REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular Council Meeting was held on February 8, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. with Council President Slavin presiding. Council members present were Mr. Anderson, Mr. Sudler, Mr. Neil, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cole, Mr. Hare, and Mr. Hutchison. Mr. Hosfelt was absent.

Council staff members present were Captain Stump, Mrs. Mitchell, Mr. Koenig, Mrs. Townshend, Fire Chief Carey (departed at 7:29 p.m. and returned at 8:19 p.m.), Deputy City Solicitor Pepper, and Mrs. McDowell. Mayor Christiansen was also present (departed at 7:33 p.m.).

OPEN FORUM

The Open Forum was held at 7:15 p.m., prior to commencement of the Official Council Meeting. Council President Slavin declared the Open Forum in session and reminded those present that Council was not in official session and could not take formal action.

Mr. Steven Towers, 400 Harmony Lane, advised members that he lives in The Village at McKee Branch, which is a new development. He proposed that the City share the expense of adequate lighting for the S1-S4 pole lights at this development with East Coast Property Management, Inc. Mr. Towers stated that this is a high crime area and, with the current lighting, you cannot see your hand in front of your face.

The invocation was given by Reverend Theodore Henderson, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Mr. Hutchison moved for approval of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Sudler and unanimously carried.

Mr. Neil requested that item #3-B-b-1- Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee Report - Persimmon Park Place Drainage Project, be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Lewis moved for approval of the Consent Agenda, as amended, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Mr. Hosfelt absent).

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - EMERGENCY COUNCIL MEETING OF DECEMBER 29, 2015

The Minutes of the Emergency Council Meeting of December 29, 2015 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Hare and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 25, 2016

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of January 25, 2016 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Hare and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

PUBLIC HEARING/FINAL READING OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2015-24 - REZONING REQUEST FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ADJACENT TO THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF 1042 SOUTH BRADFORD STREET

A public hearing was duly advertised for this time and place to consider the rezoning of property located adjacent to the west property line of 1042 South Bradford Street, consisting of a $2,373^{+/-}$ s.f. portion of a $10,373^{+/-}$ parcel, owned by Halpern Family Property Investment, LP. This property is currently zoned R-8 (One Family Residence) and the proposed zoning is C-1A (Limited Commercial) (Tax Parcel: ED-05-077.17-03-14.00-000; Second Council District; Planning Reference Z-16-01).

Mr. Sudler moved that the Final Reading of Proposed Ordinance #2015-24 be acknowledged by title only, seconded by Mr. Cole and unanimously carried. *(The First Reading of the ordinance was accomplished during the Council Meeting of December 14, 2015.)*

Planner's Review

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, reviewed the petition to amend the zoning district and the findings and recommendations of the Planning Commission. She noted that the purpose of the rezoning is to administratively shift the zoning line to allow the neighboring commercial property on South Governor's Avenue to expand its parking.

Mrs. Townshend advised that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning request and reminded members that anyone voting against the Planning Commission's recommendation will be required to state the reason for their vote

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that she was not aware of any Planning Commission members visiting the site; however, she was very familiar with the area.

Public Hearing

Council President Slavin declared the public hearing open.

Mr. Randy Duplechain, Davis, Bowen & Friedel, Inc., stated that he was representing Mr. Dave Wood and Dr. Joel Halpern on this request for rezoning. He noted that they were requesting that the rear portion of the residential lot be rezoned to commercial, which will allow them to expand the existing parking on the commercial property, which is currently an office space. Mr. Duplechain advised that there are currently two (2) renters on the first floor, one (1) is the Board of Elections and the other is Blue Cross. Chesapeake Utilities is leasing the second floor and they are going to expand their office space into that property. He stated that there are about 56 spaces on the property and they think it is close to being adequate; however, they are not sure if it would meet their requirements and would like to add another seven (7) to eight (8) parking spaces to allow for overflow parking.

Mr. Duplechain advised that some parking was removed when Governors Avenue was turned into a four-lane road. He noted that there used to be parallel parking there and there is some parking on the side streets; however, he thought it was restricted certain hours of the day. Mr. Duplechain reiterated that the request was to expand the parking a little bit, to provide a little more room, should

it be needed for visitors. He noted that the Grange is on the south side of this property, so there is a parking lot adjacent to this property, and the parking that they would be installing will be screened with a privacy fence.

Mr. Hutchison asked how many people would be working in the Chesapeake Utilities office. Responding, Mr. Duplechain stated that he thought approximately 50 people would occupy the Chesapeake Utilities office space and he was unaware of the number of people working at the Board of Elections. He stated that very few cars use the parking lot at this time.

Mr. Hutchison advised that he passes the parking lot every day and it is never full. He questioned the need for additional parking spaces.

Mr. Neil requested clarification on whether it was the tenant or the owner of the building who was requesting additional parking. Responding, Mr. Duplechain stated that the building owner was requesting the additional parking based on concerns raised by the tenant.

Mr. Hare stated that his concern was that they were not sure that additional parking was necessary and the impression was given that the negotiation for the lease of the space was based upon getting these parking spaces, even though the people renting the space feel they have enough parking. He suggested that it would be worth waiting to see if additional parking is needed instead of inconveniencing the residence with another parking lot that may or may not be used. Mr. Duplechain stated that the tenant was the one that brought the concern that there may not be enough parking to the owner of the property.

Mr. Hare stated that the property is advertised as having ample parking and there are 56 parking spots, with 35 to 38 empty spots at any given time every day.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mr. Duplechain stated that he would assume the hours of business would be from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and, although there is parking on both sides of the side street, there are signs indicating that there are restrictive hours on one (1) side of the road.

Dr. Joel Halpern, 4 Forest Hills Court, stated that there is permit parking which does not allow all day parking. He noted that the normal business hours of operation are usually from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Dr. Halpern advised that the current parking does not meet the requirements that the tenant has asked for, noting that some spaces were removed during the Governors Avenue construction. He noted that it was Chesapeake Utilities' plan to build a new building and he does no know how long they will be in this building.

Dr. Halpern stated that he did not think the current number of parking places meets the requirement. Mr. Hare stated that if the building were being built new, the requirement would be one (1) parking space for every 300 square feet. Mrs. Townshend advised that the C-1A zone does not specify a parking requirement; however, the other zones where offices are permitted are typically one (1) for every 300 square feet, as a minimum. Mr. Hare advised that this building has one (1) parking space to 290 square feet, which more than meets the parking requirements of the City and other zoning

areas. Mr. Duplechain reiterated that the tenant expressed concerns about the amount of parking and that the owner felt that they had adequate parking.

Ms. Toni Gillis, 1086 South Bradford Street, provided a petition with 18 signatures opposing the rezoning.

Ms. Gillis stated that, a few years ago, a rezoning was requested on their street for more commercial space and they were told at that time that there was a moratorium on rezoning property on South Bradford Street. She stated that, to the best of her knowledge, that moratorium has not been changed. Ms. Gillis stated that South Bradford Street is a community of families with small children and the very elderly and they like the street quiet and calm. She stated that they understand that they have mixed use on their street; however, they would like to maintain it at the current use level, noting that there has been a significant creep of commercial space into the neighborhood. Ms. Gillis stated that they do not want more commercial space and traffic on their street where their children are playing and the elderly are crossing the street. She noted that it is already difficult to cross the street due to traffic.

Ms. Gillis advised that she spoke against the rezoning of this property at the Planning Commission meeting and she thought it was interesting that the two (2) members who voted against it cited creep into the neighborhood.

Ms. Regina Stubbolo, 1081 South Bradford Street, stated that she has gone by the parking lot and there is hardly ever anybody parked there. She expressed concern about the possibility of other properties having a little bit of their property taken away to make parking spots. Ms. Stubbolo asked why they would add more parking spots if Chesapeake is building another building and will be leaving.

There being no one else present wishing to speak, Council President Slavin declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Slavin advised that, according to State law, the petition must be verified before action can be taken on the rezoning request.

Mr. Anderson moved to defer action on the rezoning request until the Regular Council meeting of February 22, 2016. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cole and unanimously carried.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT - JANUARY 26, 2016

The Council Committee of the Whole met on January 26, 2016 with Council President Slavin presiding.

Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee

Proposed Ordinance #2016-05 - Amending Chapter 106 - Traffic and Vehicles, Article III - Stopping, Standing and Parking, Division 2 - Metered Parking, Section 106-164 - Violations; Penalties

Mrs. Traci McDowell, City Clerk, informed members that the Police Department requested Proposed Ordinance #2016-05 to reduce the maximum number of past due or accumulated violations from five (5) to three (3) in order for a vehicle to be subject to enhanced civil enforcement. She explained that the Department was getting ready to order a new stock of violation permits or ticket books. Since the dollar amount related to enhanced civil enforcement for accumulated unpaid violations was previously reduced from $200 to $100, the Police Department felt that the maximum number of past due or accumulated violations should be reduced correspondingly.

The Committee recommended adoption of Proposed Ordinance #2016-05, as recommended by Staff.

By consent agenda, Mr. Lewis moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent). (The First Reading of the ordinance will take place during the latter part of the meeting).

Request for Waiver - Appendix B - Zoning, Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Section 17 - Emergency Access Requirements - Waiver of Emergency Rear Access Requirement for The Grande, Building 4: Planned Neighborhood Design - Senior Citizen Housing Option (Application C-15-04)

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, reviewed a request for waiver of the emergency rear access requirement for The Grande, Building 4. She informed members that this waiver request was related to the requirement in the Zoning Ordinance for a 24-foot wide emergency rear access. Mrs. Townshend noted that although this is a requirement in the City's zoning ordinance, it is not in the State Fire Prevention Regulations or any of the other fire codes that the City has adopted. She reminded members that The Grande currently had three (3) buildings and they previously applied for and received the emergency rear access waiver for these buildings.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the request was reviewed by Staff, the Fire Marshal's Office, and the Development Advisory Committee (DAC). She noted that the request was also sent to the Dover Fire Department and no comments were received. Mrs. Townshend advised members that the site will comply with the State Fire Prevention Regulations, and the building will be sprinklered and have the 24-foot fire lane coverage in the front. She stated that it also will have the perimeter access required under the State Fire Prevention Regulations, noting that some of those provisions were not in place at the time that the corresponding zoning text was developed.

Mrs. Townshend stated that Staff recommended in favor of the requested waiver. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the conditional use site plan for the apartment building and, after reviewing the DAC comments, also recommended the requested waiver.

Mr. Hutchison asked who sits in on the review process. Responding, Mrs. Townshend explained that the City's DAC includes the Planning Office, Fire Marshal's Office, Public Works, Kent Conservation District, and Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT). She stated that the plans are also distributed to police, fire and others, and meeting agendas are also provided to the school district. Mrs. Townshend informed members that she recently had a discussion with the Fire Department about participation in the DAC process. She noted that the Fire Department has someone who reviews plans as they come through and, although Staff may not receive comments from the Department, it does not mean they are not looking at the plans.

Mayor Christiansen strongly urged that all the departments that Mrs. Townshend contacts as part of the review process memorialize their objections or lack of objections in a letter to her so that she has a paper trail.

In response to Mayor Christiansen, Mrs. Townshend reiterated that she did talk to the Fire Department about this request and they indicated that they did not have any written comments to share. Mayor Christiansen stated that he would insist on written notification regarding comments or a lack of comments, noting that the leadership of the Fire Department changes on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Sudler asked how recent Mrs. Townshend's discussion was with the Fire Department and if she had spoken to the new Fire Chief. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated her belief that she talked to Chief Hall before he left, as well as Mr. Carter Knotts, the Fire Chief's Assistant, who shared what the Fire Department's strategy would be for reviewing plans that go through the DAC.

Mr. Sudler asked for Mrs. Townshend's opinion regarding the Fire Department's overall feeling about the project. Responding, Mrs. Townshend reiterated that the Department indicated that they did not have any comments. Mr. Sudler questioned if Mrs. Townshend thought that their lack of comments meant that they agreed with it. In response, Mrs. Townshend stated that she would not want to presume anything, noting that she gave the Fire Department every opportunity to object if they had any concern.

The Committee recommended approval of the waiver for the elimination of the emergency rear access requirement for The Grande, Building 4: Planned Neighborhood Design - Senior Citizen Housing Option, as recommended by Staff and the Planning Commission.

By consent agenda, Mr. Lewis moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent).

Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee Report

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, informed members that during the last Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee meeting, members discussed the importance of, with some regularity, updating City Council and the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee on the Subcommittee's activities. She stated that Mr. Jim Hutchison, Subcommittee Chair, was not able to attend the meeting; however, he hoped to be present at future meetings.

Mrs. Townshend noted that a number of Council members had attended some of the Subcommittee meetings and may be aware of some of things that have been going on. She reminded members that approximately one and one-half years ago the City received honorable mention through the League of American Cyclists as a bicycle-friendly community. Mrs. Townshend stated that the Subcommittee was currently in the process of working on a walk-friend community application, and trying to obtain credentials to market the City as a bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly city. She informed members that, under the leadership of the Dover-Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Dover Pedestrian Plan and the Dover Bicycle Plan were completed, noting that they were approved by City Council during their Regular Council Meeting of April 13, 2015.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the Subcommittee had held a number of events, including the third Annual Bike to Work Day last May. She informed members that the Subcommittee was actively planning for the 2016 Bike to Work Day, which she believed would be held on May 18th. Mrs. Townshend noted that on the evening of May 18th the Subcommittee would also host the second Annual Ride of Silence, which is a very short, quiet ride intended to remember and raise awareness of those who have lost their lives in cycling accidents.

Mrs. Townshend advised members that the Sub-Committee had been working very closely with Capital School District to introduce bicycle safety information into the curriculum of the physical education program in the District and, so far, it had been very well received. She stated that on the City's Parks and Recreation Department website, staff had added a page for bicycle and pedestrian information. Mrs. Townshend indicated that the Subcommittee was working with the schools to put out a bike rack design contest, noting that this was their second try because they did not get any entries last year.

Mrs. Townshend informed members that the most significant activity that the Sub-Committee is working on, with the City's Parks and Recreation Department, is planning a Dover Duathlon. She noted that there used to be a popular, introductory running/cycling event called Du-Dover which started at White Oak Park and ended

at Dover Park; however, the company discontinued the event. Mrs. Townshend stated that a Dover Duathlon was planned for the morning of April 23, 2016. She noted that members of the Sub-Committee were working to get sponsorships so that, in addition to covering costs, there could be a small contribution to an organization dealing with traumatic brain injury, which the Sub-Committee felt was important due to the tie between bicycle safety and brain injury. Mrs. Townshend informed members that the event was for the entry-level, multi-sport athlete and would include a mile-and-a-half run, followed by an eight (8) mile bike ride, followed by a mile-and-a-half run, and information regarding the event was on the City's website. She stated that the Subcommittee was also going to try to get a number of City staff to participate, and indicated that she hoped to do so.

Councilman Hutchison stated that the Subcommittee was outstanding and consisted of hardworking, focused men and women. He noted that the members were very dedicated to the cause and would make a difference.

Mrs. Townshend noted that the Subcommittee had brought forward ideas and formed a relationship between residents, DelDOT, the MPO, and the City, and through this group DelDOT had now found money for a number of projects and was making a significant investment.

Mr. Sudler asked if the bike/pedestrian friendly initiative would be included in the White Oak/Dover Park comprehensive plan. Responding, Mrs. Townshend explained that the Duathlon was a one (1) day event that would be held at the park. She expressed hope that the event will continue to be an end-goal event that will bring people to Dover, noting that when the City has successful events in the parks, it brings people who may not have otherwise come to the park and provides an opportunity for people to see what the City has to offer. Mrs. Townshend stated that the City always hopes to create park enthusiasts through recreation programming.

Mr. Sudler asked how close the City was to implementing the White Oak comprehensive plan. In response, Mrs. Townshend stated that the City had not solicited proposals yet and a consultant would be needed.

Mr. Shelton asked whether the Subcommittee had started advertising for the Duathlon, noting that he is involved with runners and cyclists and had not heard about the event. Responding Mrs. Townshend explained that the details had just started to come together during the last month. She offered to provide copies of a recently created brochure to Mr. Shelton. Mrs. Townshend informed members that the event was being managed by TriSports and would be advertised on their website, which has a captive audience; however, she agreed that the Subcommittee needed to look at other advertising options as well.

In response to Mr. Shelton's question regarding sponsors, Mrs. Townshend confirmed that the Subcommittee was seeking sponsors. Staff had prepared a letter

for the Subcommittee to use, but staff had informed the Subcommittee that City staff would not solicit sponsors. She noted that the material could be provided to any members who may know potential sponsors.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that the event would be held on the morning of Saturday, April 23, 2016.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee Report.

By consent agenda, Mr. Lewis moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent).

Legislative, Finance and Administration Committee

Persimmon Park Place Drainage Project

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised members that City staff had been working with representatives from the Permission Park Place community, the Department of Natural Resources (DNREC) and the Kent Conservation District, as well as State legislators regarding drainage issues associated with Persimmon Park Place.

Mr. Koenig informed members that approximately 12 to 15 years go, the City agreed to take the streets, rights-of-way, and utilities under public dedication in Persimmon Park Place. At that time, the City elected not to dedicate the storm water infrastructure in the subdivision because much of it was located behind the houses, in unusual places that were not in standard easements, and it some cases it was failing and continues to fail.

Mr. Koenig explained that staff, as well as State representatives, had been working with several residents on specific drainage issues, predominantly on the east boundary of Persimmon Park Place where it abuts Wild Meadows. He stated that a preliminary drainage study was done approximately a year-and-a-half ago, and the final recommendations were made in March of 2015. Mr. Koenig informed members that the preliminary study indicated the need for a final design for a potential pipe to go in the rear yards of several houses, and the pipe would be in a dedicated public easement. He stated that the new pipe would be constructed and eventually turned over to the City of Dover for maintenance. Mr. Koenig informed members that, since this was not currently a City-funded project, the legislators and the State agreed to cover the cost of the design phase of the project, for a total amount of $27,250. He stated that 90 percent of the funding would come from the 21st Century Fund and the other 10 percent would come from Representatives William Carson and Brian Bushweller as part of their community transportation funds. Mr. Koenig advised that there were agreements attached to this project, explaining that if Staff receives endorsement from the Committee and Council, they intend to execute the agreements and begin the design phase of the project. He stated that once actual construction

estimates are received, the City will have to make a decision as to how the project will be constructed, noting that it is Staff's intention to seek additional community transportation funds and/or 21st Century Funds for the construction.

Mr. Koenig explained that, since this project is not in the current CIP, it was Staff's desire to initiate the design phase, assign a project number, and obtain authorization from City Council to be working on this project.

Mr. Koenig stated that Staff was requesting authorization to execute the two (2) agreements to fully fund the Persimmon Park Place Drainage Project and begin the design phase of the project in order to finalize the design and ultimately move forward with improvements regarding these drainage concerns in Persimmon Park Place. No City of Dover money will be used to pay for the design phase of this project.

Mr. Shevock questioned whether the project would be completed in accordance with City or State specifications and who would do the inspection when it goes to construction. Responding, Mr. Koenig explained that when the project goes to construction, it will most likely be inspected under City of Dover specifications and it will be consistent with both the City's Public Works Construction Manual and DNREC Conservation District Construction Manual. He stated that there would be some joint review and the infrastructure will meet both standards.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig confirmed that there would be no City money spent on the design for the project.

Mr. Hare asked if this matter would be brought back to the Committee once the design phase is done and the project is started, so that members would know how much money will be spent on the project. In response, Mr. Koenig stated that he was sure that the construction contract would exceed $25,000. He explained that if the project is fully funded by a third party, it would not come back for further consideration; however, if the project is funded by the City, it would have to be part of the budget request. Mr. Koenig stated that, at this time, staff did not intend to include this as a City funded FY 17 project because they would like the funding to come from other sources.

Mr. Hare asked when staff anticipated this project would be complete. Responding, Mr. Koenig expressed his opinion that it would take approximately six (6) months to complete the preliminary and final designs, calculations, etc., and the project would probably be constructed in the spring or summer of 2017, at the earliest. He noted his expectation that this project would require easement acquisition.

The Committee recommended authorizing Staff to execute the two (2) agreements to fully fund the Persimmon Park Place Drainage Project and that no City of Dover money will be used to pay for the design phase of this project.

During the City Council meeting, Mr. Neil advised that Persimmon Park Place and Wild Meadows are directly across the street from the Dover Downs woodlands and wetlands and the problem with this area is that it is wetlands. As he understood it, when Persimmon Park Place was first developed, it was developed as a lease land community and then later developed into a common interest community when the lots were sold. Mr. Neil noted that both communities suffer from fissures, sinkholes, and problems related to the water level and this drainage project is definitely needed. He advised that it is a danger to the people walking through the area.

Mr. Neil stated that, in Wild Meadows, the rents pay the freight and the community owner wants to get the residents to pay more for the problems that have developed with the fissures in the land. He noted that the Planning Department, along with the Code Inspectors, have been to Wild Meadows because of the serious nature of the situation and the dangers it presents to the community. Mr. Neil stated that he strongly supports the drainage project for Persimmon Park Place in order to protect the people and their home values.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mr. Neil stated that when the Wild Meadows development was approved, the developer installed drainage and sewers in order to develop the property and that infrastructure has failed catastrophically and they want the home owners to pay to fix it. Mr. Neil noted that this issue was currently being addressed in the courts.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, stated that the common property line on the east side of Persimmon Park Place abuts Wild Meadows. He noted that there are several lots that are currently classified as wetlands that experience flooding during heavy rains. Mr. Koenig advised that there are some existing stormwater pipes in Persimmon Park Place that were constructed under the designation of a private drainage system when Persimmon Park Place was developed. He stated that approximately 10 years ago, the City of Dover dedicated the water, sewer, and existing pavement in Persimmon Park Place; however, they specifically left out the dedication of the storm drain system because there was indication at the time that there were going to be failures, there are not easements in some areas, and, at the time, they recommended that the infrastructure remain private.

Mr. Koenig advised that the Persimmon Park Place Condo Association Board has requested that legislators get involved in the resolution of those drainage issues. This is the first phase of one (1) project that is actually going to design. Mr. Koenig stated that there was a $6,000 drainage study that was done approximately a year ago and this is a correction resulting from the study that will most likely design, to public infrastructure standards, a stormwater pipe that will start at the northeast corner of the Persimmon Park Place property and run along the back side of a number of houses towards Susan Place and connect into a couple of the road drains. Mr. Koenig advised that the pipe is intended to be built in a public easement that will be acquired through these designs and, once the infrastructure is constructed, it will be dedicated to the City of Dover because it will have met all of the design standards for dedication.

Mr. Koenig noted that this is the beginning of what will probably be additional projects coming forth in the future. The major difference between Persimmon Park Place and Wild Meadows is that Persimmon Park Place is a fee simple land transfer setup where there are many landowners and the infrastructure associated with the roads, the water system, and the sewer system is currently

dedicated. In Wild Meadows, the water and sewer systems existing in easements are dedicated to the City of Dover and if there is a break in those mains, the City is required to maintain them and then repair the road. The roads, the storm drain system, and any type of drainage swales or ditches in Wild Meadows are owned by the land owner and are privately maintained.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Koenig stated that the cost of the design contract is $27,250, of which $25,000 is being funded through the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) and $2,500 is being funded by Senator Bushweller and Representative Carson. He advised that there are two (2) separate State revenue agreements associated with the design and some City staff time associated with managing the design contract; however, there is no cost to the City for this project.

Mr. Neil moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation to authorize Staff to execute the two (2) agreements to fully fund the Persimmon Park Place Drainage Project and that no City of Dover money will be used to pay for the design phase of this project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent).

Proposed Ordinance #2016-06 Amending Chapter 26 - Businesses, Article II - Licenses, Section 26-40 - License Issuance, Expiration and Form, and Section 26-42 - Penalty for Late Payment of License Fee

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, reviewed Proposed Ordinance #2016-06. She reminded members that various members of City staff had attended a Lean Boot Camp with the purpose of evaluating the City's processes in order to eliminate unnecessary steps and unnecessary work, which equate to waste. She advised members that, as a result of the Boot Camp, the Planning and Inspections Department examined the process for business licenses.

Mrs. Townshend explained that business licenses are due on July 1st each year, which is also the first day of the new fiscal year; therefore, license renewals must be mailed out in June. When they are mailed out in June, payments are returned, staff processes the payments, and the Finance Department then has to manually move the money from one fiscal year's ledger to the next fiscal year. Mrs. Townshend expressed her opinion that there are many unnecessary steps in this process, noting the amount of time and effort that it takes for the Information Technology Department to run the reports to be able to move the money, and for the Finance Department review all of this and then move it. She stated that manually moving the money from one fiscal year to another also creates the potential for error.

Mrs. Townshend informed members that she discussed this process with the Finance Department and suggested that the City change the business license year to begin August 1st, which would allow staff to mail the license renewals at the very beginning of July to avoid processing anything during the transition of the fiscal year.

Mrs. Townshend stated that Proposed Ordinance #2016-06 would bring the license renewal process in line with the fiscal year end. She explained that the ordinance

would also remove language which indicates that the city clerk, the fire marshal, and the executive officer for the board of health sign business licenses, since none of them currently do this.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Townshend stated that the license year would be from August to August, so people would get a free month.

Mr. Sudler moved to recommend adoption of Proposed Ordinance #2016-06, as recommended by Staff, seconded by Ms. Maucher.

Mr. Anderson expressed his opinion that this was a great idea and one (1) of the things that we need to be doing as a City. He stated that he looked forward to seeing more proposals.

The Committee recommended adoption of Proposed Ordinance #2016-06, as recommended by Staff.

By consent agenda, Mr. Lewis moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent). (The First Reading of the ordinance will take place during the latter part of the meeting).

Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, reminded members that the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015 had been completed. She reviewed a presentation summarizing the audited financial statements and the summary statements, noting that these were based on the audit results. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the presentation expanded on the major items in the statements, such as the pension and other post-employment benefits (OPEB) liabilities. She advised members that the presentation did not include the budget to actual reports, which are done on a cash-type basis. Mrs. Mitchell noted that the financial statements are done on an accrual basis, based on Charter and Code requirements.

Mrs. Mitchell, referring to Page 5 of the presentation, informed members that the Statement of Net Position is basically what used to be called the balance sheet. She explained that the Governmental Activities column includes grant funds, the general government fund, and general governmental capital project fund; and the Business-Type Activities included utilities. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the workers' compensation fund is included in Governmental Activities for balance sheet purposes; however, for income statement purposes, it is included as an enterprise fund. She explained that this goes both ways because the assets and liabilities are actually owned by the City, not by a business entity.

Mrs. Mitchell informed members that the Statement of Net Position included new items, including the net pension asset and the OPEB asset, which show that the City is currently over-funded for pensions and OPEB liabilities. She stated that the pension-related deferred outflows were related to pensions in a different period. Mrs. Mitchell noted that the long-term OPEB and pension liability are listed under non-current liabilities. She reminded members that the most significant change in this CAFR was that the pension liabilities had to be recorded on the face of the financial statements in accordance with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 68 accounting standard that was recently implemented. Mrs. Mitchell explained that pension liabilities used to be included only in the notes but are now listed under the Unrestricted Net Position and indicate an amount of -$27,947,000 that is due to the pension liability for governmental activities. She informed members that another GASB standard would be going into effect which would require the OPEB liability to be recorded this way in the future.

Mr. Slavin questioned what potential effect GASB 68 and showing a higher liability may have on the City's ratings. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell explained that the rating agencies will look at how the City is managing that liability. She stated that it could affect the City's interest rates on any debt service that the City may go to market for. Mrs. Mitchell confirmed that bond rating agencies would be looking at this for all governmental entities.

Mrs. Mitchell reviewed the Statement of Activities, Page 6, noting that it was previously called an income statement. She reminded members that several years ago the GASB reformatted this statement. Mrs. Mitchell stated that this statement previously indicated the City's income at the top, expenses at the bottom, and net income. She explained that it is now listed by function or program, with expenses listed first, followed by the adjustment for indirect expenses, which is what the City allocates to the utilities for overhead. All program revenues are listed next, which show the charges for services, operating grants and contributions, and capital grants and contributions. Last, the statement shows the net (expense) revenue and changes in net position for governmental activities, business-type activities, and the total. Mrs. Mitchell noted that this statement lists all of the governmental activities at the top and noted that the City does not have any government program or function that is actually self-supporting, they all net to a negative number. Referring to the bottom of the statement, she explained that property taxes, transfer taxes, and transfers from the utilities are considered general governmental revenues help cover those differences. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the net position, or net income, was $1,948,307 for the governmental activities and $7,355,001 for the utilities. She explained that the statement was re-formated to make it more apparent as to whether programs/revenues are covering costs.

Mrs. Mitchell reviewed the Governmental Fund Balance Sheet, Page 7, noting that it lists strictly current assets, current liabilities, and governmental-type activities and does not include pension or OPEB information. Mrs. Mitchell informed members

that the unassigned fund balance was approximately $3.9M and the total fund balance was approximately $9.2M. She explained that this $9.2M was on a governmental basis, without all of the GASB adjustments which reflected a negative $27M.

Mrs. Mitchell explained that the list of fund balances on Page 8 shows what makes up the $9.2M on the Governmental Fund Balance Sheet. She informed members that it was a GASB standard for the fund balances to include inventory and prepaids, noting that although these items are included on the balance sheet as assets, the City has to offset that with a reservation on the fund balance showing that they are non-spendable, because GASB feels that they are not readily convertible to cash. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the Fund includes commitments for the Contingency Reserve and the Parkland Reserve, explaining that those are considered committed because they are done by Council and not by an outside party. Referring to the assigned funds, she explained that police investigations referred to a fund that the Police Department has from donations received from citizens, specifically for purposes of the Police Department. Mrs. Mitchell noted that the other governmental funds were grant funds which are all considered reservations because they are not the City's money to spend.

Mrs. Mitchell reviewed the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in the Fund Balances of Governmental Funds, Page 9, noting that it reflected a net change in fund balance of $1.5M for the General Fund, and a negative net change balance of $55,997 for the non-major funds. She explained that this was usually just a timing difference because the grant funds came in either later or in the prior year, so expenditures might be higher than revenues based on the timing of the revenue versus the expense.

Mrs. Mitchell, referring to the Statement of Net Position - Proprietary Funds, Page 10, noted that the City does have to record the OPEB and pension liabilities for the enterprise funds, unlike the governmental funds. She stated that, even with the inclusion of the liabilities, the total net position remained positive.

Referring to the Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Net Position - Proprietary Funds, Page 11, Mrs. Mitchell stated that the changes in net position, or net income, for water and wastewater services was approximately $4.7M and approximately $2.6M for electric, for a total of approximately $7.4M. She noted that the City's internal service fund is actually the City workers' compensation self-insurance fund.

Mrs. Mitchell advised members that she included information regarding Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) on Page 15 to highlight how the City fared in making the annual required contribution. She stated that the total net OPEB obligation decreased approximately $1.6M because the City contributed more with the lump sum appropriations and the percentage of payroll. Mrs. Mitchell explained that the

City actually contributed more than the requirement and paid down that liability a little quicker by having the extra money there.

Mrs. Mitchell reviewed the OPEB Trust Schedule of Funding Status and Progress, Page 16, noting that the City was able to reduce the percentages that were used for the OPEB contributions which was helping with the current budget. She explained that actuarial accrued liability (AAL) was approximately $70.4M on July 1, 2013 and on July 1, 2014 it decreased to approximately $51.2M. Mrs. Mitchell informed members that there was a 10-year funding plan for this liability; however, the City is able to discontinue that plan because the City is at a better funding level than expected. She explained that with the 10-year funding plan, the City had to bifurcate the interest rate and use the discount rate on the municipal bonds, which is about 5.4% on the part that is unfunded, and the 7% rate, which is the City's actuarial assumption, on the part that is funded. Since the City is fully funding, the interest rate changed to 7% for the whole fund and because that interest rate went up, it reduced that liability.

Mr. Anderson noted that OPEB was no longer a separate budget line item and asked what it was now combined with. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that OPEB and pension were included in the functions/programs on the Statement of Activities on Page 6. She explained that the money for OPEB and pension has to be allocated to each division of each program and staff now has to go through a process to develop an allocation methodology. Mrs. Mitchell noted that it cannot be a separate item because it is considered a cost of service for each of those programs.

Mr. Anderson felt that the requirement was supposed to make it easier to understand and more open; however, it seemed to be hiding how much liability there is.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Mitchell clarified that the liability is included in each program on the Statement of Activities; however, it is also on the Governmental Fund Balance Sheet as liability and any asset the City may have.

Mrs. Mitchell reviewed Pension Plans - Defined Benefit and Pension Expense - Financial Reporting Purposes, Pages 17-18, explaining that the approximately $4.8M in total contributions indicated on Page 17 was reflected in the budget reports; however, the approximately $1.8M for the Police Pension Expense and $2.4M for General Employee Pension Expense indicated on Page 18 were reflected in the GASB Statement of Activities that are audited.

Mrs. Mitchell informed members that Page 89 in the CAFR included information regarding the defined contribution plans; however, that information is not on these schedules because those plans are not included in the City's financial statements. She explained that the information is included in the notes to the financial statements, but not within the statements since those are not the City's assets, they are the assets of employees because they are fully vested on day one when they start contributing.

Mrs. Mitchell stated that there were notes regarding the contributions that the City and employees made and the number of employees, and offered to provide that schedule to members who wished to receive a copy.

Mr. Hutchison noted that Mrs. Mitchell had been in accounting for more than 20 years in the City and many changes had occurred. He asked whether Mrs. Mitchell believed that the City has better control and insight on financial matters the way it is designed today. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell felt that she had better control and insight now versus 20 years ago, explaining that she is more involved and enlightened about what is going on. She stated that there have been a lot of accounting changes to incorporate, noting that the GASB changes have not slowed down. When she came to work for the City in 2000, GASB 34 was being implemented and they are now on GASB 78. She stated that although all of the changes do not apply to the City, most of them do.

Mr. Hare moved for acceptance of the Council Committee of the Whole Report, seconded by Mr. Sudler and unanimously carried.

MONTHLY REPORTS - DECEMBER 2015

By motion of Mr. Lewis, seconded by Mr. Hare, the following monthly reports were accepted by consent agenda:

City Assessor's Report
City Manager's Report
City Planner's Report
Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report
Economic Development Office Report
Fire Chief's Reports (November and December)
Police Chief's Report

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN (CIP) (OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, AND DECEMBER)

Members were provided the Quarterly Report for the Capital Investment Plan as of December 31, 2015.

By consent agenda, Mr. Lewis moved for acceptance of the Quarterly Report for the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) as of December 31, 2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent).

TENTATIVE LABOR AGREEMENT - DOVER ORGANIZATION OF EMPLOYEES (DOE)

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised that Staff has been working with the Dover Organization of Employees (DOE) on a labor agreement. He noted that negotiations began in February of 2015 and there were seven (7) face-to-face negotiating sessions that concluded on July 27, 2015. Mr. Koenig advised that, at the request of DOE, two (2) mediation sessions were held at the end of September and early October, at which point they reached an agreement in principle. The terms of

the successor agreement were outlined in executive sessions with City Council, once on January 25, 2016 and again earlier in the evening.

Mr. Koenig stated that the proposed salary changes include the following: $0.50 per hour will be added to all labor grades in the collective bargaining matrix, retroactive to September 27, 2015; $0.25 per hour will be added to each of the components of the matrix on July 1, 2016; and $0.25 per hour will be added to all components to the matrix on July 1, 2017. He advised that this agreement covers 129.5 employees across a variety of City departments and includes positions such as customer service representatives, clerks, and equipment operators.

Mr. Koenig advised that the proposed wage changes equate to an increase in cost of $832,385, over the term of the contract, which would be back dated to July 1, 2015 and would run through June 30, 2018. The total cost of labor for the contract would increase, based on the additional wages and load, from $22.305M to $23.138M, an increase of approximately 3.73% in total wages and load over the three (3) year period.

Mr. Koenig stated that the tentative agreement proposes changes to the 401 money purchase plan. The City of Dover currently recognizes the defined benefit plan, which was closed to new entry in 2009, and the 401 money purchase plan for retirement. He advised that all employees hired since 2009 are required to enter the 401 money purchase plan, which is a defined contribution plan with a current minimum matching contribution of 3% and a maximum matching contribution of 6%. Mr. Koenig stated that the negotiated changes will increase the minimum contribution from 3% to 6% and the maximum contribution from 6% to 9% over a phase-in period to begin with an additional 1% on February 28, 2016, 1% on July 1, 2016, and 1% on July 1, 2017. He noted that the minimum cost of those changes will be $51,136 over three (3) years and the maximum cost will be $134,199, which is a combination of the minimum and some additional adjustments over a three (3) year period. Mr. Koenig advised that the total financial impact of the contract over a three (3) year period, considering the wage increase and the maximum exposure of the 401 money purchase plan, is approximately $966,584.

Mr. Koenig stated that the proposed contract includes an 80%-20% health care cost sharing measure for new employees, with the City of Dover covering 80% of the premium. In retirement, the cost sharing would be 80%-20% on the "employee only" plan and the employee is responsible for 100% of dependent care.

Mr. Koenig advised that the proposed contract removes Article 41 of the current contract, which allows DOE to request adjustments to a grading of current positions. There are additional Article changes/clarifications related to on-call and call-in pay to avoid pyramiding overtime rates.

Staff recommended approval of the successor agreement for July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2018.

Mr. Anderson asked how far above minimum wage the current hourly wage was for the lowest paid employees, noting that the State minimum wage may increase. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the current grade six (6), step A, which are the library pages, is at $8.50. That rate would be adjusted by $0.50 immediately, then it would go up by another $0.25 on July 1, 2016 and additional $0.25

by July 1, 2017. Mr. Anderson noted that an increase in the minimum wage could create competition and the loss of City employees.

Mr. Lewis asked how much the contract would cost the taxpayers, if the City had the money, and how it would affect a tax increase. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the total estimated increase in cost is approximately $966,584 over a three (3) year period. Under the current contract, the City anticipated spending approximately $22.3M over the next three (3) years and, under the terms of the proposed contract, those labor costs will be approximately $23.138M, including $832,385 in salary plus load. Mr. Koenig stated that the difference between $832,385 and $966,584 is the potential impact based on the changes to the 401 plan. He stated that the contract will be paid for this year through cost savings related to open positions. Mr. Koenig advised that they are currently preparing the personnel spreadsheets for FY17 and FY18 and several members of City Council have made it clear that they do not want a tax rate increase proposed for FY17. He stated that Staff is doing everything they can to keep the budget within the expected tax collection of FY17, as well as other revenue sources associated with FY17. Mr. Koenig advised that it does not appear that the adoption of this contract will prevent the City from maintaining the current tax rate for FY17; however, he will have to confirm that as they build the budget. In response to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Koenig stated that there is no guarantee; however, there has been clear direction from City Council that they do not wish to do a tax increase.

Mr. Koenig stated that Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, is preparing budget revisions that include changes for the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) contract and project carry forwards. The cost of approximately $250,000 for the current year, because there are only wage increases from September through June 30, 2016, will be absorbed in salary and benefit savings from open positions. He noted that there were increased revenues in FY16 associated with transfer taxes and increases in the licensing fees, and the impact of the proposed agreement will be able to be contained in the revenue projections and expenses associated with the FY16 budget.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Koenig stated that, at this point, he could not predict if there would be a future property tax increase based on this contract without knowing what the State revenue projections will be or what the State revenue transfers to the City of Dover will be. Mr. Koenig advised that the labor component of City services is the highest cost component and they have to secure those labor costs for the draft budget.

Mr. Neil asked if a raise in the State's minimum wage would obligate the City to raise its contracts to that level and, if so, would there be the possibility of layoffs to keep the cost down for the taxpayers. Mr. Koenig stated that, from what he has heard, the increase in the minimum wage will not substantially affect any of the City's labor contracts, noting that one (1) or two (2) positions may be affected. He noted that the City would have to honor the State minimum wage because it would supersede the contract.

Mr. Anderson noted that Council requested Staff to try to keep labor costs under a 2% increase per year and he congratulated all sides for agreeing to that.

Mr. Neil moved for approval of the Dover Organization of Employees (DOE) contract, seconded by Mr. Cole and carried by a roll call vote of seven (7) yes (Anderson, Sudler, Neil, Cole, Hare, Hutchison, and Slavin), one (1) no (Lewis), and one (1) absent (Hosfelt).

EVALUATION OF BIDS - DEMOLITION OF PROPERTIES - 105, 111, AND 115 SOUTH NEW STREET

The City of Dover recently acquired 105 and 115 South New Street from the House of Pride. The Downtown Dover Partnership purchased 111 South New Street, which is situated between the two (2) properties purchased by the City of Dover. These properties have been the location of various nuisance activities and have drawn a disproportionate amount of police response. The Department of Planning and Inspections has bid the demolition work for the properties together, requesting that the responsive bidders break out the costs by property. By bidding the properties together as a package, Staff was able to obtain more favorable bids due to the adjacency of the three (3) properties to each other.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised that Staff recommended bundling all three (3) properties under one (1) demolition bid to secure the best price possible. The bid package was prepared by the Department of Planning and Inspections on behalf of both the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP) and the other City departments involved.

Bids were solicited and advertised according to City Policy by the City's Contract and Procurement Manager under Bid #16-0030PI. Seven (7) companies submitted complete bids and all potential vendors were deemed to be capable and competent; therefore, pricing was the determining factor in the bid award.

Staff recommended awarding the contract for demolition of 105, 111, and 115 South New Street to the low bidder, Dependable Construction of Delaware, in the amount of $46,400.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mr. Koenig stated that the cost of asbestos testing is being divided between each property and the City will pay for the testing, removal, and disposal at 105 and 115 South New Street. The cost of asbestos testing, removal, and disposal for 111 South New Street, will be paid for by the DDP. Mr. Koenig noted that the cost of asbestos removal was below the $25,000 amount requiring Council's approval and, therefore, is not included in the $46,400 demolition bid amount.

Mr. Sudler asked for an estimated cost of the asbestos abatement. Responding, Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that the analysis was complete and the abatement began earlier in the day. Although the City has the contracts for the work, Mrs. Townshend advised that she did not have the numbers with her.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Koenig advised that the total amount budgeted is $56,500 for the demolition and environmental costs, of which the City is paying $32,200. He stated that the money was appropriated through some carry-forward balances and Council authorized savings from FY15 for the purchase of the property. The expenses related to demolitions will be paid from the favorable revenue projection for FY16 that is now being realized.

Mr. Lewis asked if the $14,200 being paid by the DDP was being funded through money recently awarded by the Governor. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised that it was being paid from the DDP operating revenues. He noted that once the City transfers money to the DDP, it becomes their money.

Mr. Hare moved for approval of Staff's recommendation to award the contract for demolition of 105, 111, and 115 South New Street to the low bidder, Dependable Construction of Delaware, in the amount of $46,400. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Hosfelt absent).

ANNEXATION/REZONING REQUEST/FIRST READING OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2016-08 - PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1102 SOUTH STATE STREET, OWNED BY CAPITOL CLEANERS AND LAUNDERERS, INC.

A request was received for annexation and rezoning of property located at 1102 South State Street, consisting of 6,331$^{+/-}$ s.f., owned by Capitol Cleaners and Launderers, Inc. This property is currently zoned BG (General Business District)(Kent County Zoning Classification) and the proposed zoning is C-2A (Limited Central Commercial)(City of Dover Zoning Classification). Staff recommended that the request be referred to the Utility Committee on February 23, 2016 and to the Planning Commission on March 21, 2016; and that a public hearing be set for April 11, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. (Tax Parcel: ED-00-086.05-01-46.02-000; Planning Reference: AX-16-01)

Mr. Hare moved for referral, as recommended, seconded by Mr. Sudler and unanimously carried.

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 #2016-08 AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF DOVER BY CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1102 SOUTH STATE STREET, OWNED BY CAPITOL CLEANERS AND LAUNDERERS, INC.

FIRST READING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2016-05

Council President Slavin reminded the public that copies of the proposed ordinance are available at the entrance of the Council Chambers or can be obtained from the City Clerk's Office. Final action by Council on the proposed ordinance will take place during the Council Meeting of February 22, 2016.

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

- PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2016-05 AMENDING CHAPTER 106 - TRAFFIC AND VEHICLES, ARTICLE III - STOPPING, STANDING AND PARKING, DIVISION 2 - METERED PARKING, SECTION 106-164 - VIOLATIONS; PENALTIES
  (*Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee*)

FIRST READING - PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2016-06

Council President Slavin reminded the public that copies of the proposed ordinance are available at the entrance of the Council Chambers or can be obtained from the City Clerk's Office. Final action by Council on the proposed ordinance will take place during the Council Meeting of February 22, 2016.

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

- PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2016-06 AMENDING CHAPTER 26 - BUSINESSES, ARTICLE II - LICENSES, SECTION 26-40 - LICENSE ISSUANCE, EXPIRATION AND FORM, AND SECTION 26-42 - PENALTY FOR LATE PAYMENT OF LICENSE FEE
  (*Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee*)

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Anderson announced that Mount Zion AME Church will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the denomination at 3:00 p.m. on Sunday, February 14th, at their location in Dover. He stated that everyone was invited to attend this historic event.

Mr. Hare moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Cole and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

TRACI A. McDOWELL
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by City Council during their Regular Meeting of February 8, 2016, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/TM
S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Council-Minutes\2016\02-08-2016.wpd