# REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular City Council Meeting was held on October 26, 2026, at 7:24 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Council members present were Ms. Hall, Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Pillsbury, Ms. Arndt, Mr. Rocha, Dr. Sudler, and Mr. Lewis.

Staff members present were Police Chief Johnson, Ms. Marney, Ms. Duca, Deputy Fire Chief Iannucci, City Solicitor Griffith, and Ms. Bennett. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

**OPEN FORUM**

The Open Forum was held at 6:27 p.m., prior to commencement of the Official Council Meeting. Council President Neil declared the Open Forum in session and reminded those present that Council was not in official session and could not take formal action.

Doug Hall, Dover, DE, praised the successful Halloween Village event downtown, encouraged Council participation in community events and preservation of downtown green space, and requested assistance regarding a resident's tree-related code enforcement fine and notification. Council President Neil and Mr. Anderson explained the appeal process.

William G. Faust, Jr., Dover, DE, opposed mandatory residential fire sprinklers due to installation and maintenance costs, questioned the City's handling of FOIA matters and requested release of a report, and raised concerns about municipal revenue and Council responsiveness.

David T. Lewis, 17 Upland Avenue, commended the Police and Fire Departments, requested restoration of Council meeting broadcasts on Comcast Channel 14 for residents, particularly seniors, and encouraged public discussion by Council members.

Stuart Marks, 215 N American Avenue, discussed homelessness and activity near Reed Street, expressed concern about the People's Community Center overnight shelter, and suggested greater downtown police presence and attention to revenue needs.

Bonnie Pennington, Dover, DE, described a traffic stop while attempting to report a pedestrian safety concern and opposed residential sprinkler mandates due to costs for homeowners and seniors.

Tyrone Barlow, 312 Mardella Drive, Camden DE, raised concerns about notice and due process relating to his placement on the Delaware Child Protection Registry and requested assistance identifying appropriate review procedures and state officials.

Larry Arellano, Dover, DE, thanked police and residents for assistance during an October 1 incident and raised concerns regarding suspected drug activity and public safety in his neighborhood.

Katie Gillis, Dover, DE, spoke on behalf of the Homebuilders Association of Delaware regarding the added costs of residential sprinkler requirements and their effects on housing affordability.

Mike Riemann, 309 N. Governor's Avenue, on behalf of Homebuilders Association of Delaware, questioned the cost-effectiveness and safety benefits of mandatory residential sprinklers, citing his interpretation of fire safety data and the importance of smoke detectors.

Richard Murphy, 3909 Leipsic Road, requested reconsideration of residential sprinkler requirements and discussed impacts on construction, renovation and housing costs.

Chrissy Kyriss and Amber represented Habitat for Humanity and discussed home preservation work and expressed concerns about the financial and practical effects of sprinkler requirements on affordable housing and repairs.

Trish Kelleher, 363 Saulsbury Road, representing NeighborGood Partners, questioned the evidence supporting mandatory sprinklers and requested additional discussion with affected stakeholders.

Bobby Slagle, Gordon Drive, opposed the sprinkler requirement, citing construction estimates and concerns about water damage and repair costs.

Shawna Kirlin, Dover, DE, explained she is a realtor and described neighborhood concerns and requested more responsive code enforcement and attention to residents' quality of life.

Frank DaTillo representing NeighborGood Partners and urged Council to reconsider the residential sprinkler requirements at an upcoming meeting.

## INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Mayor Christiansen.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council President Neil.

## ADOPTION OF AGENDA

**Ms. Arndt moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.**

## ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

All Consent Agenda items are considered routine and non-controversial and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Council. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of Council so requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered a separate item.

**Mr. Anderson made a motion to remove Item #12, Consideration of Withdrawal and Reallocation of CDBG Funds for People's Community Center Renovation Project, from the consent agenda, seconded by Dr. Sudler, and unanimously carried.**

## ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF OCTOBER 12, 2026

**The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of October 12, 2026, were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.**

## COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT - OCTOBER 13, 2026

The Council Committee of the Whole met on October 13, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Council members present were Mr. Anderson, Ms. Arndt, Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Hall (joined at 6:13 p.m.), Mr. Lewis (via WebEx) (out at 8:05 p.m.), Dr. Pillsbury, and Mr. Rocha. Dr. Sudler was absent. Mayor Christiansen was also present. Civilian members present for their Committee meetings were Mr. Garfinkel (via WebEx), Mr. Shevock (via WebEx) *(Legislative, Finance, and Administration)*, and Mr. Lewis *(Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement).*

## ADOPTION OF AGENDA

**Mr. Boggerty moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.**

## Council Reports – September 2026

First District

Dr. Pillsbury reported handling several complaints and concerns from constituents during the past month.

Mr. Rocha reported attending the Family Court ribbon-cutting ceremony, two Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meetings, the DEMEC dinner, a meeting with the Downtown Dover Partnership and Jason Lyon, Assistant City Manager, regarding the EPA Riverwalk assessment, and a Village of Westover Town Hall meeting at the library. He also addressed constituent complaints.

Second District

Mr. Lewis reported that he attended Delaware State University's event on Saturday, during which he participated in the parade. He also attended the grand opening of the Delaware State News at its new location in the Duncan Center, as well as various other community events throughout the past month. Additionally, he addressed constituent complaints on Elm Terrace, Orchard Avenue, and in the Stoney Creek development. He stated that he worked with staff to address and resolve those concerns.

Ms. Hall was absent; no report was given.

Third District

Ms. Arndt reported speaking with several constituents with a range of concerns about trash in their neighborhood and along the Route 13 corridor, tree trimming, and how the city maintains trees, especially under power lines. She noted attending meetings for the Silver Lake Commission and providing assistance to the Downtown Dover Partnership. Lastly, she reported speaking to constituents regarding downtown development and concerns about downtown.

Fourth District
Mr. Anderson reported discussing efforts involving downtown properties and ongoing work on issues affecting the downtown area. He thanked staff for addressing so many of the concerns facing the different areas downtown.

Dr. Sudler was absent; no report was given.

At-Large
Mr. Boggerty reported attending the Village of Westover Town Hall meeting and meeting a constituent who is considering opening a business downtown to contribute to continued downtown growth. He noted working with a constituent regarding a property that had been boarded up following the death of a family member, and Code Enforcement assisted. Lastly, he reported attending the Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meetings as the chairman.

Council President Neil
Council President Neil reported attending the October 8, 2026, Code Board of Appeals meeting with Chairman Sudler. He discussed filling a vacant Third District seat on the Dover Human Relations Commission with Ms. Chiara Fox. He reported three East Lake constituent complaints involving a storm drain, a truck and shopping cart, and grass clippings entering drains, which Chief Code Enforcement Officer Eddie Kopp addressed. He also received a request to restrict non-local traffic on Acorn Lane while East Loockerman Street was blocked. Assistant City Manager Jason Lyon advised that Acorn Lane is under DelDOT's jurisdiction. Mr. Neil discussed a complaint about debris at a house under construction at William and Water Streets, on which Mr. Kopp had taken action, and a neighborhood complaint involving White Oake Road and April Drive.

Due to the absence of Chairwoman Hall, the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee proceeded before the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee.

## LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee met with Chairman Anderson presiding.

**Adoption of Agenda**
**Mr. Boggerty moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Rocha and unanimously carried.**

**Proposed Ordinance #2026-15 – Amending Chapter 42 – Environment – By Adding Sec. 42-3 – Lighting (Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer)**
Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, presented Proposed Ordinance #2026-15 concerning lighting in residential zones. He explained that the city had received an increasing number of complaints about light pollution, including

spotlights installed on houses and directed into neighboring windows as a means of harassment. Existing zoning language addressed commercial properties but did not provide enforceable language for the residential complaints. The proposed ordinance would provide that authority, and its fee structure was consistent with the other applicable ordinances.

Staff recommended forwarding Proposed Ordinance #2026-15 to Council for approval.

Mr. Rocha stated that he had received a complaint about a neighbor's light shining onto another property. He acknowledged that residents wanted to illuminate their backyards but stated that lighting should not interfere with another resident's property or shine into a bedroom window.

Mr. Kopp confirmed that such complaints were common and that the existing code lacked enforceable language to address them.

Ms. Arndt questioned how unusually bright lighting would be defined and noted that the proposal did not specify lumens or other measurable criteria.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Kopp stated that criteria could be added.

Ms. Arndt requested that staff review residential lighting ordinances adopted by other municipalities and consider including criteria to guide enforcement.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kopp explained that the proposal concerned lights installed on residential property, such as a spotlight mounted on a house and directed toward a neighboring property. Passing vehicle headlights would be incidental and would not fall under the ordinance. He stated that residents could direct security lighting away from neighboring windows while still protecting their properties. The intent was to prevent nuisance lighting, particularly lights deliberately directed into windows, and he was willing to consider revisions to clarify the language. Mr. Kopp further explained that the installation requirement would exclude a handheld flashlight and that the language had been adapted from another jurisdiction's ordinance.

Mr. Rocha agreed that lumen criteria could be considered but questioned how staff would determine lumens without entering the property to inspect the fixture. He suggested that the complaint-based language might allow staff to address the brightness or direction of a light through the complaint process.

Mr. Kopp stated that he also used camera-mounted spotlights. He explained that directing a camera toward another person's window raised a separate police concern and that a camera's light should not be directed into that window. Some reflected light was inevitable, but the concern was light that interfered with the neighbor's use of the property. He stated that cameras themselves should remain outside the scope of the proposed lighting ordinance.

Mayor Christiansen requested a point of personal privilege and stated that changing the advertised order of committee meetings required a Council motion to amend the agenda. He requested that Council formally approve the change or return to the original order.

Chairman Anderson returned the floor to Council President Neil for that purpose.

**Mr. Anderson moved to hold the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement meeting after the Legislative, Finance, and Administration meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.**

Council President Neil explained that the order had been changed because Chairwoman Hall had not been present to preside.

Mr. Boggerty discussed the reasonable person standard and questioned whether a numerical lumen limit would create a standard that residents and staff could readily measure. He described a light at his own home that he had discovered shone into a neighbor's house through trees. Until he could adjust it, he had limited its use and communicated with the neighbor when he needed to use it. He distinguished ordinary passing headlights and security lighting from lighting that interfered with another residence.

Responding to Mr. Shevock, Mr. Kopp stated that the proposed ordinance would not apply to commercial properties, which were already subject to lighting provisions in the zoning ordinance. He offered to review the existing enforceable language and determine how the concern could be addressed. He reiterated that the proposed ordinance specifically addressed lighting between residential properties.

Mr. Kopp described a prior complaint involving a sports field where fixtures had been converted to LED lighting without being repositioned. After staff explained the effect on neighboring homes, the lights had been redirected within a few days. He stated that staff intended to use conversations, notices, and education to resolve residential lighting complaints in a similar manner.

**Ms. Arndt moved to recommend forwarding Proposed Ordinance #2026-15 to Council for approval, as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.**

**By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**Budget Amendment Discussion (Sharon Duca, City Manager)**

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, discussed a potential budget amendment involving the Economic and Community Development Fund and entrance improvements at the Garrison Oak Technical Park. She explained that the Fiscal Year 2027 budget had authorized a $1.426 million transfer to the General Fund for the entrance improvements. The budget had reflected a prior-year fund balance of slightly more than $3 million and a remaining balance of approximately $1.672

million after the transfer. The year-to-date budget confirmed that the transfer had been completed.

Ms. Duca reported that staff had submitted an application for TIF funding in May 2026 using a revised project estimate of more than $2 million based on design changes. Staff received a funding decision on August 26 and an approval letter on September 26. The project remained in the design phase; DelDOT comments had been received, and staff had requested a meeting with DelDOT. Staff did not yet know whether the funding award would cover the final cost of the improvements. Staff hoped to advertise the project for bids within 45 days, depending on the outcome of the DelDOT meeting.

Ms. Duca explained that the funding award had prompted discussion of a budget amendment to return the $1.426 million to the Economic and Community Development Fund. Staff recommended limiting the return of funds until bids were received and final costs were known, with a buffer for potential change orders. She noted that the original $90,000 for design had also come from the fund. An additional engineering change order of approximately $45,000 was anticipated to address DelDOT's concerns and revise the plans. If required, that change order would be submitted to Council because it exceeded her approval authority under city policy.

Chairman Anderson thanked Ms. Duca for the update and stated that further consideration of the transfer would be held pending additional project information. He had been interested in restoring the fund to approximately $2 million to address identified needs and exploring whether some funds could support a rebate or credit to customers following rate increases. He noted that those possibilities would need to be balanced against other priorities.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

**Alderman's Court Ad Hoc Committee Update (Councilman Anderson)**

Councilman Anderson provided an update on the Alderman's Court Ad Hoc Committee and referred members to the committee minutes included in the packet. He reported that the committee had received substantial participation from State representatives, community members, and individuals with court and academic experience. The Newark court clerk had provided information about that municipality's operations, and Mr. Garfinkel had contributed his experience as a State magistrate. Judge Witham, a retired Superior Court judge, and Dr. Hoff also provided expertise.

Councilman Anderson stated that an alderman's court was feasible because six Delaware municipalities already operated such courts and Dover had previously operated one, although that had ended approximately 70 years earlier. The committee was examining how a court could operate fairly and sustain itself financially. He emphasized that the purpose was to give Dover greater control over enforcement of lower-level offenses while allowing the Department of Justice to

concentrate on higher-level offenses, rather than to create a revenue-generating mechanism.

Councilman Anderson described ten committee goals: improving quality of life for residents and offenders; distinguishing matters handled by the Alderman's Court from those handled by the State courts; establishing exclusive and joint jurisdiction; developing cost and revenue estimates and evaluating financial sustainability; maintaining a community focus rather than relying solely on fines; permitting referrals to drug, veterans, and other specialty courts; retaining a criminal focus without affecting property through the court's jurisdiction; developing sentencing guidelines with constructive community service; exploring an entry point for mental health assistance; and considering probation before judgment to support workforce skills and assessment of individual needs.

William G. Faust, Jr., Dover, questioned the accessibility of afternoon committee meetings for working residents. He referred to a reported startup estimate of approximately $500,000 and asked where funding would come from for a judge, personnel, facilities, security, and holding cells. He expressed concern that fines would place additional burdens on residents and stated that existing courts should address the offenses. He urged Council to focus on the budget, revenue, and serious public safety concerns, including gun violence, prostitution, and drugs.
Chairman Anderson responded that, in his view, the current Department of Justice policies and existing court process had not adequately addressed prostitution and drug-related concerns. He stated that an Alderman's Court could provide the referrals needed to address those issues.

Belinda Main, Dover, opposed creating a new court before addressing access to assistance for homelessness and addiction. She questioned whether another court or committee would resolve the problems and urged Council to act on constituent concerns.

Council President Neil responded that Council had been asked by residents and business owners to help individuals whose addiction or mental illness contributed to homelessness and disrupted businesses and neighborhoods. He stated that Council members lacked authority to require treatment and that a legal process was needed to require individuals to obtain help and remain in treatment long enough to address addiction or mental illness and enter training programs. He emphasized that the goal was assistance rather than collecting money from those individuals.

Bonnie Pennington, Dover, urged participants to work together and consider existing vacant buildings, including the former Family Court, before spending money on new facilities. She also stated that she could not attend a 3:00 p.m. meeting because of work and expressed concern about the City's financial condition. She supported efforts to address homelessness, addiction, and pedestrian safety and encouraged cooperation rather than conflict.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Anderson stated that the timing depended on establishing that the court could sustain itself and obtain jurisdiction sufficient to

meet the committee's goals. He stated that facility arrangements and other implementation choices could take additional time, and that the court might begin in an existing location and move later. Mr. Anderson clarified that it would likely take three months or longer for a recommendation and at least two years to implement the recommended changes, especially to the Charter.

Reginald Daniel, Townsend, emphasized gaps in substance use and mental health services. He described a homeless resident who was deaf and had difficulty accessing assistance, as well as literacy barriers and the difficulty of finding treatment for individuals who needed wound care. He urged the City to focus on filling gaps in existing services and addressing the underlying conditions contributing to homelessness and addiction. He questioned whether fines or a court with limited capacity would resolve those problems and favored strengthening coordinated resources for long-term improvement.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

**Mr. Anderson moved for adjournment of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.**

## PARKS, RECREATION, AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

The Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee met with Chairwoman Hall presiding.

**Adoption of Agenda**

**Mr. Boggerty moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.**

Mr. Rocha recused himself from the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Council President Neil stated that he had reviewed the packet and prior meeting minutes and intended to support staff's recommendation based on the documented federal requirements, City ordinances, and timelines. He emphasized the need to replace lost shelter spaces and supported exploring the former Morris correctional facility. He also noted that the former Family Court was State property and that the subject would be discussed further on October 27.

Mayor Christiansen reported that he and two State legislators had been working with the State on options to address the loss of winter housing and expected to have information to present.

Mr. Boggerty moved to accept staff's recommendation to withdraw the previously approved $40,000 CDBG allocation for the People's Community Center

Renovation Project and direct staff to make the funds available through the 2027 Annual Action Plan process. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury.

Mr. Anderson urged members to hear the additional information from the People's Community Center before acting.

Ms. Arndt requested an opportunity for additional comments.

Mr. Boggerty withdrew his motion, and Dr. Pillsbury withdrew her second.

**Consideration of Withdrawal and Reallocation of CDBG Funds for People's Community Center Renovation Project (Debbie O'Brien, Community Development Manager)**

Ms. Debbie O'Brien, Community Development Manager, presented a recommendation concerning the previously approved $40,000 CDBG allocation for the People's Community Center Renovation Project.

Staff recommended approval of the withdrawal of the previously approved $40,000 CDBG allocation for the People's Community Center Renovation Project and to direct staff to make the funds available through the 2027 Annual Action Plan Process.

Ms. O'Brien, Community Development Manager, corrected her response to a question Dr. Sudler raised at the previous meeting, clarifying that the People's Community Center had complied with the requirement to obtain a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

Ms. O'Brien explained that her recommendation was strictly limited to whether the city should continue the environmental review process and proceed with releasing the $40,000 allocation for the workforce development renovations project.

Ms. O'Brien stated that, since her presentation on September 29, 2026, she had identified two additional concerns. The first involved MFI Construction Services, the contractor identified in the reimbursement request. She explained that an internet search indicated the business was not licensed with the State or the City, was not registered as a contractor, and had a disconnected telephone number.

The second concern involved the People's Community Center's public statement that it did not intend to pursue the conditional use approval necessary to continue operating the overnight shelter. As a result, the shelter was not expected to operate during the upcoming winter. Ms. O'Brien noted that the city had already made a substantial federal investment in renovations and shelter-related improvements at the church through American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding. Those improvements were associated with the intended use of the facility to provide shelter and services to individuals experiencing homelessness. Given the organization's decision not to pursue the required approval, she questioned whether a similar situation could occur with the proposed $40,000 allocation.

Ms. O'Brien emphasized that her concerns extended beyond a single missing document, procurement mistake, or administrative error. She stated that the city had made repeated efforts to identify a path forward through communications regarding spending requirements, requests for additional documentation, opportunities to submit corrected information, and efforts to identify eligible expenses and ways to continue supporting the proposed activities.

Ms. O'Brien acknowledged that previous discrepancies and deficiencies could not be undone; however, the outstanding concerns warranted pausing the process and considering all available information before proceeding. She reaffirmed her recommendation regarding the funding.

Ms. Sue Harris, Coordinator of the People's Community Center, expressed her support for the proposed use of the Morris Correctional facility as an overnight shelter and commended Senator Buckson's efforts. She explained that operating the overnight shelter was only one component of the services provided by the People's Community Center and placed considerable demands on the organization during its four months of operation. She stated that the Center served up to 100 individuals daily through meals, a free store, counseling, assistance with detoxification services, showers, clothing, toiletries, and other resources. Ms. Harris emphasized that the organization would welcome an alternative location for the overnight shelter and was willing to assist in establishing the new facility.

Ms. Harris stated that, although the organization hoped to recover its expenditures, her primary concern was addressing questions regarding the Center's financial responsibility and reputation. She expressed appreciation for the city's collaboration with the organization and other churches over the past decade, particularly through federal American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding. She clarified that these funds were federal pass-through funds rather than funds from the city's general budget.
Ms. Harris acknowledged Ms. O'Brien's efforts in reviewing the organization's agreements and expenditures but expressed concern regarding political pressure and what she believed were factual inaccuracies in the previous presentation. She maintained that the organization had generally complied with applicable requirements, with two exceptions. The first involved the failure to submit a required final report within the established timeframe. She stated that the completed report had been provided to Ms. O'Brien that evening and attributed the delay, in part, to the organization not receiving the necessary reporting forms until approximately two weeks earlier. The second involved following federal procurement requirements rather than the city's procurement requirements. She explained that, in the absence of clear instructions, the organization had relied on federal guidelines and did not become aware of the discrepancy until after the procurement process had been completed.

Ms. Harris noted that the city's reimbursement procedures required expenditures and supporting documentation to be reviewed for compliance before payments were issued. She maintained that this process ensured that previously reimbursed expenses had been reviewed and approved by city staff.

Ms. Harris outlined renovations and improvements completed or underway at the facility, including architectural and engineering plans for the four-story building, installation of approximately 6,000 square feet of flooring, painting of basement walls, renovation of a permitted commercial kitchen with commercial-grade equipment, construction of three additional bathrooms and three shower rooms, installation of laundry facilities, renovation of storage and work areas, installation of a fire suppression and sprinkler system, exterior lighting, security cameras, and electronic security improvements. She also reported that demolition of a 125-year-old bowling alley had been completed to accommodate future workforce development and readiness offices, although construction of that space remained unfinished.

Ms. Harris provided the following project expenditures and funding information:

- Architectural and engineering plans totaling approximately $150,000.

- Commercial kitchen renovations totaling $94,232, funded through the initial ARPA allocation.

- Fire suppression and sprinkler improvements totaling approximately $125,000, of which $59,714 was funded through ARPA.

- Workforce development renovations estimated at $200,000, with the $40,000 CDBG allocation currently on hold.

- Building-wide HVAC replacement covering all four floors, totaling approximately $1.1 million, with completion anticipated by December 2026.

Ms. Harris stated that the initial ARPA-funded projects, including the commercial kitchen and sprinkler system, had been completed. She further reported that a second ARPA allocation of $63,288 for salaries, maintenance, and utilities had been fully reimbursed and that an August 7 monitoring review found the expenditures to be in compliance. She stated that the city subsequently approached the organization in 2025 regarding approximately $63,000 in previously allocated ARPA funding that another organization had been unable to expend. The Center accepted the funds for eligible expenses, including salaries, operating costs, and bunk beds, and approximately $17,000 remained available for reimbursement before the deadline of December 31, 2026.

Ms. Harris reported that the organization had received approximately $277,941 in ARPA funding and $62,700 in CDBG funding, including the disputed $40,000 renovation allocation and a pending $22,000 operations allocation. She estimated that the overall improvement projects totaled approximately $1.5 million, with approximately $340,000 provided through federal funding and the remaining expenses primarily covered by the church congregation. She disputed suggestions that the organization had failed to provide its required financial contribution.

Regarding the FY2025 CDBG renovation award, Ms. Harris explained that former Community Development Manager Tracey Harvey had advised the organization to follow federal procurement requirements, which Ms. Harris understood to require three bids for projects exceeding $50,000. Because the award was $40,000, the organization believed three bids were not required. Nevertheless, she stated that three contractors had been consulted, with two declining to submit bids after reviewing the architectural plans prepared by Becker Morgan. Following a recommendation from the Downtown Dover Partnership's development director, the organization selected MFI Construction Services and entered into a contract, making two initial payments totaling approximately $53,000.

Ms. Harris stated that the contract and proof of payment were submitted to Ms. O'Brien in spring 2026 with a reimbursement request. When asked to explain the absence of three bids and the selection of MFI Construction Services, the organization provided a written explanation, which Ms. O'Brien acknowledged receiving.

Ms. Harris further explained that, during a fall 2025 site visit, Ms. Harvey advised the organization of federal environmental compliance requirements, including lead-based paint testing, potential abatement, and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. She stated that the organization understood these expenses would be eligible under the $40,000 CDBG allocation. The environmental work was completed in November and December 2025, and supporting documentation and reimbursement requests were submitted to the city.

Ms. Harris maintained that the city was obligated to reimburse approximately $17,100 for environmental-related expenditures and $22,900 toward the demolition expenses, totaling the $40,000 award.

Ms. Harris also addressed the matching-fund requirement, stating that the church congregation had financed substantial improvements, including the $1.1 million HVAC project, exceeding the required $153,978 contribution. She referenced the 2022 subrecipient agreement between the City of Dover and People's Church of Dover, which established a performance period from April 27, 2022, through December 31, 2026. She emphasized that the agreement was with the church rather than the People's Community Center.

Drawing on her professional experience managing federal, state, and local grants, Ms. Harris stated that grant applications typically include detailed procurement, reporting, and record-retention requirements. She expressed concern that the city's grant application materials did not clearly identify the city's $10,000 procurement threshold. She reiterated that the organization had relied on federal guidelines in the absence of written instructions and noted that it had previously obtained three bids for a project in 2022.

Ms. Harris explained that project timelines and budgets frequently required adjustments due to funding availability, contractor shortages, rising construction costs, environmental requirements, and other unforeseen circumstances. She stated

that these challenges had been particularly significant following the COVID-19 pandemic. Although funding sources and project schedules had changed, she maintained that the organization's overall objectives of providing services to individuals experiencing homelessness had remained consistent.

Ms. Harris expressed concern that complaints and allegations regarding the organization had negatively affected its ability to secure additional funding. She stated that some funding sources had become hesitant to support the Center because of uncertainty surrounding its continued operations. She specifically referenced the loss of anticipated homeless services funding, while noting that funding for the organization's children's programs had continued. She explained that the organization had anticipated receiving the homeless services funding until approximately mid-June and had identified it as a pending funding source in other grant applications.

Ms. Harris disputed concerns regarding compliance with CDBG national objectives and maintained that both the operations and renovation projects satisfied the applicable federal requirements, referencing 24 CFR §§ 570.201 and 570.208.

In closing, Ms. Harris reiterated that the 2022 agreement was entered into with People's Church of Dover, a separate entity from the People's Community Center. She stated that the city had previously issued correspondence confirming fulfillment of the church's contractual obligations and that the church had invested substantially more in renovations than required under its agreement. She maintained that concerns regarding the earlier agreement should not be used as justification for withholding funding under the People's Community Center's 2025 agreement.

Ms. Arndt stated that there appeared to be misunderstandings on both sides and emphasized the importance of learning from past mistakes and maintaining open lines of communication. She clarified that her decision in March to vote against the $36,000 workforce development program grant application was based solely on the merits of the application and not on the performance or concerns associated with the overnight shelter. She explained that the application had not adequately demonstrated the program's long-term sustainability or identified sufficient funding sources beyond the city. She expressed reservations about providing initial funding for a program without a clear plan for continued financial support, noting that she was generally more comfortable supporting capital improvements where expenditures and completed work could be documented.

Ms. Arndt emphasized that she had never advocated for the closure of the overnight shelter and recognized the importance of the services it provided. However, she believed the shelter should operate in a manner that was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and addressed residents' concerns. She expressed surprise at Ms. Harris's statement that the organization did not wish to continue operating the overnight shelter and would not pursue the conditional use approval necessary to continue those operations. She noted that the city had received significant public criticism the previous evening regarding the potential closure of

the shelter. She questioned that criticism in light of the organization's apparent decision not to pursue the available conditional use approval process, which could have allowed the shelter to continue operating.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Harris explained that the People's Community Center had gradually assumed responsibility for operating the emergency overnight shelter during the COVID-19 pandemic after other participating churches discontinued their involvement. She stated that the organization had continued providing shelter services for several years, often without dedicated funding, despite overnight shelter operations being the most demanding aspect of its services. She emphasized that the Center preferred to focus on programs that helped individuals experiencing homelessness achieve stability and independence rather than continuing to provide emergency shelter indefinitely.

Ms. Harris expressed her belief that the community needed transitional and affordable housing rather than additional emergency shelters. However, she acknowledged that emergency shelter capacity in Dover remained inadequate. She explained that the organization had actively sought alternative shelter locations and partners, including discussions with the Salvation Army and representatives associated with the proposed correctional facility. She expressed strong support for using the correctional facility, noting that its existing rooms, kitchens, and showers could accommodate shelter operations.

Regarding the conditional use approval, Ms. Harris explained that the organization did not wish to pursue the process because it had historically operated as an emergency shelter under Code Purple provisions and believed the additional approval would require considerable city staff time, expense, and public hearings without guaranteeing approval. She further expressed concern that obtaining permanent approval could create expectations that the organization operates a year-round shelter, which was not its intention.

Ms. Harris stated that the facility was equipped to accommodate approximately 30 individuals but frequently served between 50 and 60, with attendance occasionally reaching 80. She emphasized that the organization would prefer another provider assume responsibility for overnight shelter operations but would continue providing emergency shelter if no alternative became available, as it did not want individuals left outside in freezing conditions.

Ms. Harris also addressed concerns regarding neighborhood impacts, stating that the organization had made efforts to address complaints and encourage appropriate behavior among those receiving services. These efforts included identifying individuals responsible for discarded food containers and prohibiting individuals observed engaging in drug-related activities from returning. She acknowledged the difficulties associated with managing individuals experiencing homelessness, substance abuse, and other challenges but emphasized the importance of continuing to provide assistance.

In response to Ms. Arndt's concerns regarding the sustainability of the workforce development program, Ms. Harris stated that the organization had secured or anticipated several additional funding sources, including approximately $350,000 in opioid-related funding, which remained pending, and approximately $100,000 in other funding awarded earlier in the year. She also referenced contributions from additional organizations and expressed confidence in the program's financial sustainability.

Ms. Harris explained that Harold Stafford, former Delaware Secretary of Labor and former Polytech School Board member, would oversee the workforce development program. She stated that the program would initially focus on workforce readiness, including assisting participants with obtaining identification and necessary documentation, addressing substance abuse and mental health needs, and establishing the stability required before beginning employment training and development. She emphasized that these supportive and navigation services were essential components of the proposed program.

Ms. Harris concluded by reiterating her confidence in the organization's financial management and expressing hope that additional funding opportunities would become available once concerns surrounding the organization were resolved. She acknowledged that her extensive professional experience in grant administration and financial management could be better utilized by the organization and stated that she intended to assume greater responsibility for overseeing and managing its grants moving forward.

Ms. Arndt reiterated that there had been misunderstandings and misinformation on both sides and emphasized the importance of correcting those misconceptions and working collaboratively moving forward. She expressed her inclination to allow the funding to proceed, acknowledging that some constituents might disagree with her position. However, she noted that the work had already been completed and believed consideration should be given to allowing the reimbursement. Ms. Arndt further emphasized that, should the organization apply for and receive city funding in the future, it would be expected to fully understand and comply with all applicable grant requirements, ensuring that all documentation and procedures were properly completed.

Mayor Christiansen asked Ms. O'Brien whether she had followed the procedures and instructions provided during her training regarding the reimbursement of grant funds.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. O'Brien confirmed that she had.

Mayor Christiansen further asked whether he or any member of Council had influenced her presentation or decision to bring the matter before Council.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. O'Brien stated that neither the Mayor nor any member of Council had influenced her decision.

Mr. Anderson stated that he supported Ms. O'Brien's decision to withhold the funds until she received the necessary information. He explained that the matter had since progressed to the decision of whether to reprogram the funding, which he did not support. Mr. Anderson described the People's Community Center as an organization that had made significant contributions to the city.

Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Harris whether, to the best of her knowledge, the People's Community Center was currently in compliance with city regulations.

Ms. Harris responded affirmatively.

Mr. Anderson further asked whether the expenditures and requirements that had been satisfied were compliant with federal regulations and eligible for reimbursement under federal guidelines, despite the organization's inadvertent failure to comply with the City's purchasing requirements.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Harris responded affirmatively, confirming that, to the best of her knowledge, the expenditures complied with federal requirements and were eligible for reimbursement under federal guidelines.

Responding to Ms. Hall, Ms. Harris stated that she believed MFI was a credible company because the company had been recommended by the Downtown Dover Partnership. She explained that she made a note to follow up.

Ms. Hall requested that Ms. Harris report her findings back to Council.

William G. Faust, Jr. stated that the Morris Correctional Center had been closed by the Department of Correction due to funding constraints and expressed concern regarding the building's maintenance and condition, which he believed could affect its suitability for use as a homeless shelter. He expressed support for the People's Church and its efforts to assist vulnerable individuals. However, he cautioned Council against making exceptions to established funding requirements, noting that doing so could create a precedent for other organizations seeking similar consideration in the future. He emphasized that the funding involved public money and that appropriate oversight, accountability, and checks and balances were necessary to ensure its proper use.

LaChelle Paul, Dover, questioned how much funding the city had invested in the People's Church for its emergency shelter operations. She expressed concern that previously invested funds could be wasted if the shelter was unable to continue operating, particularly given the ongoing need for emergency shelter services and the approaching winter months. She acknowledged the importance of accountability and proper oversight of public funds but emphasized the need to be responsible stewards of money already invested, whether through City, State, or federal funding. She questioned whether it would be reasonable to jeopardize those investments over administrative or procedural issues that could potentially be corrected. She suggested that some of the issues may have resulted from miscommunication or uncertainty regarding responsibilities among those involved

in administering the grants. She encouraged the city to consider resolving those concerns rather than allowing previous investments and the services provided to the unhoused population to be negatively affected.

Responding to Ms. Paul, Ms. O'Brien stated that the city had invested $283,338 in overnight shelter operations. She clarified that the funding currently under consideration was for renovations associated with the workforce development program, not the overnight homeless shelter.

Ms. Paul asked whether the funding previously invested in the People's Church was necessary for the facility to comply with applicable requirements for operating the emergency shelter.

Ms. O'Brien explained that she could only address the funding agreement between the city and the People's Community Center and could not speak to the facility's zoning or operational requirements.

Ms. Harris clarified that the $40,000 allocation under consideration was specifically designated for renovations to convert the former bowling alley into a workforce development and readiness center and was unrelated to the overnight shelter. She explained that previous ARPA and CDBG funding had supported both capital improvements and operational expenses, including supplies and services already provided. She noted that an additional $22,700 in FY2025 CDBG operational funding remained pending.

Ms. Paul asked whether the workforce development program and other services were intended to support the same population, including individuals experiencing homelessness and substance abuse challenges.

Ms. Harris confirmed that the organization's programs served low-income, extremely low-income, and homeless individuals. She explained that the overnight emergency shelter was only one component of the organization's broader services, which continued throughout the year. She further clarified that funding for emergency shelter operations, year-round services, and capital improvements was generally obtained through separate grant applications.

Ms. Paul questioned whether the overnight emergency shelter would reopen during the upcoming winter.

Ms. Harris explained that the organization would consider continuing shelter operations if no alternative location became available and the city agreed to allow the organization to operate under the arrangement that had been in place for approximately ten years.

Ms. Paul expressed concern regarding the approaching winter and asked whether the city had a concrete plan to ensure emergency shelter would be available for individuals experiencing homelessness. She specifically questioned whether the

city would permit the People's Community Center to resume emergency shelter operations if no other facility became available.

Ms. Harris stated that the organization was prepared to assist but emphasized that it would not jeopardize its business license, certificate of occupancy, or other year-round programs by operating without the necessary agreement or authorization. She reiterated the organization's willingness to assist in establishing an alternative shelter location and expressed hope that the City would continue pursuing those options. However, if no alternative became available, she hoped the city would consider an agreement allowing the organization to continue providing emergency shelter services as it had in previous years.

Bonnie Pennington, Dover, expressed concern regarding the potential closure of the People's Church emergency overnight shelter and the lack of alternative accommodations during the winter months. She shared her personal experience with her son, who had previously experienced homelessness, and emphasized the importance of providing safe shelter during freezing temperatures. She urged Council to explore available funding within the city's budget to allow the church to continue providing emergency shelter services.

**Mr. Neil moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation to withdraw the previously approved $40,000 CDBG allocation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boggerty and failed by a roll call vote of three (3) yes (Boggerty, Neil, Mike Lewis), three (3) no (Hall, Anderson, Arndt), one (1) abstention (Pillsbury) (Sudler, Lewis absent).**

Mr. Anderson voted no for the reasons he had previously stated.

Dr. Pillsbury stated that she remained undecided and abstained.

Council President Neil explained that his affirmative vote reflected concerns brought forward by neighboring residents and information in police and emergency medical reports about activity in the surrounding area.

Ms. Hall stated that she was troubled by the questions about the contractor payments and wanted further information, but also believed that the prior investment and the importance of completing the project supported her negative vote.

Following the failed motion, Council President Neil reiterated that the allocation concerned workforce development renovations rather than emergency sheltering. He stated that the city had continued contacting the Center's trustees and others to explore assistance. He noted Ms. Harris's willingness to provide emergency shelter under an agreement and stated that such an agreement would need to include the City's requirements.

**Ms. Hall moved for adjournment of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.**

**Mr. Neil moved for adjournment of the Council Committee of the Whole meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.**

During the Regular Council meeting, Mr. Anderson explained that an authorized representative of the Board of Trustees of the People's Community Center (PCC) had confirmed that PCC voluntarily withdrew its request for $40,000 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding. PCC acknowledged that the CDBG agreement associated with the project had expired on June 30, 2026, and that it was not seeking to reinstate, extend, or otherwise continue the agreement or the associated funding allocation. By signing the withdrawal, the authorized representative confirmed that the action was taken on behalf of PCC and that PCC had no further claim against the City of Dover for reimbursement of expenses associated with the CDBG allocation.

**Mr. Anderson moved to accept the formal withdrawal submitted by the People's Community Center of its request for the $40,000 CDBG renovation allocation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for acceptance of the Council Committee of the Whole Report, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**QUARTERLY REVENUE REPORT AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2026**

Members were provided the Quarterly Revenue Report as of September 30, 2026.

**By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for acceptance of the Quarterly Revenue Report as of September 30, 2026, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**QUARTERLY REVIEW – CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN REPORT (CIP) (JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER)**

Members were provided the Quarterly Report for the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) as of September 30, 2026.

**By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for acceptance of the Quarterly Report for the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) as of September 30, 2026, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**SEMI-ANNUAL INSPECTION BY CITY MANAGER – ROBBINS HOSE COMPANY**

In accordance with Chapter 46 – Fire Prevention and Protection, Article II – Fire Department, Division 1 – Generally, Section 46-43 – Semiannual Inspections of the Dover Code, the City Manager, Ms. Sharon Duca, conducted the required semiannual inspection of the Dover Fire Department on October 20, 2026, at Robbins Hose Company (Station No. 2), with Fire Chief David Carey. Ms. Duca submitted a memorandum outlining the items discussed and noted that the facilities, fire apparatus, equipment, and technology were generally in good condition and well maintained. She reported that Squad 2 was scheduled for replacement in April 2027, Engine 2 had been sent for maintenance due to transmission issues, and the computers installed in the fire

apparatus would require replacement in the near future. The memorandum also addressed facility maintenance, equipment upgrades, and staffing and membership at Station No. 2.

**KENT COUNTY HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

Ms. Kay Sass, Emergency Management Director, explained that the Kent County Hazard Mitigation Plan must be updated every five years. She reported that the city participated in the planning process beginning in 2024, that FEMA approved the plan, and that Kent County adopted it on October 13, 2026. She emphasized that adoption was necessary to maintain eligibility for certain mitigation assistance.

**Dr. Sudler moved to accept the staff recommendation and adopt the Kent County Hazard Mitigation Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boggerty and unanimously carried.**

**REALLOCATION OF BUDGETED PERSONNEL RESOURCES**

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, requested authorization to reallocate budgeted personnel resources in the Electric and Police Departments. She explained that vacancies and anticipated retirements created salary savings sufficient to unfreeze a groundworker position in the Electric Department and allow recruitment overlap for the Electric Director and Police Accreditation Manager positions. She estimated Electric Department replacement and overlap costs of approximately $271,000 against projected savings of approximately $311,000, and Police Department overlap costs of approximately $58,000, covered by vacancy savings. She clarified that the departments are funded separately and that overlapping hires would be contingent upon formal retirement documentation.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca explained that the Electric Department was funded through the Electric Fund, while the Police Department was funded through the General Fund; therefore, the proposed expenditures would remain within their respective funds. She stated that the Electric Department's analysis included the projected costs of four vacant positions and the savings realized from those vacancies during the current fiscal year. The estimated savings totaled $311,000, while the proposed costs associated with filling the positions were approximately $271,000. Regarding the Police Department, Ms. Duca explained that the analysis included both sworn officer and civilian vacancies. She noted that the department had maintained a civilian vacancy throughout the fiscal year and that the savings from that position alone were sufficient to cover the proposed temporary overlap associated with the Accreditation Manager position.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca confirmed that, due to vacancies and staffing shortages, the department had remained under budget, allowing for the proposed hiring of personnel and overlapping positions within the Electric Department.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca clarified that employees scheduled to retire would not be retained beyond their anticipated retirement dates. The goal was to hire replacement employees approximately two to three months before retirement to allow for training and knowledge transfer. It was also noted that newly hired employees would likely receive lower salaries than the tenured employees they were replacing.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca confirmed that the proposed expenditures would remain within budget due to savings from existing vacancies.

**Dr. Sudler moved to accept the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried by a unanimous roll call vote.**

**FIRST READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-15 – AMENDING CHAPTER 42 – ENVIRONMENT – BY ADDING SEC. 42-3 - LIGHTING**

Council President Neil reminded the public that copies of the proposed ordinance were available at the entrance of the Council Chambers, on the City's website at www.cityofdover.gov under "Government", or by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 302-736-7008 or cityclerk@doverde.gov. Final action by Council on the proposed ordinance will take place during the Council Meeting of November 09, 2026.

Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, explained that Proposed Ordinance #2026-15 would establish standards for exterior residential lighting to address glare, excessive illumination, and light trespass affecting neighboring properties. He stated that the ordinance arose from resident complaints and would be enforced primarily through a complaint-driven process, with staff seeking voluntary compliance through education and notices.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kopp explained that the proposed ordinance would not address businesses, as existing provisions within the Zoning Code already regulated such activities. He noted that the Zoning Code did not address residential properties, which prompted the development of the proposed ordinance.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kopp explained that the proposed ordinance addressed the shielding and positioning of outdoor lighting to prevent spotlights from shining directly into neighboring residences. He clarified that incidental light entering a neighboring property would not necessarily constitute a violation, as the ordinance was intended to address excessive glare from improperly directed lighting. He noted that outdoor security lighting could be positioned effectively to illuminate a property and deter intruders without negatively impacting neighboring properties.

Responding to Council President Neil, Mr. Kopp confirmed that enforcement of the proposed ordinance would be complaint-driven. He explained that staff would attempt to conduct investigations during already scheduled after-hours work to minimize additional payroll expenses. He emphasized that staff would not routinely patrol for lighting violations and that investigations would be initiated in response to complaints.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Kopp explained that complaints would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, with investigations coordinated with existing evening commitments, such as homeowners association meetings, whenever possible. He noted that individuals who disagreed with staff's interpretation could appeal to the appropriate board. He emphasized that not all complaints would necessarily constitute violations and that the primary goal was education and voluntary compliance. Staff would work with property owners to identify lighting adjustments that could resolve concerns without negatively impacting neighboring properties. He added that the ordinance would provide a mechanism for notifying property owners of potential violations and addressing complaints.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kopp explained that the proposed ordinance was based on similar language used by Kent County, with modifications to accommodate the City of Dover's specific needs and enforcement practices.

In accordance with Section 1-9 of the Dover Code, Council acknowledged the First Reading of the proposed Ordinance as read by the City Clerk, by title only, as follows:

> Ordinance #2026-15 – Amending Chapter 42 – Environment, by adding Sec. 42-3 Lighting.

**CITY MANAGER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Sharon Duca, City Manager, announced that the Water Main Replacement Project had a few remaining punch list items to be addressed in the Fairview Alley area and on Queen Street. She noted that paving was underway on South Queen Street, with additional paving scheduled for North Queen Street to repair trench areas associated with the installation. She also reported that concrete deliveries would continue at the Dover Mobility Center and that no operational issues or customer complaints had been reported in connection with those activities.

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mayor Christiansen reminded everyone that the Veterans Day Parade would be held on November 7, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. in downtown Dover. He also announced that the Veterans Remembrance and Memorial Service, sponsored by Vietnam Veterans Chapter 850, would be held on November 11, 2026, at the Vietnam Veterans Monument near the Kent County Administration Building.

**COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Dr. Sudler thanked the City Manager for the corrective action taken regarding paving on North and South Queen Streets. He noted that Mount Zion AME Church greatly appreciated the improvements and that Calvary Baptist Church had also been affected by the paving conditions.

Mr. Anderson expressed appreciation on behalf of the Woodcrest community for the improvements made to the walkway honoring a fallen police officer. He noted that he had received positive feedback from residents, many of whom stated that the walkway looked better than it had in years. He commended city staff for their efforts and emphasized that the improvements enhanced safety for children in the area. He also thanked the various city departments for their responsiveness in addressing concerns along South Governors Avenue.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

ANDRIA L. BENNETT, CMC
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by City Council during their Regular Meeting of October 26, 2026, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR