

**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL
HELD IN THE 10TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
2400 WASHINGTON AVENUE
September 12, 2016
1:00 p.m.**

PRESENT: Marcellus L. Harris III; McKinley L. Price, DDS; Sharon P. Scott; Tina L. Vick; Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Herbert H. Bateman, Jr.; and Sandra N. Cherry, D. Min. -----7

ABSENT: None-----0

OTHERS PRESENT: James M. Bourey; Collins L. Owens; Mabel Washington Jenkins; Cynthia Rohlf; Alan Archer; Lynn Spratley; Wanda Pierre; Lisa Cipriano; Florence Kingston; Everett Skipper; Sheila McAllister; Claudia Cotton; Chris Morello; Reed Fowler; Cleder Jones; John P. Thomas; Tedd E. Povar; Karen Wilds; Michael J. Packard; Tricia Wilson; Michael Poplawski; Mike Neal; Claire Murphy; Jennifer Walker; RoShaundra Ellington; and Dave Ress

I. Closed Meeting

(1:05 p.m. – 2:20 p.m.)

II. Virginia Institute of Government Presentation and Discussion – Requested by Mayor M. Price

Mayor Price stated that the Virginia Institute of Government session that he and Councilmembers Scott and Harris attended during the Virginia Municipal League Institute for Local Officials Conference (Key Training for New and Veteran Officials - A Like), in Richmond on July 22 – 23, 2016, provided useful information. He believed the information about the roles and responsibilities of City Council and their appointees would enhance the performance and interaction of City Council. He introduced Mr. John P. Thomas, Director, and Mr. Tedd E. Povar, Associate Director, Virginia Institute of Government, Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service at the University of Virginia, to offer the presentation and facilitate the discussion.

Mr. Thomas stated that he and Mr. Povar were present because they were passionate about local government in the State of Virginia. They both had been with the Virginia Institute of Government for many years, and reminded officials about the processes, procedures and policies that were used as governmental entities.

Mr. Thomas stated that the United States was founded on two fundamental core values: democracy and trust. National, state, and local government structures were placed in this country over 200 years ago so that no single authority could govern themselves however they wanted. It was fascinating to look back on what was described as democracy.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that there had been no election in the history of the State of Virginia where 50% of people voted. In looking at recent election results for the City of Newport News, and its 182,965 residents, only a handful of people voted. He believed City Council had a responsibility to reach out to the vast majority of citizens who did not vote. He stated that 75% of the citizens of Newport News did not make a selection as to who would represent them. The low turnout could mean many different things. City Council played a role in helping the citizenry understand what the City Council of Newport News did. City Council must remember that they were being observed constantly. Members of City Council must be aware that they were not only representing the citizens that voted for them, but they were representing a governmental entity. The citizenry of the City of Newport News expected their governmental entity to be one of the best in the world, which was the responsibility of City Council.

Mr. Thomas reported that City Council was working in an environment, such as trust, that did not exist 200 years ago. He stated an annual Financial Gallop Poll was conducted to determine the percentage of trust that citizens had in various institutions that served the public. He noted the changes in the percentages of trust that the citizens had in their governmental institutions from 2006 to 2016:

- **Police**
 - 2006 58%
 - 2016 56% (The numbers dropped dramatically in various parts of the U.S.)
- **Military**
 - 2006 73%
 - 2016 73%
- **Public Schools**
 - 2006 37%
 - 2016 30%
- **Organized Labor**
 - 2006 24%
 - 2016 22%
- **Newspapers**
 - 2006 30%
 - 2016 20%
- **Democracy**
 - 2006 19% (80% of the American public had very little or no confidence in the United Congress.)
 - 2016 9%

Mr. Thomas stated that City Council needed to be concerned that citizen's level of trust in governmental institutions had declined, and in many cases, dramatically. He stated the 75% of citizens who did not participate in the governing process had very little confidence in what their City was doing for them. There was no one in the City of Newport News that was recognized more than the members of City Council. When City Council spoke, they were representing the best of the City of Newport News. How a government functioned and operated, through transparency and interaction, had an impact on how citizens viewed their City. It was discovered, when the Virginia Institute of Government looked at award winning local governments around the country, that the City Council made a conservative effort to keep their conflicts, whether personal or problematic, private rather than in a public arena. He encouraged members of City Council to be responsive to all citizens whether or not they were involved in the political process. He stated that City Council's behavior was always documented and played a very significant role.

Mr. Thomas stated that negative behavior by City Councils was not new to American history. He stated that state and local governments were areas of disaster during the last century. State and local governments were run by control groups and were non-participatory. Those who won elections were controlled by the spoils of the system. The Mayors had control of their Councils and only certain citizens received certain services. An elected official could organize the police, fire, and others to be their poll and campaign workers, and could control the governmental process. That was also at the time when the American corporate structure needed to be redefined. Because of such behaviors a corporate CEO model and organized hierarchy structure was adopted. The CEO then determined that they needed to get in charge of how state and local governments functioned, which resulted in a reformed movement wherein cities needed to operate as corporations by having a Board of Directors and a City Manager (Council-Manager form of government). Mr. Thomas stated that the first jurisdiction to adopt a Council-Manager form of government was the City of Stanton, Virginia. The City of Stanton continued to be an outstanding City Manager operated organization.

Mr. Thomas stated, as the Executive Director of the National Association of Counties, which covered 3,200 counties nationwide, he marveled at the quality of government in Virginia and North Carolina. The reason for the quality was because there were institutions who trained officials on how to be City and County Managers. You would find that Cities and Counties in the States of Virginia and North Carolina were in the upper ratings if one measured the quality of local government in the country. It also was frustrating to see that this was not the case for many localities in the State of Virginia. He received calls from localities in the State, from time to time, that were totally dysfunctional and had fired the City Manager and ran people away. He and Mr. Tovar were in the business of preventative medicine for localities suffering from dysfunction. They helped jurisdictions by sharing matters that they saw as indicators that some assistance was needed. They had watched Newport News and other communities in Hampton Roads and saw that assistance was needed. He introduced Mr. Povar to continue with the presentation.

Mr. Povar advised that he had worked as a City Manager for 20 years, prior to his appointment as the Associate Director for the Virginia Institute of Government, where he had also worked for 20 years. He stated that the Institute was established in 1994 by the Virginia General Assembly to offer training, technical services and informational resources to localities in the State of Virginia. He felt that he had the best job in the State of Virginia. The Institute networked with localities through their EBIS (Email Broadcast Information Services) system. The EBIS system allowed localities to share and gain information from each other. Mr. Povar stated he was present to discuss the Council/Manager Form of Government (a copy of the presentation, Virginia Institute of Government – A discussion about Council – Manager Form of Government, September 13, 2016, is attached and made a part of these minutes). He encouraged dialogue from the members of City Council.

Mr. Povar noted the fundamentals of the Council-Manager form of government:

- Was over 100 years old
- First adopted by the City of Staunton, Virginia
- Formed to counter rampant corruption due, in particular, to the employment of friends and family and the bidding of contracts for family and friends
- Encouraged Ethical Professional Management and built a more Corporate System
- All cities in Virginia, except Richmond and most counties and towns were run by a City or Town Manager

Mr. Povar noted the role of City Council included:

- Establishing Policies/Priorities
- Approving the City's Financial Budget Plan (Plan of Operation)
- Setting Goals/Vision through the City's Land Use and Comprehensive Plans
(Mr. Povar stated that City Council noted where they wanted the City to be in 10, 20 or 50 years, and how what was done today helped them accomplish their future goals.)

Councilwoman Cherry stated that the City's Comprehensive Plan was handled by the City's Planning Department, and they had been working on a new plan over the past two years. She stated the Plan had not reached City Council for approval. She inquired whether City Council could consider the Plan once it reached them for approval or whether Mr. Povar was saying that City Council had to prepare the Plan. Mr. Povar replied that City Council should use the resources of their Planning Department staff that had input; however, the Comprehensive Plan was a huge document that could be modified and changed. He stated that City Council should have a bigger vision beyond the five-year Comprehensive Plan.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether City Council was required to provide the direction of the Comprehensive Plan or whether it was their responsibility to approve the Plan. Mr. Povar replied that City Council was required to adopt the Plan to make it official.

- Identifying and addressing community needs/priorities
(Mr. Povar stated it was critical that City Council understood the desires and needs of its citizenry, which was sometimes hard because many were not involved in the political process.)
- Supervising the City Manager's performance and how he/she guides the overall organizational performance

Mr. Povar noted the role of the City Manager included:

- Executing the policies and directives of City Council
- Maximizing Organization Efficiency
- Developing the Budget
- City Council's Chief advisor and point person.
(Mr. Povar stated that the City Manager was City Council's primary resource and contact through the organization. The City Manager could not do his job or be as informed if City Council did not work out matters through him, such as questions, problems, demands from citizens, etc. The City Manager could not assist members of City Council if they voiced their concerns to a City Director rather than to him. He was unable to help members of City Council if he was unaware of an issue. It was critical that City Council worked through the City Manager's office or the system that was in place, so that there was accountability and tracking of those things that City Council needed.)
- Identify topics requiring City Council action or attention
- Anticipate issues/problems
- Information source – internal and external

Mr. Povar stated the Council – Manager Relationship was very interesting, and it changed from locality to locality, and personality to personality. He noted the roles of responsibility for the Council – Manager Relationship included:

- Understanding the division of duties between policy and administration
(Mr. Povar pointed out that early orientation of City Council members was important so that everyone heard the same thing and understood the operation.)
- Trust
(Mr. Povar advised that trust made it work, took years and time to grow, and could be broken in one second. Trust was critical. Virginian's philosophy was that "one

trusted until they could not trust.” We trust until someone broke that trust. New Yorkers and New Jersian’s philosophy was “one did not trust until they could trust.” People had to earn trust. Mr. Povar stated that trust worked both ways in a Council – Manager relationship. The City Manager was going to give City Council the information that they needed to do their job. Much of that information was going to be in confidence, such as information provided in a Closed Session. If a member of City Council had sensitive information to share with the City Manager, they would hope not to hear the information on the street. It was critical that City Council was truthful in what they told the City Manager and the City Manager was truthful in what he told the City Council.)

- Full and equal communications
(Mr. Povar stated there became times on City Council when someone had a suspicion that the City Manager was cozy with another member of City Council who was receiving more information than another member. It was critical that everyone felt that they were receiving the same information at the same time. When a Council member had a conversation with the City Manager and information was generated, it behooved the City Manager to send a memo to all members of Council advising of the conversation and the outcome. The sharing of information was very important so that everyone felt equally informed and comfortable.)
- Manager as Council’s organization contact
(Mr. Povar stated it was important that the City Manager be in the loop on the all matters and desires of City Council.)
- Citizen demands – Council responsiveness
(Mr. Povar advised that City Council members were sometimes accosted by citizens asking for a quick fix to a problem. He stated the correct procedures had to be followed to fix a problem. Things were in place to assist City Council with such matters.)
- Facts v. political pressure
(Mr. Povar encouraged the City Manager and members of City Council to deal in facts, and try to avoid the politically expedient answer, which was sometimes the easiest answer. When someone said they needed something done, it was okay to say I’ll try or I will look into the matter. It was human nature to want to help, but get the facts first.)

Mayor Price stated there was a misconception by citizens that he had more power than what he actually had. He inquired whether that was just a lack of knowledge in people. Mr. Povar replied yes, most people were not educated in local government procedures.

Councilwoman Scott agreed that the majority of citizens were not familiar with the duties of the Mayor as they did not read the City Charter. Mr. Povar advised that the only Civics that public schools offered dealt with the Federal Government. Citizens understood the Federal Government and its branches, but did not understand State and local government. He stated it took a very enlightened Civics teacher to come in and run a Government Day.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated that Ms. Kimberly A. Winn, Executive Director, Virginia Municipal League, had held an "If I Were Mayor Contest" for the past two years. Unfortunately, not one letter was received from the City of Newport News. It seems that the contest was not promoted in the Schools.

Vice Mayor Vick stated that there was a time when everyone lived in the same community and kept up with the Mayor and members of City Council. Today, unfortunately, 80% of the teachers were not from the area and did not know the members of City Council.

Mr. Povar pointed out that the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests did not include one question about local government, which presented a challenge for City Council. He stated that the Institute had to beg schools to distribute their information. It would take an enlightened Civics teacher to get kids involved.

Councilman Harris encouraged members of City Council to reach out to the Schools by contacting a Civics or Government teacher to plan a time to come by and offer information about City Council and public policy.

Councilwoman Woodbury recalled that the City Clerk at one time had coloring books and other literature for children.

Councilwoman Scott stated that she liked the idea of a Student Government Day for Grades 8 and above. She felt that was something that could be done as a team. Several years ago, she provided student seminars at various Elementary Schools in Newport News, which was very enlightening to the students. Staff from the City Clerk's office assisted her with a PowerPoint presentation and several gifts, such as pencils, pens, etc.

Vice Mayor Vick pointed out that the City Council brochure was also a good medium to provide to the schools.

Mr. Povar continued with the roles of responsibility for the Council – Manager Relationship included:

- Confidentiality
- All Council members are equal

- It takes a MAJORITY
- Power of Position
- Interpersonal relationships (Treat people with respect)
- Let the City Manager help you (and Council) be successful (You are both on the same side)

Mr. Povar stated the “Grey” Areas of Council – Manager Relations entailed:

- Leadership – situation/traditional dependent
- Council member v. Council as a whole
(Mr. Povar stated that City Council and the City Manager had to determine the line between policy and administration, which was a matter of communication. This would help City Council stay out of matters that they should not be getting into and the City Manager was not driving the policy completely. The City Council had to do its job and take responsibility and initiative in various areas.)

Councilwoman Scott agreed that City Council should not get into certain matters, but she believed that City Council should know what the City Manager was doing at all times. She stated she had an issue about information getting to the media and citizens before it reached City Council. She wanted to receive information upfront. She cited an example of a shooting that took place in her district that she was not aware of. The shooting happened in her district at approximately 5:00 p.m., but she had no knowledge about the matter until after 7:30 p.m. It would have been good to know what was going on in her district. She would like the City Manager to keep City Council abreast of matters before the information reached the media. City Manager Bourey understood Councilwoman Scott’s frustration. He stated that the Police Department had not contacted him in a timely manner.

Mr. Povar replied that he understood Councilwoman Scott’s frustration, which fell under making City Council look good.

- Representing the City – who/when/how
(Mr. Povar stated that communication was important, but members of City Council had to determine when it was necessary to speak about a particular situation. That was a dynamic that needed discussion by City Council. He stated that they had to function as a team to get matters done and to work in concert with each other.)
- Staff interface & relationships
(Mr. Povar reiterated that the members of City Council had to work with the City Manager so that he knew what their issues and needs were. City Council had to understand the power of their position. If you asked a question of a City Director,

you know that it was going to have major importance and they were going to get the question answered.)

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether Mr. Povar was saying not to ask questions directly to a Department Director. Mr. Povar replied no; but, to ask the City Manager, as he was their point person.

Councilwoman Scott stated she sometimes sent an e-mail message to a Department Director with a copy to the City Manager, if she knew about a matter that would be handled through that department. She tried to “kill two birds with one stone”, as the City Manager would eventually send the matter to the Department Director. She asked whether Mr. Povar thought that was appropriate. Mr. Povar agreed that the City Manager would refer the matter to the Department Director, but he suggested that Councilmembers use the City Manager for the reason he was hired.

Councilwoman Scott disagreed because she saw the City Manager and the Department Director receiving the information at the same time and the Department Director would have a heads-up when they were contacted by the City Manager. The Department Director could be working on the matter, prior to the City Manager contacting them.

Mr. Povar stated, as a City Manager, he would want to be the person City Council came to for assistance from City departments. The City Manager knew the organization and the capability of individuals and could assign the matter appropriately.

Councilwoman Scott stated that she had been a member of City Council for approximately 14 years and knew which Department Director handled which matter.

Mr. Povar understood, but reiterated that the City Manager was City Council’s front person.

Councilman Bateman agreed with what Mr. Povar, but felt that an e-mail message to both the Department Director and the City Manager could expedite matters of concern.

City Manager Bourey agreed with the procedure of sending an e-mail message to a Department Director with a copy to him. He stated the challenge came because staff members were incredibly anxious to please. That being said, if a Council member made a request, they would treat such as a priority and may interrupt another project or assignment.

Councilman Bateman understood, as he had seen such matters cause a chain reaction, where too many people were handling the same request.

City Manager Bourey agreed and stated that another challenge came when a request was sent to multiple people and departments. He stated he would not know about the matter and all involved if he was not copied on the matter. He stated such had happened approximately 50 to 100 times since he had been the City Manager.

Mr. Povar continued with the “Grey” Areas that Council – Manager Relations entailed:

- Council member v. Council as a whole
 - Information requests
(Mr. Povar stated if a member of City Council asked for information from the City Manager, the same information should be sent to the entire City Council.)
 - Speaking to the public and press
 - Citizens hat v. Council person hat
(Mr. Povar stated that members of City Council were speaking for the City when they spoke to the press. It was difficult for someone to discern whether you were the spokesperson. It was important that City Council work as a team and through their Public Information Officer. Make sure that statement was handled properly. Work through staff that was trained to issue public statements.)

Councilwoman Scott stated such was rather fuzzy, because the Daily Press Reporter, Mr. Ress, would call to ask her opinion regarding a certain situation, such as the Ivy Tower Apartments matter that was on the evening’s agenda. She stated that the public sometimes wanted to know how a member of City Council felt about a situation, such as the Ivy Tower Apartments matter that did not have the consensus of City Council. She offered her opinion as one member of City Council that represented one district.

Councilwoman Woodbury stated that the Ivy Tower Apartments issue had not been discussed between the City Council and the City Manager, which made it difficult to provide an opinion to the press.

Councilwoman Scott stated that Mr. Ress asked for her opinion about the project. If she provided an opinion to the press, it was based on the facts that she had at that particular time. It was not based on information pulled out of the air. She did not speak on behalf of City Council.

Mayor Price stated that the problem with that was that the public may look at the matter as an argument, which meant that Councilwoman Scott was having a conversation through the paper

rather than with City Council. The public saw that as contention among members of City Council, when they never had the opportunity to discuss the matter. It was actually a false reading that the public was going to get because it looked like an argument, although they did not have the opportunity to discuss the matter.

Mr. Povar stated it was difficult when a microphone was pointed in one's face. It's was difficult to say that the matter had not been discussed by members of City Council. Councilwoman Scott advised that it was an action item, and when a reporter saw an action item, they assumed that it was discussed among the body. Mr. Povar noted that matters got carried over. He stated there was a natural desire to speak, but City Council had to look at matters as a body, and had to be in agreement.

Councilwoman Cherry stated that rule applied to the City Council, but did not apply to the City Manager. When the City Manager made a statement, people could perceive it as City Council's decision. Problems were created if City Council had not had an opportunity to discuss the matter. Not only did the City Council have to be careful, but the City Manager had to be careful as well. When statements were made by the City Manager about a matter that the City Council had not discussed, it appeared that he made the decision without City Council's input.

Mr. Povar stated that matters had to be handled as a body; not individually.

Mr. Povar noted rules for Council members v. City Council:

- Rule of 4
- Citizen/district representation pressures
- Bringing issues to Council's attention
- Agenda items
(Mr. Povar stated members of City Council should not add items to the agenda, without speaking to the City Manager.)
- Overcommitting
- Good of the City v. good of my district
(Mr. Povar advised that matters should boil down to what was good for the City.)
- Being a good partner

Mr. Povar noted Standards and Documentation that City Council and the City Manager should follow (see information attached and made a part of these minutes):

- Newport News City Charter & Ordinances (see attached information)

- Adopted Policies and Procedures
 - Ethics
 - Procedures: agenda, rules of order, etc.
(Mr. Povar suggested that City Council adopt and vote on their Rules of Procedure at their Organizational meeting.)
 - Council/Manager relationship
 - Staff relationship
 - Other travel, committee appointments, etc.
- Enforcement – Council rules are to be enforced by City Council
- Samples of Rules of Procedure: Blacksburg, Staunton, etc. (see attached information)\ (Mr. Povar stated it was on the shoulders of City Council to discipline their colleagues due policy and procedure violations.)

Mayor Price inquired whether it should be done in Open or Closed Session. Mr. Povar suggested that it be done in Closed Session under personnel, but confer with the City Attorney. This was something that few Council members did, but it sometimes became necessary.

Mr. Povar noted the Newport News City Charter provision regarding Section 5.03 – Interference by Council in Appointments or Removal; Dealings between Council and Administration. He stated the provision jumped out at him, as it was a Class 4 Misdemeanor.

Councilwoman Scott questioned whether interference dealt with a matter concerning a person who might share an incident with her and she reported it to the City Manager. Mr. Povar replied no; interference would deal with the hiring or promotion of one's family member and/or friend.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether interference meant that City Council could not get involved with employee issues. Mr. Povar replied that they could listen, but would have to pass the matter on. There were many rules and procedures in place for City employees; however, they had to go through the correct channels that were in place for their protection.

Mr. Povar noted rules for Other Appointees of City Council:

- **Attorney**
 - Represents the City, not the City Council
 - Bound by Ethical and Confidentiality standards
 - Must serve the Council as a whole
 - Items discussed with one Council member will be shared with the entire body

- Directives – majority vote
(Mr. Povar reiterated that items discussed with one Council member should be discussed with all Council members if there was a legal ethical and unethical issue, and all should to be informed.)
- **City Clerk**
 - Serves the entire Council
 - Critical record keeping and other legal responsibilities
 - Directive – majority vote
 - No favorites/favoritism

Mr. Thomas stated that City Council was at the forefront of another major transition. The Fortune 500 companies were in an information economy, and information flowed faster. The City was in the midst by going to a paperless environment. The Institute and City Managers were dealing with the fact that information was moving too fast, and sometime without facts. He encouraged the members of City Council to begin to think about corporate practices and shift them into a way that was positive and constructive. It was critical to Newport News and the City Council. We were in an era that we had never seen in relation to information. Information used to be sent to the City Manager, who processed the information and forwarded it to his team for resolution; but, due to the information age, the information reached them in a fast way. City Council had to rethink how to do business in this type of environment. There was a very fundamental and different way that we were communicating with one another and it was a very serious issue. He stated the rules in the City Code could not be effective unless City Council was believed and owned the information, which came down to how they communicated.

Mr. Povar stated that one of the biggest changes, and most troubling for the City management profession, was anonymous blogs that disseminated inaccurate information. It was frustrating to try to counter the information, because people believed in the inaccuracy of information. Many managers were concerned and at a standstill as to what to do about the information that bloggers made public. The public could not tell fact from fiction, and had difficulty discerning trust from fiction. The more positive information that could be shared in a solid, uniformed professional way, the better it would be. He encouraged members of City Council to have a conversation with their Public Information Office about how to best get accurate information out to the public.

Mr. Thomas stated that City Council had a great opportunity to get to know each other well enough to stand up for one another. City Council was in a position of tremendous confidence and could build upon their trust for one another. He encouraged members of City Council to develop trust and confidence with each other, by being attentive to issues.

Mayor Price thanked Mr. Thomas and Mr. Povar for the information provided to City Council to improve their communication with each other.

III. The Towers on Ivy Avenue Discussion

City Manager Bourey reminded that the City was presented with a request to authorize approval of Newport News Redevelopment and Housing Authority (NNRHA) issuance of Multi-family Housing Revenue Bonds for the Ivy Tower Apartments in the amount of \$16 million at the August 9, 2016 Regular Meeting of City Council. He advised that he initially recommended denial of the request. Since that time, he had significant conversations with Mr. Michael J. Packard of Weston Associates, Inc., who noted that the structure would remain a Section 8 apartment building for at least 18 years. Mr. Packard convinced him that the renovations would result in a better building for the residents and would add value to the community. He was very comfortable with how the structure would be managed and he recommended that City Council approve the request. He would ask the City Attorney to draft a Resolution to be presented for approval by City Council during the September 13, 2016 Regular Meeting under New Business. He introduced Mr. Packard to provide a briefing on what Weston Associates, Inc., planned to do and how they would manage property.

Mr. Packard advised that Weston Associates had been in the affordable housing business since 1969. He stated that Weston had done a tremendous amount of development with U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) subsidized projects (turn-key projects for local housing authorities). Local housing authorities hired Weston Associates to renovate/build a structure and set it up, stabilize it and turn it over. Weston Associates was one of the first management companies of HUD subsidized apartment complexes in the United States. They managed properties for some of the biggest operators in the U.S.

Mr. Packard stated that Weston took affordable projects, such as the Towers that were old, aging and had not been rehabilitated and reinvigorated them by using low-income tax credits. Low-income tax credits, paired with tax-exempt bond financing, offered a developer the opportunity to put a significant amount of capital into buildings. They physically repaired all of a building's systems.

Mr. Packard stated the Towers needed physical and management attention. He noted the physical first, to be followed by the management attention needed. The Towers was built in 1973 and opened in 1976. The building was old and had never been significantly rehabilitated. The building's components were installed in the 1970s. The building needed to be rehabilitated.

Mr. Packard advised that Weston planned to take the envelope off of the building because it contained non-friable Asbestos materials. It was a strange wall system that was leaking and causing the

insulation to deteriorate. Weston was taking the façade completely off of the building and replacing it with a brand new system. They were replacing all the building's windows and doors as well as the heating and cooling system. They were replacing the heating system with a two-pipe system that was extremely energy efficient and would generate hot water to heat the building. Weston was also installing a cooling tower to provide coolant to the building. At the end of the day, the building was going to have central air and heating that would work in every room. Weston was completely redoing the Fire Alarm System, and modernizing the elevators. They planned to install sprinklers in the building, beginning with the first floor. They planned to install all new floors in each unit, with the exception of the bathroom floor because they were already tiled. They would install new kitchen floors and carpet, and new electric appliances, kitchen cabinets, sinks, faucets with low flow sensors, and countertops. They planned to install new LED lighting fixtures throughout the entire complex. The units and the hallways would be painted. The biggest change, aside from the HVAC system, was Weston planned to completely rehabilitate the first floor of the building and would build a Community Room, new management office, new laundry room, new mailboxes, handicapped accessible bathrooms, and new entryway on the first floor. Weston planned to completely redo the first floor and would take seven of the eight existing units and make them ADA accessible.

Mr. Packard stated that Weston would rehabilitate the Towers in the way that would better suit the needs of the residents. The newspaper reported that the majority of residents were elderly and/or disabled. The building was going to be renovated for the residents, and they would feel good about calling it their home. The people who needed handicapped-accessible units would be able to move into a new accessible unit.

Mr. Packard stated, on the management side, Weston planned to bring in a Resident Service Coordinator (Social Worker) who would work on the property and help people get the services they needed, whether employment or Meals on Wheels. Weston planned to install a Computer Learning Center, which had been unbelievably successful at other locations. Weston planned to have a hands-on approach to the building. Weston was a unique company, was respected and was family run. The residents knew them personally at many of their properties. He looked at buildings as if they were his children. He cared about the buildings, spent a lot of time developing them and visited them at unusual hours to stay abreast of what was going on. He wanted to know that everyone was secure. Weston wanted to be a good steward and neighbor. They worked hand in hand with the Police Department. He believed that the City would not get a better owner for the Towers because they cared about the buildings they rehabilitated and managed as well as the residents.

Councilwoman Scott applauded the improvements that Mr. Packard suggested as they were quality of life issues. She believed some people who resided in the Towers had lived under such circumstances for a long time. The proposal noted by Mr. Packard would drastically change the lives of

the residents, especially those who suffered with disabilities. She inquired about the elderly and disabled residents who would continue to reside above the first floor who would not be relocated to the handicapped accessible units on the first floor.

Mr. Packard replied that the elevators would serve the other residents on the upper floors. He stated the handicapped accessible units had to be kept on the ground floor because the elevators were not large enough to handle certain weight capacities. By City Code, Weston could not put the accessible units on top floors.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the first floor was the only floor that could accommodate residents who needed wheel chairs. Mr. Packard replied the first floor would be the only floor that would have handicap accessible units.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the elderly and disabled residents on floors above the first floor who used canes and walkers. Mr. Packard replied that the handicap units would not be reserved for specific residents. He stated there would be a preference for people in need of the features in the first floor units.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the Towers was filled to capacity. Mr. Packard replied yes.

Councilwoman Scott understood there was 140 units and inquired whether any units would be compromised to construct the new rooms on the first floor, such as the computer room, the management office, and others. Mr. Packard replied that they would take the existing common space and build it out. They would gain 800 square feet from the first floor.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the Resident Service Coordinator would be hired and monitored by Weston Associates. Mr. Packard replied yes; they would work at the property, would dedicate 100% to the property, and would be supervised by the Boston office.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about parking. Mr. Packard replied that there was a huge parking lot, which would be resurfaced and repaired. A camera security system would be installed on and throughout the property. The effective way that they controlled criminal activity was through stringent resident selection and the lockdown of buildings to control who entered and exited. There would be one main entrance and activity would be recorded and time-stamped through the security camera system. Information would be shared with the Police Department if or when necessary.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether units would go out of service due to the installation of new HVAC systems. Mr. Packard replied no; Weston had become experts at in place renovations.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether Weston was using local HVAC contractors to assist with the renovations. Mr. Packard replied that Weston would use local general contractors. A Weston project manager/coordinator would come to the area and work with a local general contractor.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether the Towers rehabilitation venture would help Weston in the southern part of the country since most of their properties were located in the northern part of the country, such as in New England and Maine. Mr. Packard replied yes. He stated the weather could become unbearable during the winter months in Maine.

Councilman Bateman inquired about the number of units under management by Weston Associates. Mr. Packard replied approximately 2,500.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether Weston had been able to use weatherization funds available through the federal government for the Towers or any of its projects. Mr. Packard replied no.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether Weston used different syndicators or the same ones each time for their projects. Mr. Packard replied they used a variety of syndicators. Weston dealt with approximately four groups as their syndicators. It depended upon who provided the best deal. The syndicators for the Tower's project were local and were using Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) credits. He did not have the name of the entity or person.

Councilman Bateman stated he appreciated Mr. Packard's attendance at the Work Session to offer information to City Council about the project.

Councilman Harris inquired whether any of the Towers' residents would be required to be out of their units for a specific period of time. He was concerned about the large number of elderly and handicapped residents in the building. Mr. Packard replied that it depended on what was going on in the unit and their preference. Weston usually set up a day unit for residents to relax in as their units were being renovated. The Community Room would also be accessible for the residents. They worked with each individual to determine their needs.

Councilwoman Cherry thanked Mr. Packard for the briefing. She noted the two concerns she shared previously with Mr. Packard: 1) What would Weston do to change the resident's mindset to take care of the property; 2) Whether Weston would meet with the residents to note expectations; and 3) When would Weston meet with the residents? Mr. Packard replied that the seller did not want the information announced until after settlement. He stated he would meet with the tenants once the project was finalized with all parties.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether current residents of the Towers Apartments would be allowed to remain until their lease expired, and whether they would be re-evaluated to determine whether they qualified to sign a new lease. Mr. Packard replied that Weston would accept any of the current residents and they would have first preference; however, they would have to abide by the rules and requirements to remain a resident of the building. HUD required a 12-month lease, and month-to-month following the one year requirement. Weston would meet with the tenants to explain the requirements.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about sustainability of the building and whether Weston would have someone periodically maintain the building. Mr. Packard replied that Weston would have site staff that would be dedicated to the building at all times. He stated that regional staff would visit the building monthly or as needed, and he would show-up from time to time.

City Manager Bourey asked the City Attorney to draft a Resolution in support of the project for adoption by City Council at the evening's (September 13, 2016) meeting under New Business.

City Attorney Owens replied he would have the Resolution for the evening's meeting.

IV. Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Program Submittals

City Manager Bourey stated that each year staff came before City Council with a list of projects for State funds, which need and/or did not need the approval of City Council. He introduced Mr. Everett Skipper, Director, Department of Engineering, to provide the presentation.

Mr. Skipper stated the Department of Engineering annually submitted approximately 12 or more projects for transportation funding. He reminded, in FY 2016, the City obtained approximately \$9 million of 50/50 Revenue Sharing funds, approximately \$9 million of 100% State and Federal HB2 funds, \$8 million of Federal Land Access Program funds, and additional funds from various sources. The City had been very successful in trying to fund projects across the board. He stated several projects required the approval of City Council. He noted two applications and projects that required City Council action (a copy of presentation, "FY 2018 State and Federal Transportation Funding Applications", is attached and made a part of these minutes):

1. **Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)** – This was a Federal Program and its goal was to enhance alternatives to reduce vehicle traffic, through Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements. The program provided an 80% Federal contribution with a 20% Local match. A Resolution of support by City Council and the Hampton Roads Transportation

Planning Organization was required. There was \$1.7 million of regional funding available in the Hampton Roads region.

- **FY 2018 Requests**

- Washington Avenue Street Scape Phase II
 - 30th Street to 34th Street
 - Connect Apprentice School to HRT Transit Center Sidewalks, handicap ramps, and lighting
 - Phase I included in Apprentice School
 - Current Application \$500,000: Federal \$400,000; City Match \$100,000
 - Previously awarded \$500,000 in TAP funding in 2015
 - Will request final \$500,000 in FY 2019

2. **Revenue Sharing Program** – This was a 50/50 State and City funding match program, which was used for general road and transit infrastructure projects. There was an annual limit of \$10 million from the State, which amounted to a total of \$20 million to include the City match. The statewide target for funding in FY 2018 was \$100 million, down from \$150 million in FY 2017. The State was moving more funding to HB2. Revenue Sharing Program funding would decrease over time and was expected to be eliminated over the next six years. A Resolution of support from City Council was required.

City Manager Bourey explained that over the course of time, Revenue Sharing had been 50/50, but because of reduced program funding, the State did not fund some of the City's FY 2017 projects. He stated that caused some confusion among several members of City Council regarding funding for Hogan Drive. The City only received a portion of the 50/50 funding for Hogan Drive. Mr. Skipper agreed, and advised that the State initially advised the City that certain projects would be funded fully and certain projects would only be funded by one-third, which was increased to two-thirds of partially funded projects. Some projects did not receive any funding. This was a State application process to be submitted in October 2016. At that time, the State would advise the City of the approved projects by February 2017, which would be acted on by the Commonwealth's Transportation Board in May 2017. Funds would become available in July of FY 2017 - 2018.

City Manager Bourey pointed out that the funding received was one-third and/or two-thirds of the 50% match; not one-third or two-thirds of the project.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether it was possible that the City would receive additional funding in FY 2017 – 2018, if improvements to Hogan Drive were delayed. City Manager

Bourey replied that the City was going to apply for additional funding; however, the problem was they could not wait for FY 2017 – 2018 to make improvement to a particular section of Hogan Drive, because there were buildings that needed to be constructed.

Councilwoman Woodbury asked about the reason that the project could not be delayed. City Manager Bourey replied that a portion of the Tech Center needed to be constructed immediately, not a year from now, which was part of the problem. Mr. Skipper pointed out that Revenue Sharing funding would be reduced each year, and the City had a better chance of obtaining funding in FY 2017 - 2018 than in years to come.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the \$6.3 million proposed for Hogan Drive was the City's share and the State funding. Mr. Skipper replied the \$6.3 million was the total share between the City and the State (\$3 million each).

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the Resolution that was on the evening's agenda (September 13, 2016) requesting \$5.6 million for Public Infrastructure & Facilities Incentive Contribution for the Tech Center Phase I and the additional \$6 million included to the FY 2017 - 2018 State Funding request for Phase II of the Tech Center. City Manager Bourey replied the \$5.6 million was for Phase I of the Hogan Drive project, and the \$6 million included the State share for Phase II.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired of the percentage of State Revenue Sharing funding that the City received for Phase I of the Tech Center and Hogan Drive project. Mr. Skipper replied that the City asked for \$2 million for Hogan Drive in FY 2017 and received \$2 million (\$1 million from the State and \$1 million from the City); however, that money could not be spent on Phase I because of the timing. There were many rules as it pertained to Federal and State funding. The \$1 million would be a part of the future phases, either Phase II or Phase III.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the amount of funding the City received for Phase I of the project and the amount required by the City. Mr. Skipper reiterated that the City requested \$2 million from the State in FY 2017, because they hoped to move the project at a certain pace, but it became necessary to move the project sooner.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the need to move the project sooner. City Manager Bourey replied it was necessary to have the road constructed and in operation for the apartments and the 8,000 square foot Office Research building.

Councilwoman Woodbury felt that if this was all predicated on the Ion Collider, which the Governor and City wanted, why the State was not providing additional funding for the project. City

Manager Bourey stated that the project was not all predicated on the Ion Collider; the project made sense whether or not the Ion Collider was ever awarded to Jefferson Laboratory and the City just built the Research Center. Yes, it would be helpful, but this was to accommodate the private investment of one million square-feet of office and research space; it was not to acquire the Ion Collider.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the reason for the urgency. City Manager Bourey replied to build the Tech Center.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the Habersham Drive Extension project, and stated it was part of the Wegmans proposal. When she asked about the funding previously, she understood that the City had to acquire the approval of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and the Airport Commission to build the road. She inquired whether approval had been received from either entity. City Manager Bourey replied that the City received VDOT approval, but had not received approval from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This funding was for the cost of the relocation of Habersham Drive, which was not fully funded. Mr. Skipper agreed, and stated that the City originally asked for \$6 million for the entire Habersham Drive Extension project and was awarded \$4 million in FY 2017.

Councilwoman Cherry questioned what portion of Habersham Drive the \$4 million would be used for. She inquired whether the City received permission from VDOT and the FAA to do the Habersham Drive extension project. She further questioned why the extension was necessary if the City already knew that it was not going to get the full amount of Revenue Sharing. City Manager Bourey stated that the City needed FAA approval. Mr. Skipper replied that staff did not say that they did not expect the State to fund the project. In fact, the City received \$17.3 million in FY 2017 out of its request for \$20 million.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired which projects would be funded with \$17.3 million. Mr. Skipper replied that the City asked for \$4 million for Atkinson Boulevard and received \$4 million. The City asked for \$1.3 million for Warwick Boulevard and received \$1.3 million. The City asked for \$1.25 million for Lake Maury Bridge and received \$1.25 million. The City asked for \$4.5 million for Jefferson Avenue Streetscape (12th to 24th Streets) and received \$4.5 million. Many of the projects were fully funded, partially funded and not funded at all. The City requested \$250,000 for the ADA Ramps/Sidewalks new and maintenance projects, but did not receive any funding. The City requested \$6 million for Habersham Drive and received \$4.1 million. There were differences in all pieces and the City applied for funding with the hope that the State would fund all of the projects.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the Habersham Drive extension was coming off of the interstate down to Boykin Lane. City Manager Bourey replied no; Boykin Lane was included with the realignment of Brick Kiln Boulevard.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether Habersham was on the side where the proposed Wegmans would have been located. Mr. Skipper replied yes; Habersham was the street that was on the West Side of Jefferson Avenue by Lowe's Home Improvement Store.

Mr. Skipper pointed out that VDOT was not funding a particular part of a project when they awarded partial funding for roadway construction. VDOT provided the funding, and the City distributed the funding as they saw fit. The entire project was constructed when the City received full funding from VDOT. The City had to decide whether to do the entire project, part of the project or whether to return the funding when partial funding was received from VDOT. That was how the City received additional funding in FY 2017, as other localities returned funding to VDOT.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the \$4 million received in FY 2017 for the Habersham Road Extension was being held in the City's budget. Mr. Skipper replied yes.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the project that the \$4 million was being held for. She inquired whether the \$4 million was for the Wegmans extension project or whether the City was adding the \$4 million to the \$2 million for the Wegmans extension project. Mr. Skipper replied that there was no Wegmans.

Councilwoman Cherry understood that, but the initial request for the Habersham Drive Extension was to accommodate the Wegmans project. She questioned what the \$4 million would be used for. City Manager Bourey replied that the City did not receive \$4 million in FY 2017; the City received \$2 million in State funding. Mr. Skipper agreed.

Councilwoman Cherry questioned what the \$2 million for Habersham Drive would be used for. Mr. Skipper replied that it had not yet been fully determined what the funds would be used for.

City Manager Bourey replied that the funds would be used to build the realignment at Habersham Drive. He stated that City Council did not have to apply for funding if they did not want to move forward with the realignment of Habersham Drive.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the need to realign Habersham Drive. City Manager Bourey replied that the realignment would improve traffic conditions.

Councilwoman Cherry stated that she recalled that the City Manager stated that FAA approval was needed to construct the Habersham Drive extension. City Manager Bourey replied that the City would seek approval of the FAA to construct the Habersham Drive extension, as approval had not yet been received.

Mr. Skipper reiterated that the projects would be submitted to the State in October 2016, the City would receive approval/disapproval in January/February 2017, the Commonwealth Transportation Board would provide final approval/disapproval in May 2017, and funding for approved projects would be available in July 2017.

- **FY 2018 Applications**

- Jefferson Avenue Streetscape (12th to 24th Street) - \$4 million
- Campbell Road North - \$2 million
- Hogan Drive Extension Phase II - \$6.3 million
- Habersham Drive Extension - \$2 million
- Independence Boulevard - \$5 million (Primary Connector Road between Denbigh and Fort Eustis Boulevards and the matches were funded by the developer of Huntington Point)
- Traffic Signal Upgrade (Jefferson Avenue & Bellwood Road) - \$450,000
- Annual ADA Ramps/Sidewalks - \$250,000

Total Funding Amounts Shown Above – City Share is 50%

Councilwoman Woodbury stated it was interesting that the developer was going to provide match funding for the Independence Boulevard project instead of the City and yet, the City was providing match funding for the Habersham Drive Extension.

Mr. Skipper stated that the above-noted projects totaled \$20 million, which was the maximum that the City was allowed to request. He stated that the City realized that the total amount requested in FY 2017 was not fully funded; however, \$17 million of the \$20 million requested was funded, which was very successful.

Mr. Skipper noted other road funded projects that did not require the approval of City Council. He stated that City Council would have the opportunity to review the projects before the City proceeded, because they have to appropriate the funding received from the State.

3. **Other Road Funding Projects**

- **State of Good Repair** – This was new in 2016 and was focused on facilities at the end of their service life (Route 105 Bridge over the Reservoir). The City received \$8 million in Revenue Sharing in FY 2017 towards the construction, and \$9 million was being requested in FY 2018. VDOT pre-selected the projects. The City received 100% grant funding.

- **Smart Scale (Formerly HB2)**
 - **2018 Applications**
 - Jefferson Ramp C - \$6 million
 - Intersection Improvements, Jefferson Avenue & Yorktown Road - \$2 million
 - Campbell Road Improvements North - \$7.5 million
 - Pedestrian Improvements – Warwick Boulevard to Bland Boulevard - \$2.8 million
 - Jefferson Avenue Widening – Kings Ridge Drive to Industrial Park Drive - \$34 million
 - Warwick Blvd. Widening – Nettles Drive to Boxley Boulevard - \$39.5 million
 - Harpersville Road/Saunders Road (J. Clyde Morris Boulevard to City Line) - \$67 million
 - Rt. 105 Reservoir Bridge - \$9 million
 - Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
 - Project Eligibility determined by:
 - Historical crash and volume data
 - Improvement benefit to cost ratio
 - FY 2018 Applications
 - Traffic Signal Upgrades Citywide
 - New Traffic Signals

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the widening projects on Warwick Boulevard and Jefferson Avenue. She stated the City was already landlocked, and questioned how the widening projects would be achieved. She believed that such would put businesses closer to the roadways. Mr. Skipper replied that the right-of-way generally existed for the widening projects in those areas.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether such projects would include one additional lane on each side of the roadway. Mr. Skipper replied that one additional lane would be constructed in each direction of the roadway. The roadway would go from two lanes to three lanes, each way.

Mr. Skipper noted that a Resolution for the above projects would appear on the September 27, 2016 Regular Meeting agenda for action by City Council.

V. City Farm Barn Condition Briefing

City Manager Bourey explained that over the course of many years, the City Farm barn had deteriorated to the point where it had major structural damage. He stated City staff was in the process

of stabilizing the structure, and learned that there were many significant problems than anticipated, and that it would cost a huge amount of money to stabilize and keep the structure from falling down. There also, was no use for the structure. He introduced Mr. Everett Skipper, Director, Department of Engineering, to discuss the condition and specifics of the barn, based on the Engineering Study that was done (a copy of the presentation, "City Farm Barn Update," is attached and made a part of these minutes).

Mr. Skipper stated that the initial purpose for repairing the barn was to shore-up the roof and replace the shingles so that the building would be dry and livable. He stated the City issued a contract for \$82,766. The work was put on hold and the City spent \$52,772 of the \$82,766 to-date. The two problems found were structural and pest damage. The total cost to repair the structure amounted to \$332,946. He stated that \$60,000 of the total cost was for pest control damage and the remaining funds would address structural damage. Mr. Skipper noted examples of the damage to the property (see photos in the presentation attached to these minutes):

- Exterior walls on the second floor bow out 4 inches in each direction
- Floor boards were deteriorated
- Termite and post-boring beetle damage to framing members
- Stair step cracks in the Brickwork
- Concrete retaining wall was in disrepair

Mr. Skipper reiterated that the original plan was to repair the roof; however, in attempting to do so, other damage was noted. He stated the repair cost of \$332,946 only stabilized the building. The cost to demolish the building would be approximately \$70,000. City staff felt that the repair cost was beyond what they believed was necessary and reasonable and wanted to seek City Council guidance.

City Manager Bourey agreed, and stated the repairs would not put the building in a usable state; it would just ensure that the building did not fall down. He did not believe it was in the public's best interest to spend \$332,946 to keep a building that had no use. He did not support spending the funding to stabilize the building. He asked for City Council direction in regards to the matter.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the barn was in the archaeological area that had been designated on the City Farm. City Manager Bourey replied no; the building was outside of the archaeological area that had been identified as holding archaeological resources. He stated the City had submitted an RFP for archaeological services. He introduced Ms. Cindy Rohlf, Assistant City Manager, to highlight the three archaeological areas that were noted on the City Farm property. Ms. Claire Murphy, Project Manager of Historic Services, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, provided a slide presentation that noted the archaeological areas of the City Farm.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf pointed out the three archaeological areas that were found on the City Farm's property.

Ms. Murphy advised that an RFP for archaeological work for three areas on the City Farm had been put out to bid. She advised that the City Farm barn was outside of the archaeological area. Historic Services identified three hot spots on the property that were identified as having archaeological significance.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf stated that a hot spot meant that the City may find something of archaeological significance, which could be shards of glass, pottery, or other matters of importance, based on what had already been found in the proposed area.

City Manager Bourey inquired about the gymnasium on the City Farm property.

Ms. Murphy stated that the gymnasium was in relatively good shape. The area that housed the gymnasium was the one area that had a Phase III Study. She explained there were generally three steps to an archaeological investigation and the gymnasium was the only area that reached Phase III, because of when it was built.

Councilwoman Cherry questioned when the gymnasium was built as opposed to the barn. Ms. Murphy replied that the barn was built in the mid to late 1930s and the gymnasium was built in the 1990s.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the potential of there being archaeological artifacts on the barn property, since it was built before the gymnasium. Ms. Murphy replied that it could hold artifacts, but it was not included in the regulated archaeological area, which was registered with the State. City Manager Bourey explained that the area was regulated because that was where items were found.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the State would allow expansion of the archaeological area to include the barn property. Ms. Murphy replied it was entirely up to the City to expand the area.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf replied that the sites were based on Phase I and Phase II reviews of the property. Ms. Murphy agreed, and indicated these were the areas that were found to justify reporting to the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

City Manager Bourey advised that the other important piece was that the best way to proceed was to demolish the old City Farm jail structure, which had no use, and find out what was beneath the structure.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf advised, for a thorough study to be done, the buildings would have to be torn down. One could not see what was beneath the buildings until they were torn down. Staff wanted to ensure that City Council was informed as they moved through the process. The Archaeological RFP was due on September 19, 2016.

Councilwoman Cherry questioned when the jail was built. Mr. Michael Poplawski, Director, Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, replied that the jail was probably built in the 1930s.

Councilwoman Cherry stated if the jail and barn were built during the same timeframe (1930s), then there was the potential that the ground beneath the barn could hold archaeological artifacts. Mr. Poplawski replied that a study would need to be completed.

City Manager Bourey pointed out that the City would not disturb any proposed artifacts beneath the structure if it were torn down.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf pointed out that the areas were determined based on an archaeological consultant's professional opinion and recommendation.

Councilman Bateman inquired about the date of the archaeological map that noted the three areas as holding archaeological significance. MS. Murphy replied that the map was from the early 1990s.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether LIDAR technology or ground penetrating radar had been used to determine the archaeological areas of the City Farm property. Ms. Murphy replied that she was not aware of such technology being used. She stated that the City Council would have to say that they wanted to expand the search using recent technology.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf agreed that such had not been done, but the City had the technology. She stated discussions were held about using the technology, but no decision had been made.

Councilman Bateman inquired whether the State would allow the City to expand the area. Ms. Murphy replied it was up to the City to expand the area.

City Manager Bourey agreed that the area could be expanded if City Council desired to do so.

Councilman Bateman stated that the City's archaeological map was out-of-date. He stated new Archaeological technology may point out other areas on the City Farm property with archaeological significance.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf replied that a request for a new search could be requested from the archaeological vendor that the City hired, based on cost. She stated the entire area could be included, based on the cost.

City Manager Bourey reiterated that the artifacts would not be disturbed by the demolition of the barn.

Assistant City Manager Rohlf pointed out that the City had experienced staff that would check the site once the barn was demolished.

Councilman Harris inquired whether there was any benefit to spending the \$332,946 to keep the barn for an event. City Manager Bourey replied that the only benefit was if there was going to be a future use for the barn. He stated that any future use would require a huge investment amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in addition to the \$332,946.

Councilwoman Cherry questioned where the artifacts would be housed if they were found on the property. Mr. Poplawski replied that staff would determine where the artifacts would be housed at a later date.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the gymnasium could be used to house the artifacts, until a final determination was made. She inquired whether the gymnasium could become a museum. Mr. Poplawski replied that it could, but the building was not in an appropriate long-term location.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the area could become a historic site should artifacts be found. Mr. Poplawski replied it could; it was up to the City to designate the property as a historic site. That would not necessarily guarantee that nothing else could be done with the site.

Mayor Price inquired whether there was consensus among City Council to demolish the City Farm Barn. There was consensus among City Council to demolish the City Farm Barn.

Councilwoman Woodbury believed that the City Farm Barn was deliberately neglected so that it would eventually be demolished, which she felt was criminal.

Councilwoman Scott believed that over time the building deteriorated, and was not deliberately neglected.

VI. Comment/Ideas/Suggestions

City Manager Bourey stated he was asked to travel to China to make a major presentation at the Smart Cities Conference in Shang du, sponsored by the University of Science and Technology of China. He received a two-week notice, and indicated that he could not travel to China. Instead, he offered to provide a video presentation on projects taking place in the City of Newport News, which was very well received. He stated that there may be positive fallout about the video presentation.

Councilman Bateman thanked the Mayor for setting-up the Virginia Institute of Government presentation. He felt the presentation was productive.

Councilman Bateman asked the City Manager to do more with open spaces that were located as one was travelling on and off of Interstate I-64. He noted Exit Ramps 256A/B and 257A/B off of I-64 at Route 17. The trash in the area was awful. He felt the area needed to be made aesthetically pleasing. City Manager Bourey stated he would report the matter to VDOT.

Councilwoman Scott agreed and asked that the I-664 exits as one came off of Aberdeen and Chestnut Avenues be addressed as well.

Councilman Bateman stated as one exited the Interstate, coming from Suffolk at the 35th/36th Street towards Warwick Boulevard, the signs were impeding one's ability to exit the roadway. It was hard to see the signage, and the exit was horribly marked. He asked the City Manager to have staff look into the matter.

Mayor Price pointed out that there was no sign for merging traffic as motorists merged on to I-664 at 26th Street and Jefferson Avenue. He had seen and almost been involved in several accidents. City Manager Bourey stated he would have staff look into both matters.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about removal of the bench on 27th Street, adjacent to the 7-Eleven. Assistant City Manager Rohlf stated the City asked 7-Eleven to install the bench; however, the trash issue had been resolved.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether the pond issue had been resolved. Assistant City Manager Rohlf replied that she had sent a report to Councilwoman Cherry noting that the pond was improperly designed and staff was working on a redesign plan.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired whether Mayor Price had called about the sign being down on Shore Drive.

Councilwoman Cherry thanked the City Manager for the presentation made by the Virginia Institute of Government.

Councilwoman Cherry thanked the City Manager for the traffic light that was installed on 16th Street and Wickham Avenue.

Councilwoman Cherry inquired about the plan for vacant land that resulted from a structure being demolished. Assistant City Manager Rohlf replied that a briefing was planned in the near future about a project that staff was working on in regards to the use of vacant land.

City Clerk Mabel Washington Jenkins stated that the Certificate of Voting Delegates for the Virginia Municipal League Annual Conference, on October 9 – 11, 2016, was due by September 23, 2016, which would be before City Council's next meeting. She stated that a Resolution approving the designation of City Councils' Voting Delegates for the VML Conference was needed.

City Attorney Owens replied that the Voting Delegates could be determined by a motion of City Council at today's Work Session.

Councilwoman Woodbury moved to designate Vice Mayor Vick as the Voting Delegate and herself as the Alternate for the 2016 VML Annual Conference; seconded by Councilman Bateman.

Vote on Roll Call:

Ayes: Harris, Price, Scott, Vick, Woodbury, Bateman, Cherry

Nays: None

Councilman Harris stated that a former resident of the City of Newport News, Mr. Allen Iverson, had been inducted into the Basketball Hall of Fame. He stated, regardless of what some might feel, the younger generation looked up to Mr. Iverson. He suggested that a historical marker be erected in the Stuart Garden Apartment complex where Mr. Iverson lived for several years. This would be an encouragement to youth.

Councilwoman Scott inquired whether the City Manager could look at what could be done to aesthetically improve the Lee Hall area, by the intersection of Lee Hall Drive and Amherst Lane near the Lee Hall Depot. She stated the area needed some attention.

Councilwoman Scott inquired about the status of the Lee Hall Depot and the acquisition of the funds and contracts.

Mr. Skipper replied that a project for the Lee Hall area was on the books and funded. He advised that the challenge had been dealing with the property owner, CSX, who had been arguing about their rights. The City was continuing to work with CSX and believed that a resolution was close. He agreed that the area was in need of attention, and a project was planned.

Mr. Skipper replied, in regards to the Lee Hall Depot, the State Department of Historic Resources had to allow the City to bid the contract. City staff was in contact with the Department and continued to work on the matter.

Councilwoman Scott asked Mr. Skipper to provide a briefing in writing so that she could share the information with her constituents.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired whether City Council would consider canceling the November 8, 2016 Regular Meeting of City Council due to the Presidential Election. There was consensus among City Council to cancel the November 8, 2016 meeting of City Council. City Attorney Owens stated he would prepare the Resolution Canceling the November 8, 2016 City Council Meeting for adoption by City Council at its September 27, 2016 Regular Meeting.

Councilwoman Woodbury inquired about the appointment of Mr. Keith Parnell to the Transportation District Commission of Hampton Roads by the Governor Terry McAuliffe. She recalled that the City Council had a discussion and made a recommendation the last time that an appointment was made to the Commission. She inquired about the process as City Council never made a recommendation. City Manager Bourey stated that the City did not have anything to do with the appointment, and had no input. It was an appointment made solely by the Governor.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 6:11 P.M.


Jennifer D. Walker, MMC
Chief Deputy City Clerk

McKinley L. Price
Mayor
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk