

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION  
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL  
HELD IN THE 10<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
2400 Washington Avenue  
September 9, 2008  
2:30 p.m.

---

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

ABSENT: None ----- 0

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy W. Hildebrandt; Stuart E. Katz; Mabel V. Washington; Alan  
Archer; Neil Morgan; Cynthia Rohlf; Butch Blanks; Allen Jackson; Al Riutort; Sheila  
McAllister; Florence Kingston; Michael King; Everette Skipper; John Kaoudis; Samuel Belfield;  
Chad Pritchett; Tricia Wilson; Karen Wilds; Dave Kuzma; Chris Morrello; Jennifer Walker;  
Cleder Jones; and Lottie Vincent

I. Virginia Natural Gas Pipeline Project

Mr. Randy W. Hildebrandt, City Manager, stated the City had been working with Virginia Natural Gas for several months as they embarked upon a new pipeline project to increase gas supply into their Northern pipeline. He stated the additional gas supply would support future growth and be at a more competitive cost. Virginia Natural Gas was required to apply for a Conditional Use Permit to begin the project. The pipeline was scheduled to be completed on November 1, 2009. Construction of the pipeline had to begin on October 1, 2008, to meet the completion date of November 1, 2009. A public hearing was scheduled for the September 23, 2008 Regular Meeting of City Council. (A copy of the City Manager's memo, regarding the Hampton Roads Crossing (HRX) Pipeline Project Process, dated August 26, 2008, is attached and made a part of these minutes.) He introduced Mr. Les Flora, Senior Project Manager, Virginia Natural Gas, to report on the project.

Mr. Flora stated the Virginia Natural Gas Hampton Roads Crossing Project (HRX) was an infrastructure improvement that allowed: 1) integrated gas supply for the region; 2) minimized risks due to gas supply interruptions; and 3) allotted flexibility in gas delivery, which optimized gas cost. (A copy of his presentation: "Virginia Natural Gas Hampton Roads Crossing Project (HRX), September 2008," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Flora reported the pipeline would extend down the Hampton/Newport News corridor, across the Harbor, toward Craney Island and into the Virginia Natural Gas distribution center. The pipeline route would begin north of the Hampton Roads Center Parkway at the Newport News/Hampton City line, and follow a Dominion Transmission electric easement for approximately 26,000 feet to the vicinity of 48<sup>th</sup> Street and Chestnut Avenue. The remainder of

the proposed route would parallel the Hampton-Newport News City boundary line until it reached Salters Creek, Peterson's Yacht Basin and Anderson Park. He stated the pipeline would be laid with directional drill technology.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the depth of the directional drill. Mr. Flora replied the depth of the directional drill, for a 24 inch pipe, would be 15 feet or deeper.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the depth of the directional drill under the water. Mr. Flora replied the depth under water was 60 to 80 feet below the surface level.

Councilman Bateman inquired about the composition of the directional pipe. Mr. Flora replied it was a steel pipe with welded construction.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about the size of the valve station on 25<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Flora estimated the valve station would be a fenced, above ground structure that measured 30 x 60 feet; however the main line valve would be underground.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated City Council would open the bids for the above project at the September 9, 2008 Regular Meeting of City Council and award the bids and act on the Conditional Use Permit at the September 23, 2008 Regular Meeting of City Council.

## II. Oyster Point Transportation Study Review

City Manager Hildebrandt introduced Mr. John B. Kaoudis, Assistant Director, Department of Engineering, to report on addressing the proposed impacts of the Oyster Point Transportation Study over the next 30 years, projects that would be the result of the new Canon facility expansion and grants received from the State to support the projects.

Mr. Kaoudis reported, in the spring of 2007, the City requested the Hampton Roads Metropolitan Planning Organization (HRMPO) to conduct a traffic management study of the City's Oyster Point area. The purpose of the study was to assess the existing transportation system and identify ways to maintain or improve traffic flow in the future. (A copy of the presentation, "Oyster Point Transportation Study Presented by John B. Kaoudis, Assistant Director, Department of Engineering, September 9, 2008," and "Oyster Point Transportation Study, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, April 2008," are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Kaoudis reported the plans and future development for City Center, had been adjusted and called the "special" 2030 forecast. He stated the "special" 2030 forecast noted that the City's household population would increase by 50% and retail and non-retail employment would increase by 16% in the City Center area.

Mr. Kaoudis reported the Oyster Point Transportation study area was bounded on the right by Interstate 64 to the north, Oyster Point Road and Victory Boulevard to the west, and Jefferson Avenue and U.S. Route 17/J. Clyde Morris Boulevard to the south. He stated the population would grow by 50,000 people by the 2030 forecast. One-fourth of the City's employment population would be bounded by Oyster Point.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired how the City accounted for a population increase of 50,000 or more people by the year 2030. Mr. Al Riutort, Director, Department of Planning, replied the information was received from the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission's 2030 forecast for the region.

Mr. Kaoudis stated the City and HRMPO proposed the following 2030 alternatives: 1) Alternative A: "No Build" - represented no build of any major transportation improvements; 2) Alternative B: Extend Middle Ground Boulevard from Jefferson Avenue to Warwick Boulevard; 3) Alternative C: Extend Middle Ground Boulevard from Jefferson Avenue to Warwick Boulevard and I-64 Partial Interchange; 4) Alternative B Improved: Extend Middle Ground Boulevard from Jefferson Avenue to Warwick Boulevard and Intersection Improvements. He stated the Future 2030 intersection analysis resulted in the approval of Alternative B Improved.

Mr. Kaoudis noted the intersection geometric and channelization recommendations for the following study area intersections: 1) Jefferson Avenue/Oyster Point Road; 2) Jefferson Avenue/Middle Ground Boulevard; 3) Jefferson Avenue/Loftis Boulevard; 4) Jefferson Avenue/Thimble Shoals Boulevard; 5) Jefferson Avenue/Pilot House Drive; 6) Jefferson Avenue/J. Clyde Morris Boulevard; 7) Oyster Point Road/Canon Boulevard; 8) Canon Boulevard/Old Oyster Point Road; 9) Canon Boulevard/Middle Ground Boulevard; 10) J. Clyde Morris Boulevard/Thimble Shoals Boulevard; 11) J. Clyde Morris Boulevard/Diligence Drive; 12) Diligence Drive/Rock Landing Drive; 13) Diligence Drive/Thimble Shoals Boulevard; and 14) Canon Boulevard/Thimble Shoals Boulevard. (A copy of the specifics regarding each geometric and channelization recommendation is attached in the above-referenced report, "Oyster Point Transportation Study, Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, April 2008," attached to these minutes on page 5.)

Councilwoman Vick inquired about the impact to property owners for the above-mentioned recommendation for J. Clyde Morris Boulevard/Diligence Drive. Mr. Kaoudis replied there were two lanes coming out of the shopping center. He stated signs would be the only thing that were impacted by adding a right turn lane.

Councilman Bateman inquired about the rejection for an interchange between Middle Ground Boulevard and Interstate 64 (I-64). He inquired whether the logic for the rejection was due to the interchange at I-64 and Oyster Point Road and Route 17 in that the

interchanges would be too close to each other. Mr. Kaoudis replied staff had a mixed opinion about the need and the benefit of constructing an interchange at I-64 from Middle Ground Boulevard. Staff asked the question of whether such an interchange was cost effective. Staff could not justify spending millions for such an interchange as opposed to improving delays on local streets. There was value, but the question was whether the City wanted a six-lane highway running through the middle of Oyster Point. Middle Ground Boulevard would have to be modified in order to allow Jefferson Avenue to run through Oyster Point Road. Given the impacts, minimal benefits, and high costs, an interchange at Middle Ground Boulevard and I-64 was not the alternative that staff recommended.

Mr. Kaoudis stated the City progressed from seven minutes of delay, per vehicle, down to a marginal level of below one minute and a half under Alternative B Improved.

Councilwoman McMillan stated page 4 of the Oyster Transportation Plan noted that Alternative B would provide a five second vehicle delay reduction in the morning and a six second reduction in the afternoon. She assumed from reading the report that the recommendation was Alternative B and the success of that Alternative was based on some or all of the intersection improvements as stated above, but Appendix J of the above plan noted the level of service was still "FFFFFF," with only two "As" and one "C." She inquired what the significant reduction was based upon.

Ms. Kaoudis replied the improvements that were suggested were improvements at localized intersections. He stated Middle Ground Boulevard and its options were not so much beneficial to local intersections inside Oyster Point, but were beneficial to improving traffic on the City's arterials. The City could get a 16 – 17% reduction on Oyster Point Road and J. Clyde Morris Boulevard and as paralleling east/west facilities the City could take traffic off of those. Locally, the five/six seconds mentioned was the benefit one would get inside Oyster Point Park. It was not the benefit one would get on outside arterials. There was a mixture of information in the Plan.

Councilwoman McMillan understood the reduction Mr. Kaoudis noted was on the localized improvements and the benefit of Middle Ground was the connectivity between Jefferson Avenue and Warwick Boulevard, and not necessarily reducing the amount of time motorists were going to remain in traffic on the main arterial streets. Mr. Kaoudis stated the City would achieve improvements at localized intersections, but Middle Ground Boulevard would not provide that improvement. Middle Ground Boulevard would provide more improvements on the City's arterial network of J. Clyde Boulevard and Oyster Point Road.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether the reduction was based on subsidized growth or sustained growth. Mr. Kaoudis replied it was based a 50% increase in household population and an increase in development in the Oyster Point area. It was based on specialized growth based on the land use.

Mr. Kaoudis noted the major transportation initiatives included: 1) VDOT Funding; 2) CIP – Roadway improvements and small intersection improvements; pedestrian accommodations; 3) Canon Expansion and Transportation Partnership Opportunity Fund; and 4) Middle Ground Boulevard. He noted five Congestion Mitigation Strategies: Strategy #1 – eliminate person trips or reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT); Strategy #2 – Shift trips from automobile to other modes; Strategy #3 – shift trips from Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV) to High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV); Strategy #4 – Improve Roadway Operations; and Strategy #5 – Add capacity.

Mr. Kaoudis noted City strategies included: 1) Engineering - working to improve safety and efficiency, and seeking VDOT and CIP funds; 2) Planning – multimodal solutions, livable community and soft strategies; and 3) Development – encourage future development enhancements, work to develop an urban grid network.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated, while visiting Seattle more than ten years ago, she found Seattle had received a grant from the United States government to provide free bus service for their citizens for five years, which was an incentive to get the citizens out of cars and onto public transportation. She stated the program was successful, and indicated Seattle presently had a rail system. She inquired whether Newport News had looked at innovative ways to get the citizens to use public transportation. Mr. Kaoudis replied he would check into any such incentives, and indicated word was received that funding was drying up.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether the City was going to investigate any employer driven strategies and initiatives to offer City employees, i.e. telecommuting, flextime, and car pooling incentives. Mr. Riutort replied the City was looking into various strategies to offer City employees, such as TRAFFIX. City Manager Hildebrandt stated the City had to look at employer driven strategies and balance them against productivity. He felt some programs may reduce traffic and cost of travel, but the City had to be certain it received the same productivity and outcome from its employees.

Councilwoman Vick inquired whether the City had investigated programs in other Cities that had pushed to implement some of the above strategies. Mr. Kaoudis replied the study presented was an executive summary for the benefit of City Council on how staff might proceed. These were strategies on developing the CIP and items the City needed to look at in the future in developing its Framework for the Future.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated one of the strategies included making more opportunities for people to live closer to where they worked. He stated by providing housing in City Center, the City hoped that people would be able to walk from their houses to their place of employment and not get into a car.

Vice Mayor Whitaker stated he visited Baltimore, five or more times, to see what light-rail had done for that City. He stated Baltimore was much different than Newport News in that Newport News had built in the wrong places, which made a light-rail system difficult to construct.

### III. Staff Report: "Friends of the Homeless" Shelter

City Manager Hildebrandt introduced Mr. Allen Archer, Assistant City Manager, to report on the options for use of the FOTH building. (A copy of the City Manager's memo, regarding the Reuse of the 1600 25<sup>th</sup> Street Friends of the Homeless Building, is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Archer noted causes of homelessness ranged from the lack of a living wage, to domestic violence, and to no access to a family and social network. He stated each cause had the potential to escalate into a crisis, which could eventually result in homelessness. The 2008 Greater Virginia Peninsula Continuous Care Council's point in time count, estimated that 526 persons were homeless on the Virginia Peninsula. Households without dependent children was the largest category of homeless persons and 380 persons in that category were in emergency shelters, 26 were in transitional housing and 38 were unsheltered. This category represented the total of 394 homeless persons or 75% of the homeless population. Households with dependent children were the remaining category of homeless persons and 52 persons in this category were in emergency shelter, 78 were in transitional housing and two were unsheltered. This category represented a total of 132 homeless persons, or the remaining 25% of the homeless population.

As a result of the FOTH board's closure of the homeless shelter, the City Manager's Office and the NNRHA collaborated to identify potential emergency homeless shelter providers to operate the facility. At City Council's November 27, 2007 Work Session, Council requested that staff re-evaluate the merits of competing emergency shelter proposals from the Salvation Army and the Office of Human Affairs (OHA) and present a subsequent recommendation to provide emergency shelter services at the former FOTH facility. Additionally, Council reached consensus to appropriate \$10,000 to the NNRHA in order to pay off a lien to obtain clear title to the property. Since that time the Salvation Army reassessed their interest in the property and determined that the facility was too small and functionally obsolete to meet their needs as an emergency homeless shelter. Consequently, they withdrew their interest in the property. OHA revised its proposal from an emergency homeless shelter to an Outreach Center to minimize financial support from the City and to sustain ongoing operations of the proposed use. OHA was willing to purchase the property for a price not to exceed \$10,000, and would not seek any financial support from the City. The City received a proposal from LINK of Hampton Roads to use a variety of Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and Virginia Housing and Development Authority (VHDA) low interest loans and low income housing tax credits to develop up to 22 units of low income/affordable permanent housing for elderly and/or frail, physically disabled, formerly homeless adults. The

estimated project cost was \$4 million. LINK had agreed to purchase the property for a price not to exceed \$10,000, and no additional financial commitments were requested from the City.

The Planning Department concluded that OHA's proposal for an Outreach Center was not compatible with the residential nature of the area. Concerns were raised about the potential for individuals to gather at the facility and the inability to provide parking on the property. Additionally, the Planning Department determined that the LINK proposal could not be accomplished. Unfortunately, the LINK proposal did not meet the criteria because the expansion did not exceed 100% of the floor space at the time the use became non-conforming. The addition of three floors, as proposed by LINK, violated the criteria. The proposal would not meet the setbacks of open space requirements of the multiple-family-zone. The Planning Department concluded that neither proposal was appropriate for building within a single family residential area.

Mr. Archer stated the City Manager recommended that the City initiate the following actions to address the re-use of the FOTH shelter at 1600 25<sup>th</sup> Street: 1) Develop a Request for Proposal to market and sell the building for a community or commercial use; and 2) Task the Department of Human Services (DHS) to identify the requirements of homeless families and determine the need to financially support a community-based organization that provided emergency or transitional shelter services in the FY-2010 Annual Operating Budget.

Councilwoman McMillan recalled the City had already established that a need existed for a homeless shelter, particularly for families with children. She recalled, LINK noted that the City did not have a stable place that could provide shelter for homeless families with young children. She inquired whether another study was needed, and indicated the City had the information they needed. She voiced concern about selling the property and inquired whether there was an organization that could operate the facility as it was. City Manager Hildebrandt stated the Salvation Army, who had prior interest in operating the facility, did not want to operate the facility.

Mayor Frank felt the Salvation Army wanted to use the shelter as a fund raiser; they were looking for money.

Councilwoman McMillan recalled the Salvation Army was willing to take on the shelter; City Council was not happy with the proposal and the matter was sent back to the table. At the time, both entities were asking for money. City Manager Hildebrandt recalled between the two, OHA did not have the ability to waive donations as the Salvation Army had.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the amount of funding that needed to be included in the FY-2010 annual operating budget for the homeless. City Manager Hildebrandt stated the City needed to include an amount of funding that would continue the evaluation of an alternative to housing homeless families in transitional facilities as opposed to a homeless shelter. The Salvation Army, through grant funding, was putting homeless families into extended stay facilities. The families would then work with case managers who would help them gain permanent housing.

Councilwoman Scott inquired what the FOTH shelter on 25<sup>th</sup> Street would be used for. City Manager Hildebrandt replied the building would not be needed for a shelter, and inquired whether City Council wanted to allow the housing authority to market the property to determine whether someone wanted to use it as a commercial use, as it was zoned, or as some type of community office. The proposal was not to reopen the building as a shelter, because the City did not have anyone to operate the building as a shelter. He did not recommend the City getting into providing shelter services directly for the homeless.

Vice Mayor Whitaker noted he had visited the FOTH building and indicated it would cost a significant amount of money to renovate. He felt a homeless shelter should not be located in a residential zone. City Manager Hildebrandt agreed and noted the Community Services Board had been successful in obtaining permanent housing for the homeless population.

Councilwoman Vick inquired about the proposal by LINK for multi-family housing and how it did not meet the residential and commercial zoning. City Manager Hildebrandt replied multi-residential use had a different set of zoning criteria. Ms. Sheila McAllister, Assistant Director, Department of Planning, stated LINK proposed to expand the building backwards, but the existing building did not have setbacks and the lot was too small to provide adequate parking.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated homelessness was a reality. She inquired about what would be done to help the homeless. She stated there were two proposals and inquired whether the City was going to ignore them. City Manager Hildebrandt responded that the City proposed continuing to work through the Salvation Army with their program to put people into transitional housing before locating them into permanent housing; however, the Salvation Army needed more money to achieve that goal.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether there were other mechanisms available from other localities to increase, or match the donations to the Salvation Army; homeless individuals and families came from other jurisdictions, not just Newport News. City

Manager Hildebrandt replied that was the reason Newport News led an effort to create the Peninsula Regional Homeless Commission, where all localities agreed to provide funding. The Commission was in its planning phase and was analyzing data to determine the exact scope of the homelessness problem. The whole concept was to eventually have a program that eliminated the need for emergency shelter. The goal was to provide a system where people could be moved into transitional and permanent housing.

Vice Mayor Whitaker stated the Southeast community was home to an array of group homes, where the homeless resided. He stated many were let out in the community, daily, with nowhere to go. Most of the homeless interfered with people by begging. Other communities, such as Hampton and Yorktown, were not doing anything about the homeless population. He felt there should be a regional approach to end homelessness. Newport News could not do it alone. Most of the homeless were not from Newport News, but from other localities.

Mayor Frank voiced concern about the 500 plus homeless individuals. He stated the winter months were approaching and many would be without shelter. Children and families were homeless and the issues were not going away. He was concerned the City was trying to find ways to put off addressing the homeless issue in a meaningful way. Mayor Frank noted the shelter on 25<sup>th</sup> Street was not a clean and healthy environment, but it was shelter. Whether it could, or should be used as a shelter, was a different discussion. What concerned him was the City was trying to put together a regional initiative that was still in the study phase. He did not believe the City was doing an adequate job to address the issue of homelessness. He did not see any results in the homelessness problem.

City Manager Hildebrandt disagreed and indicated the City had organizations whose priority was working with families to move them into permanent housing. He stated the Salvation Army put homeless families into transitional housing and eventually moved them into permanent housing. The City was not able to deal with 600 homeless adults in the community; the FOTH only dealt with a handful of that population. He inquired how City Council was going to provide shelter and beds for 600 individuals; some of whom did not want to live in shelters, or permanent housing, and needed significant and mental health services. The Regional Task Force on Homelessness noted it would take approximately \$10 million, on an annual basis, to create the support system and housing to support the homeless situation on the Peninsula. The City Manager stated that was going to be the ultimate solution. He felt the City should look at a program that moved people into permanent housing, and a program that worked with families before they became homeless, i.e. funding to pay utility fees. The homeless needed prevention programs that helped them avoid becoming homeless because of economic circumstances. City Manager Hildebrandt stated the war on homelessness was a huge and very expensive issue. He felt the City was taking the right approach, with the regional commission to work on a permanent solution on homelessness, rather than bandaging the problem.

Councilwoman McMillan felt, while the City was studying a solution, a bandage was needed. She stated the City needed places to house the homeless, and indicated the Extended Stay Motel, was not a viable option to continue to place the homeless. She inquired what the City of Hampton was doing with regard to the homelessness issue.

Mayor Frank stated the Salvation Army was working with families to provide transitional housing, which was one segment of the homeless population. The Link program worked with the homeless during the winter, but from March through November, the homeless were on the streets. There were mentally ill who sometimes fell through the cracks and did not want help; but there were people who needed urgent, critical, and immediate housing because of job loss and illness. He admired the idea of looking for permanent solutions to make a significant difference. Clearly, the homeless problem should not be solely Newport News' problem; it should be the region's problem as well. Mayor Frank felt, along with Councilwoman McMillan, that while the City worked on other matters, it needed to work on the homeless who fell through the cracks of the program. He felt the City should not be comfortable to sit back and say because the Salvation Army was doing this, and Link was doing that, that the City had no responsibility for the homeless.

Vice Mayor Whitaker stated the City was not saying it had no responsibility for the homeless. He recalled the Salvation Army did not do an adequate job in running the homeless shelter at Whitaker Hospital several years ago. The Salvation Army was given the first and second floors of the building and they did not succeed. They experienced too many problems trying to create decent housing. He stated homelessness was not in the Mayor's community, but was in the Southeast Community, which he witnessed daily. The CSB received negative comments from the community for trying to put transitional housing in various communities. No one wanted the homeless in their neighborhoods, but everyone had to take responsibility for the homeless.

Councilwoman McMillan felt the big problem of homelessness was being addressed, but it was the here and now problem that the City needed to be concerned with.

Councilwoman Woodbury felt the homeless would not flood the community if there was a temporary place such as the FOTH shelter. She pointed out that when Newport News Public Schools (NNPS) received children from other localities, that locality received a bill for the services that the child received from NNPS. If the homeless were coming from other localities, the City should be able to charge a fee to the other localities for servicing their citizens. In the meantime, there must be a place for the homeless to exist.

Vice Mayor Whitaker pointed out he had the same concern, but voiced concern that the homeless solution was only being geared at one part of the community.

Councilwoman McMillan disagreed and stated there were group homes in the Northern District as well, i.e. the Menchville House.

Vice Mayor Whitaker stated illegal group homes were being allowed to exist in and throughout the Southeast community.

City Manager Hildebrandt stated that every jurisdiction involved in the regional commission had put money up to begin the planning process for the war on homelessness. The commitment was for two years, and out of the process, a solution would be forthcoming when localities would be required to step up. That was when the \$10 million per year would be needed.

Councilwoman Vick recalled the presentation made by Mr. Chuck Hall, Executive Director, Community Services Board, at a previous Work Session, where he indicated that Eastern State Hospital was going to lose 90 beds. She felt that put the City in a "State of Emergency," because those individuals were going to come to Newport News. This would impose a bigger problem for the City. She stated the Mayor of the City of Norfolk had designated a special Task Force for Homelessness issues and had positive solutions. She felt the City needed to look at other localities to see what they were doing. City Manager Hildebrandt responded that was what the Regional group was doing.

Councilwoman Scott felt the positive aspect about the FOTH shelter was that it provided a place for the homeless, and helped them to plan for an exit. They helped them to strategize based on income. Many who were homeless were employed, but had minimum wage jobs. She felt a transitional building needed to be available for the homeless. When the Salvation Army took in homeless individuals they would only house them for no more than two weeks, after which they were back where they started.

Councilwoman Scott felt there was often a disconnect between the agencies that actually provided services for the homeless. She suggested that the City look at how all the agencies worked together to fill the gaps of homelessness. Councilwoman Scott requested a report of the agencies that received funding from the City to see what their role was on homelessness.

Councilwoman Woodbury replied, in addition to Councilwoman Scott's request, it would be good to see what amount of money was used to put the homeless in temporary housing versus what it would cost to provide a building such as the FOTH shelter.

After ongoing discussion there was consensus among City Council to have the City Manager schedule an upcoming Work Session, with representatives from the Salvation Army, LINK, OHA, and the Peninsula Regional Task Force on Homelessness, to report on what

they were doing to combat the war on homelessness, and prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) out on the FOTH building, to determine whether there was an interest to selling the building, with a provision that the City could turn down any and all proposals.

IV. Enhanced Retirement Benefits for Hampton Roads Regional Jail Authority Employees

City Manager Hildebrandt stated the Board of the Hampton Roads Regional Jail Authority (HRRJ) approved a resolution to elect the Enhanced Benefits for Hazardous Duty Positions for the Jail Authority's eligible employees. Those benefits were equivalent to those provided throughout Virginia to most local public safety personnel within the Virginia Retirement System (VRS), and roughly equivalent to what Newport News provides its sheriff, police, and fire personnel. In order for the board's election of these benefits to become effective under the laws and regulations governing the VRS, a resolution was required by the City Council, of each of the participating cities, confirming that they concurred with the HRRJ's election of the enhanced benefits. No funds were being requested from the member cities for the implementation of these benefits. The actuarial estimate of the annual cost was \$787,400. The HRRJ would pay this cost for the foreseeable future from increased federal revenue, earned by housing federal inmates.

Councilwoman Scott voiced concern about the proposed change to lower the early retirement years of service to 25 as opposed to the current 30, in that it opened up more opportunity for people to transition and receive retirement benefits. City Manager Hildebrandt replied one would receive reduced benefits. An employee had to have 25 years of service to receive full retirement. He stated the HRRJ was making the benefit structure for the Regional Jail correction officers identical as Newport News Deputy Sheriffs and those in the surrounding region and State. Everyone, except Regional Jail employees, who worked in such facilities, received the proposed retirement benefits.

Councilwoman Scott inquired at what point did the cost to provide such benefits affect the City.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired whether the federal funding would be consistent or whether it would have to be absorbed into the City's budget. Mayor Frank replied the federal funding was in the form of the HRRJ receiving federal prisoners.

Mr. Roy W. Cherry, Superintendent, HRRJ, explained the Hampton Roads' Region had 14 jails and correctional facilities within it. The 14 facilities included: 1) Hampton Roads Regional Jail, located in Portsmouth; 2) Western Tidewater Regional Jail; 3) Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail, located in James City County; 4) Newport News City Jail; 5) Hampton City Jail; 6) Norfolk City Jail; 7) Portsmouth City Jail; 8) Chesapeake City Jail; 9) Virginia

Beach City Jail; 10) Gloucester County Jail; 11) Southhampton County Jail; 12) St. Bryans State Facility; 13) Indian Creek State Facility; and 14) Southhampton Correctional Facility. Of those 14 jail facilities, HRRJ was the only one that offered the proposed enhanced benefits. Such benefits, by the laws and regulations that applied to VRS, were made available to persons who served in hazardous duty positions. The employees that would be eligible were the sworn officers of the Regional Jail. (A copy of the memo, from City Manager Randy W. Hildebrandt to City Council, dated August 29, 2008, noting the proposed benefits is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Mr. Cherry stated the primary aspect of the enhanced benefits was retirement at age 50 with 25 years of service versus age 60 with 25 years of service. The main difference in the general VRS and the enhanced benefits proposed, would allow one to retire with full retirement benefits at age 60 rather than age 65. Retirement was allowed earlier with 25 years of service instead of 30.

Mr. Cherry stated in order to maintain an adequate workforce of competent jail officers the HRRJ felt it was necessary for the Regional Jail to have the same benefit structure that all other facilities had, within the region. He asked that City Council pass a resolution confirming approval of the HRRJ's election of the enhanced benefits plan.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether there would be any impact to the City's budget should the City Council adopt the resolution in support of the election of enhanced benefits for the employees of the Regional Jail. Mr. Cherry replied the Finance Committee of the HRRJ identified a plan to house additional federal inmates to generate revenue that amounted to more than \$800,000 per year. No one could guarantee that there would be a supply of federal inmates in the future, but up to this point, there had never been any lack of supply of federal inmates. The cost would fall on the HRRJ should there be a lack for federal inmates. But, those costs would be no more than the cost that fell on all the jurisdictions that offered the exact same benefits for their employees.

City Manager Hildebrandt replied the City paid for 25% of the beds at the Regional Jail, so 25% of the \$800,000 would be the City's obligation, should the Regional Jail not receive federal prisoner revenue to cover their costs.

Mayor Frank understood that the City had a commitment to cover 200 beds at the Regional Jail and any additional prisoners; however, if the City had no prisoners, it still would be required to pay for the 200 beds. City Manager Hildebrandt agreed and stated the City's share was still 25% of the ongoing operating revenue for the Regional Jail.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether the HRRJ would give notice to the City should they anticipate additional funding due to a reduction in federal prisoners. City Manager

Manager Hildebrandt stated the HRRJ had a rate stabilization fund that allowed them to handle the decrease in federal inmates, but ultimately, the per diem rate would be increased for all jurisdictions to cover the lost in revenue.

Mayor Frank stated the City had a contractual obligation for the 200 beds, which related to the Regional Jail's total population. This was a benefits package that would be locked-in and the employees would be entitled to it. Once the City approved the resolution there would be an obligation to pay any increases in future funding.

There was consensus among City Council to adopt the resolution in support of Enhanced Benefits for Hazardous Duty Positions for the Jail Authority's eligible employees.

V. November 12, 2008 City Council Meeting

Mayor Frank stated the first meeting of City Council in November would fall on November 11, 2008, which was Veteran's Day, a federal holiday. The City Code called for the meeting to be held on the following day, November 12. He inquired whether there was an interest to reschedule or cancel the first meeting in November.

After determining that two members of City Council would not be available on November 12, 2008, there was consensus among City Council to hold the first regular meeting in November on Thursday, November 6, 2008.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,  
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 5:24 P.M.

Jennifer D. Walker, CMC  
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Joe S. Frank  
Mayor  
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk

tack