

**MINUTES OF WORK SESSION  
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL  
HELD AT THE DOWNING-GROSS CULTURAL ARTS CENTER  
2410 WICKHAM AVENUE  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2024, 5:00 P.M.**

---



**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Councilwoman Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Vice Mayor Curtis D. Bethany III; Councilman John R. Eley III; Councilman Marcellus L. Harris III, D. Div; Mayor Phillip Jones; Councilman Cleon M. Long, P.E.; and Councilwoman Tina L. Vick

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Alan Archer, Robert Pealo, Mabel Washington Jenkins, Darlene Bradberry, Lisa Cipriano, Cory Cloud, Virginia Lovell, Sheila McAllister, Flora Chioros, Florence Kingston, Derek Perry, Fire Chief Wesley Rogers, Police Chief Steve Drew, Jered Grimes, Frank James, Craig Galant, James McElheney, Allison Dichoso, LaTessa Davis, Kimberly Bracy, Marlin McDaniel, Jeff Albright, Jerri Wilson, Kim Thomas, Yann Le Gouellec, Ralph "Bo" Clayton, David Freeman, Eoghan "Owen" Miller, Tiffany Conatser, Kay Ferguson, Kristin Chhim, Joye Thompkins, Kellen Reed, Dorothy Shuler, Joshua Cajune, Mark Jordan, Noelle Pinkard, William Harrell, Ray Amoruso, Robert Lee, Pam Hall, Angela Futrell, Brian Woolfolk, Dwight Riddick, Willard Maxwell, Reginald Woodhouse, Joni Ivey, Giselle Russell, Josh Janney, and Zina F. Middleton

Mayor Jones called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone.

**I. Peninsula Ferry Feasibility and Market Study**

City Manager Archer advised that Hampton Roads Transit (HRT) would provide information regarding its evaluation and study results for a new passenger ferry service between the Peninsula and Waterside in Norfolk. He introduced Mr. William Harrell, HRT President and CEO, Mr. Ray Amoruso, HRT Chief Planning and Development Officer, and Mr. Robert Lee, HRT Regional Transit System Manager. (A copy of the presentation "Peninsula Ferry Feasibility and Market Study" August 13, 2024 is attached and made a part of the agenda.)

Mr. Amoruso shared members of the HRT Board requested the feasibility and market study. He indicated that HRT put together some funding to explore the opportunity and to look at the feasibility of passenger service between the Peninsula cities and the Southside. He advised that the study examined the following:

- Potential Ridership
- Infrastructure Needs
- Estimated Capital Costs
- Operational Requirements
- Operating and Maintenance Costs

Mr. Amoruso advised of the history of ferry service and studies as follows:

- Several studies and plans for ferry service:
  - Downtown Vision Plan (Newport News, 2016)
  - Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) Hampton Roads Fast Ferry Feasibility Report (2013)
  - HRT Waterborne Transit Concepts Study (2010)
  - HRT Newport News Feasibility Study (2004)
- Harbor Link ferry service operated between Hampton and Norfolk (1999 - 2002) and was discontinued due to low ridership:
  - The Zephyr was a 149-passenger ferry that operated on a two-hour frequency, with a \$5 one-way fare. Service was operated from 7:15 a.m. to 8:15 p.m., except for Fridays and Saturdays during the summer months.

Mr. Amoruso indicated that the market analysis was performed to determine the ferry service feasibility for the Cities of Hampton and Newport News. The HRT study began with the market analysis and the main factors to help determine the ferry feasibility of the region:

- Job and Population Density
  - Density was the #1 indicator of transit use
  - This helps in understanding local population and potential success of ferry services
- Commuter Propensity
  - Examined the prevalence of employed individuals and existing transit commuters
  - Identified areas with high potential ferry commuters
- Travel Flow Data
  - Analyzed current travel patterns, which encompassed both daily commuters and general travel
  - Travel Flow data informed of placement of ferry terminals
- Stakeholders Interviews
  - Stakeholders provided insight into pre-existing site challenges and opportunities
- Site Visits
  - Provided context to ferry sites, infrastructure challenges and development opportunities and HRT reviewed background information (previous ferry studies of the area)

Mr. Lee advised that for the ferry service to be viable and optimal, HRT reviewed ridership per peak period, number of passengers would riding during peak period in the mornings from 6:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. and in the evenings from 3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. for the service to work. He indicated while looking at other agencies that were of similar size HRT came up with the number of 150 as optimal. He shared there was very low ridership potential between Newport News and Hampton identified, while Hampton only met the ridership during the PM peak period. He shared the predicted peak period passenger trip data as follows:

Proposed Ferry Location	AM Peak Trips (Southside to NN)	PM Peak Trips (NN to Southside)
28 <sup>TH</sup> Street	235	220
23 <sup>rd</sup> Street	155	150

Mr. Lee shared that during stakeholder interviews he had an opportunity to talk to Ms. Sheila McAllister, Director, Department of Planning, and Ms. Angela Hopkins, Senior Planner, to review the Newport News Downtown Vision Plan for potential sites. He indicated that HRT looked at three sites within the City of Newport News which included the small boat harbor (1067 Jefferson Avenue, 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, and 28<sup>th</sup> Street, but the small boat harbor was ruled out. He shared the following information regarding the stakeholder interviews:

- Interviews offered insight into local obstacles and future development plans
  - Newport News Downtown Vision Plan
  - Downtown Hampton Master Plan
- Stakeholders included members of local government, maritime experts, US Coast Guard, US Army Corps of Engineers, and more
- Interviews confirmed the infeasibility of specific sites included military installations with force protection concerns

Mr. Lee advised that Mr. David Jordan, Norfolk by Boat, indicated 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and 28<sup>th</sup> Street in Newport News, and Virginia Air & Space Science Center in Hampton would be good locations. The US Coast Guard, spoke to HRT about the viability of 28<sup>th</sup> Street, but would necessitate approval through the US Coast Guard for a new pier. He indicated that Ms. Mary Fugere of the Hampton Convention and Visitor Bureau noted the Hampton Maritime Center would be a great short-term location as the Hampton Downtown Vision Plan for the waterfront showed potential for future upgrades near the Virginia Air & Space Science Center. The City of Norfolk and US Army Corps of Engineers were both supportive of additional service at the Waterside Terminal, and mentioned the initial stages of a Coastal Storm Risk Management project that may impact ferry services during construction of a sea wall.

Mr. Lee indicated that site visits had been done at 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Street, and the small boat harbor to gather firsthand, ground-level information about potential ferry landing sites. He shared that the small boat harbor was ruled out because there was very little potential for destinations in that area presently, or in the long-term, as it was primarily residential. He indicated that the seafood market was coming in, but there would be difficulty navigating because it was all a no wake zone throughout the channel and that increased the transit time therefore making it a longer trip.

Mr. Lee indicated the following after review of previous studies, ridership potential, stakeholder interviews, and site visits, HRT narrowed its scope of feasible ferry landings to five locations:

#### **The Peninsula:**

1. 28<sup>th</sup> Street, Newport News
2. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, Newport News
3. Virginia Air and Space Science Center, Hampton
4. Hampton Maritime Center

#### **Southside**

1. HRT Waterside Ferry Terminal, Norfolk

Mr. Lee shared the pros and cons of the potential **23<sup>rd</sup> Street** ferry landing sites as follows:

- Pros:
  - Site visit and stakeholders support this location for a near-term location
  - Bulkhead supportive of ferry infrastructure for use in the near-term
  - Close to public transit connections and proposed development
- Cons:
  - Weather exposure
  - Location not as close to shipyard
  - Parking conflicts with nearby residential and commercial uses

Mr. Lee shared the pros and cons of the potential **28<sup>th</sup> Street** ferry landing sites as follows:

- Pros:
  - Near Newport News Shipbuilding and associated facilities
  - Newport News Downtown Vision Plan proposed a pier/ferry service and entertainment in this location
  - Close to public transit connections and proposed development
- Cons:
  - Would be a longer-term option as there was currently no supporting infrastructure
  - Dredging and permitting would be required
  - Parking needed to be available


Mr. Lee shared an illustration from the Newport News Downtown Vision plan showing the actual layout of the proposed route; the only difference from the route that HRT had in the survey study itself was that the ferry service would not go to Portsmouth, which was identified within the City’s plan. The ferry service would travel straight to Norfolk and back which allowed a 60-minute travel time and 10 minutes of embarkation time at the pier.

Mr. Lee pointed out the navigation restrictions from Newport News to Norfolk as follows:

30 knots	Distance (Miles)	Max Speed (Knots)	Travel Time (Mins)
Hampton River	0.46	5	5
Hampton Roads	11.0	30	19
Elizabeth River	2.30	5	24
One-way Trip			50

Mr. Lee shared the Elizabeth River Ferry was used between Portsmouth and Norfolk and explained the vessel was not an open water vessel. The principal characteristics were as follows:

**PRINCIPAL CHARACTERISTICS**

 Monohull Paddle-Wheeler	
Length Overall	65 ft
Beam	22 ft
Draft Max	6 ft
Max Capacity	150

- **Could only be operated in protected waters**
- **Poor seakeeping design**
- **Too slow**

Mr. Lee indicated that HRT would need a vessel operating service between Newport News and Norfolk to include the capacity of an approximately 150 passenger peak load. He shared catamaran style vessels needed to operate within the open waters and the weather conditions throughout the harbor with the required passenger load and the speed. He shared the following ridership and fleet requirements:

- Assumed minimum 150 passenger capacity: based on industry best practices and peer ferry service
- 150 – 235 passengers expected during the morning peak period (6:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.)
- 2 – 3 catamaran-style fast ferries with 150-passenger capacity



Mr. Lee provided fleet operating scenarios as follows:

Parameter	Scenario 1	Scenario 2
Operating Days	260 (weekdays)	355
Operating Hours	8 hours Monday -Saturday	8 hours on weekdays/9 hours on Saturdays and Sundays
Crew Size Per Ferry	3	3
Ferries in Operation	2	2
Annual Hours	12,480	17,344
Annual Operating Cost	\$ 2,060,000 *	\$ 2,862,000 *

\*2025 dollars that would be escalated 4% annually beginning in 2031

Councilman Harris questioned whether the annual operating cost was just for Newport News. Mr. Amoruso replied, HRT would discuss the cost allocation agreement, but in addition to the operating costs there was also capital costs which included the purchase of the boats and the reconstruction of the docks or the construction of the missing dock, retrofitting to have a second landing at Norfolk Waterside, and permitting.

Mr. Amoruso shared the total capital cost assumes revenue service begins 2031 and/or capital costs were inflated to year 2030 as follows:

Location	Newport News Landing		Norfolk Landing
Vessels	\$16,004,000 (3 vessels)		
Ferry Landing Sites	23 <sup>rd</sup> Street \$450,000	28 <sup>th</sup> Street \$8,078,000	Waterside \$956,000
Homeport Site	\$316,000		
Subtotal Landings Capital Cost	\$450,000 - \$8,078,000		\$956,000
Grand Total (Includes Vessels)	\$17,726,000- \$25,354,000		

Mr. Amoruso advised that the total cost range was between \$17 million to \$25 million with the bulk of that including the purchase of three vehicles to operate that service with the turnaround time of 1 hour. He indicated two boats, and a spare were needed to comply with Coast Guard requirements. The cost allocation agreement would be set up in HRT similar to how the City funded bus service, and on the Southside cities funded bus, ferry, and light rail services. This agreement would dictate how the City would share in the benefits of Federal and State operating assistance (Fair Box Revenue) and then what remained would be picked up by each of the localities. In this case, it would be two cities, because it was a proposed operation that two cities would benefit from, with the possibility of a third should the City of Hampton agree to participate. He indicated since HRT was in Newport News, the discussion would be a 50/50 split, and the revenue hours would be the same for both cities, so that annual operating costs would be divided in half. Mr. Amoruso advised there would be a shared cost annually on top of what the City of Newport News already funds, which was approximately \$8 million of bus service after all of the Federal and State operating assistance was applied. This would be increased by 2031.

Mr. Amoruso shared that the capital costs for HRT were different. When it came to capital costs for construction, HRT pursued grants of all types, and the current Administration had made a lot of grant

money available to buy passenger ferries as well as to rehabilitate or build passenger ferry docks. He indicated that HRT would choose every avenue possible to look at discretionary and traditional funding for these types of services. He shared that HRT would also have to embed it within its 10-year Capital Improvements Plan, and there was no current discussion regarding passenger ferry service. He advised that HRT would do so should Newport News City Council, Norfolk City Council, and Hampton City Council want HRT to move forward.

Mr. Amoruso indicated that the next step was the final report, which would be concluded at the end of August 2024. That report would be shared with City staff and members of City Council. He stated HRT would provide a work session briefing with the cities of Norfolk and Hampton depending on the level of interest. The City Manager could express the City's intent in a letter to Mr. Harrell and would move forward. He shared that the next stage would be to provide more detailed engineering cost estimates, and begin discussions about what it would take to rehabilitate beyond the planning level and understanding those costs. He indicated HRT would aggressively seek money for capital investments since HRT did not have to define capital budgets like the cities, and depended heavily on Federal and State grants.

Councilwoman Vick indicated that currently there was a problem with getting people to work and operate the ferry, because the whole United States had been suffering from lack of skilled workforce since COVID. She questioned how that played into that annual operating cost and how that would make a difference in consistent ridership. Mr. Amoruso replied, unlike the bus system which HRT operated directly through bus operators, HRT contracted out ferry services with a company called Norfolk by Boat for ferry service between Norfolk and Portsmouth, which contracted them to provide the captains and deck hands. He advised that HRT provided the vessels owned by HRT and ran the service labeled and branded HRT while running the service on its behalf. He stated that was what HRT would anticipate with Newport News ferry service to contract it out with the company to run it for HRT.

[Peninsula Ferry Feasibility and Market Study - 8.13.2024 - Presentation](#)

## **II. Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI)**

City Manager Archer advised City Council that a resolution authorizing a donation of \$200,000 to the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc. (the organization), to assist with the initial development and administrative costs necessary to establish a business loan fund to support peninsula businesses was on the August 13, 2024 Regular City Council meeting agenda for action. He introduced Mr. Brian Woolfolk of Swan Creek Strategies who was working with the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation to help establish the business loan fund. He indicated that Mr. Woolfolk was joined by Bishop Dwight Riddick, Chair of the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, to provide Council with more information on this resolution. (A copy of the presentation "Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc." August 13, 2024 is attached and made a part of the agenda.)

Bishop Riddick expressed happiness with the opportunity to present the Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) proposal to City Council. He indicated the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation had achieved great things through partnerships and collaboration. This proposal represented an evolution of the programming, but it also reflected consistency with the focus on community empowerment. He advised the idea to pursue CDFI investment funding was initiated and suggested by Senator Mark Warner. He said Senator Warner was a longtime champion of the CDFI program and asked the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation to consider establishing a CDFI. He shared that after approximately one-year reviewing the program and feasibility, the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation was creating a CDFI project. This proposal represented the next steps and the support needed from the City of Newport News and advised that the City of Hampton

had already provided \$200,000 in launch funding to the project. He introduced the attorney consultant Mr. Brian Woolfolk to provide the project details.

Mr. Woolfolk advised that the Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) was a project to leverage a federal program that had been available, but the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc. (the organization) had not taken advantage of the federal program. He shared that the program would provide funding in essence from both institutional investors and backing from the federal government to raise funds that invested in underserved areas that had not seen capital investment, that had unmet business loan needs. Unfortunately, there were a number of those areas in Newport News and Hampton which the organization sought to leverage funding to help finance and spur small business development.

Mr. Woolfolk shared that the CDFI Public View map (shown on page 4 of the presentation) showed an analysis from the Department of Treasury site on which census tracts in Hampton and Newport News were eligible for CDFI funding and significant number of tracts in the City that could take advantage of the funding. He indicated that the organization was in a formation stage and the funds had not been formed because it was an investment fund with certain requirements and processes. The CDFI required certain processes to establish a fund before the organization could raise investment funds from institutional investors. Foundations, banking institutions, and financial institutions were the most likely supporters of the fund. He shared that once the organization had gone through the formation process, profiles would be developed, for the types of small businesses that would be reviewed to support and participate in the fund. Mr. Woolfolk stated to receive investment, the organization would work closely with the economic development agencies of both Hampton and Newport News, leverage the research and capacity available in those offices and ideas regarding where funding should be directed, but that process would be collaborative and intense process to get up and running as soon as possible. He shared that the organization wanted to raise the capital needed for the fund. Mr. Woolfolk advised that the organization's floor limit to raise for the fund was \$15 million, but they would attempt to exceed that limit. He indicated there were a significant number of businesses that could take advantage of the types of funding with the goal of the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. It was also the goal of the organization to provide significant business assistance because there were obviously entrepreneurs out there that had the ideas but may lack the wherewithal in some areas which could be in internal finance, legal, or marketing capacity but needed to provide that organizational support to fill that gap to get small businesses/entrepreneurs to the point of being fund ready and able to take advantage of the available funding. The requested funds would operate and move the dial to assist and make a difference.

Mr. Woolfolk advised that the request from Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation was for \$200,000 to match the contribution from the City of Hampton and the launch budget would get the organization through the stage of formation, hiring and securing lawyers, doing the filings in the multiple states where the organization would solicit fund contributions, organize the board and organizational capacity to be able to get the needed funds to get up and run. He shared the launch budget as follows:

<b>CAPACITY</b>	
Legal Services: Formation, Regulatory Filings, Partner Agreements, Compliance	125,000
Board Development	5,000
Operations	40,000
<b>MISSION</b>	
Strategic Planning Consultant: Technical Assistance Partnerships, Market Analysis, Financial and Impact Analysis	40,000
Community Engagement	45,000
<b>MONEY</b>	
Filing Fees	20,000
Grant Writing	50,000
Fundraising / Development Consultant	75,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$400,000</b>
<b>NEWPORT NEWS FUNDING REQUEST</b>	<b>\$200,000</b>

Councilwoman Woodbury questioned where the Foundation was located. Mr. Woolfolk replied that the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc. was new and a location had not been determined. Councilwoman Woodbury questioned whether there was an area where the program had been previously. Mr. Woolfolk replied Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc. was a new organization and had only been in existence for one year. Councilwoman Woodbury indicated that the organization did not have a track record or any records to show Council. Mr. Woolfolk replied the team being assembled included Mr. Marc Miner, Securities Lawyer, Thompson Hine, a firm that was one of the preeminent experts in the country on this subject matter. Mr. Woolfolk advised that the organization had also consulted the former Treasury Director that ran the program and would continue to advise on the project. He shared that Ms. Carmen Perkins, Investment Banker, had been involved in CDFI projects and in investment banking with Goldman Sachs and Duram capital on the project. The team assembled had significant experience with CDFI.

Councilman Long thanked all involved for bringing the program forward to City Council. Regarding the implementation of CDFI, he questioned when the entrepreneurs were selected to be awarded the funds and whether they would they be peered or paired up with Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of other companies that were successful, to ensure success in their business. Mr. Woolfolk replied, yes there would be layers of support. He indicated that the organization envisioned there would be intensive directed coaching, but also protégé relationships and the networks would be key. He shared this was not just intended to be a loan fund, where one would get a loan from a bank and the bank did not have any skin in the game on whether a business grew and got to the next levels, but having planning, support, client development, mentorship, and networking was key. He indicated a win for the organization was not just funding businesses, but seeing those businesses grow, succeed, and graduate to the next levels with the appropriate funding.

Mayor Jones advised that he was the Council sponsor for the Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) for the Greater Peninsula C.A.R.E.S. Foundation, Inc. and going forward, he believed the program was a great idea that could access the much-needed capital for businesses. He shared he would support the fund match as requested.

[Community Development Financial Institutions - 8.13.2024 - Presentation](#)

### III. City Scorecard

City Manager Archer advised that City staff had been working diligently over the past year to develop the City Scorecard. He expressed appreciation for the dedication of the Innovation team that put in tremendous effort to bring the City to this point. He indicated the City Scorecard was more than just a set of metrics; it was a strategic management system that would help monitor and measure the City's progress toward achieving key outcomes. He

shared that these outcomes, which had been carefully identified, were designed to reflect the priorities and needs of the community. He thanked everyone involved on this project for their hard work and dedication and believed the City Scorecard would be a vital tool in helping to achieve the vision for Newport News. He looked forward to feedback and support as the City moved forward with the important initiative. He introduced Mr. Eoghan “Owen” Miller, Chief Strategy Officer, and Mr. Marlin McDaniel, Innovation Program Manager, Office of the City Manager, to provide an overview of the City Scorecard. (A copy of the presentation “City Scorecard” August 13, 2024 is attached and made a part of the agenda.)

Mr. Miller reminded Council that at the June 23, 2023 Retreat and Council charged staff with figuring out a way to better track progress towards strategic goals in the City’s strategic plan. He indicated other items that were tasked as part of that was to figure out a mechanism or tool which could also provide greater transparency, accountability, and help the City make better data-driven decisions. He invited Mr. Marlon McDaniel, Innovation Program Manager, to share an update on the City’s Scorecard.

Mr. McDaniel expressed sincere thanks to all of the department heads and their teams in supporting the Innovation Office through the effort and building out the transparency and strategic alignment tool and acknowledged Mr. Jeffrey Allbright, Innovation Specialist, member of the Innovation Office, and analyst that had been “the gas” behind the development of the scorecard.

Mr. McDaniel shared that the structure of the scorecard was to create good metrics that aligned well to the Strategic Plan. He indicated that Mr. Miller mentioned the Strategic Plan that City Council reaffirmed, and the second point was to store the data that was conducive to productive use of the scorecard. The first key element around that alignment to the Strategic Plan was shown in and Illustrated shown below:



Mr. McDaniel advised that the structure diagram began at the top with the City’s Strategic Plan; the Strategic Priorities were people, places, and government; City goals; then new with the advent of this scorecard were Key Performance Indicators (KPIs); and Supporting Activities. He shared that the KPIs were quantitative measures of success, which were outcomes that City leadership in concert over several meetings and discussions, and a lot of homework had defined and designed to get the City to this point. He indicated that subsequent to the KPIs were the supporting activities. Key performance indicators, generally lagging in nature, showed what was after the fact the supporting activities were what got the City to those outcomes. The supporting activities were broken down into two domains in the architecture programs and projects. He indicated that programs were ongoing services that city leaders and their teams deliver to the community and projects were generally finite efforts with a defined start date and a planned completion date.

Regarding leveraging the scorecard Mr. McDaniel shared the first point was to ensure that there was constant alignment with strategic priorities, and the second point was stewarding



the data and creating a positive culture around how the new powerful insights were used. He shared some of the best practices the City learned from the organizations that had built their scorecards to last decades. He shared the scorecard leveraging details as follows:

- Focus on Progress, Not Perfection
  - Recognize the efforts and strides made, even if targets were not fully met
- Recognize Achievements
  - Publicly acknowledge and celebrate successes and milestones
- Provide Constructive Feedback
  - Frame feedback in a constructive manner instead of pointing out shortcomings
- Offer Support and Resources
  - Use the scorecard to identify where additional support or resources may be needed

Mr. McDaniel advised that there were two additions to the City Scorecard presentation. The first piece of supplementary information were all 49 of the KPIs and how they trended generally over time and where the City was at as of August 2<sup>nd</sup>. The second piece of supplementary information was essentially the encyclopedia of each individual project that the City was running and how it aligned back to one or multiple 49 KPIs.

Mr. McDaniel advised of a couple quick aggregations that he wanted to bring to City Council's attention. He indicated the first aggregation was of the 49 KPIs and their status of how those projects or programs fit into the target thresholds. He shared an overview chart that summarized the number of KPIs by red (below target), yellow (caution), green (on target), and blue (pending information). He explained that reds and yellows were not necessarily "bad" but rather provided transparency around where effort and support might need to be focused. He shared that some of the KPIs were data from third party sources i.e. the federal government and should expect to see movement from quarter to quarter, based on the timing of when presentations were delivered.

### City Key Performance Indicators



Mr. McDaniel indicated the team discussed aggregation of the 49 KPIs and how they mapped the status indicators. He shared an illustrative example (shown on page 8 of the presentation) of what Council would see in its Council packet while reviewing each of the 49 KPIs. Also each KPI had its own unique visualization and chart that represented what the current data point was and how it aligned back to the green, yellow, or red status indicator.

Mr. McDaniel shared a different viewpoint for the City scorecard which was an aggregation of Citywide Projects by Goal area, not necessarily a direct alignment to the KPIs but looking at

approximately 200 projects in the report which align back to each of the seven goals in the Strategic Plan.

Mr. McDaniel shared that the goal was to make the insights available for Council to review. He advised that moving forward the goal was to make the process better, refine, and be more useful.

Mr. McDaniel provided the history and timeline of the city scorecard as follows:



Mr. McDaniel indicated the next steps were to operationalize this across City leadership in a variety of shared leadership networks as well as begin to build in for transparency purposes and insights around project status and show how individual projects were relative to target goals. He indicated that a connection to the finances of the City was something to be incorporated as the Budget office got incorporated into the scorecards. He shared that Council could see across KPIs how the dollars invested mapped back to the outcomes that the City was driving towards collectively.

Vice Mayor Bethany commended City Manager Archer, Mr. Miller, Mr. McDaniel and staff, and everyone that undertook the initiative. The scorecard was extremely important whether it was public or private. He indicated having the scorecard established was extremely important to ensure the City was hitting the goals and being as efficient as possible. He shared that as the City moved toward being data informed and not data driven that he was excited about where the City was going as the City moved forward.

[City Scorecard - 8.13.2024 - Presentation](#)

#### IV. Comments/Ideas/Suggestions

Councilwoman Vick advised that along the Jefferson Avenue corridor and on Huntington Avenue as previously mentioned several months prior that the trees being planted were growing up too tall and impeding the view. She indicated when the trees were planted, they were small, but in time those trees grew up and covered the signs of the businesses and other buildings. She shared another area where the same tree grew (Jefferson Brooksville in front of the Ella Fitzgerald picture, Ridley, and Huntington Avenue). She advised that she had photos available for Council to review. She believed that the City was wasting money by planting trees because eventually those trees would need to be removed. She indicated that the City was constructing and renovating buildings and requested that the City took a serious look at planting trees and the type of trees being planted.

Councilman Long shared an update on the Homeless Study - as he got a chance to meet with the VM Consulting, who was performing the regional homeless study and after further discussion it appeared that in a six-month time frame that the study would be completed. He



indicated the things being looked at were the level of service compared to the demands that were placed on these different service providers and looked for gaps, as well as provide sustainable innovative solutions for preventing homelessness from occurring. He reminded that the regional study was inclusive of Newport News, Hampton, James City County, Williamsburg and York County. He advised that more updates would be forthcoming about that Regional Homeless Study.

Mayor Jones requested that Councilman Long share the details of a call which included Mayor Karen Bass, City of Los Angeles and others.

Councilman Long shared that he participated on a phone call/meeting for Mayors across the country and Redevelopment and Housing and Human Services also participated on the call. The call mainly focused on Section 8 vouchers and looking at innovative solutions for providing incentives for landlords to increase the number of units in the City which he believed was going to be very important when the City began addressing the homelessness issue. He indicated more Section 8 housing would need to be made available once a person came to the shelter and moved to the next phase of supportive housing, and then off to Section 8. He indicated the presentation was good and looked forward to more conversations with the mayors. Mayor Jones advised that he was unable to participate in the mayor's meeting and thanked Councilman Long for participating.

Councilman Eley shared that he and Councilwoman Vick had the opportunity to attend Ketchmore Kids Back To School event held Sunday, August 11, 2024 at King-Lincoln Park (600 Jefferson Avenue). He indicated that approximately 1,200 people attended the event. He reminded City Council that Chanel Ketchmore, Ketchmore Kids Foundation, spoke at the July 2, 2024 meeting and requested additional funding to help offset the funds used at the Back To School event. The request made was for \$5,000 from the City Council contingency fund. He shared, at the event, 350 book bags were distributed, vendors provided free food, hairstyles and haircuts, and Walmart dropped off a truckload of items which included microwaves and other items. Councilman Eley requested \$5,000 from the City Council contingency fund for the Ketchmore Kids Foundation. Mayor Jones agreed with Councilman Eley, but shared that there were procedures that needed to be followed with the contingency fund form.

Mayor Jones requested the status of the Merit, Excellence, and Intelligence (MEI) from Ms. Allison Dichoso, Director, Department of Human Resources via memo.

Mayor Jones requested gun data from Chief Drew, Police Department, he believed that information was being working on, but asked if the loop could be closed on the gun data.

Mayor Jones advised that the City was working on the grant application for \$2 million for Environmental Justice. He thanked Mr. Miller, Ms. Jennifer Privette, and Ms. Jerri Wilson. He indicated that on Monday, August 12, 2024, all the Community Partners, the Universities, Yugonda Sample-Jones - EmPower All, and all the non-profits were really going after the track one grant from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Mayor Jones advised there had been a lot of work done behind the scenes and he was hoping for good news. He shared that track one of the grants would be able to look at coal dust concerns and ways to mitigate it. The City could not perform this work on its own and would need the federal government.

Mayor Jones reminded of Hispanic Month (September) and was being worked on, he requested feedback on the progress.

Mayor Jones requested a meeting between City Manager Archer and the Department of Communications for the 2025 State of the City to be held in the Spring 2025.

Mayor Jones requested the PowerPoint for parking minimums for review from Ms. Sheila McAllister, Director, Department of Planning. He advised to send it as a reminder, ideally, he wanted to tie-in whatever the City would change with the parking minimums for the same day as the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and the PowerPoint that would be helpful.

## V. Closed Meeting

(5:50 p.m. – 6:43 p.m.)

## VI. Adjourn

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS  
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 6:43 P.M.

Zina F. Middleton, MMC  
Chief Deputy City Clerk

Phillip Jones  
Mayor  
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk

**MINUTES OF CLOSED MEETING  
OF THE NEWPORT NEWS CITY COUNCIL  
HELD AT THE DOWNING-GROSS CULTURAL ARTS CENTER  
2410 WICKHAM AVENUE  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 13, 2024, 5:50 P.M.**



### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Councilwoman Dr. Patricia P. Woodbury; Vice Mayor Curtis D. Bethany III; Councilman John R. Eley III; Councilman Marcellus L. Harris III, D. Div.; Mayor Phillip Jones; Councilman Cleon M. Long, P.E.; and Councilwoman Tina L. Vick

### **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

### **OTHERS PRESENT:**

Alan K. Archer; Robert Pealo; Mabel Washington Jenkins; Darlene Bradberry; Eoghan "Owen" Miller; David Freeman; Ralph Clayton; Tiffany Conatser; Florence Kingston; Christopher Morello; Jay Joseph; McKinley Price, DDS; Lindsey Carney; Thomas Garner; L. Scott Seymour, Tom O'Grady; and Zina F. Middleton

After ascertaining that proper meeting notice had been provided to each member of City Council, Mayor Jones called the meeting to order and stated the meeting was being held for the following purpose:

- (1) To call a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, subsection: (5) a discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the community, the subject of which is a prospective new business in the central section of the City.

Councilman Long moved for a closed meeting under sections and reasons cited above; seconded by Councilwoman Vick.

Vote on Roll Call:

Ayes: Woodbury, Bethany, Eley, Harris, Jones, Long, Vick

Nays: None

Absent During Vote: None

After reconvening in open session, Councilman Long moved to certify that to the best of each member's knowledge (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered in the closed meeting by the Council. Motion seconded by Councilwoman Woodbury.

Vote on Roll Call:

Ayes: Woodbury, Bethany, Eley, Harris, Jones, Long, Vick

Nays: None

Absent During Vote: None

(Closed Session 5:50 p.m. – 6:43 p.m.)

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS  
ON MOTION, COUNCIL ADJOURNED AT 6:43 P.M.

Mabel Washington Jenkins, MMC  
City Clerk

Phillip Jones  
Mayor  
Presiding Officer

A true copy, teste:

City Clerk

### **CERTIFICATE OF CLOSED MEETING**

**MEETING DATE:** August 13, 2024

**MOTION:** Councilman Cleon M. Long, P.E.

**SECOND:** Councilwoman Patricia P. Woodbury

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Newport News has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote as required under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712.D of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, requires a certification by this City Council that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Newport News does hereby certify that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such business matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the City Council.

**VOTE**

AYES: Woodbury, Bethany, Eley, Harris, Jones, Long, Vick

NAYS: None

ABSTENTION: None

ABSENT DURING VOTE: None

ABSENT DURING MEETING: None

ATTEST:

---

Mabel Washington Jenkins, MMC  
City Clerk