

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN THE 10th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
2400 Washington Avenue
November 25, 2008
2:00 p.m.

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

ABSENT: None ----- 0

OTHERS PRESENT: Randy W. Hildebrandt; Stuart E. Katz; Mabel V. Washington; Neil Morgan; Alan Archer; Cynthia Rohlf; Lottie Vincent; Allen Jackson; Florence Kingston; Everett Skipper; Chuck Hall; Tricia Wilson; Joy Cipriano; Sabine Hirschauer; Jennifer Walker; Clede Jones; Kim Lee; and Jerri Wilson

I. Residential Parking Permit Program Modifications

City Manager Hildebrandt stated City Code, Article IX, Sections 26-221 through 26-225 and 26-227 through 26-228 authorized the Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Program in 1985, with an amendment to the program in 1990. He stated recent complaints to City Council from residents, regarding issuance of permits for multiple vehicles, had caused the City to re-evaluate the ordinance and provide clearer language to limit such situations. He introduced Mr. Everett Skipper, Director, Department of Engineering, to report on the revisions to the RPP Program.

Mr. Skipper stated the major proposed revisions to the RPP Program included: 1) Limit one permit per vehicle licensed at an address or each licensed driver at a residence, whichever was less, up to three permits; and limit one permit to a non-resident landlord; 2) Increase the fee from \$4.00 per permit to \$10.00 per permit; and 3) Limit the issuance of annual passes to one annual visitor pass per residence, issued at the time of the permit's purchase, to expire contemporaneously with said permit. Multiple temporary guest passes were available, for special events, not to exceed 72 hours.

Mr. Skipper reported the increase in the permit fee from \$4.00 to \$10.00 would apply to the administrative costs associated with the RPP Program. Direct costs would be the operating budget expenses associated with the cost of decal fabrication.

City Manager Hildebrandt recommended that City Council approve the adoption of the amendment to revise City Code Chapter 26, Article IX., Sections 26-221 through 26-225 and 26-227 through 26-228, Residential Parking Permit Program.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the expiration date for the visitor's passes. Mr. Skipper replied the City would issue one permanent RPP permit hang tag that could be shared for one year.

Councilwoman Scott voiced concern about the ability of a resident to renew a residential parking permit by mail and whether the resident would be required to provide a copy of their vehicle registration. She inquired whether the City was taking the word of a resident that they only had a certain number of vehicles. Mr. Skipper replied the City generally took a person's word; however, the City did audit and cross-check requests for residential parking permits. The City did not require one to return once they originally registered their vehicle.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the City could require a resident to return in person to renew a residential parking permit to eliminate abuse. Mr. Skipper replied the City cross-checked requests through the Department of Motor Vehicles and had not found any abuse in the system. The problem noted was obtaining multiple visitor passes and selling those, because they were not tied to any particular vehicle.

Councilwoman Scott questioned how the City would address past parking permits that were issued, i.e. the citizen who had up to 29 passes. Mr. Skipper replied citizens would be required to re-apply for a new permit by February 2009.

Councilwoman McMillan inquired about the number of neighborhoods that were in the RPP program. Mr. Skipper replied eight neighborhoods were in the RPP program, which represented 900 households, and out of those, 75% obtained passes.

Mayor Frank inquired whether the detailed information was provided to residents about the RPP program. Mr. Skipper replied the City did provide detail information, as well as an application to apply for inclusion into an RPP program. The City would also provide the revised policy to residents already included in the RPP program prior to February 2009.

II. Shelter for the Homeless

City Manager Hildebrandt recognized Mr. Alan Archer, Assistant City Manager, for his ongoing work to create a regional plan and comprehensive approach to end the cycle of homelessness in Newport News and on the Virginia Peninsula.

Mr. Archer noted the continued efforts that had been made to end homelessness in the region. He introduced Ms. Joy Cipriano, Representative of the Commission on Homelessness, to provide a presentation that included the following objectives: 1) Defining the operating context and structure of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Develop-

ment Continuum of Care Process; 2) Defining the operating context and the roll of Local Service Providers in meeting the needs of the homeless population; 3) Explaining the sources of homelessness data to provide a better sense of the numbers; and 4) Distinguishing some of the major funding sources for homeless programs. (A copy of the presentation, "Homelessness – Putting the Pieces Together," is attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Ms. Cipriano stated, prior to 1994, agencies independently competed for funding to eliminate homelessness. She stated, during that time, HUD was accused of funding the best written grants, not what was most needed in communities. To combat the problem, in 1994, HUD introduced a Continuum of Care (CoC) Plan to organize and deliver housing and services to meet the specific needs of people who were homeless.

Ms. Cipriano explained the CoC plan included action steps to end and prevent a return to homelessness. Communities had to determine need, projects to be funded, and plan for and monitor services. Communities had to develop a comprehensive planning process that was: 1) inclusive; 2) met year-round; 3) was aware of activities in the community; 4) showed results; and 5) was policed and monitored. Plans had to be long-range, comprehensive, strategic, collaborative and based upon community needs and priorities. HUD's submission structure and the key to understanding the Continuum of Care Funding included: 1) the annual statement; 2) the projects; and 3) the pro-rata share.

Ms. Cipriano stated HUD received an annual CoC budget from Congress. She explained a pro-rata share of that budget was distributed across the United States. The initial funding represented the basic amount of funding a CoC expected to receive if they scored high enough on their Annual Statement. The City of Newport News suffered a decrease in its score for lack of an active ten year plan. However, HUD's funding line was 90.25 and the City's score was 92.25 which allowed the City to still receive funding. Ms. Cipriano stated the only matter that was out of line for the Peninsula CoC, including Newport News, Hampton, Williamsburg, Poquoson, James City County and York County, was the lack of a ten year plan. All communities participating in the CoC must have a ten year plan.

Councilwoman Woodbury asked for clarification that because the City did not have a ten-year plan it counted against its score. Ms. Cipriano replied that was the reason for the lower score. She stated the Bush Administration started the one-year plan process and wanted everyone to get on board and begin a process that would end homelessness within their community in ten years.

Mayor Frank inquired whether all communities involved in the CoC had to sign-off on a ten-year plan. Ms. Cipriano replied all communities involved in the CoC had to sign-off on the ten-year plan.

Ms. Cipriano stated the Peninsula was fortunate to have a large number of participants in the CoC. She stated the service providers had always been very involved and because of that the Peninsula was rated as the number one CoC until last year. The reason for the high rating was because the Peninsula was particular and careful about the process, and the projects. They followed HUD steps in seeking a priority system that was fair, equitable and inclusive. The Peninsula looked at what was failing and what was working.

Ms. Cipriano noted homeless services continuum, local providers by housing types, types of available housing, and data. She stated everyone requested data, but it was hard to pin down. No matter who provided data, it would be different than the next entity providing data. There was no one source for data on homelessness that everyone participated in, or that was consistent with any other source.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the data source that the Commission on Homelessness used. Ms. Cipriano replied they used as much data as possible, i.e. data from the region's school systems and CoC Point in Time comparisons. She noted a decrease in homelessness numbers.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired what caused the decrease in homelessness comparisons. Ms. Cipriano replied the decrease was realized due to HUD's focus to turn to communities to fund priorities rather than funding specific projects. The focus from costly shelter systems to permanent housing solutions also helped decrease the comparisons. While the community focused on emergency shelters, which did not combat the homeless population, HUD concentrated on permanent housing solutions.

Councilwoman McMillan appreciated all the analysis and work put into the presentation; however, she voiced concern that the analysis did not include the people she dealt with in her district, i.e. those who lived in the woods, were substance abusers and who did not want help. She hoped that this population was included in the analysis and comparisons offered by Ms. Cipriano. Ms. Cipriano replied the population that Councilwoman McMillan referred had been the focus of HUD over the last five years. She stated each new project had to be geared to the chronically homeless in order to be funded. The chronically homeless used about 80% of the resources.

Mayor Frank inquired how the CoC was addressing families with children that were homeless. Ms. Cipriano replied homeless families with children were always HUD's priority. Homeless families with children usually received priority over the chronically homeless because of community values. Shelters always focused on homeless families with children.

Mayor Frank reiterated his concern about homeless families with children and how they were being helped. Mr. Glenn Butler, Director, Department of Human Services, replied there had been a number of brainstorm session with staff regarding permanent solutions

Page 5
Minutes of Work Session
November 25, 2008

for homeless families with children. He stated he would provide a final report to the City Manager, in the near future, concerning efforts that had been made to address the homeless families with children population.

Ms. Cipriano concluded by noting local government's role in eliminating homelessness: 1) Continued support of the Commission on Homelessness; 2) Approval and Adoption of the Regional Plan to End Homelessness; 3) Focused Leadership on Needs of the Homeless; and 4) A Focused Regional Agenda.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 5:06 P.M.

Jennifer D. Walker, CMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Joe S. Frank
Mayor
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk