

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL
AND THE NEWPORT NEWS SCHOOL BOARD
HELD IN JAMES ROOM AT CITY CENTER**

700 Town Center Drive

April 16, 2019

4:00 P.M.

PRESENT: McKinley L. Price, DDS; Sharon P. Scott, MPA; Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Sandra N. Cherry, D. Min. (Arrived 5:15 p.m.); Marcellus L. Harris III; and David H. Jenkins-----6

ABSENT: Tina L. Vick-----1

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Terri L. Best; Douglas Brown; John Eley; Marvin L. Harris; Gary B. Hunter; Shelly Simonds; and Lisa Surles-Law-----7

OTHERS PRESENT: Dr. George Parker, III; Cynthia Rohlf; Collins Owens; Mabel Washington Jenkins; David Freeman; Lyn Spratley; Leonard Wallin; Mary Lou Rouseau; Tiffany Moore-Buffaloe; Brian Nichols; Lisa Cipriano; Cory Cloud; Constantinos Velissarios; Maria Abilar; Keith Ferguson; Keith Webb; Venerria Thomas; Elaine Johnson; Darlene Bradberry; Rashard Wright; Tracy Brooks; Catina Bullard-Clark; Patrick Finneran; John McMillan; Billie Hart; Stephanie Hautz; Michelle Price; Angela Rhett; Nancy Sweat; Joseph Ellis; Felicia Barnett; Florence Kingston; Matthew Johnson; Eoghan Miller; Chief Steve Drew; Assistant Chief Michael Grinstead; Officer Brandon Maynard; Zina Middleton; Jane Hammond; and Josh Reyes

Call to Order

Mayor McKinley Price called the Special Joint Work Session of the Newport News City Council (and Newport News School Board) to order. He welcomed the members of the School Board. He thanked the City Council and School Board for the opportunity to meet.

MOTION MADE BY COUNCILWOMAN SCOTT; SECONDED BY COUNCILMAN HARRIS; AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO EXCUSE VICE MAYOR VICK FROM THIS MEETING.

Mayor Price advised that Councilwoman Cherry would arrive late due to a previous commitment.

Councilman Marcellus L. Harris, III, a member of the Newport News City Council, filed a declaration in accord with Section 2.2-3115H of the Virginia Code. He declared, pursuant to subdivision A.3 of §2.2-3112.B and §2.2-3115.H of the Virginia Conflict of Interest Act, that for discussion at the City Council Work Session Agenda of April 16, 2019 (i) the City Manager recommended to the Newport News City Council adoption of a City Operating Budget for FY 2020 (the transaction);(ii) the said Operating Budget includes, in small part, funds to pay the salaries of persons employed by the Newport News School Board, which was a group of three or more persons the members of which were affected by the transaction; (iii) that he was employed as a Counselor for the Newport News School Board; (iv) that he was on the board of directors of Hampton Roads Community Action Program (HRCAP), which was a charitable

organization providing services to Newport News residents, for which he received no remuneration, and which would be a recipient of monies designated to it in the City Operating Budget for FY 2020; (v) that his wife was on the board of directors for the Peninsula Agency on Aging, which was a charitable organization and for which she received no remuneration, and which would be a recipient of monies designated to it in the City Operating Budget for FY 2020; and (vi) that he was able to participate in the transactions fairly, objectively, and in the public interest (a signed written declaration was filed with the City Clerk prior to the City Council meetings at which time the transaction was considered – April 9, 2019; and is attached and made a part of these minutes).

Mr. Gary Hunter, Chair, Newport News School Board, called the Special Joint Meeting of the Newport News School Board (and Newport News City Council) to order. He thanked the members of the City Council and School Board and for the willingness to provide an opportunity to meet. The members of the School Board were appreciative of the opportunity for further discussion and collaboration, and believed that the children and families in the community deserved support and leadership. He was encouraged whenever the opportunity arose to discuss and resolve any issues that impacted the success of the Newport News Public Schools (NNPS).

Chairman Hunter advised, that the School Board set a realistic expectation on what may be able to be accomplished. The School Board's goals were obtainable. They provided City Council with feedback and supporting information regarding the two proposals provided relating to the NNPS revenue shortfall of \$2.4 million. The School Board also provided City Council with potential options for moving forward. Chairman Hunter indicated there were pros and cons. He felt that better decisions were made when there was an understanding of the issues.

Chairman Hunter asked Dr. George Parker, Superintendent, NNPS, to provide the School Board's response to both proposals provided relating to the NNPS revenue shortfall of \$2.4 million as suggested at the April 9, 2019 Regular Meeting of City Council.

School Board's Response

Dr. Parker distributed a folder to members of the School Board and City Council, which included the two proposals suggested by the City and the School Board's thoughts about each option. Included were the Pros and Concerns for both options, and options recommended by the School Board for City Council consideration, as well as justification for each (a copy of the options are attached and made a part of these minutes).

City Proposal #1 – NNPS to return \$2.4 million from FY 2019 Operating Budget to City and City will use that to fully fund FY 2020 request. Pros of Proposal #1: This was a more formal revenue agreement, which allowed all unencumbered revenue, by June 30th, to return to the School Division as one-time dollars for cash capital, technology or instructional needs which could be a benefit to the School Division. Dr. Parker advised that having a formal articulated revenue reversion process would be of benefit to the NNPS and the City. He would support this in future years.

Concerns of Proposal #1: The amount of unencumbered revenue varies from year to year; therefor, this was not a long-term strategy for accounting for the increase in obligated revenue (Compensation/Benefits/Staffing, etc.) that would be added to the current Operating Budget.

A Reversion Process did not account for repairs or projects that must be scheduled while schools were unoccupied.

Reversion funds may be returned with restrictions or not returned at all. Since 2007, there were three years where reversion dollars were returned and requested as follows:

- 2009 (\$2.8 million returned to schools because it was federal impact aid)
- 2013 (\$621,000 returned with a stipulations that the funds were to be used on DSA (Discovery STEM Academy furniture).
- 2014 (\$23,910 was not returned by the City).

Both options increased the portion of the NNPS Operating Budget spent on salaries/benefits.

Both options did not account for potential State Revenue shortfalls. Since 2008, there had been four years when student enrollment was less than budgeted, which meant that the State revenue was significantly less than budgeted, and one year where sales tax was lower than budget. Revenue was lost during the fourth quarter (see table below).

Year	State Revenue Shortfall	Average Daily Membership (ADM) Shortfall
2017	- \$3.9 million	- \$400
2015	- \$2.7 million	- 404
2012	- \$2.3 million	- 250
2009	- \$2.0 million	Sales tax lower
2008	- \$2.6 million	- 612

Reversion did not meet well with the timeline of school occupancy.

City Proposal #2 – NNPS to reduce FY 2020 Operating Budget request by \$2.4 million and City would increase CIP by \$2.4 million for FY 2020. Pros of Proposal #2: This was the better of the two (One-Year) Options. Provided the appropriation of the dollars for the capital projects were done in a timely manner, the identified technology, security and capital projects would be completed during the fiscal year as planned. This option provided for further dialogue regarding how minor and major Capital, Technology, and Security needs may be met in the future.

Concerns of Proposal #2: This was not a long-range solution for addressing the increasing (recurring obligations) of the School Division Operating Budget (Salaries, Benefits, increased Staffing, etc.)

This would continue to increase the portion of the School Division's budget that was spent on salaries and benefits, which limited the funds available for other purposes.

The FY 2020 CIP Budget identified more capital needs for FY 2020 than could be funded. There would need to be some level of assurance that identified NNPS CIP projects would receive funding.

What would be the timing of this appropriation?

Any Borrowed Debt had been considered as school funding by the City.

The maintenance needs that had been met with these funds were vital to keeping aging school buildings in good repair for students and staff. The graph reflected maintenance related work completed between 2014 – 2018 (see chart below)

EFFORTS TO KEEP AGING BUILDINGS AND INFRASTRUCTURE FUNCTIONAL

Expenditure Category	Cost (in millions)	Description
HVAC	\$ 4.3	Units, Boilers, Cooling Towers, RTUs Environment safety, Ceilings, Flooring, casework, doors, lockers, water and gas lines
Aging Building Infrastructure	\$ 4.1	Water and mold damage
Equipment failure	\$ 2.0	Water heaters, fuel tanks, sewer lift pumps, lighting & fixtures, main electrical switch gear
Paving	\$ 1.7	Parking lots and tennis courts
Learning Cottages	\$ 1.3	Replacement of units beyond repair
NN City Ord Compliance	\$ 1.2	Inside & Outside grease trap replacement
Safety & ADA Compliance	\$ 0.7	Stage Rigging, Chair Lifts
SCOT Relocation	\$ 0.7	Bus Wash not funded as part of the relocation
Roof Replacement	\$ 0.7	Yates: Emcy Replacement, Imminent failure, metal joints rusted, roof saturated with water
Green initiative	\$ 0.4	Discontinued use of dangerous chemicals harmful to works an building occupants
NFPA Code & Stds	\$ 0.3	Arc Flash Studies
Huntington Feasibility Study	\$ 0.2	Basis for Superintendent Recommendation for future use of building and site
State Mandated Water Testing	\$ 0.1	Drinking water testing
Grand Total	\$17.6	

School Board Suggestions for Moving Forward (presented in the order of preference):

Option #1: Fund full budget request for FY 2020 by adding \$2.4 million to the School Division Operating Budget and begin development of a revenue sharing formula for FY 2021, which enabled both the City and the NNPS to project revenue for the next fiscal cycle.

Option #2: Use a combination of revenue increase to the NNPS Operating Budget and One-time funding through the City's Cash Capital to meet the FY 2020 request. Option (A) requests no additional cuts to the NNPS Proposed budget. Option (B-D) required the school division to cut the proposed operating budget (See Chart Below).

\$ in millions

	Total Request	Increase NNPS Operating Budget	Increase City Cash Capital	NNPS \$\$ Cuts
Option (A)	\$2.4	\$ 1.6	\$0.8	\$0.0
Option (B)	\$2.4	\$ 1.5	\$0.5	-\$0.4
Option (C)	\$2.4	\$ 1.5	\$0.25	-\$0.65
Option (D)	\$2.4	\$ 1.4	\$0.3	-\$0.7

Option #3: City proposed Option #2 (NNPS to reduce FY 2020 Operating Budget request by \$2.4 million and the City would increase the CIP or Cash Capital by \$2.4 million for FY 2020 and appropriate funds in FY 2020. This option could garner School Board support under the following conditions:

- A long-range plan developed for the funding of City and School Division Capital needs.
- A commitment made to fund 80% of the cost of compensation increases (not funded by the State) over the next Biennium – FY 2021 and FY 2022 (See Table below).
- A revenue sharing agreement was considered which would allow both the City and Schools to share in an appropriate percentage of existing and new City revenue.
- A commitment was made to adequately fund the school division CIP needs in addition to funding a replacement for Huntington Middle School.

The following data supported either of the options mentioned above:

The State budget provided funding for a 5% salary increase for SOQ funded positions over the 2-year period 2019-2020. The maximum credit for raises provided in 2019 was 3%. To receive the full State funding in FY 2020 of \$5.9 million, NNPS was to provide at least a 2% raise by September 1, 2019. The following graph indicated the commitment of State, City and NNPS to meet the State required 5% salary increase for school employees (based on City Manager Proposed Budget). The amount that was not funded by the State or City had to be absorbed in the NNPS budget, and displaced other non-compensation needs from being included in the budget.

\$ in millions		
5% Raise	TOTAL over (2 Yrs)	Percentage
Total Cost	\$10.7	100%
State Contribution	\$5.9	55%
City Contribution	\$0.7	7%
NNPS Budget	\$4.1	38%

Closing Comments

Mayor Price proposed that City Council and City Manager Rohlf review the information presented by Dr. Parker, and have City Manager Rohlf meet with Dr. Parker regarding the City’s suggestion. Related to the NNPS Option 3, i.e., the long-range plan developed for the funding of City and School Division Capital needs, Mayor Price was of the belief that the future needs of NNPS would not be met using the current budget method. He suggested the formation of a committee, comprised of an agreed upon composition, to look at the future needs of the City and the way it was funded, the needs of the school division, how the resources were available and how they would be funded, in an effort to avoid the prior funding problems. Mayor Price suggested City Council evaluate the proposal provided by the School Board, commit to the fact, moving in a new direction, with an agreed upon committee, to look at the future needs of the schools. The current funding source would not be of help. Mayor Price suggested some type of formula or resource that would project how the City would pay for the things that were needed for the School division and the City.

Councilwoman Scott asked the City Manager to explain the reason for her proposal of zero funding for NNPS so that everyone would have the same information. She advised the budget was distributed on March 26, 2019, and was concerned that the conversation about how the NNPS budget would be negotiated and should have been on the table weeks later. Councilwoman Scott advised that she had spoken with Dr. Parker about the budget, and had to agree to disagree on some things. She understood his role was to do what was best for the schools, as did she, but City Council had to do what was best for the entire City. She inquired about the date for adoption of the School Board’s Proposed Operating Budget. City Attorney Owens responded that the School Board’s Proposed Operating Budget must be adopted by June 15, 2019. She and Dr. Parker spoke about percentage funding. She asked Dr. Parker if the City and the Schools were sharing revenue, what would happen if revenue were to drop, and his response was that the NNPS would return to the City and request additional funding. Councilwoman Scott advised that both bodies should be mindful of how both boards (City and NNPS) were impacted when discussing money.

City Manager Rohlf advised that she and Dr. Parker were in complete agreement that the option that was provided were not long-term solutions. It was her job to take a look at all of the needs of the City, not the schools alone, and to take into account those needs to benefit all across the board. Her intent was to fully fund the NNPS. The best option available to do that was to use two different funds. She understood there were facility and maintenance needs with the

schools, which was a different conversation which should be had outside of the budget process. There were policy implications on how to move forward. And there were revenue allocation and resource issues of how to move forward. That was a conversation that City Council should have internally, and could not be done in a vacuum. If additional resources were required, City Council needed to have that conversation. Her intent after looking at all of the needs was to do the best possible for FY 2020. The most flexibility allowing that to be done was to pull from two different funds. She indicated there was cash capital that was funded in the CIP. The plan was to make things work with existing dollars. There was not another \$2.4 million - this would be funded with what the City had in the existing cash capital allocations. If additional resources were required, members of City Council needed to have that conversation. Council appropriated \$6.4 million for the NNPS, not for City projects, but moved forward with the NNPS because it was time sensitive. Every attempt was made to fully fund the Schools request of \$113.3 million. The City's proposal would get the NNPS \$113.3 million.

City Manager Rohlf reminded about the downward trend of 24% in funds in the NNPS. From the City's perspective, there were restricted funds that could not be used for other things. She stated when the City could use unrestricted funds, the City had the ability to distribute in other areas, and the percentage approached 32-33%. Some funds the City received, i.e. for Social Services, which could not be spent and some items needed to be taken out of the calculation. The City had legal obligations to do certain things. The obligation for FY 2020 was for additional debt service, which increased in FY 2020 by \$2.4 million. Both the City and the NNPS had needs. City Manager Rohlf indicated there needed to be additional conversations about surplus funds. Other municipalities did. There were policies, and everyone should know what should be expected at the end of the year. She and Dr. Parker agreed that there needed to be additional conversations as there were no long-term solutions, but it could be reached with open communication, and she received every indication that City Council was willing to have those conversations. She wanted to separate the conversations from the process give the NNPS what was needed for FY 2020, and come up with recommendations on increasing resources, and come back to City Council with recommendations that made sense in an effort to move forward to meet the NNPS needs, and in the long-term, the City's needs.

Dr. Parker advised that he and City Manager Rohlf did meet and had a great deal of dialogue around the two options. He indicated that they both agreed there were no long-term solutions included in the proposals. A great deal of consideration was given to the two options. At the end of the day, they were talking salaries and benefits, both needed to remain competitive. Good teachers made good students. He had concerns about where the NNPS was going in terms of building opportunities for workforce development, instruction, technology, that align with the visions of the NNPS. This was a broader conversation that should remain at the forefront. Many things take place in the operating budget, regardless of where assigned. Programs begin and programs end. Additional staffing was added based on the needs of the students. As the 13% continued to decrease, that was a concern moving forward. There needed to be flexibility to meet the needs of the NNPS students. Dr. Parker indicated that he was committed to working with City Manager Rohlf to come up with a long-term solution, not only in the capital

arena, but also for the operational decisions. He felt a revenue sharing agreement was number one as far as what should be investigated. It worked well in other cities. The State had indicated that the economy was doing very well, and he felt they would continue to support education in the short-term. Dr. Parker advised there may come a time when the economy experienced another recession, and NNPS had data to show when it was time to cut operations or staffing, they did cut the programs to keep their budget balanced to be fiscally responsible. If revenue was a problem, or the economy went south, NNPS would partner with the City, rather than asking for more, which was what the revenue sharing agreement did - it created a partnership between the NNPS and the City.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether NNPS considered returning surplus funds to the City in this new relationship, understanding that surplus funds were to come back to the City, as was documented in the proposals distributed by Dr. Parker to City Council. Dr. Parker advised that he first needed clarification on what the City Code actually required. He indicated that the Code required that any revenue that was not by June 30th, revert back to the locality. He repeated, the Code said what was unspent or encumbered. City Attorney Owens, interjected, and advised the City Code mentioned what was unexpended, it did not say was encumbered. For clarification, Dr. Parker reiterated, the Code stated, at June 30th, what was not spent reverted back to the locality and the original process put in place. He indicated there had been much discussion about the intent of the NNPS Operating Budget. Dr. Parker advised, like the City, the NNPS job was to meet the needs of the current students in the current fiscal cycle. If there was a need in the NNPS, the budget needed to address it. He indicated he did not have a problem with the reversion process, but wanted to be clear on what it entailed. There had to be some level of flexibility in meeting the needs of the students during the current operational cycle. If there were additional dollars, NNPS would not think of cheating the children. There had been times when the amount of revenue projected when all of the revenue was not received in the fourth quarter. Dr. Parker reiterated that he had no problem with the reversion process as long as both bodies continued to work across the table.

Councilwoman Scott was appreciative of Dr. Parker's comments, but indicated just as NNPS tried to meet the needs of the students, the City had a double whammy – having to meet the needs of the citizens and the NNPS. She hoped everyone would keep that in mind when discussing money and where the money would come from. As a City Council, they had to respect the City Manager's funding suggestions, as she, and her team, worked together to come up with the numbers. She hated to keep harping on the same conversation over and over, making both bodies look indecisive. She was willing to go with the City Manager's recommendation, and start working together on the next budget (FY 2021). Councilwoman Scott commended Dr. Parker, recalling that this was his first budget with the NNPS, which was inherited from FY 2019. She believed, going forward, that he would be in front of the conversation.

Touching on Dr. Parker's comments, City Manager Rohlf, advised that the goal of the City Council and the School Board was to view the surplus as an opportunity, as opposed to giving back to provide the opportunity to plan for things when there was a sizeable surplus, and would like to roll it over and put it toward a different project. She recalled conversation with the

Superintendent about a surplus and her going to City Council advising there was, for example, \$4 million in surplus the NNPS was willing to return, but would like to use it for a certain project, and she would recommend the City matching the amount with \$2 million, as an example, to get a different level of a project. City Manager Rohlf saw an opportunity for the two bodies to work together and for the NNPS to use resources and leverage those resources, when possible, recognizing there may be shortfalls, but to deal with it instead of the City taking something back, an opportunity to work together to build on it, and leveraging for the key needs, particularly in a timeframe when there were limited resources.

School Board Member Lisa Surles-Law stated that options and opportunities had to be available. She indicated one of the biggest challenges for the School Board, and for the City at large, was hearing that there was “flat funding” for FY 2020 for the NNPS. Rather than going through the process, that next year, she hoped the conversation between the City Council and the School Board would begin with a dialogue prior to hearing an announcement similar to “flat funding.” School Board Member Surles-Law indicated that the School Board and City Council appeared to be “on the same page,” more so than two weeks previously and it would be a great starting point.

Regarding end-of-year funds, School Board Member Shelly Simonds advised the NNPS had a list of projects on which could be agreed, to include technology and security heavy, and some of those projects could be tackled with end-of-year funds because many did not want to put technology projects in a long-term CIP, where one was borrowing money for technology. The projects would be a good use for end-of-year money to operate security systems, and update computers. She further advised the technology was very important to NNPS students, and had become a bigger issue over the years. Not only was there a need for new school buildings and maintenance, but there were needs for technology updates, and safety in schools, ensuring to modernize the schools for safety reasons. Many proposals in the NNPS FY 2020 Operating Budget included technology and safety. This could be looked at as an opportunity to get many of those projects completed.

City Manager Rohlf clarified that the City did not, nor would they suggest, using bond proceeds on projects that did not qualify. The conversation had was about cash capital and was no different than what was identified in the NNPS FY 2020 Operating Budget, but was only allocated differently.

School Board Member Douglas Brown expressed appreciation for the conversation and thoughts between City Council and the Newport News School Board. He hoped there would be definitive timelines and dates as to when the two bodies would sit down and hear more about the revenue sharing model. He believed the revenue sharing model was good because NNPS did not want to in a position to come before City Council with additional emergency requests on a constant basis. He further advised that members of the School Board wanted to be responsible stewards of funds, and have a budget, set a year, and sit down to execute that budget without having to come back to the City for funds. He was of the belief that a revenue sharing

model would work. Having a set level in the plan would put both bodies (School Board and City Council) in the driver's seat of being partners and moving the entire City forward.

School Board Member Douglas Brown stated the overall concern was that without the \$113 million in FY 2020, and if it was not \$113 million in FY 2021, the money for FY 2020 could not be used for staff with one-time funds. He would like to get to a point where City Council and the School Board was not in a constant variance from year to year.

Councilwoman Woodbury suggested asking the State for permission to look at categorical funding, i.e. salary increases; and that pot of money could not be used for anything else. She would like to do that so the teachers were aware that City Council wanted them to have raises; and City Council would get a pot of money specifically designated for salary increases; and the NNPS could not use those funds for anything else.

School Board Member Douglas Brown responded that categorical funding would have the opposite effect. It put the NNPS in a bad position – seeking emergency funds in various categories for certain projects.

Superintendent, Dr. Parker, replied that categorical funding would put the School Board in the position of having to go to City Council whenever funds were moved from category to category. It also put City Council in a position of managing the NNPS Operating Budget. It was not a good funding model, because while Councilwoman Woodbury had great intentions, a different Council member in 3-6 years may oppose the manner in which the NNPS spent their funds and may want more input, and may vote against categorical funding when a transfer may be required in order to cover expenses. Dr. Parker advised, the NNPS, an award winner for fiscal responsibility, was well capable of managing the operational dollars of its Budget. He felt that categorical funding would be moving in the wrong direction. He did agree with Councilwoman Woodbury in that the NNPS needed to protect employees from its competition. There would be other models to support that.

School Board Member Douglas Brown stated that local funding the NNPS received from City Council allowed the NNPS to do such innovative programs such as SPARK.

Councilwoman Woodbury advised that her suggestion for categorical funding came as a result of City Council being beat up by the teachers, when it was the NNPS that could allocate funds for salary increases for teachers and staff, not City Council; and the teachers deserved to be compensated. They thought City Council did not allocate enough money to the NNPS. She felt if the money was provided to the NNPS in categories, it would actually be used for salary increases.

Councilman Jenkins indicated it seemed as though City Council was not providing NNPS enough to provide the raises that they had to take out of the NNPS Operating Budget.

Dr. Parker pointed to Page 4 of his handout which was distributed to City Council, the commitment of \$700,000 from the City in new revenue would allow the NNPS to give salary increase. He stated the commitment from the NNPS was \$4.1 million, with a five percent (5%) salary increase by SOQ positions over the 2-year period 2019 - 2020. There was a larger commitment of 6% of the Operating Budget were approved. He shared the commitment was there in the NNPS Operating Budget for raises and compensation. When additional revenue was needed for compensation and benefits, the NNPS would be required to cut things from its budget.

Councilman Jenkins asked Dr. Parker to address the surplus funding that existed for NNPS at the end of the year – had it been used for projects identified throughout the School year, that had not been put in the FY 2020 budget, because it was anticipated to address those projects, and how were those issues addressed. He questioned whether the NNPS could eliminate the entire non-compensation budget, do nothing but pay people, and still appear to have a surplus at the end of the year.

Dr. Parker replied that personnel was approximately 87% of the NNPS Operating Budget and they had to staff the schools based on the projected enrollment of students. When teachers were not present, and their salary was in the budget, the money accrued until the position was filled.

City Manager Rohlf suggested taking the information and comments back for further discussion at the April 23, 2019 Works Session of City Council.

Councilman Jenkins asked the City Manager about the \$3.4 million in projected new revenue, and requested a breakdown of projects planned. City Manager Rohlf advised the amount was \$3.1 million. City Manager Rohlf replied that \$2.8 million was for a pay for performance two percent (2%) increase for City employees. She would get him a report on the remaining \$300,000. Councilman Jenkins questioned the procedure for the pay for performance increase. City Manager Rohlf replied employees had performance evaluations performed by his/her supervisor, each department had goals, established by each department.

Mayor Price thanked both the members of the School Board and City Council for their attendance and bringing the matters to the forefront.

Mr. Gary Hunter, Chair, Newport News School Board, on behalf of the Newport News Schools thanked both the members of the City Council and the School Board their attendance. He suggested that more meetings be held between the two bodies to continue the positive dialogues begun at the April 16, 2019 Joint Meeting of the School Board and the City Council.

Adjourn

Mayor Price adjourned the meeting of the Newport News City Council.

Chairman Hunter adjourned the meeting of the Newport News School Board.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS,
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 5:18 P.M.



Mabel Washington Jenkins, MMC
City Clerk

McKinley L. Price, DDS
Mayor
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk