



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 Jimmy Gray
Councilmember Chris L. Bowman
Councilmember Steven L. Brown
Councilmember Hope L. Harper
Councilmember Billy Hobbs
Councilmember Martha Mugler

STAFF: Mary Bunting, City Manager
Steven D. Bond, Interim City Attorney
Katherine K. Glass, CMC, Clerk of Council

Wednesday, May 24, 2023

1:00 PM

Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

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

Present 7 - Councilmember Chris L. Bowman, Councilmember Steven L. Brown, Vice Mayor Jimmy Gray, Councilmember Hope L. Harper, Councilmember Billy Hobbs, Councilmember Martha Mugler, and Mayor Donnie R. Tuck

DONNIE R. TUCK PRESIDED

AGENDA

1. [23-0149](#) Housing Repair Programs Update

Attachments: [Presentation](#)

City Manager Mary Bunting introduced today's deep dive session on home housing repair programs. The City, in cooperation with the Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority (HRHA), has had homeowner rehabilitation programs for quite some time. Having recently received federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds, the City decided to expand the breadth and reach of the program to try to deal with more people who had been on the waiting list for some time. Because of the limited dollars the City has previously received from the federal government, there have been challenges including the limited availability of contractors, and federal bureaucracy associated with the programs that will be shared. Staff will also be sharing some of their ideas for how to improve the programs moving forward, particularly with the use of local dollars, to try to help people more rapidly, as opposed to the lengthy time it has historically taken. She introduced Housing and

Neighborhoods Division Manager Jonathan McBride to make the presentation.

Mr. McBride began by sharing the City's housing reinvestment strategies which include everything from redevelopment and major market changes within the community to the urgent repair approach.

Redevelopment focuses on master plan developments and housing venture areas to meet broad population needs, like seniors, disabled veterans, and affordable market-rate housing. It also focuses on very strategic geographic areas and encourages single-family home ownership.

Reinvestment focuses on neighborhoods and meeting the need for safe, accessible, decent living conditions for homeowners. This is the urgent repair aspect that includes projects run by Habitat for Humanity such as the Home Repair Blitz which moves around to different neighborhoods each year, and Rock the Block. He shared that the City has been able to bring in some other resources from the state like the lead abatement program which is being piloted on a historic rehab on a property on Claremont in the Wythe/Kecoughtan corridor.

Mr. McBride stated that towards the end of the year, they hope to focus on the model block to discuss incentives for the insides of the homes as renovations are being done. The plan is to show some demonstration projects and be able to incentivize people to do renovations on the interior.

Today's presentation will focus on reinvestment and urgent repair work. Reinvestment work for federal programs includes the Weatherization and Energy Efficiency Program (WEEP) and the HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) which have been offered across the City and are based on the income requirements of the individual homeowners rather than the income of the overall neighborhood. It's not necessarily in one neighborhood or another but is focused on older homes across the City. In the last year, a driveway grant program has been added to address the parking on the lawn ordinance adopted by Council to help provide some relief around parking enhancements for properties. When the Great Recession was occurring, the state offered funds around the neighborhood stabilization program for the purchase and rehab of foreclosed properties. He shared that Hampton's housing authority was one of the most successful localities in the state at turning around properties.

Mr. McBride shared that another area of focus which is individual homeowner needs. Specifically, the accessibility program focuses on making sure that people can age in place and be able to access their homes safely. The urgent repairs aspect includes the same programs as the City-wide reinvestment programs (WEEP

and HOME). These programs have been used to address housing needs such as roofs, and Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems. Mr. McBride shared that later in the presentation there will be suggestions in the future to do a better job at addressing urgent repairs.

Mr. McBride shared the various sources of federal, state, and local funding used to make these programs work. The main reinvestment funding sources are the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME, and ARPA programs. The CDBG program has been allocated \$1.7 million to focus on the WEEP and accessibility programs. The HOME program has been allocated \$180,000 to focus on homeowner rehab. The Hampton Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) has \$2 million to focus on waitlist assistance.

Mr. McBride introduced Ms. Yvonne Hodges, Director of Community Development, and Ms. Sherry Payton, Housing Programs Manager, both from HRHA, to continue the presentation.

Ms. Payton explained the first stage of the rehab process which is the application intake. When it is a homeowner's turn on the waitlist, they are invited to attend a homeowner's workshop where they will learn about the process, receive an application, and an appointment. The first step in this stage is the homeowner appointment where they will submit their application along with documentation that is required by Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to verify the information provided in the application. This step takes one to two weeks to complete. Once all documentation is received step two is to verify the application and review it for accuracy. The third step is the determination of eligibility, which will make sure their income limits are within HUD guidelines.

Ms. Hodges noted that the application is based on HUD requirements since federal funds are being used. It takes time to pull all of the information together because the application is 20 pages and the documentation required to show proof of income can be up to 17 documents.

In response to Mayor Tuck, Ms. Payton stated that individuals sometimes get discouraged but staff does everything possible to help them.

In response to Councilman Brown, Ms. Payton stated that there is currently one intake person who makes sure all documentation is taken care of. Upon receiving an application at the first appointment, Ms. Payton and the full-time counselor make sure all disclosures are signed and all documentation has been received.

In response to Vice Mayor Gray, Ms. Hodges stated that the program is set up for

up to \$30,000 so approximately six projects can be completed with the \$180,000 received from HOME each year.

Ms. Hodges explained that when inspections are done, rehab inspectors look at the property and prepare a scope of work. They may find that the home needs a roof, foundation work, and assistance with accessibility in the bathroom. Staff then decides how to divide the project and allocate funding from all three programs if the money is available.

Ms. Hodges confirmed for Vice Mayor Gray that if HVAC installation or upgrade is done, weatherization will also be done and the costs charged to the weatherization program. All other items such as accessibility will be charged under one of the other programs.

Vice Mayor Gray asked for information on the income criteria a person must meet to get approved. Ms. Payton shared that the Council was provided with a copy of the HUD income limits which were released at the end of last week. For a one-person household, the income limit is around \$55,000 and increases for every additional person in the household. She noted that when qualifying someone, they use the household income and not the income of that one person. For example, if a senior citizen is in the household along with an adult grandchild who is working and living there, their income must be counted even if they are not a co-applicant.

Mayor Tuck asked what happens when \$30,000 is allotted but the amount of work necessary exceeds that amount. Ms. Payton explained that it depends on the program. For the HOME program, the house must be brought to code so if it costs over \$30,000 they would not be able to do the work. However, for the weatherization program, it does not necessarily have to be brought up to code so some of the work may be able to be completed. She explained that the way the programs are being layered, the weatherization, and the HOME programs together could bring it up to code. She confirmed that the maximum amount available for weatherization is \$30,000, as well as the \$30,000 available under HOME and \$8,500 available for accessibility.

In response to Vice Mayor Gray, Ms. Payton explained that if the project costs exceed what is available under the HOME and weatherization programs, they would not be able to use the HOME funds due to the requirement to bring the house up to code, but they would do as much work as possible under the weatherization program. She confirmed that they are planning to layer in funds from the CIP to assist with cases like this.

Mayor Tuck asked if the cap of \$50,000 still exists for people in the Hampton

Housing Venture (HHV) areas. Ms. Payton explained that the cap does still exist, however, most of the people needing assistance right now are not in the HHV areas.

Ms. Hodges noted that WEEP was never part of the HHV program so they always stayed within the cap. Until a few years ago the programs were not layered so the homeowner was not getting the maximum benefit.

Councilman Brown shared that one of the concerns he hears about a lot is whether there is a pre-screening over the phone when someone calls to inquire about the program. Ms. Payton explained that callers are asked about their yearly income, or how many people are in the household so they can tell the caller what the limit is. They also look at the homeownership value limits for the HOME program. This pre-investigation allows them to be able to tell the homeowner whether or not it is worth their while to proceed with the process. She stated that a lot of the people who call are senior citizens with very low incomes who do qualify.

Councilman Brown asked if there is a priority assigned to applicants because there are people who have been on the waiting list for years. Ms. Hodges stated that additional funding provided by Council through CDBG and City funds will make a tremendous difference. However, because it took several years for the list to get so long, they realize they will not be able to tackle the list in a few months but are moving as quickly as possible. She stated that they are looking to make changes so that if there is an applicant who only needs a roof, they can accomplish the roof installation quickly to get them off the list. Priority is given to anyone who only has an accessibility need so there is no waiting list for that. When someone calls, their application is done, and usually within four weeks the application is approved and the ramp is installed.

The second stage of the rehab process is the inspection stage. Once the application is approved, the rehab and construction staff will contact the homeowner and coordinate scheduling for the first step of the inspection stage which is the lead testing and termite inspections. This step takes, on average, two weeks to complete. The next step is for the rehab team to go to the property, look at the work that needs to be done, discuss it with the homeowner, and evaluate and assess the house. Once that is done, they will write up the detailed scope of work and decide how to layer the funding.

In response to Councilwoman Harper's question regarding whether staff can inquire about an increase to the \$180,000, Mr. McBride explained that that money is from the HOME program and the \$2 million in City funds that Council has appropriated is used to supplement that. He stated that later in the presentation they will talk about some of the challenges including federal funding. The HOME program only provides

about \$500,000 of which a portion is already set aside for the community housing development organizations, or Habitat. A portion goes towards the administration costs to manage those programs and the rest goes towards either home rehab through new construction or acquisition, or this rehab program.

Ms. Payton continued the presentation with the next step. She stated that normally four or five projects are usually done at the same time so they will invite the contractors to tour the homes and look at each project to see what needs to be done per the scope of work. They are then given two weeks to research and submit a separate bid for each project. Each project will be awarded to the lowest bidder.

The next stage in the rehab process is the rehabilitation stage. Once the contractor has been chosen, staff will meet with the homeowner to get the construction contracts, deeds of trust, disclosures, and any other documents needed to get the work started. It takes about 45 days for the construction work to be completed depending on weather, arrival of materials, etc. After construction is complete, the rehab staff will make a final inspection to ensure the work is completed satisfactorily. Following the inspection, the homeowner will sign a certificate of completion, the contractor will be paid, the deeds of trust will be recorded at the courthouse, and the project will be closed out in the system.

Ms. Payton provided information on the HUD program requirements, above what the City and state require, to use CDBG and HOME funds. This includes income verification, counseling, and environmental reviews. The housing counseling is important because in reviewing an applicant's file staff sometimes finds that the applicant is behind in their mortgage or deeply in debt. The housing counselor can assist the applicant in contacting the mortgage company to see if they can get some type of modification or deferment to help them get back on track with their mortgage funding. Mr. McBride noted that these requirements are things the City would most likely require as best practices for any program.

The HOME ownership limit, project initiation within six months of application approval, and Section 103 reporting are items required by HUD that the City may not choose to require.

Ms. Hodges continued the presentation with information about each of the three rehab programs. The WEEP program is designed to weatherize a home and install energy-efficient items such as heating, cooling, windows, insulation, and electrical. Grant amounts range from \$1,000 to \$30,000. There is a deed of trust that is recorded against the property for five years. As long as the homeowner lives in the property for five years, the grant will be forgiven at the end of that period.

Ms. Payton explained the eligibility requirements for homeowners and properties. The household must be 80% or less of the area median income; applicants must be the principal homeowner and live in the property for the duration of the grant; and the applicant must receive housing counseling. The property must be in the City of Hampton; can be attached or detached, single-family dwelling; must be covered by homeowner's insurance; taxes must be paid and current, exempt or deferred; and must undergo HUD environmental reviews.

Ms. Hodges provided information about the accessibility grant program which is paid for using CDBG funds. The program is designed to provide materials and labor for reasonable accessibility modifications like an exterior ramp, interior grab bars, or motorized chair lift. The grant amount is up to \$8,500 and there is no deed of trust or affordability period with this program so once the items are installed the grant is forgiven.

Ms. Payton explained the eligibility requirements for homeowners and properties. The area median income is 100%. The applicant must be the principal owner-occupant or have approval from the landlord, and the applicant or dependent must be disabled/physically challenged. The property must have homeowner's insurance and the City taxes must be paid current or exempt.

Ms. Hodges provided information about the HOME rehabilitation program which uses HOME funds. Funding through this program requires that the house be brought to code. Some of the items that are covered include, but are not limited to floor repairs, crawlspace or foundation repairs, kitchen or bathroom replacements, and roofs. Grant amounts range from \$1,000 to \$30,000 and has a deed of trust for five years which will be forgiven as long as they live in the house for that entire time.

Ms. Payton explained the eligibility requirements for homeowners and properties. The household must be 80% or less of the area median income; applicants must be the principal homeowner and live in the property for the duration of the grant; and they must receive housing counseling. The property must be in the City of Hampton; can be attached or detached, single-family dwelling with an assessed value below the homeownership limits; must be covered by homeowner's insurance; taxes must be paid current, exempt, or deferred; and must undergo HUD environmental reviews.

Ms. Payton provided an update on the waitlist. Of the 136 households processed, 54 declined or did not respond and three were disqualified or over income. There are 36 applications in process, 26 projects underway, and 17 projects that have been completed. There are 218 people on the waitlist at this time.

Ms. Hodges noted that, for the ones who did not respond, Ms. Payton reached out

by mail, phone, and/or email inviting them to the information session and asking them to call the office. Some individuals passed away while their application was being processed.

Councilwoman Mugler asked for more information about the repeat applicants included in the number of people currently on the waitlist. Ms. Hodges explained that one of the reasons they started layering funding is because someone may have received \$30,000 to participate in the WEEP program years before layering existed. They call now and are back on the list because they need something else. Councilwoman Mugler asked if they would provide information on the number of people who fall into that category. Ms. Hodges said they want to be accurate and will get that information and provide it to Council.

Mr. McBride continued the presentation with information on the housing program challenges and changes moving forward. The first challenge is that the current housing market has driven increases in material costs and supply chain delays. The second challenge includes a limited pool of contractors; contractor concerns with the bidding process, bureaucracy, profit margins, and the challenge of working with older clients whose expectations may not align with the program; and the ability to maintain quality standards. The third challenge includes limited support for seniors in the community.

The final challenge is the federal regulations. In the last nine years, the CDBG funds have decreased and remained relatively flat. The better we do as a community, the less federal funding we receive so we need to think about whether that is a sustainable source of funds to support these programs. In addition, increased reporting and oversight put a greater burden on staff.

Mr. McBride shared changes that have been made to try to address the challenges. This includes additional City funding, contractor recruitment, and working with Economic Development on strategies to attract more contractors.

Ms. Hodges shared that they are starting a small bidding process so that if an applicant only needs one thing, such as a roof or HVAC, it can be priced and completed to allow them to get through the waitlist more quickly.

The most recent change has been the addition of more HRHA staff through the CDBG funding. Ms. Hodges explained that there is one person who does the application intake, two housing counselors, two rehab positions, an additional administrative position, and a construction support position. She noted that up until December there was only one person doing inspections, work write-ups, and meeting with contractors and clients but thanks to the additional funding Council

granted, the second rehab position was added. She shared that she envisions the construction support person as the one who goes out to the job sites daily to make sure that the contracted work is getting done and getting done correctly. The two rehab specialists currently divide their time between doing work scopes, meeting with clients, and visiting job sites.

Ms. Hodges presented proposed program changes regarding costs. One of the reasons people end up back on the waitlist is that we are unable to assist them with all the needs in the house. The proposed change is to increase the limits to \$50,000 per program. Staff believes almost everything can be accomplished in the house with that amount of money and they won't end up back on the list in two or three years. The proposed increase for the accessibility program is \$1,000 which will meet the needs of the clients being served.

In response to Councilwoman Mugler, Ms. Hodges stated that the current cap of \$30,000 pre-dates her but she believes when the programs were established 15 or 20 years ago the amount was chosen because it seemed like a fair amount then.

Councilwoman Mugler shared that when she had a conversation with the City Manager about this proposal, the amount could initially be \$30,000 with the stipulation that an additional \$20,000 could be added for any supplemental project or service.

Ms. Hodges stated that they could spend any dollar increase Council can provide while still staying within the cap.

Ms. Bunting clarified that the question is, was the \$30,000 dictated at all by the federal government and just not updated or was it something that was within local control? If it is increased to \$50,000, that is fewer people who can be served. She believes Councilwoman Mugler is suggesting we keep the current cap but allow up to an additional \$20,000 if it is determined that there are code-related issues or other things in the house that need to be dealt with.

Mayor Tuck asked if it was even necessary to advertise the amount. He doesn't think Council was aware that they were allowing up to \$60,000 with the layering. He thinks staff should use their best judgment to try to extend the dollars as far as possible while trying to assist as many people as possible.

Councilman Brown stated his agreement. He asked what the plan is for the surplus federal funds that must be spent by the end of the fiscal year. Mr. McBride explained that with the CDBG funds that were moved forward in September 2022, and the upcoming action plan funds, there is about \$1.7 million that must be spent by the

end of the fiscal year. He noted that this includes this program as well as other CDBG programs such as code enforcement and staffing. He confirmed for Councilman Brown that that money is included in this proposal.

Councilman Brown asked what the strategy is to reduce the waitlist to a manageable level without overworking staff and having satisfied customers. Ms. Hodges stated that the goal is to complete 80 projects this year and 80 projects next year.

The next change being recommended is in spending the funds but also making sure that the urgent needs are being met. They will do the proposals to address a project as a priority and get the contractors lined up to support that while continuing to do other longer-term investment projects. They will focus on scheduling in a way that will allow them to shuffle something as the greater priority in the process. He asked Council to provide feedback to see if that is the way the process should be handled.

Vice Mayor Gray asked for examples of repairs or improvements involved in bringing a home up to code. Ms. Hodges shared that some electrical issues like homes that still have a fuse box and need a new air conditioning (AC) unit, but the electrical doesn't support a new unit, the change would be required. Vice Mayor Gray stated that he would recommend and like to see that code issues have been addressed in addition to the repairs. He would be willing to allow flexibility in using the various sources of money rather than capping it at \$50,000.

Vice Mayor Gray referenced the example given earlier of the homeowner allowing her grandson to live with her. He gave another example of the grandmother who allows her grandson, who has just been released from a lengthy prison sentence, to live with her. They cited the income limit for one person at \$55,000 increasing to \$63,000 for two people. If the grandson gets a job working minimum wage it now puts them above the two-person limit which doesn't seem fair for someone who's been sitting on the list for an extended period. He requests looking at having some flexibility around the income that holds people strictly to the federal guidelines, especially when there is the additional \$2 million.

In response to Mayor Tuck, Ms. Hodges explained that the lead abatement is determined based on how much money is put into the project. Some projects don't require full abatement, but measures such as sealant paint must be put in place to prevent any lead from transferring. Households with children under the age of six are required to do lead abatement.

Mayor Tuck stated that he thinks caution should be used in setting income limits because that potentially reduces the number of people who can receive help.

Mr. McBride pointed out that the reinvestment City-wide programs around WEEP and HOME are the same ones being used for urgent repairs. There is not a specific urgent repair program to address issues like an HVAC system going out when it's 90 degrees outside. He stated that Ms. Hodges and Ms. Payton have done a great job of trying to fast-track certain projects but over the next two to three years the plan is to develop a proposal to bring to Council to address these types of projects. He noted that this information was presented to the HRHA this morning and some of the comments revolved around homeowners who are over the limit by just a few thousand dollars and whether a sliding-scale approach would work.

Councilman Brown asked who would make up the difference if an applicant is receiving funds on a sliding scale and not getting the full \$50,000, but the project is over \$50,000. Mr. McBride stated that is one of the things they need to figure out.

Councilman Brown stated that his position as a member of Council would be to help as many people as possible without eliminating them unnecessarily.

Mr. McBride shared additional goals for the next several years which include focusing more effort on contractor recruitment and outreach and refocusing federal funds.

Next year staff will be working on the five-year Consolidated Plan, which will be a good time to have a conversation about the possibility of using federal funds for larger projects. One thing to keep in mind is that most of the Housing Authority staff that does the rehab work fall under CDBG so to absorb that cost on the City side would mean addressing how the Housing Authority staffing is funded.

Ms. Bunting asked if the staffing could be funded out of the money for processing, and the loans out of the City money. Mr. McBride explained that because of changing HUD regulations, one of the things that had to be changed in the plans is that the housing counseling and processing has to be tied to a project that comes out of that funding.

Ms. Bunting stated that one of the things she wants to clarify with Council and have Mr. McBride clarify on the record is that the \$2 million that Council set aside is more flexible in terms of the timing. She asked Mr. McBride to clarify the amount of money that must be spent and by what date, and remind Council and let the public know that, while we might look at refocusing the federal funds, there is not sufficient time to do that for the money that must be spent by November. We will need to prioritize using that money first to avoid having to turn any of that back. We also want to use the \$2 million of City funds but in terms of prioritizing applications, the federal funds need to be spent first.

Mr. McBride clarified that the total that has been moved forward under housing programs for CDBG is \$1.7 million which includes this past year and the current action plan coming up. We need to keep that in mind because we will be getting new federal funds this coming year and can only have so much on hand at one time. The amount that HUD has been informed we plan on spending by November is about \$800,000. There is a month-to-month plan in place for how to move that forward based on the projects underway and the ones coming in. He noted that that is the WEEP and accessibility programs only. The HOME program allows us to have as much on hand as possible but that is the smallest amount. The plan is to spend the HOME money and then use the \$2 million to support the HOME funds as those funds run out. We are currently using the CDBG funds right now and since they are expected to run out next year, we will start using the \$2 million to do the WEEP and accessibility rehab such as the interior and bringing things up to code.

Mayor Tuck observed that this is the first time in the last seven years that we've had this kind of presentation and the scope of it related to what is done, how it is done, what the challenges are, and how to try to resolve and address them. When the Council first looked at taking the ARPA dollars to assist in trying to reduce that waitlist, they only knew of a cost but were not aware of everything that goes into those numbers. He suggested that in three to six months, staff come back with a plan of how they want to try to work this program, whether it's looking at sliding scales, or what can be done as far as the City's regulations versus those that are dictated by the federal government. He thinks that Council would be in a better position to give their best thoughts and ideas about how to proceed rather than trying to do it on the spot.

In response to Vice Mayor Gray, Ms. Hodges confirmed that demographic information is collected from the households that are screened.

Mr. McBride confirmed for Councilman Bowman that there is a plan to use the \$800,000 over the next six months on the projects that are currently underway, and in the application and bidding phases.

Ms. Hodges confirmed for Councilman Bowman that in addition to lead abatement, asbestos testing is also being done. He shared that, for ramps installed for people with disabilities, some companies install metal ones much more quickly than wood or composite ones can be constructed.

Mr. McBride shared long-term considerations including addressing broad housing and population needs before they become needs. This includes providing long-term solutions for the senior population who are no longer able to stay in their homes so

they can stay in the community and have safe and healthy living. One of the strategies communities are looking at is providing small six-to-eight-unit rental developments within the community instead of large, 100-unit rental developments.

Vice Mayor Gray stated that funds were not put in the budget for this year for a housing study. He asked Mr. McBride how they would go about identifying the needs in the community for various types of housing without the benefit of a City-wide housing study. Mr. McBride stated that in the short-term as part of the community planning process, they are listening to the community conversation to make sure equitable investment is being made across the City and that the housing stock is being preserved and enhanced. In the long term, funds have been set aside under the CDBG administration to do an affordability and housing study which will provide data for the five-year plan.

Mayor Tuck expressed his thanks for the detailed presentation. He restated his suggestion that staff return in six months with an updated presentation. Ms. Bunting suggested a return in October for a deep dive session when Council has two meetings.

This should give enough time for staff to do what Council is asking, get some more experience, and get some more people off the waitlist.

REGIONAL ISSUES

There were no regional issues to report upon.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Bunting shared that the splashdown park at the Aqua Plex is opening officially on Memorial Day weekend. There are day passes and season passes. The park has a variety of outdoor activities including a lazy river, a whirlpool area, two slides, water basketball, a toddler playground, and a pool. Lounge chairs and a concession stand are also included. The park will be open from Memorial Day to Labor Day.

She also shared that Hampton's water touring boat, the Hampton Queen, is being inspected by the Coast Guard today and, if approved, they begin operating this weekend.

CLOSED SESSION

2. [23-0142](#) Closed session pursuant to Virginia Code § 2.2-3711 A (.3) to discuss the disposition of publicly held property in the Neil Armstrong Parkway and Phoebus areas of the City; and the potential acquisition of property in the Kecoughtan Road corridor

where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining or negotiating strategy of the City.

At 2:21 p.m., a motion was made by Councilmember Martha Mugler and seconded by Councilmember Billy Hobbs, that this Closed Session - Motion be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Councilmember Bowman, Councilmember Brown, Vice Mayor Gray, Councilmember Harper, Councilmember Hobbs, Councilmember Mugler and Mayor Tuck

CERTIFICATION

3. [23-0147](#) Resolution Certifying Closed Session

A motion was made by Councilmember Billy Hobbs and seconded by Councilmember Chris Bowman, that this Closed Session - Certification be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Councilmember Bowman, Councilmember Brown, Vice Mayor Gray, Councilmember Harper, Councilmember Hobbs, Councilmember Mugler and Mayor Tuck

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Contact Info:

Clerk of Council, 757-727-6315, council@hampton.gov

Donnie R. Tuck
Mayor

Katherine K. Glass, CMC
Clerk of Council

Date approved by Council _____