and world. He asked City Council to look at the regional wide strategy, consider the assets that Newport News had, and apply those assets to the region. (A copy of the presentation, "Hampton Roads Partnership – Regional Report for City of Newport News," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the amount of funding the City paid to HRP. Ms. Lisa Cipriano, Director, Department of Budget and Evaluation, replied the City paid \$15,675 per year to be a part of the HRP. Mr. Dickens stated the HRP was funded by the public and private sector. Twenty-three and one-half percent of funding came from local government and the remainder came from non-local government sources. Over the past two years, the HRP had lowered the amount asked of local government, and did not plan to fill lost positions. The HRP had a staff of five people.

Councilwoman Vick inquired about HRP's partners, i.e., the Hampton Roads Technology Council, and whether they were located in Norfolk, Virginia. Mr. Dickens replied the Hampton Roads Research Partnership and Technology Council were located in Newport News. The Hampton Roads Film office was housed in the HRP office and Opportunity Inc. was located on the Southside.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether HRP's private partners were listed on their website. Mr. Dickens replied that the private partners were listed on the website.

## II. Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance (HREDA) Update

City Manager Morgan introduced Mr. Darryl Gosnell, President and Chief Executive Director, Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance (HREDA), accompanied by Mr. Jerry Clark, President, SunTrust Bank, to offer an overview of the HREDA.

Mr. Gosnell reported the HREDA was a 501-c-6 non-profit, public-private partnership created in 2005 as the result of a merger with the Peninsula Alliance for Economic Development. The HREDA represented ten Cities and five Counties (Cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach and Williamsburg, along with the Counties of Gloucester, Isle of Wight, James City, Southampton and York). These communities were represented by 14 economic development offices, which were the partners of the HREDA. The HREDA also partnered with 140 of the most successful and influential private companies in the region.

Mr. Gosnell stated the mission of the HREDA was to singularly attract new business and market the Hampton Roads region. He stated over the past three years (2007-2009), the HREDA responded to 180 project services and 311 general inquiries, and conducted 136 marketing activities and 952 face-to-face meetings, which resulted in 157 prospect visits to the region. The HREDA did not close deals, manage properties, or handle incentives for the region. Local economic development professionals were in the business of closing deals in their respective communities. The HREDA was created to generate more opportunity to close the deals.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about the number of businesses that relocated or established occupancy in the Hampton Roads region out of the 157 prospects that visited the region. Mr. Gosnell replied 15 new companies, over the past three years, had been announced in the region, with a capital investment of approximately \$86 million.

Mr. Gosnell reported the HREDA leveraged public dollars with the private sector. Each community became a partner in a \$2.9 million annual program that focused on marketing and research in response to business inquiries. He stated HREDA maintained a community specific page on each of the 15 Cities and Counties that they represented. (A copy of Newport News' community page is attached and made a part of these minutes.) HREDA's direct marketing focused on and involved face-to-face meeting. Nationally, surveys noted face-to-face interaction was the most effective way to market. (A copy of a Forbes Magazine article entitled, "Business Meetings – The Case for Face-to-Face," is attached to these minutes.)

Mr. Gosnell stated, between 2007 through 2009, City staff had joined the HREDA on 19 marketing missions; seven missions were scheduled for 2010. He reported the City's investment to the HREDA amounted to \$179,899 in FY 2007 – 2008, and \$178,281 in FY 2008 – 2009. The HREDA voluntarily requested a 5% reduction in the City's per capita formula in FY 2009 – 2010, which amounted to \$170,195.35 and \$170,633.30 in FY 2010 – 2011. Newport News' investment represented nearly 6% of HREDA's total 2009 budget, and the City saw over 20% of the total 42 clients that the HREDA hosted.

Mr. Gosnell stated there was no duplication of services between the HREDA and other regional organizations. The HREDA was not duplicating local economic development efforts. The HREDA complemented and added value to local economic initiatives. (An informational sheet, "Hampton Roads, heart of the Mid-Atlantic," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the number of clients that located their businesses to Newport News out of the 42 clients that were hosted by the HREDA. Mr. Gosnell was sorry to say that none of the 42 clients located their businesses to Newport News over the past three years.

Mr. Jerry Clark voiced support with regard to Mr. Gosnell's remarks. He stated the HREDA'S umbrella that the region was working under was of benefit, because there was a need to go outside of Virginia and market the region. He understood the need to do this and the need for each of the 14 economic development organizations to partner and be actively involved to offer input and direction. It was this effort, and HREDA's follow-up, that was really going to make Hampton Roads grow.

III. Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC)/Hampton Road  
Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) Update

City Manager Morgan introduced Mr. Dwight Farmer, Executive Director/Secretary, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) and Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) to provide an update.

Mr. Farmer stated the HRPDC and HRTPO had been reformed and had two functions. He stated Mr. John Carlock was the Deputy Executive Director of the HRPDC and Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht was the Deputy Executive Director of the HRTPO formerly known as the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Mr. Farmer reported the HRPDC and HRTPO member localities included the Cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach and Williamsburg, and the Counties of Gloucester, Isle of Wight, James City, Southampton, Surry and York. The HRPDC and HRTPO had 46 board members and approximately 45 staff members. The HRPDC met on the third Wednesday of each month at 9:30 a.m., and the HRTPO met on the third Wednesday of each month at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Farmer reported the HRPDC was a planning organization, whose mission was to: 1) serve as a forum for local elected officials and chief administrators to deliberate and decide issues of regional importance; 2) provide the local governments in Hampton Roads and their citizens with credible and timely planning research and analysis on matters of mutual concern; and 3) provide leadership and offer strategies and support services to other public and private, local and regional agencies, in their efforts to improve the region's quality of life.

Mr. Farmer stated the HRTPO was the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads region. He stated any highway or transit project or program to be constructed or conducted within the metropolitan planning area had to be approved by the MPO.

Mr. Farmer noted local jurisdictional contributions, sources of HRPDC funding, and HRPDC pass-through funding. He introduced Mr. Carlock to explain the core functions of the HRPDC.

Mr. Carlock stated the value of the HRPDC was that they had a very qualified technical staff that worked closely with the City staff of each locality in the areas of public works, water, planning, emergency planning, economic development and housing. Together,

they brought policy recommendations to the board for consideration, evaluation and action. The core functions of the HRPDC included: 1) Economics; 2) Emergency Management; 3) Housing and Human Services; 4) Physical and Environmental Planning; and 5) Rural Transportation Planning. HRPDC's program priorities for FY 2011 included: 1) Climate Change; 2) Energy Development; and 3) Catastrophic Events. He introduced Dr. Ravanbakht to report on the core functions of the HPTPO.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether the HRPDC had conducted the study for the King William Reservoir project. Mr. Carlock replied the HRPDC did not conduct the study on the King William Reservoir project. He stated the HRPDC worked closely with City staff and other partners in the region on the Raw Water Study Group, but did not carry out the study. The HRPDC was in the process of ensuring that the region met the state requirement for a water supply plan.

Dr. Ravanbakht explained the core functions of the HRTPO included: 1) a Long-Range Transportation Plan; 2) a Unified Planning Work Program; 3) a Transportation Improvement Program; 4) Public Participation; and 5) Technical Programs (Rail Planning; Congestion Management Process; HOV and Congestion Pricing, Non-Driver Mobility; Safety Planning; Security – Emergency Evacuation and Critical Infrastructure; Freight Planning; Intelligent Transportation System and Operations Planning; Transportation Planning and Engineering Studies; and Corridor and Intersection Studies).

Councilwoman Woodbury understood, regarding the Peninsula's evacuation program, in the event of a major hurricane, residents of Newport News would not be able to travel west on Interstate 64. Dr. Ravanbakht stated the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) updated its evacuation plan six months ago and would reverse travel on Interstate 64 depending on the strength of a hurricane; however, she did not believe it would affect the residents of Newport News. Mr. Farmer stated the initial reaction from VDOT was to reverse Interstate 64's westbound traffic to eastbound traffic in the event of a category 2 hurricane; however, westbound travel would still be available for Peninsula residents to head north, three days in advance of a category 2 hurricane. He advised that a briefing of the new program was scheduled for the week of March 15 – 19, 2010.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether the HRTPO would inform City Council about the new program. Mr. Farmer replied VDOT would provide the information to the public. Dr. Ravanbakht replied the Virginia Department of Emergency Management had developed an extensive outreach program and would inform localities about the new plan.

Dr. Ravanbakht reported HRTPO program priorities for FY 2011 included: 1) Enhanced Passenger Rail Services; 2) Statewide and Regional Transportation Funding; 3) Hampton Roads Military Transportation Network Assessment; and 4) Research and Analysis for Emerging Critical Topics.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about Freight Planning that was part of the Technical Program under HRTPO's core functions. Dr. Ravanbakht replied that HRTPO would work closely with the Freight Transportation Advisory Committee and staff from the Virginia Ports Authority to ensure the needs were met for the movement of incoming and outgoing freight.

Dr. Ravanbakht noted special tasks done by HPTPO for Newport News: 1) Oyster Point Subarea Transportation Study – FY-1998; 2) Newport News Level of Service Study – April 2001; 3) Oyster Point Transportation Study – April 2008; 4) Transit Shuttle Projects: A Literature Review and Best Practices – June 2008; and 5) Regional Land Use Research – FY-2010/2011.

City Manager Morgan stated the HRPDC and the HRTPO dealt with a large amount of information. He stated their presentation reinforced the need to discuss the work done by regional organizations.

Mr. Farmer stated he or his staff would be happy to provide a briefing on specific issues at any time. He stated funding was on hold (\$100,000 or more) for critical issues, not presently identified to take them through the next 18 months. He asked that Newport News not be shy to ask for HRPDC's assistance should a critical issue arise that needed researching. City Manager Morgan stated the widening of Interstate 64 was a project that would benefit the entire region if that was something that HRPDC wanted to research.

#### IV. Hampton Roads Regional Jail (HRRJ) Update

City Manager Morgan introduced Mr. Roy Cherry, Superintendent, Hampton Roads Regional Jail, to provide an update.

Mr. Cherry reported the Hampton Roads Regional Jail (HRRJ) served Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, and Portsmouth. He stated the HRRJ was not the typical model of a regional jail. The HRRJ Authority's Board was the governing body of the HRRJ and consisted of 12 members (a Council member, Sheriff and City Manager of each of its four jurisdictions).

Mr. Cherry stated a study of the HRRJ, conducted in 1989, noted that "the Southeastern Virginia Regional Jail should be a facility which housed only sentenced adults.... un-sentenced inmates... should continue to be housed in local jails where they would be more convenient to the local courts....." A Planning District Commission study in 1993 summarized the structure, mission, and purpose of the HRRJ. The 1993 study noted "in order to maximize use of the regional facility and to reduce problems at the local jails, the regional facility would hold those prisoners who present management problems: females; juveniles; and inmates with

medical, mental health or other behavioral problems.” The 1993 study also was the decision document that formed the HRRJ Authority, and committed to submit inmates to the regional jail, which in turn created the financial structure for the sale of the bonds to finance the regional jail. The regional jail opened in March 1998.

Mr. Cherry reported a staffing study by the Department of Corrections was completed in 1999 which identified an additional mission of the regional jail. The study noted “the high numbers of seriously ill individuals requiring daily medications and ongoing treatments. In fact, given the current medical statistics, the HRRJ would be more aptly considered a medical/mental health facility for the Jail Authority’s participating jurisdictions.” From the 1999 study, the HRRJ evolved into a medical/mental health facility. He introduced Ms. Jacqueline L. Jones, RN, Health Services Administrator, HRRJ, to make a presentation about the medical activities that went on at the regional jail.

Ms. Jones stated that she began at the HRRJ in October 2000 as the Health Services Administrator. She reported the HRRJ contracted health services from First Medical Management (FMM). FMM provided comprehensive medical, mental health, and pharmaceutical services for all of the inmates within the HRRJ. Their clinical staffing included: 1) a Full-time Medical Director, MD; 2) a Part-time Physician; 3) a Full-time Nurse Practitioner; 4) a Part-time Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner; 5) RNS, LPNs, and Medical Assistants; and 6) Social Workers /and Subcontracted Professionals.

Ms. Jones reported approximately 50 inmates were seen daily. She stated the HRRJ served approximately 52 HIV patients, four dialysis patients and 12 emergency visits per month. The inmate population totaled 1,200, and of that, 800 required chronic medical care follow-up. To protect the community, the following medical services were provided onsite: 1) Dialysis and Nephrology; 2) Obstetric Care; 3) Dental Care; 4) Optometry; and 5) Extensive Wound Management and Care. The HRRJ also offered onsite Ancillary Services (radiology, physical and occupational therapy and laboratory services).

Ms. Jones noted the HRRJ therapeutic class prescriptions for January 2010 totaled 3,279, which amounted to \$140,224.

Councilwoman Vick inquired whether there was a line item for medical expenses included in the HRRJ’s budget, or whether inmates qualified for Medicaid and/or Medicare benefits. Ms. Jones replied there was pharmaceutical funding within the budget of the medical contractor. Inmates did not qualify for Medicaid or Medicare while incarcerated. Mr. Cherry replied medical coverage was 100% local responsibility. Annual medical contract costs were approximately \$8.5 million.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether an inmate’s shot and health record was up-to-date upon release from the HRRJ so they could be medically fit to obtain employment.

Ms. Jones replied an inmate's shot and health record was not always up-to-date upon release from the HRRJ. Because there was such rapid turnover, it was difficult to know when an inmate was being released. Upon intake, an inmate received a health screening, and received one thereafter, annually, as long as they resided at the HRRJ. An inmate always retained the ability to access their medical record, if needed, for a specific purpose; however, the HRRJ did not prepare inmates for a job on the street.

Councilwoman McMillan stated she was puzzled that inmates were not prepared to find employment once released from the HRRJ. She stated the first thing one should be able to do, once they were released from jail, was to find employment. Inmates could not find employment, i.e., as a food service provider, without a tuberculosis test, which she felt should be done upon their release. Ms. Jones replied a tuberculosis test was given to inmates upon their arrival, as part of the mandatory health screening and was done annually.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether a released inmate received a certificate noting a tuberculosis test had been given on a particular date. Ms. Jones replied that the HRRJ had to provide inmates with an annual health screening, which included a tuberculosis test. Confirmation that an inmate had a flu shot and H1N1 vaccination was the only documentation given to an inmate upon their release from the HRRJ.

Councilwoman McMillan indicated she did not know who was in charge of inmate reform; however, she felt it would be a great service to provide an inmate, upon release from the HRRJ, with a photo id, documentation of a negative tuberculosis test, and an inexpensive cell phone for employment purposes. She questioned who took care of such matters. Mr. Cherry agreed with Councilwoman McMillan that transitional services were very essential to inmates re-entering the community; however, the problem was cost. There were minimum requirements that the HRRJ was responsible for and beyond that, there were some things, from a policy standpoint, that the HRRJ Authority Board could choose to do. In light of the economy, the Board looked at eliminating education and substance abuse programs, which were mandated, but voted to retain those programs. When inmates were released from the HRRJ they left with a short-term supply of medication, and there was an attempt to link them up with community organizations to assist with their transition. In all communities, funding for transitional services for inmates fell short of what everyone would prefer.

Mr. Cherry stated the objective of the HRRJ was to meet the medical requirements, imposed by the State, towards an inmate. He stated the HRRJ was required to provide medical services (dialysis, radiation treatment, etc.) to an inmate as long as they were incarcerated. The HRRJ provided adequate care as required; however, there was room for improvement in the area of transitional services. (A copy of the presentation, "Hampton Roads Regional Jail Update," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether the per diem rate varied, per inmate. Mr. Cherry replied the per diem rate that the City paid was \$38 per day, which had recently increased to \$41 per day.

Councilwoman Woodbury understood that the per diem rate did not depend on the severity of an inmate's medical problem. Mr. Cherry replied the per diem rate was the same for all and did not depend on an inmate's medical problem.

V. Comments/Ideas/Suggestions

Mayor Frank stated, pursuant to Section 4.06 of the City Charter and Section 2.22 of the Newport News City Code, that notice of this meeting, which was provided timely to each member of the City Council, was required to contain the specific item or items of business to be transacted during this portion of the meeting. He asked for a motion of City Council, by unanimous consent, to waive the requirement.

Councilwoman Woodbury moved to waive the requirement; seconded by Councilman Bateman.

Vote on Roll Call:

Ayes: Frank, McMillan, Scott, Vick, Whitaker, Woodbury, Bateman

Nays: None

City Manager Morgan noted a request from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) to televise their Candidate's Forum scheduled for Thursday, April 8, 2010 in the City Council Chambers. He recommended that the City not televise the forum because there was no established policy. He felt to televise one Candidate's Forum, and not another, would pose legal issues. It would be possible to come up with a policy, but he was not comfortable with televising political electoral events.

City Attorney Katz stated the City shaped the programming for Channel 48 when the initial Cox Cable Franchise Agreement was signed. He stated the agreement stipulated that City administration was not to broadcast programming on request. The only programming that was done was conceived by the City administration. The same philosophy was done with the Verizon Franchise Agreement.

There was consensus among City Council in support of the City Manager's recommendation to not televise the SCLC's Candidate's Forum.

Mayor Frank reminded of a memo, from the City Attorney, dated March 5, 2010, regarding criminal history reports for Boards and Commissions Appointees. He felt City Council could have a process where the City Clerk would work with the Virginia State Police to obtain a criminal history report of board appointees. The cost to the City was \$8 per criminal history search or \$16 per search for a combination criminal history and sex offender search. There was a Sex Offender Registry on-line that the City could access, at no cost, if Council desired to reduce the cost and were satisfied with the comprehensiveness of the site; however, the State Police advised caution to the accuracy of the on-line site.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about the annual costs associated with such a procedure. Mayor Frank replied the background checks would only be conducted on those individuals that were appointed by the City Council.

There was consensus among City Council to have the City Attorney meet with the City Clerk and contact the State Police to work out the appropriate process to obtain criminal history and sex offender reports on Boards and Commissions Appointees.

Councilwoman McMillan stated there were 2,000 more people coming into Fort Eustis, and there had been no discussion on the Atkinson Boulevard overpass and the new intersection. She asked for an update on the project.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated she and Vice Mayor Whitaker served on the Hampton Roads Transit Board and since there had been so much criticism about the \$40,000 per month salary paid to Mr. Phil Shucet, she felt it was worthy of an explanation. She stated \$12,000 of the \$40,000 per month salary, was paid by the City of Norfolk. The City of Norfolk hired Mr. Shucet as a consultant when the light rail project looked like it would stop. Since Mr. Shucet's arrival, an analysis of what went wrong was done for \$150,000. The second portion of that analysis was a \$308,000 proposed Recovery Plan. Mr. Shucet cancelled the proposed \$308,000 Recovery Plan and proposed another less expensive plan, which saved \$308,000. In addition, Mr. Shucet renegotiated two contracts in the amount of \$14.5 million that HRT would not have to pay. Councilwoman Woodbury felt such work justified Mr. Shucet's salary.

Mayor Frank felt HRT hit a home run in the hiring of Mr. Shucet. He had the occasion to work with Mr. Shucet over the years and found him to be a professional.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated Mr. Shucet hit the floor running and had offered a date and cost for completion for the light rail project and indicated there would be no variation.

Councilwoman McMillan recalled an occasion when Mr. Shucet briefed the VML Transportation Steering Committee. She stated he had a way of taking information and breaking it down so that one clearly understood an issue. He had a wonderful personality.

Page 12  
Minutes of Work Session  
March 9, 2010

Mayor Frank felt, putting the rail issue aside, the Hampton Roads area would end up with a better transportation system, overall, under the leadership of Mr. Shucet.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,  
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 5:40 P.M.

Jennifer D. Walker  
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Joe S. Frank  
Mayor  
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk