



City of Hampton

22 Lincoln Street
Hampton, VA 23669
www.hampton.gov

Council Approved Minutes - Final City Council Work Session

Mayor Donnie R. Tuck
Vice Mayor Linda D. Curtis
Councilmember Jimmy Gray
Councilmember W.H. "Billy" Hobbs
Councilmember Will Moffett
Councilmember Teresa V. Schmidt
Councilmember Chris Snead

STAFF: Mary Bunting, City Manager
Vanessa T. Valldejuli, City Attorney
Katherine K. Glass, CMC, Clerk of Council

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

1:00 PM

Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Tuck called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. All members of the City Council were present.

Present 7 - Vice Mayor Linda D. Curtis, Councilmember Jimmy Gray, Councilmember Billy Hobbs, Councilmember Will Moffett, Councilmember Teresa V. Schmidt, Councilmember Chris Snead, and Mayor Donnie R. Tuck

DONNIE R. TUCK PRESIDED

AGENDA

1. [17-0004](#) Strategic Priorities

Attachments: [Strategic Priorities Presentation](#)
[Davenport Presentation](#)

City Manager Mary Bunting noted that Council has been working on identifying projects for the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). She introduced Mr. Brian DeProffio, Director of Budget and Strategic Priorities, whose presentation would focus on bringing together the financial aspects of projects previously chosen by Council. Additional information will be presented by Mr. David Rose of Davenport & Company, the City's financial planners. She stated that there is no expectation of direction from Council at this time, as they are just receiving the information. This item will be on the January 25th agenda for discussion, at which time staff will request Council's direction.

Mr. DeProffio reviewed the work done by Council previously, to include the Vision

Statement and identified Strategic Priorities. He also reviewed the finalized list of projects.

Mr. Rose presented on the City's Debt Capacity and Affordability Analysis using four scenarios in addition to a "base" scenario.

Mayor Tuck asked for clarification on the \$2 room night fee described in Scenario 2 and Scenario 4. Mr. Rose explained that this was the same amount not because the total amount of funding is \$1 million, but rather an additional \$1 million towards the funding totals in Scenario 1 and Scenario 3.

Ms. Bunting stated that the current \$1 room night fee is used for tourism grants. Those grants are scheduled to end, and instead of renewing the program, the City can shift that money to Debt Service. The City can consider adding an additional \$1 to the fee, to increase it to \$2, which would be in line with other localities in the State.

At the conclusion of Davenport's presentation, Ms. Bunting noted that they are not predicting what the City's revenue growth will be, but rather what the City would need to use each year to increase Debt Service. It was not unusual for the City to add to Debt Service each year prior to the recession, and \$300,000 to \$600,000 is reasonable now that the City is out of recession, while still being able to take care of other needs the City has identified. Councilwoman Snead confirmed with Ms. Bunting that this would be taken off the top of revenue growth.

Mr. DeProfio reviewed how Davenport's scenarios applied to the projects Council chose to focus on previously.

Ms. Bunting emphasized that the Downtown Seafood Initiative project has actually been merged with other Downtown projects; the cost of that project has not increased. The City is hoping that the State will be willing to make some investment in that project.

Councilwoman Schmidt asked why the Downtown Seafood Initiative project is listed in Tier 1. Mr. DeProfio stated that the actual Downtown Seafood Initiative project was selected for Tier 1, and the other projects were selected for Tier 2; this is why the first three scenarios are capped at \$10 million for the project.

Councilwoman Snead asked why the Coliseum Drive Redevelopment was funded in Scenario 1 but not Scenario 2. Mr. DeProfio stated that this was because Scenario 2 would provide enough funding for the Sports Tourism Facility to move forward. Councilwoman Snead stated that she believes the Sports Tourism Facility and the

Coliseum Drive Redevelopment were projects that both need to happen for either one to be successful.

Ms. Bunting noted that it was too much to manage five different scenarios at once. For example, if Council's preference is to focus on Scenario 1, staff would provide different options within that scenario based upon prior direction from Council. At that point, Council can decide what funding options they would like to move around. Trying to do that for five different scenarios is too cumbersome. During the January 25th meeting, Council will be asked to narrow down which scenario they want to focus on.

Vice Mayor Curtis noted that Scenario 2 and Scenario 4 assume an increase in the room night fee. She asked for information on how the tourism grants have been used to date and what impact shifting that funding elsewhere will have. Ms. Bunting stated that the grants were time limited and were not intended to be permanent funding. She clarified with the Vice Mayor that if the funding was continued, it would not be for the current recipients, but rather new grants for new recipients. Vice Mayor Curtis stated that if that money has brought the City significant revenue, she would have a hard time shifting that funding to Debt Service.

Councilwoman Snead noted that she had discussed with the City Manager previously about keeping 50-cents for new types of tourism initiatives and moving \$1.50 to Debt Service. Ms. Bunting stated that the City can also set aside a set amount of funding for the grants, and then all additional funding from this fee would go to Debt Service.

Mr. DeProfio noted that the only project that had increased in cost was the Police Academy, based on new information provided by Hampton Police Department.

Ms. Bunting noted that unless Council had any specific acquisition questions, it will not need the .3 exemption for Closed Session.

Presented by Brian DeProfio, Director of Budget and Strategic Initiatives. Also presenting from Davenport & Company (the City's financial planners) were David Rose, Senior Vice President and Manager of Public Finance, and Roland Kooch, Senior Vice President.

2. [17-0003](#) Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Evaluation Report

Attachments: [Presentation](#)

Ms. Bunting stated that the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Evaluation Report was undertaken by staff, consultants, and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS)

to answer questions raised both internally and externally about the investments the City has been making along the shoreline. The goal is to ensure that the investments made are returning the expected dividends and are answering questions citizens have proposed about whether the City's investments are potentially having negative effects on private properties. She introduced Ms. Gayle Hicks, Water Resources Engineer.

Ms. Hicks presented the background and overview of the Chesapeake Bay Shoreline Evaluation Report.

Mayor Tuck asked for an explanation of geotubes. Ms. Hicks stated that they are bags of sand that help to provide shoreline protection through creation of a dune system. They were featured in a picture in the presentation.

Ms. Hicks introduced Ms. Rebecca Francese of Waterway Surveys & Engineering, Ltd. Ms. Francese provided a history of the major events that affected the shorelines in Hampton and a summary of various shoreline improvement projects.

Mayor Tuck asked if a bulkhead is the same thing as a seawall. Ms. Francese confirmed this.

Mayor Tuck asked if sand was getting behind the breakwaters faster than before. Ms. Francese stated that even with the breakwaters in place, sand is still moving through the system faster than it was historically. The City has not completely mitigated the issue. Mayor Tuck asked how this could be resolved. Ms. Francese stated that strategies are included in the management plan. She noted a majority of the sediment moves to the south naturally in Hampton due to wave activity. Mayor Tuck asked and Ms. Francese confirmed that this was the sand that is affecting the Salt Ponds Inlet. When the Salt Ponds Inlet is dredged, the City puts it onto the south side to allow it to continue to move south. To avoid management problems, the City needs to keep it moving south towards Fort Monroe.

Mayor Tuck asked if the sand was moving from Factory Point towards Fort Monroe. Ms. Francese stated that there is a current reversal near Lighthouse Point and Grandview Nature Preserve that requires a more in-depth coastal engineering explanation. The predominant movement in Hampton is to the south.

Councilwoman Schmidt asked if the sand taken out of the Salt Ponds Inlet is put on private beaches. Ms. Francese stated that City policy is to put investments into public beaches. The beach directly in front of Salt Ponds is a public beach with public access. Behind the dune system is private. A breakwater is currently under construction to manage some of the sediment transport.

Councilwoman Schmidt asked if this is the project that was supposed to be done three years ago, the project that is supposed to help the City increase the time between dredging. Ms. Francese stated that the City is still working on improving the inlet, but this breakwater was always in the management plan. During development, VIMS remodeled the project specifically towards Salt Ponds. By sighting the breakwater closer to the inlet, it might help manage sediment going back into the inlet from the north and maintain the beach plan form to the south. The initial bids came in too high, but it was reworked and is being constructed now.

Councilman Gray noted that when breakwaters are installed, sand still moves back and forth through the system. He asked what kind of problems are created when sand is restricted. Ms. Francese stated that this would result in a sand loss with accelerated erosion. The City experiences erosion anyway because it is in a sediment-starved system. If the City does not continually add sand, the beaches would erode.

Councilman Gray noted that prior to installing breakwaters at Buckroe, the City added 600,000 cubic yards of sand to the beach. He asked if the City would still have to add sand in the future. Ms. Francese noted that breakwaters were hard to justify initially because it would only reduce the natural reduction of sand by 11%. The breakwaters have reduced storm impact, so the City does not lose as much sand during storm events.

Councilwoman Schmidt asked if the City gives residents of private beaches opportunities to participate in projects being done by the City. While she understands the City cannot invest money into private property, these properties do hold value in Hampton. Ms. Francese stated that citizens would have to build their own structures on the private beaches, there would be no cost participation from the City to assist these residents. Approximately 60% of the residents do help with public projects.

Councilwoman Schmidt asked why residents on private beaches would assist the City with public projects if they felt their property was being harmed. Ms. Bunting stated that the citizen complaints were not coming from the Salt Ponds area, but rather Chesapeake Landing. Ms. Francese stated that there have been no public expenditures in that area. Because the sand continually moves south, after the initial renourishment projects, Chesapeake Landing and Fort Monroe received a lot of sand naturally, with a shoreline increase of approximately 80-100 feet. After that occurred, it eroded like the rest of the shoreline in the City.

Ms. Francese stated that there is a terminal structure in the management plan in the

Chesapeake Landing area to help reduce some of the losses off Fort Monroe and manage the sediment there, but it is private property.

Ms. Francese introduced Mr. Fred Whitley of AECOM Technical, Inc. (AECOM), who presented on the Factory Point project.

Councilman Gray asked where the City is in the Salt Ponds Inlet project. Ms. Hicks stated that it is under design now. Councilman Gray asked if the City will still need to dredge every three years once that project is finished. Ms. Hicks stated that the City is hoping to increase the time between dredging. Some of the proposals need to be fine-tuned. The general opinion is that the north jetty leaks, so there are plans to tighten that jetty, create a sand trap, build a breakwater, and other projects. The City has to be prudent available funding and approach it in a measured way.

Ms. Francese noted that historically the City dredged every two years. A permit was received to widen the dredging footprint, which extended the dredging to three years, and there is a hope that the additional projects will extend it to four or five years.

Councilman Gray asked if private beaches have access to Federal grants. Ms. Francese stated that in order to obtain State or Federal funding, a beach must have public access. Only Grandview has expressed an interest in doing that.

Vice Mayor Curtis stated that Chesapeake Landing believes their beach is being stripped of sand by Public Works. Ms. Hicks stated that they are receiving sand from public renourishment through natural movement. If the City had not done renourishment projects, the private beaches would be much worse. Analysis indicates that Chesapeake Landing is not any worse off than it was in 1990. When sand is added to Buckroe again, it will move naturally into the private areas.

Ms. Bunting stated that there is no evidence that any City projects have stopped the movement of sand. The City has continually invested in adding sand, so public beaches have grown over time. Private owners have not replenished their sand, so they are not growing beyond the natural sand movement. It is proven that if sand is not added, the beach will erode.

Ms. Bunting stated that she has extended an offer to the Chesapeake Landing community to meet with staff and consultants to explain the situation.

Presented by Gayle Hicks, Public Works' Water Resources Engineer; Rebecca Francese of Waterway Surveys & Engineering, Ltd.; and Fred Whitley of AECOM Technical, Inc.

REGIONAL ISSUES

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Tuck announced that he is hosting a Town Hall meeting tomorrow, January 12th at 6:00pm at the North Hampton Community Center. The meeting is open to the public.

Mayor Tuck stated that Wreaths Across America is requesting volunteers to assist with taking down the wreaths placed at the Hampton National Cemetery on December 17th. This effort will take place on Saturday, January 14th at 10:00am.

CLOSED SESSION

4. [17-0010](#) Closed session pursuant to Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711.A.1, .5 and .7 to discuss City Council appointees and appointments as listed on the agenda; to discuss 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 Hampton; and to consult with legal counsel pertaining to actual litigation and a contract issue where such consultation or briefing in an open meeting would adversely impact the negotiating or litigating posture of the City Council.

Vice Mayor Curtis made a motion to convene the closed session at 3:09 p.m. The motion was seconded by Councilman Gray and passed on the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Vice Mayor Curtis, Councilmember Gray, Councilmember Hobbs, Councilmember Moffett, Councilmember Schmidt, Councilmember Snead and Mayor Tuck

5. [16-0222](#) Consideration of appointments to the Peninsula Stadium Authority
6. [17-0002](#) Consideration of an appointment to Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority
7. [17-0018](#) Consideration of appointments to Animal Control Advisory Committee

CERTIFICATION

8. [17-0013](#) Resolution Certifying Closed Session

At 6:01 p.m., Councilman Moffett made a motion to certify the closed session. It was seconded by Vice Mayor Curtis and passed on the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Vice Mayor Curtis, Councilmember Gray, Councilmember Hobbs, Councilmember Moffett, Councilmember Schmidt, Councilmember Snead and Mayor Tuck

ADJOURNMENT

Donnie R. Tuck
Mayor

Katherine K. Glass, CMC
Clerk of Council

Date approved by Council _____