REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular Council Meeting was held on August 24, 2015 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. Hosfelt, Mr. Hare, and Mr. Hutchison.

Council staff members present were Police Chief Bernat, Mrs. Mitchell, Mrs. Townshend, Fire Chief Hall, Mr. Koenig, City Solicitor Rodriguez, and Mrs. McDowell. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

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.

Ms. Janetta Guinn, 749 Slaughter Street, stated that her water meter is sitting in her driveway and it is hard for her to get her cars back and forth. She indicated that if they park in the driveway they risk having the landlord tow their cars, and if they park on the street they risk the Dover Police towing the cars.

Responding to Ms. Guinn, Council President Slavin stated that they noted the situation with Ms. Guinn's driveway and the possible need for sidewalks in that area during their recent walkthrough. Mr. Slavin suggested that she speak with Mrs. Ann Marie Townsend, Director of Planning and Community Development, after the meeting.

Mr. Tyrone Ratu, a Dover citizen, stated that he thought the Open Forum should be televised for the public so that everybody can see what is going on. He indicated that he would be protesting in front of City Hall if it is not televised.

The invocation was given by Bishop Thomas L. Holsey, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

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

Mr. Lewis requested that item #5A - Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee Report - August 10, 2015 - Exception Request to Allocate Down Payment Assistance Outside of the Downtown Development District Target Area, be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Anderson requested that item #8 - Discharging the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee, be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Neil moved for approval of the Consent Agenda, as amended, seconded by Mr. Cole and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETINGS - BUDGET REVIEW OF MAY 27-28 AND JUNE 1-3, 2015

The Minutes of the Special Council Meetings - Budget Review of May 27-28 and June 1-3, 2015 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Neil, seconded by Mr. Cole and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF AUGUST 10, 2015

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of August 10, 2015 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Neil, seconded by Mr. Cole and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

PRESENTATION BY THE KIWANIS CLUB TO THE GREATER DOVER BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB

Mr. Allan Kujala, Past President of the Kiwanis Club of Dover, presented Mr. Darrell Tingle, Director of Business Development for the Boys and Girls Club, with a check representing the final payment toward a $25,000 donation for construction of the new Boys and Girls Club facility. Mr. Kujala stated that this is a worthwhile project that will greatly benefit the children of the Dover community for many years to come. He challenged other service clubs to meet the Kiwanis commitment to improve the world one child and one community at a time.

Mr. Kujala stated that the Kiwanis Club of Dover is proud to support numerous, meaningful projects that benefit their community, noting that several years ago they donated $10,000 toward the construction of the Dover Public Library, the largest such contribution by any service club located here in the state capital.

Mr. Tingle thanked the Kiwanis Club and all those who have pitched in to make this facility a reality. He noted that this is going to make a big difference in the lives of the children in this community by giving them another place to go, grow, learn, and have fun.

PROCLAMATION - NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, National Preparedness Month creates an important opportunity for City of Dover residents to prepare their homes, businesses, and their communities for potential natural disasters or terrorist attacks; and

WHEREAS, investing in emergency preparedness can reduce injuries, fatalities, and economic devastation in our community and nation; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's "Ready" Campaign, Citizen Corps, and other federal, state, local, private, and volunteer agencies are working to increase public activities to prepare for emergencies and to educate individuals on how to take action; and

WHEREAS, the Ready Campaign established four universal building blocks of emergency preparedness, Be Informed, Make a Plan, Build a Kit and Get Involved with the 2015 National Preparedness Month Theme being “Don't Wait. Communicate. Make your emergency plan today”; and

WHEREAS, emergency preparedness is the responsibility of every citizen of the City of Dover and all citizens are urged to make preparedness a priority and work together, as a team, to ensure that individuals, families, and communities are prepared for disasters and emergencies of any type, and are encouraged to participate in preparedness activities and to be proactive in establishing sound plans for addressing emergencies.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF DOVER, DELAWARE do hereby proclaim the month of September 2015 as NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS MONTH in the City of Dover, and encourage all citizens, businesses, and organizations to develop their own emergency plan and work together toward creating a more prepared society.

MAYOR ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN'S VETO OF THE MOTION ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL ON JULY 27, 2015 - TO AFFIRM CITY COUNCIL'S DECISION OF MARCH 23, 2015, TO MOVE THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICE UNDER THE CITY MANAGER, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THIS MATTER WILL BE REVISITED IN SEPTEMBER, WHICH COULD LEAD TO A DIFFERENT ACTION

Council President Slavin reminded members that, during the Regular Council meeting of August 10, 2015, based on Deputy City Solicitor Pepper's legal opinion that Mayor Christiansen's veto notice was not provided within seven (7) days of the March 23, 2015 Council action and, therefore, had no bearing, City Council unanimously accepted Deputy City Solicitor Pepper's recommendation regarding the veto. He advised that, subsequently, Mr. Pepper provided a revised legal opinion stating that, because City Council adopted the Fiscal Year 2016 Annual Operating Budget, including the Mayor's Fiscal Year 2016 organizational chart showing the Police Department and Economic Development Office under the Mayor, the March 23, 2015 motion to move departments under the City Manager, as far as the Economic Development Office is concerned, was reversed. Mr. Slavin noted that the effect of the July 27, 2015 motion affirming City Council's decision of March 23, 2015 to move the Economic Development Office under the City Manager was to revise the Mayor's organizational chart in the FY 2016 budget. Since the Mayor vetoed that motion within the time required by the Charter, the Economic Development Office will remain under the Mayor pursuant to the Mayor's Fiscal Year 2016 Organizational Chart unless and until Council overrides the veto.

Mr. Hare suggested that, with everything that is going on in the city, they should just leave things as they are and let the Mayor be in charge of Economic Development and the Police Department, just like it was before this discussion started. He felt that there were more important things to deal with than worrying about who is going to report to whom and starting all these inner battles.

Mr. Hare moved to reset the form of government to what existed on March 8, 2015 with the Police Department and the Economic Development Office reporting to the Mayor and the City Manager, Controller/Treasurer, City Planner, City Assessor, and City Clerk reporting to Council. All other departments will report to the City Manager. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Hare moved to cancel the Special Meeting scheduled for September 16, 2015 to discuss the issue of Form of Government and Reporting Structure. After a brief discussion resulting in a consensus of Council that their constituents should be included in the discussion, Mr. Hare withdrew his motion.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT - AUGUST 10, 2015

The Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee met on August 10, 2015 with Chairman Anderson presiding.

Exception Request to Allocate Down Payment Assistance Outside of the Downtown Development District Target Area

During the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement meeting of March 9, 2015, members considered the Review/Scoring of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Applications. Members recommended awarding $60,000 of the City's CDBG grant allocation for public service activities to the City of Dover Homeownership Assistance Program and that priority be given to the Downtown Redevelopment Target Area as designated in the Dover Code until January 2016, with funding to be re-evaluated at that time to see if there are funds left over for the remainder of the City. The Committee's recommendation was approved by City Council during their Regular Meeting of March 23, 2015.

Mrs. Tracey Harvey, Planner I, stated that staff was requesting an exception to the Committee's recommendation to allow $20,000 of the approved funding for the City of Dover homeownership program to be reallocated to a first time homebuyer who was experiencing a hardship and was currently under contract to purchase a home outside of the Downtown Development District (DDD) Target Area. She explained that without the funding, this individual's contract would be canceled and she would not be eligible to purchase a home for at least 10 years. Mrs. Harvey advised members that Ms. Tomeka Crawford, the housing counselor for this client, was present to speak on this individual's behalf.

Staff recommended allocating $20,000 in down payment assistance outside of the DDD Target Area to a client experiencing a hardship.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison, Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that the request had not been reviewed by the City Manager.

In response to Mr. Hutchison, Mrs. Harvey stated that the request was supported by staff.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Harvey stated that the home being purchased was a townhouse located behind the Redner's Warehouse Market on Route 8 in Dover, and if this $20,000 allocation were approved, $40,000 in funding would remain in the homeownership program for FY 2016. She stated that $60,000 had been allocated for the entire year.

In response to Mr. Anderson regarding pending applications, Mrs. Harvey stated that there was one (1) application pending for the downtown area.

Mr. Caldwell questioned the reason for this special case outside the DDD area. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated that Ms. Crawford could better explain the hardship of the client.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt's request for clarification regarding the CDBG program, Mrs. Harvey explained that CDBG funds are typically used City-wide, but because of the City's DDD designation, the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee chose to allocate all of the funding for the City's homeownership program for the downtown area.

Mr. Hosfelt questioned if a request of this nature would be an unusual use for this money if the property were located in the downtown area, and Mrs. Harvey indicated that it would not be.

Mr. Hutchison requested Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, to comment on this item. Responding, Mr. Koenig explained that it was a goal across the City to promote homeownership in general. Although these CDBG funds were intended to focus on the DDD as the target area, he had no objection to staff coming to Council to expand beyond the DDD since this would go toward the overall goal of the City. Mr. Koenig noted that he did not have the benefit of knowing the location of the subject property.

Ms. Tomeka Crawford, Homeownership Specialist, National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research Fund, Inc. (NCALL), 363 Saulsbury Road, explained that this client had approached her nearly a year ago wanting to purchase a home in Dover. She indicated that her client works and lives in the City and would like to remain in the City by using the City of Dover down payment and settlement assistance program. Ms. Crawford stated that this individual had worked very hard to become mortgage ready by selling a mobile home that was sub-standard and no longer meeting her family's needs, paying off debt, improving her credit score, and saving money. At the point of becoming mortgage ready, the underwriting guidelines changed, which made it impossible for the client to buy without using the City of Dover program. If unable to use the $20,000 down payment and settlement assistance program, this client would have to look at a much longer term of over 10 years to purchase a home. Ms. Crawford requested members to visualize having a ready-to-move-in dream home and having that dream disappear all at once. She stated that this is what would happen if this client were not approved for the CDBG funds.

Ms. Crawford explained that she was present as a voice of the client who was not present to represent herself. She advised members that she worked with this client and saw the hardship, challenges, and the dream in front of her, noting that this dream was almost to the point of disappearing. She requested approval for the client to utilize the City of Dover program, which would allow her to move into the home by September 15, 2015.

Mr. Caldwell indicated that he was 100% in support of helping the client but questioned if providing assistance for the purchase outside of the designated area would set a precedent for the City in the future whenever someone has a hardship and cannot buy a home. Responding, Mrs. Harvey reminded members that the Committee had agreed to revisit the allocation of funds if all of the funds were not expended in the target area by January 2016, and to determine then if funds would be used City-wide. She noted that the City's CDBG program was normally a City-wide program and had not targeted the downtown area previously.

Mayor Christiansen reiterated that this program had always been a City-wide program and was made site-specific when the City was designated as a DDD to strengthen that program. He advised members that the City had partnered with NCALL in revitalizing downtown Dover and the Restoring Central Dover initiative. It was Mayor Christiansen's belief that NCALL, a partner in good faith with the City, would not have stepped forward and asked for this exception if they were not in support of assisting this client in becoming a homeowner in Dover. He stated that the opportunity to make someone a homeowner is a great opportunity for the City, noting that this could be used as an advertisement for people considering moving to the City. He stated that NCALL's presence helps strengthen the City's commitment to restoring homeownership in the City.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt as to whether the funds would be recouped by the City, Mrs. Harvey explained that the funds would be a forgivable grant and the City would only recoup these funds if the homeowner chooses to buy, sell, or rent the property within 10 years.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Harvey stated that if the recipient homeowner buys, sells, or rents the property, they will be required to pay back a percentage of the loan on a sliding scale, based on the type of loan and the length of the loan.

Mr. Anderson explained that the City's homeownership program is funded out of the CDBG program to help with the City's goals related to low-income housing. He stated that this is federal money and the City determines where it is spent within the federal government's guidelines.

Mrs. Crawford stated that she was committed to the downtown Dover initiative and that she had another client who was in a position to purchase a home in the target area and would be taking advantage of the funding available through the City's CDBG program as well.

Ms. Denise Freeman, Housing Counseling Director, NCALL, explained that NCALL had long been a supporter of City of Dover initiatives and a huge supporter of the City's homeownership program. She stated that NCALL was fully committed to the Restoring Central Dover initiative. Ms. Freeman explained that NCALL had participated in many related events in Dover, including workshops with Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity, Inc. She noted that events had been scheduled or held at locations such as Bibleway Temple Church of God in Christ, Solid Rock

Baptist Church, and Holy Trinity Church. Ms. Freeman stated that NCALL was also fully committed to providing assistance to help families purchase homes, particularly first-time home buyers. She explained that this particular client had remained committed to becoming a home buyer. Ms. Freeman stated her pleasure that Ms. Crawford was serving as housing counselor for this client, noting that Ms. Crawford was passionate about wanting this family to succeed.

Responding to Mr. Anderson as to when the client entered the program, Ms. Crawford explained that this occurred in June of 2014 and confirmed that the criteria for the mortgage process had changed since that time.

Members were made aware that the loan officer working with the client had provided a confidential letter outlining the client's hardship.

The Committee recommended approval of staff's recommendation to allocate $20,000 in down payment assistance outside of the Downtown Development District (DDD) Target Area to a client experiencing a hardship.

During the Council meeting, Mr. Anderson, Chair of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee, advised that the Committee recently recommended focusing the Community Development Block Grant funds on the Downtown Development District where the first priority would be for housing within the district. He noted that the Committee felt it would be better to allow this exception rather than have the applicant lose their mortgage.

Mr. Lewis expressed concern that the grant money was specifically allocated for the Downtown Development District targeted area and he felt it should be utilized for that. Responding, Mr. Anderson stated that the Community Development Block Grant funds are actually available to eligible residents citywide; however, the Committee wanted to ensure that the money was prioritized so that most of it went into the Downtown Development District.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townsend, Director of Planning and Community Development, advised that, because of the efforts with the Downtown Development District, the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee recommended that the home ownership assistance focus on the District. She noted that the recommendation was approved by City Council and was not a requirement of any of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rules.

Mrs. Townshend stated that, in this specific case, the purchaser of this home had been working with the NCALL housing counselor for about a year, and her process started prior to the decision to focus on the Downtown Development District. Although it would be ideal to spend all of the funds in the downtown because they do need to increase home ownership in that area, this purchaser was caught in the middle. Mrs. Townshend noted that the housing counselor who had been working with the purchaser testified that if she was not able to get the down payment assistance, she would not be able to go to settlement and would miss the opportunity for home ownership. She advised that this purchaser started the home buying process well in advance of the City receiving the Downtown Development District designation and City Council's decision to prioritize the downtown area.

Mr. Lewis asked if new homeowners living in his or other districts could apply for and receive a $20,000 grant if they were experiencing a hardship. Responding, Mr. Hare stated that this applicant applied and put their blood, sweat, and time into doing what they were told for seven (7), eight (8), or nine (9) months and then the City changed their rules.

Mr. Hutchison stated that, based on the testimony regarding this applicant during the Committee meeting, although the property is outside of the Downtown Development District he supported the request because it fulfilled the requirements of the grant application process. He noted that any other grant requests should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Anderson noted that this program had historically been for the whole city; however, because an incentive package was being developed for the Downtown Development District, the Committee recommended prioritizing most of the money for the downtown area. He noted that 75% to 80% of the money is still going to go into the Downtown District with the understanding that some of that money would go into other parts of the City after the downtown applications were received and evaluated.

Mr. Anderson reiterated that this applicant had gone through the process and was eligible for the program; however, she was caught in the process when the rule changed. He noted that there was a provision for an exception to be considered and it did not seem fair to disqualify this applicant because of a rule change.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Hare stated that if 20 people applied they would be considered in the order they are received; however, the Downtown Development District rule would apply. If there are enough funds for five (5) applicants and five (5) applicants in the Downtown Development District applied, they would get first consideration. If there is only one (1) in the Downtown Development District, then four (4) of the other 20 might qualify. Mr. Hare reiterated that the Downtown Development District rule was not in place when this applicant applied and followed the process.

Mr. Anderson stated that the federal grant leaves it to the municipality to prioritize where the funds are spent.

Mrs. Townsend noted that NCALL, one of the lead partners in the downtown revitalization, provides the housing counseling and is very aware of this situation. They will be building homes for home ownership in the downtown, along with Habitat for Humanity, and as new clients come in, they are focusing them in the downtown area if they are looking in Dover.

Mr. Anderson moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation to allocate $20,000 in down payment assistance outside of the Downtown Development District (DDD) Target Area to a client experiencing a hardship. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a roll call vote of eight (8) yes and one (1) abstention (Lewis).

Recreation Needs Assessment

During the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee meeting held on July 13, 2015, members considered the Draft Recreation Needs Assessment

and recommended continued discussion of the Recreation Needs Assessment at their next meeting. The Committee's recommendation was approved by City Council during their Regular Meeting of July 27, 2015.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, recommended that members take action on the Draft Recreation Needs Assessment, noting that the assessment could be fine-tuned moving forward.

Mayor Christiansen requested clarification regarding the splash park concept. Responding, Mrs. Townshend explained that, based on the information from the public, staff would be looking toward locating splash pads at Silver Lake and Dover Park. Based on the needs assessment, the City would move into doing master plans for the parks, including the amenities. She stated that it had yet to be determined which location would be first for a splash pad since this was not part of the assessment.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen regarding the time frame for the opening of the splash pads, Mrs. Townshend stated that, because of the desire for the City to deliver more opportunities on the east side of the City, she felt that staff should move forward with the master plan for Dover Park as the location for the first splash pad. She indicated that this splash pad could not be constructed next fiscal year but probably the year after.

Noting that the Capital School District had a new superintendent, Mayor Christiansen questioned if it was expected that the City would be able to continue to use the District's two (2) facilities on the east side of the City. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that the City uses the Capital School District's facilities routinely, noting that the City uses the field at the old Dover High School and runs an after school program at Towne Point Elementary School. She stated that the District had been very supportive in working with the City on other programming as well. Regarding expanding the City's programs to East Dover Elementary School to accommodate the needs of youth on the east side of the City, Mrs. Townshend stated that this had not yet been discussed but it was something she could look into.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison regarding working cooperatively with Kent County Levy Court, Mrs. Townshend stated that the City was working with Kent County and planned to meet with County staff to discuss recreation needs and working together. Additionally, she indicated that the City works with the YMCA routinely, and that this was increasing. Mrs. Townshend indicated that the YMCA was currently conducting swim lessons for the City's Camp Small Wonder and provides transportation to and from their facility for these lessons.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the City of Dover Recreation Needs Assessment.

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

Mr. Anderson expressed his thought that strategic planning and goal setting goes hand in hand with the Recreation Needs Assessment in that they are both plans to improve various aspects of the City, revitalize the downtown, and improve recreation opportunities. He asked for members of the Committee and the public to review the information provided and offer suggestions and priorities regarding what needed to be done. Mr. Anderson noted that some improvements would be easier than others, such as adding trail stations at Schutte Park, and some would be more difficult and more costly, such as a splash park. He pointed out the importance of determining which park would have which amenities and noted that different funding proposals must be considered. Mr. Anderson stated that there had been a proposal to change the open space requirements and to also review the fee system dedicated to the Parkland Reserve Fund, noting that there is no funding stream for capital improvements in this area, and that most of the funding currently comes out of the General Fund, with approximately $100,000 coming from fees.

Responding to Mr. Caldwell as to how the City's recent tax increase would affect park funding, Mr. Anderson stated his belief that this revenue would be applied to public safety and infrastructure.

In response to Mr. Caldwell as to whether parks and recreation funding was being received through grants, Mrs. Townshend explained that the City had utilized grant funding through the Delaware State Parks from the Land and Water Conservation Trust Fund; however, she indicated that there may be other opportunities for projects that would help to improve public health. Mrs. Townshend stated that she recently discussed looking for other grant opportunities with her staff.

Mr. Anderson stated that grants may be available for the expansion of trails and updating of fitness stations.

Mrs. Townshend stated that a lot of the fitness classes offered at the YMCA and Club Fitness use barbells, which the City's programs are lacking, noting that they are expensive to purchase. Some of the instructors that staff had spoken with indicated they could offer a wider variety of classes if barbells could be incorporated into the programming. Mrs. Townshend advised that staff was looking into researching grant funds for these types of small projects, noting that last year Nemours donated $1,000 to purchase four (4) bicycle racks. She indicated that although grant funds may not help with large projects such as splash pads and restrooms, there are probably untapped funds for some projects.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend advised that the fees collected for the parks and recreation programs do not cover the cost of the programs and that fees only account for about 20%, when considering only the Parks and Recreation budget. When the Grounds Division, which maintains all of the parkland, is factored in, the

revenue from recreation only pays for approximately 8% of the combined budget. Mrs. Townshend confirmed Mr. Hosfelt's understanding that the majority of the needs assessment survey respondents felt that fees collected should help fund the programs. She stated that most of the respondents indicated that there should be a fee differential for residents versus non-residents, particularly some of the field and pavilion rental fees which had not been adjusted in a number of years and were very labor intensive for the Grounds Division. Mrs. Townshend stated that the softball leagues that rent the fields are some of the larger money makers; however, the fees collected do not cover the cost to maintain the grounds.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend advised that league fees vary, depending on the season, and noted that each team pays a fee. The softball registration fee for the fall was approximately $500 per team, but can be as high as $800. She noted that a current challenge was a decline in interest for softball and there were fewer teams registering. Mrs. Townshend stated that Mr. Steve Pickering, Sports Coordinator, had been working to expand leagues and the City had been doing a lot more in regard to bringing in leagues for growing sports, such as field hockey and lacrosse.

Mr. Anderson suggested ultimate frisbee as an option.

In response to Mayor Christiansen regarding State contributions, Mrs. Townshend advised that the State contributes very little to the parks and recreation programs and the only State funding the City receives is from grants, such as matching grants. For example, having submitted a pre-application, the City recently received an invitation to fill out a grant application for the Mallard Park improvements project, which would cover approximately $33,000 of a $66,000 project.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen regarding utilizing Delaware State University's (DSU's) School of Business to find grant money for other projects, Mrs. Townshend indicated that this was something she could look into. She also stated that, in the spring, the City always utilizes an intern from DSU who has to work 400 hours and she could have this intern research grant funds.

At the request of Mayor Christiansen, Mrs. Townshend and Mr. Anderson agreed to meet with the Mayor to discuss grant research and resources. Mayor Christiansen noted that the DSU School of Business is a great untapped source of reference that the City could use.

Mr. Anderson stated that he would also like to meet with the City's counterparts at Kent County.

Mr. Anderson posed questions to members regarding their thoughts on what areas staff should be asked to look at first in relation to the needs assessment. He noted that staff desired to look at building a new master plan for east Dover and to look at

the expanded area in Schutte Park, which he felt were both important. Mr. Anderson stated his desire for the Committee to come back to this issue, noting he would like more of the Committee members to be present to discuss this.

Strategic Planning and Goal Setting (Restoring Central Dover Strategic Plan)
Referring to the Executive Summary of the Restoring Central Dover - Our Vision for Vitality plan, Mr. Anderson questioned if members had any particular points to discuss in the plan or areas to prioritize, such as housing, community economic development, recreation, or youth programs.

Mr. Hosfelt stated that he would like to hear from Mr. Joe Myer, Chair, Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee, and staff, and expressed a desire to meet with this committee. Mr. Hosfelt stated that he was one (1) of the original members of the steering committee years ago when the process started. Noting that many things had occurred since that time, he felt it would be important for Council as a whole to get an overview of how it started and where things stood currently in order to determine a direction for the future. Mr. Hosfelt indicated that the Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee was the driving force behind this effort.

Noting that the Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee had grant funds but no legislative authority, Mr. Anderson expressed his opinion that they needed the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee in this regard. He felt that working together, great things could be accomplished. Mr. Anderson stated that members of the Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee had reached out to members of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee, and suggested issuing an invitation to the Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee to meet with the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee.

The Committee recommended issuing an invitation to the members of the Restoring Central Dover Steering Committee to meet with the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee.

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

The Committee deferred this item for further discussion during the September 14, 2015 Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Meeting.

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

Mayor Christiansen advised members that Mrs. Horsey was on the way to recovery and should be able to attend the next meeting.

The Committee recommended sending official speedy recovery and get well wishes to Mrs. Horsey from the Committee.

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

Mr. Anderson moved for acceptance of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee Report, seconded by Mr. Hare and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

UTILITY COMMITTEE REPORT - AUGUST 10, 2015

The Utility Committee met on August 10, 2015 with Chairman Hutchison presiding.

Annual Review and Approval of Governing Policy for Energy Commodity Risk Management

Members were advised that the City of Dover has in place an approved risk management policy associated with the purchase of energy commodity and related investment contracts. The purpose of the energy commodity and investment contracts resulting from the application of the risk management policy is: (i) to secure economic and reliable energy supply to meet the ongoing energy requirements of the City and its citizens, and (ii) to provide price certainty for those end users purchasing electricity supply from the City.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, stated that City management, along with The Energy Authority (TEA) and their client manager, completed their annual review of the Energy Commodity Risk Management Policy, and he reviewed the changes recommended for the Utility Committee and City Council acceptance. He indicated that the revisions were maintenance changes recommended by both TEA and staff to clarify issues, streamline the process, or remove language that was outdated because of the changing markets.

Staff recommended acceptance of the revised Governing Policy for Energy Commodity Risk Management.

Referring to Page 13 - Risk Limits and Risk Measurements, A. Limits, Item #1, Volume/ Maturity/Value Limits, Mr. Blakeman noted the inclusion of Fuel Oil #6 in the chart. He questioned if the City was still buying #6 oil and was permitted to burn it. Responding, Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, stated that the City was no longer buying #6 fuel oil.

Mr. Koenig stated his belief that the City was not permitted to burn this type of oil and that this could be removed from the policy. Mr. Blakeman supported removing it, feeling that it was misleading.

With reference to Item #2, Delegation Authority, on Page 13, Mr. Blakeman noted the statement that "The ERMC may delegate these authorities to individuals authorized to commit Dover to financial obligations." He questioned if there was a list of these authorized individuals. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated his belief that the positions that are able to commit to those transactions were specified on Page 8 - Management and Controls, B. Executive Risk Management Committee (ERMC),

which defines the roles of the members of the ERMC. He noted that the members of the ERMC include the City Manager, Director of the Utility, and Controller, and between these three (3) individuals, the City has the authority to make those transactions.

Mr. Blakeman questioned if the "individuals authorized to commit Dover to financial obligations" referred to the members of the ERMC committee. In response, Mr. Koenig stated that TEA can perform a small range of transactions themselves.

Mr. Blakeman questioned if these transactions would be performed by an employee of TEA. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that TEA's current service manager is one of the members of the ERMC and this individual would instruct their employees to do hedging. She confirmed that the Utility Committee would authorize the City's members of the ERMC Committee to authorize TEA to act.

Mr. Blakeman indicated that it might be helpful if someone at TEA was listed so that it would be known who this was going to be. Mrs. Mitchell explained that position titles rather than the names of ERMC members were included in the policy to avoid the need to revise the document when there are staff changes. Mr. Blakeman noted that the statement referenced only "individuals authorized." He did not feel that individuals needed to be specified but thought that the term "other authorized individuals" was vague.

Mr. Koenig expressed his belief that delegation would also be covered by TEA's insurance, etc. TEA would not delegate this responsibility to an unqualified person since TEA would be as responsible as the City.

With reference to Item #3, Volume Limits on Page 13, Mr. Blakeman referred to the statement that "For no reason should a transaction be executed that exceeds the City's electric load requirements" and questioned if this referred to exceeding the limits on an hourly, daily, or monthly basis and if there was a time frame attached to exceeding. In response, Mr. Koenig stated his belief that the excess would be based on the purchase. If the City were purchasing load to 80% for the current year, this may involve day-ahead transactions, which the City sometimes makes. He stated that it would be either the cumulative load profile for the year or the daily expected load profile, noting that there are many kinds of transactions that happen. Mr. Koenig indicated that it could be a daily, monthly, or annual time frame.

Mrs. Mitchell stated that this would be based on TEA monitoring the City's load and needs, noting that TEA is not supposed to exceed this. She concurred with Mr. Koenig that this is based on the percentage that is hedged versus what the City buys in the open market. Mrs. Mitchell advised members that the City does not hedge 100% in case the load for the month does not come in at 100% and that volumes are measured.

Mr. Blakeman questioned, if 80% of the load were hedged, whether this percentage could not be exceeded. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that TEA can buy what they need on the market based on the load but cannot exceed 100%.

Mr. Koenig stated that the hedge target for FY 16, which began on July 1, 2015, was 80% in the month of July. The City was still carrying 20% of the load as short-term purchases and trying to take advantage of the market. In FY 17, a target of 60% of the estimated load was set. He explained that the City is under 100% on a rolling basis moving through the year. When starting each year, the City would not be over 80% of the projected load.

Mr. Blakeman suggested, perhaps not this year but next year, that the language be clarified as he felt it was vague.

Noting that the policy references the City of Dover hedge program, Ms. Stewart questioned if there was a hedge program document available for her review as a new member of the Committee. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that staff would bring this document forward.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the revised Governing Policy for Energy Commodity Risk Management.

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

Quarterly Review of Utility Related Capital Investment Plan (CIP) (Electric and Water/ Wastewater) *(April, May, and June)* (Pre-Audit)

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, reviewed the preliminary Capital Investment Plan Project Tracking Quarterly Report as of June 30, 2015. He advised members that staff in the Public Works Department, the Electric Department, and in some other departments with respect to vehicle purchases, had been working diligently to finish a backlog of projects that had accumulated over several years. Mr. Koenig expressed his pleasure that a number of the projects listed in the report that had been in progress for some time had been completed. He noted that some projects, such as stormwater utility planning, were multi-year projects and were expected to extend beyond one (1) year.

Mr. Koenig indicated that staff had worked hard to complete the Garrison Oak Technical Park (GOTP) improvement projects, which were expected to be completed in FY 16 and a backlog of individual street paving and utility-related projects that had been lagging behind had been caught up. Mr. Koenig stated that a number of projects were under construction throughout the City, and several street program and community transportation projects under the General Fund had closed out. He advised members that some projects still lingered, such as the Lincoln Park Center, as well as some small unused funds in some individual Community Transportation Fund locations.

In regard to the water and sewer utility, Mr. Koenig stated that staff had been working on finalizing a site for an elevated storage tank at the north end of the City and was very close to securing that site. He advised that this project was considered by the Planning Commission and there were some objections regarding the site location. Staff believed that a new site had been worked out and this project would be brought forward in the next few months. Mr. Koenig informed members that the GOTP water system improvements were complete and the sanitary sewer system improvements were very near completion. He advised that the elevated storage tank had lagged behind slightly, but the top of the tower was now on. Mr. Koenig stated that the welds on the bowl of the tower would be finalized and the project would be moved to completion this fall, which would help finalize all of the Garrison Oak projects. He indicated that the curb line had been poured in the back section.

Mr. Koenig indicated that a new deep well at Schutte Park had been completed and back-up generators had been put into place. He advised that there had been several Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) projects that were completed throughout the system. Mr. Koenig stated that, in general, staff had caught up or was making good progress on catching projects up and getting into current year money, versus funds that had lagged behind for a while.

With reference to the Electric Department, Mr. Koenig stated that improvements to the Horsepond Substation were completed in FY 15 and Staff had been working on a system upgrade related to the new Energizer location. He indicated that the General Scott Substation project was now underway and he reiterated that staff was making significant progress in getting into the current year's money and projects, which had fallen behind. Mr. Koenig advised that the Electric Department completed the relocation of the 69 KV line, and staff was awaiting base paving and some additional moves from Verizon and Comcast to finish up that work.

In response to Mr. Hutchison regarding the time frame required to complete the water tower north of the City, Mr. Koenig estimated that it would take approximately one (1) year to construct.

Mr. Hutchison questioned how the City's long-term system appeared based on the current increased demand for water at Calpine. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised members that Calpine block one (1) had been in operation all summer and the City had managed the demand of Calpine and the rest of the system with the existing well system and elevated storage tanks. He noted that there had been significant volume changes in the tanks. To Mr. Koenig's knowledge, no complaints about pressure had been received across the City, which was good news. The additional tank at the Garrison Farm would take the City from about 3.75M gallons of elevated storage to 5.25M gallons, since the tank would hold 1.5M gallons. This would take care of all demand related to the future build-out of the GOTP. Mr. Koenig advised that the additional 1.0M gallons being discussed on the north end of the City would increase storage to 6.25M gallons. He explained that the purpose of the additional elevated storage was to allow for water supply for a fire in a worse case scenario. Mr. Koenig

stated that, from an everyday operating standpoint, the system would be over-built; however, the towers are built to allow for response to an instantaneous emergency or severe fire demand at the worst possible time during a hot summer. He advised members that after going through all the engineering calculations and building the systems to all of those variables, the end result is pretty significant additional elevated storage, and he anticipated that those features would be in place by the end of 2016.

Mr. Koenig stated that if block two (2) of Calpine were built, a need for elevated storage was not anticipated; however, additional drilling for water resources was anticipated. He noted that money was set aside in FY 16 to try and identify the location of that next well resource, and staff would be meeting with the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) shortly to discuss how to proceed from a regulatory standpoint, and then hopefully begin an investigation in design and construction over the next few years. Mr. Koenig indicated that the system had generally performed very well this summer, even when there were days with high heat during the week. He noted that his office had not received the number of complaints that he felt might occur when the full load at Calpine was turned on. Mr. Koenig stated that the water treatment plant on Long Point Road was acting as the buffer to supply water to the energy block. He noted that there had been significant demands on the system without negative repercussions, noting that Calpine, the City's power plant, and NRG Energy, Inc., had all been running at times. Mr. Koenig noted that there was a lot of water moving through the system currently, but this was good for the City for a number of reasons.

In response to Mr. Blakeman regarding the fact that the new well was a shallow well as opposed to a deep well, Mr. Koenig stated that the deep Piney Point well at Schutte Park was the newest well constructed as a replacement of a former Piney Point well. The allocation was moved from one (1) point of the system to another point and the well was drilled at basically the same depth.

Mr. Blakeman expressed his understanding that the City could not receive any more allocation for deep aquifer water. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the challenge was that the State wants the City to discontinue drilling in the Piney Point aquifer. Wells can be replaced, but they did not want to authorize significant new allocations. He advised that the State does not want to authorize additional allocations in the Cheswold aquifer because of the same issue, potential mining of the aquifer. Mr. Koenig explained that the concern about pumping from the Colombia aquifer, which is the unconfined aquifer out near Long Point Road, was that pumping that aquifer causes the potential intrusion of salt water, which would not be desired. He stated that when looking for the next well, the City may be in the Frederica aquifer, which is much deeper than the Piney Point well at about 250 to 300 feet. Mr. Koenig noted that there are many decisions to be made from a technical and administrative level before determining the next well. Staff had tried to develop the interconnections with Tidewater Utilities and other systems for drought protection and for the entire discussion about how to manage the resource. Mr. Koenig

explained that the State was now requiring farmers to obtain allocation permits, and that the table is heavily weighed in the agriculturalists' favor. He indicated that agriculturalists' demands for hundreds of thousands of gallons are typically granted; however, if the City makes similar requests, they typically begin a negotiating process begins. Mr. Koenig noted that the State may grant a portion of the request, but then asks the City to take a portion of the allocation from other areas. In the past two (2) years, if the City had allocation permits that permitted production at 500 gallons per minute but production had been 450 gallons for the last 10 years, the State had requested that the permit be reduced to 450 gallons, stating that they would grant the extra gallons elsewhere. Mr. Koenig indicated that the State is very stringent with the overall umbrella of the system.

Mr. Koenig stated that there are approximately 22 wells in the entire system. If the City requested another permit or another well, adding a 23rd well would not mean that the State would take the City's limit from 10 Million Gallons per Day (MGD) to 11 MGD; they may leave it at 10 MGD and just approve another well. He indicated that many discussions were going on internally to determine how to manage this resource. Mr. Koenig advised that drinking water is a valuable resource and noted that the State recognizes its value. He stated that the City of Dover is in the State growth zone, and, at the policy level, the State wants development to happen in a way that they term "on system." Policies in years past have favored pushing developments and economic development to the municipalities, but this requires the appropriate allocations for water and sewer. Mr. Koenig indicated that it was somewhat of a moving target at the State to get all of those things to match up.

Mr. Blakeman noted that there were 31 projects listed in the report in progress and questioned the likelihood of them being carried over to the next budget year. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised members that some were intended to be multi-year projects. He noted that Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) was ordered for the Fire Department which did not come in by June 30, 2015; therefore, this had to be carried over as a project in progress, and there was a handful of other projects that remained for similar reasons. He noted that some projects were simply behind and the City was not on target with every single project.

Mr. Blakeman stated that staff had done a good job cutting down on the backlog and expressed a desire that projects would not build back up again.

Mr. Koenig stated that funds for projects in the I & I funds do not dry up on June 30th, noting that these projects have to be rebudgeted, but funds are present.

Mr. Anderson thanked Mr. Koenig for good progress at Woodcrest Drive and Buttner Street, noting that constituents from these areas had contacted him with a very favorable review and he had not observed or heard about any flooding problems recently there. Mr. Anderson stated that he was glad to see some of I & I projects moving forward because the infiltration costs the City a lot of money, and the more that can be done, the better.

Mr. Anderson questioned whether Mr. Koenig was concerned that funds for some of the projects must be spent because of the possibility of the State trying to recapture unspent funds next year, noting that the State had tried to do this in 2008/2009. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that his concern was with regard to State funding related to the street program. With the budget increases in FY 16, Council brought the City street program up to $1M. He felt it was important for the City to keep the community transportation projects tight administratively, in terms of getting them authorized, completed, and reimbursed. Mr. Koenig explained that the State legislature had indicated that Community Transportation Funds may be significantly cut next year, and this would affect the City's ability to do some specially requested street projects. He noted an additional concern that if Municipal Street Aid were cut, the City would have to tailor back the street program from $1M to make up for some of this funding. Mr. Koenig indicated that this was not a concern for the FY16 budget but was a concern for FY 17. He indicated that if there were State revenue cuts to local governments, the City would be looking at capital project cuts and potentially operational cuts.

Mr. Anderson indicated that he had heard talk about some devolution to local governments but no talk about money going with that. In response, Mr. Koenig stated his thought that this would be debated significantly over the next year. He indicated his hope that if revenues do go away, that this would occur on a horizon that the City can plan for rather than immediately, since the immediate pullback of those revenues would cause the City to reconsider some of the capital projects.

Responding to Mr. Anderson regarding the reason for the delay on the Lincoln Park project, Mr. Koenig indicated that the money afforded for this project was related to design. He explained that there was a conceptual design for the project; however, one (1) of the reasons that the project had not progressed was because of the fairly significant construction cost and because no one had yet been identified who was interested in building in that area. Mr. Koenig stated that if a private developer was willing to take on some of this project, they may elect to construct the road or improvements privately, and they would not be under wage rate requirements. He advised members that a public-private partnership to build out the concept would likely not require the City to borrow money to go forward to construction. Mr. Koenig explained that the grant that the City received was for design and planning. In regard to the potential purchase of property, he felt the federal guidelines would become another obstacle that must be managed, since construction as a federal project would require a different set of rules than those for a private developer or if the City were to take on the land acquisition for it. Mr. Koenig stated that if the project was done through a grant, there are special rules for land acquisition, business relocation, and home relocation, and it would become a very burdensome project to undertake. Assistance would be needed from the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT), including their expertise in land acquisition, to move it forward as a joint federal, state, and local government project. Because of the uncertainty about what would be done with this area, staff had not asked for construction money at this point.

Mr. Anderson questioned how the new prevailing wage structure would benefit the City. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised members that the State relaxed some of the prevailing wage guidelines for public works projects related to Community Transportation Funds, and staff was waiting for written guidance. His understanding was that there was a new threshold at the State level for the kicking in of the State prevailing wage for community transportation. Mr. Koenig stated his belief that the threshold was approximately $250,000, noting that he needed to confirm this figure. He explained that a City road project valued at $100,000 funded solely with community transportation funds would be below the threshold. Mr. Koenig noted that this would help with projects such as the Inner City Cultural League, the Solid Rock Church, and some individual road projects, since the prevailing wage would not be required under the new rules, which would result in potential savings.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the report as presented.

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

TEA/NAES Report *(June)*

The TEA/NAES Monthly Report for June 2015 was provided to members to enable them to monitor electric sales and revenues received, which will provide a better understanding of any fluctuations that occur and allow the opportunity to make improvements if deemed necessary.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, noted that the monthly reports received in the 11th and 12th months of the year are the most important. He felt that the City had a pretty good year overall regarding its power supply and hedging program efforts. Referring to Page 13 of the report, he noted that year-to-date information, which reflects the 12-month period, indicated a budgeted gross load of 744,332 MW and the actual was 757,247 MW; therefore, the City sold more energy than staff was preparing in the budget. Mr. Koenig noted that the Total - Utilities Cost reflected that the City had budgeted $49.4M and actually spent $47.8M. The City's load was higher than anticipated and the City came in under budget in power supply by about $1.5M. He reminded members that several years ago the City realized a multi-million dollar savings in this area because the City's hedges were coming off and the City was able to buy power at a lower cost. There was a similar condition moving through this year, but there were some months that tended to fluctuate. Mr. Koenig noted that extreme cold weather during the winters of 2014 and 2015 resulted in some major swings in costs, and the City was able to overcome that over the 12-month period. He reminded members that the energy market is extremely dynamic, changing almost daily, which creates challenges in projecting for the future. Mr. Koenig advised members that hiring Mr. Harry Maloney, Electric Director, had provided additional perspective. He stated that Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/ Treasurer, had been involved with this contract from the beginning and previously in the transition from PACE to TEA as the City's energy management provider.

Mr. Koenig reiterated that he was happy where the year ended up, noting that staff expected that things would tighten up over the 12-month period, and they had, but the City had been faring reasonably well.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison as to how far out the City buys into the market, Mr. Koenig stated that the City was buying no more than five (5) years out and makes declining purchases over a five (5) year period. He stated that the City was just starting to purchase products for five (5) budget years out, which presents challenges in projecting the future.

In response to Mr. Hutchison, Mr. Koenig confirmed that when buying five (5) years out, the City is generally locked in. He noted that there may be a unique opportunity to sell and a deal is not finalized until the date is attained; however, the City is, for the most part, locked in when committing to these purchases.

Mr. Blakeman commented that if the City wanted to sell undesirable power, others would probably also find it undesirable.

Referring to the $1.9M total listed for hedge transactions in the Executive Summary on Page 2 of the report, Mr. Blakeman questioned if these funds were paid in the PJM bill or paid separately as a check to another party. In response, Mrs. Mitchell explained that hedges are paid separately to somebody else. The City has counterparties, such as Constellation, Macquarie, and BP, and the City pays whomever it has the hedges with for the month. She indicated that TEA makes sure that everything matches up and forwards the invoices to the City for payment.

Mr. Blakeman stated that he was having difficulty reconciling the purchase and cost information in the report, indicating that the Executive Summary on Page 2 listed a $1.8M purchase and energy charges of $898,169.44; however, the PJM bill for July was approximately $775,000, which was the amount that the City sent to PJM. He noted that the $1.8M purchase and $898,619.44 in energy charges were substantially higher than the $775,000 amount.

In response, Mrs. Mitchell explained that the PJM bill reflects both sales and purchase transactions. When PJM is paid, the City pays them the net of the credits and the debits on the bill. The net at the end of the year should be the total of all the weeks' bills, which is the final bill for the month. She indicated that on a weekly basis, it may go one way or another, reflecting a payment in week one (1) and a credit in week two (2). In the final week of the month, PJM provides a total bill that trues up all transactions, and the net of all debits and credits is what the City pays.

Mr. Blakeman reiterated the problem that a total of approximately $1,866,000 was reflected in purchases and fees from PJM, but the bill came to $775,000. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that the credits that the City receives for its load reduces what the City pays PJM.

Mr. Blakeman stated that he would like to see an explanatory reference if the City is paying substantially less, because he was not able to reconcile the report with the bill.

After additional discussion, Mrs. Mitchell referred to page 11 of the TEA report. She explained that the items included in Power Supply at the top of the report, such as the PJM - Energy, Congestion, and Losses and PJM - ARR, Transmission and Fees, and PJM - Capacity UCAP Obligated Purchased, reflected the purchases from PJM, such as the $1.8M total referenced previously. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the Power Generation Non-Production Revenue listed near the bottom of Page 11, listed on this spreadsheet as totaling approximately $930,666, reflected the net amount billed, such as the $775,000 mentioned previously. She explained that the $1.8M in the Executive Summary was based on the power supply in the top section and is not netting against the capacity credit.

Mr. Blakeman indicated that this was his concern since the larger number was being used to calculate the cost of kWh or MWh of power, and if only an amount in the neighborhood of $775,000 was being paid, the cost per MWh should be lower than using the $1.8M.

Mrs. Mitchell stated that, as presented on page 11, the power supply MWh cost is netted against the credit for power supply generation to offset the City's credit, providing the net MWh cost, which is the true cost.

Mr. Blakeman suggested that lower number would be a better number to put in the Executive Summary, as opposed to using the $1.8M as a calculation, to show the actual cost per MWh of purchasing power.

Mrs. Mitchell explained that this is the power supply piece and stated the need to look at the terminology used by TEA. The generation credit is the City's production credit piece. TEA provides amounts for the power supply, the generation credit, and the net cost for the month.

Mr. Blakeman stated his belief that the City was actually paying $775,000, not $1.8M, and if the kWh's from this report were divided to show the cost per kWh or MWh, a higher cost would be reflected than if the net number were used. His concern was that the City was reflecting a higher cost per kWh or MWh than if the $775,000 number, which he felt was the real number, were used.

Mr. Blakeman felt that this was something that should be looked at.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the report as presented.

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

Updates

Green Energy Funding and Programming

Members reviewed details regarding Green Energy Funding and Programming.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) Permit

No update was provided.

Garrison Oak Technical Park Project Updates

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, provided the following updates:

City Infrastructure/Calpine Energy Center

From a utility standpoint, projects at the Garrison Oak Technology Park (GOTP) would be coming to an end over the next couple of months and a final cost would be determined and reported to Council. Mr. Koenig expressed his belief that these projects were right about at budget; however, the electric relocation was about $50,000 under budget. He indicated that the City was beginning to see a return on its investments. The Calpine facility was occupied and producing energy out of block one, and Calpine was a large water user and fairly large sewer customer. It was Mr. Koenig's belief that the Uzin Utz facility had received its temporary certificate of occupancy and was beginning to ramp up for a full operation shortly. He expected that these facilities would have opening dedications in September and October and staff was continuing to market the balance of the park, having committed to a sale for one (1) parcel in addition to the Uzin Utz and Calpine facilities. Mr. Koenig advised members that there was additional activity in the GOTP for those interested in relocating or building new businesses there and that staff was very happy with the GOTP's standing in this regard.

Mr. Koenig stated that infrastructure comes to a close, the FY 15 and FY 16 total City budgets were close in numbers. He noted that the operating budget was becoming more expensive and the capital budget decreased slightly as the City was progressing through a spike in cost associated with the development of the GOTP.

In regard to the budget, Mr. Anderson questioned if the surplus would go toward the power supply, to pay back funds, or to the reserve. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated his belief that funds saved through the purchase of energy would go into the Rate Stabilization Fund, rather than the operating budget, to help with potential future increases or levelization of future power costs or power cost adjustments.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Mitchell confirmed that these funds were not accounted for in the budget that was just passed by Council.

Dover Sun Park

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, reviewed a spreadsheet entitled "City of Dover Electric Revenue Fund - FY 15 - White Oak Solar Park Incremental Cost." He advised members that numbers were provided through June 2015, and the incremental cost of the solar park to the City's ratepayers was approximately

$909,000 for the year. Mr. Koenig stated that the City pays a premium for solar energy; however, it is required to diversify the City's portfolio. He advised members that the challenge was how to make this work for the City in the long run. Mr. Koenig noted that there had been some instances during months with extreme temperatures when power coming off the solar park was cheaper on a monthly basis than what was being bought off the grid, which he had not expected. He advised members that the reality was, moving forward, that the City would have to invest more in solar and other renewable energy projects to comply with Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) standards and to diversify its portfolio. He noted that these costs would be higher, but this must be done to maintain the utility.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the updates as presented.

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

By consent agenda, Mr. Neil moved for acceptance of the Utility Committee Report, seconded by Mr. Cole and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE REPORT - AUGUST 10, 2015

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee met on August 10, 2015 with Chairman Hare presiding.

African American Business and Workforce Inclusion Report (Economic Inclusion Study) by Delaware State University Center for Economic Development and Trade (Dr. Michael Casson)

During their Regular Meeting of November 25, 2013, City Council considered a request from Mr. Clayton Hammond II, Delmarva Black Chamber of Commerce Chairman, for funding for the Delaware State University Center for Economic Development and Trade to conduct an economic inclusion study for the City of Dover. City Council approved the request to fund the Economic Inclusion Study in the amount of $6,000, as recommended by the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee.

Dr. Michael Casson, Director, University Center for Economic Development and Trade (UCEDIT), reviewed a presentation of the African American Business and Workforce Inclusion Report for the City of Dover, Delaware.

Dr. Casson thanked leadership for commissioning the study. He explained that Mr. Bill Neaton, Economic Development Manager, and the City's Economic Development Office staff were instrumental in moving this process forward and showing leadership pertaining to the engagement of the African-American population in the City of Dover.

In terms of the importance of an inclusion study, Dr. Casson stated that at this time last year a need was laid out to address the African-American community so that this community could be seen to grow economically, socially, and professionally. He stated that the intent was not to exclude any other populations within the City, but to look particularly at potential areas of growth in business and workforce development in the African-American community. Dr. Casson noted that when all populations progress at their optimal level, there is economic growth, cities become more competitive, and there can be movement forward as a city.

Dr. Casson explained that the basis for the study was a questionnaire that was presented to the City's Economic Development Office, and he reviewed some of the questions included. He indicated that the questionnaire looked at resources pertaining not only to African-Americans but to the total population, noting that the African-American population is a part of the total population. Dr. Casson stated his understanding that no exclusionary practices were happening; however, he expressed the desire to see what mechanisms may trigger more participation among the African-American community as opposed to other populations.

Dr. Casson reviewed statistics reflected under Dover's African American Population at a Glance.

Dr. Casson stated that Data Driven Decision Making (DDDM) should be used as a basis to ensure effectiveness across programs, services, and resources. He noted the importance of collecting sound data and utilizing that data to make informed decisions. Dr. Casson stated that it was important to make sure that the initiatives, practices, and actions put forth are optimizing resources and funds when there are budget constraints.

Dr. Casson reviewed the steps of the DDDM "Cycle of Inquiry," emphasizing that this was a dynamic process and adjustments would be made based on the information collected during that process. He indicated that starting to think about how to effectively collect this data for the African-American community would be the number one (1) priority.

Dr. Casson stated that commissioning the economic inclusion study was a very important first step in this process, and the next important step would be an inclusion plan. This plan would take some of the points from the inclusion study, bring together the stakeholders, and begin to create strategies around engaging the African-American community.

In reviewing the recommendations from the study, Dr. Casson indicated that the chief recommendation was the need for a comprehensive inclusion plan. This would entail pulling together a steering committee of stakeholders to delve deeper into the African-American small business community and the workforce community, determine what the needs are, and begin to devise action items around those needs.

He emphasized the need to employ DDDM to ensure that the strategic plan and the action items that come forth from the inclusion plan actually reach the target population.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Dr. Casson explained that the unemployment statistics included in the report were Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projections, indicating that they were five (5) year projections based on the 2000 census. He stated his belief that the information was from the American Community Survey.

Mr. Anderson noted the 16% unemployment rate for African Americans as a percentage of the total labor force and stated that the Hispanic population had approximately doubled in the last five (5) years.

Dr. Casson stated that the Hispanic population had grown by 9%. He indicated that the African American population had increased by approximately 3% to 4%, and the white population had decreased by 11%.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Dr. Casson confirmed that these were not absolute numbers but a percentage of City population.

Mr. Anderson noted that African American businesses accounted for approximately 8.7% of the businesses in the State. He stated that African Americans represented approximately 40% of the City's population but only 12.7% of the businesses. Noting that he would have expected the business figure to be around 20% as a percentage of population, Mr. Anderson inquired what Dr. Casson would attribute this disparity to.

Responding, Dr. Casson stated his belief that this was due to the processes and protocols in place for African-American small businesses to engage resources and services for development. He felt that this might be an area for growth, noting that if these resources and services were present and were not being utilized for some reason, perhaps the proper communication channel was not being used. Dr. Casson noted that the City was above the State average in African American businesses, but there was still a disparity based on population. Noting that there was a propensity or taste among the African-American population for entrepreneurship, Dr. Casson stated the question was how to determine what processes were in place to ensure this. For example, Dr. Casson questioned how the City's Economic Development Office could oversee data collection or track movement as it pertains to African Americans who are interested in the development of small businesses. If this movement could be tracked, these potential business persons could be directed toward more optimal paths. Dr. Casson indicated that sometimes a path may be followed that leads to stagnation, and from there a business never grows or develops.

Mr. Anderson questioned if being more focused in getting the message out would help the general population as well. He noted that the purpose was not to direct government money to any particular group, but to make sure that the whole population is served and that Dover is growing as a City.

In response, Dr. Casson confirmed that it was important to ask what was being done for the general population as a whole. He indicated that if this question were answered, it would be possible to understand if there was information flow, if services were available, and if these services were reaching the general population, and then to find out why the African-American population was not getting this information. Dr. Casson stated, from a general perspective and through DDDM, it could be said, for example, that there was a program for business technical assistance and the African-American population did not attend. Questions could then be asked about the reasons why, such as whether it was due to the marketing or a lack of knowledge or information as it pertains to a business. He felt that by starting there, efforts could then be made to begin to dissect not just the participation of the African-American community but all populations in the City of Dover, noting that the Hispanic population was growing. Dr. Casson stated the need to look at the broader area and then begin to pinpoint why certain populations were not getting the services that they need.

Noting that there are budgetary constraints, Dr. Casson stated the importance of getting strategies and action items in place that would give the highest yield. This would be done through DDDM, through development of an inclusion plan, and by drilling deeper into the questions being asked. Dr. Casson reiterated that the question was what the current process was for engaging the public and the African-American community.

Mr. Anderson noted that strategic planning would be discussed by the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee.

Mr. Hutchison stated that he was impressed with the information that had been gathered and asked if the number of students graduating versus those dropping out of high school was being looked at from an economic development and workforce perspective. Responding, Dr. Casson stated that this would go directly to the point of DDDM. He questioned where those students who were dropping out were going and what workforce needs in the City could be filled and addressed.

Mr. Hutchison expressed his opinion that this information could be helpful in the future.

Mr. Sudler questioned what one (1) of the major issues was that was identified by the African-American business owners in the downtown area in regard to conducting business in the City of Dover, or an issue related to engaging, encouraging, or advocating for individuals of African-American, Hispanic, or minority descent. In response, Dr. Casson advised members that this study was actually focused on the services and programs that were coming out of the City.

Mr. Sudler questioned if a survey could be conducted or if questions could be asked to get current feedback from African-American business owners and minority owners as a whole. Dr. Casson stated that this request went directly to the recommendations of the study in terms of the inclusion plan. He indicated that this would bring the

stakeholders to the table to talk about the strategic plan and the focus for addressing some of the needs pertaining to African-American business and workforce development.

Dr. Casson encouraged members to consider the economic inclusion plan, which would include the type of surveys that Mr. Sudler mentioned to gather information and find out why African Americans were or were not being engaged.

The Committee recommended acceptance of the report as presented.

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

Request to Waive Demolition Liens - 27 North New Street and 45, 67, and 101 South Queen Street

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised members that the City had been working in the Downtown Development District (DDD) to improve a number of different components in this area and a number of structures had been demolished there over the last few years. Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity, Inc. had offered to purchase four (4) properties from Dr. Joe Burden, Jr. Under the proposal, the liens would be transferred from Dr. Burden to Habitat, and Habitat would then pay the City of Dover $7,500 for each of the four lots (4), for a total of $30,000. The subject properties were 27 North New Street and 45, 67, and 101 South Queen Street. Each of the properties had been encumbered by a demolition lien due to prior dangerous building declarations. A summary of the offer and associated write-off amounts was as follows:

Address	Offer Price	Total City Lien Amount	Write-Off Amount	City's 2015 Assessed Land Value
27 N. New Street	$ 7,500	$ 22,274.97	$ 14,774.97	$ 13,100
45 S. Queen Street	$ 7,500	$ 13,862.18	$ 6,362.18	$ 11,900
67 S. Queen Street	$ 7,500	$ 14,348.46	$ 6,848.46	$ 13,800
101 S. Queen Street	$ 7,500	$ 15,684.02	$ 8,184.02	$ 13,400
Totals	$ 30,000	$ 66,169.63	$ 36,169.63	

Mr. Koenig advised members that, while the write-off would be substantial, the long term benefit of the proposal outweighed the financial impact of this write-off. Mr. Koenig stated that it was staff's strong belief, from an administrative standpoint, that transferring this property would be a good thing for the City of Dover. He noted that the City had preached home ownership in this area and Habitat would virtually guarantee long-term home ownership.

Staff recommended authorizing the properties to be transferred from Dr. Joe Burden, Jr. to Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity without collecting the City's liens against the properties in exchange for a payment of $30,000 from Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity ($7,500 per parcel).

In response to Mr. Shevock regarding whether Dr. Burden owned any other properties in the City, Mr. Koenig stated that Dr. Burden owned a substantial amount of property within the City.

Responding to Mr. Shevock as to whether either the write-off or the total lien amount could be transferred to Dr. Burden's other properties and attached for payment, Mr. Koenig stated his belief that this could not be done. He expressed his opinion, in the larger context of dealing with distressed properties, that this would not be a good precedent to start and was unsure if the City could legally do this. Mr. Koenig stated that staff had talked to Mr. William Pepper, Deputy City Solicitor, about this particular transaction and there was no legal reason that the City could not transfer a lien from one (1) property owner to another and then forgive the lien.

Mr. Koenig advised members that Dr. Burden had been working with staff and had paid all of his FY 15 taxes. He stated his belief that Dr. Burden had paid FY 16 taxes on all but the subject properties; therefore, progress had been made in a number of areas. Mr. Koenig indicated staff's belief that this land transfer would clear the water in some cases and provide a fast forward to home ownership on these four (4) lots. He stated that if the City continued to pursue the liens and forced a tax sale, there would be no guarantee that those purchasing the properties would occupy them, as they could be rentals. Mr. Koenig reiterated, under the proposal, that the City would be virtually guaranteed home ownership.

Mr. Sudler stated that he was glad that Dr. Burden and the City of Dover had reached an understanding and agreement and were working together.

The Committee recommended approval of Staff's recommendation to authorize the properties to be transferred from Dr. Joe Burden, Jr. to Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity without collecting the City's liens against the properties in exchange for a payment of $30,000 from Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity ($7,500 per parcel).

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

Disposition of City Owned Land – Property Located at 710 and 715 Slaughter Street

Members were informed that the City of Dover acquired properties located at 710 and 715 Slaughter Street at a monition sale due to liens for taxes and demolition expenses. Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, stated that these were excess properties, as the City had no use for them and would be better served by the properties being redeveloped and restored as taxable properties.

Members reviewed the details regarding these properties as follows:

Address	Land Area	City Expenses and Other Charges	City's 2015 Assessed Land Value
710 Slaughter Street	0.1722 Acres (7,500 sq ft)	$12,462.50	$39,400
715 Slaughter Street	0.1079 Acres (4,700 sq ft)	$8,653.75	$38,700

Mr. Koenig stated that the City had been in an active demolition phase for some time and was prepared to start releasing some properties for redevelopment. He advised members that these two (2) properties lie outside the City's Downtown Development District, and the Central Delaware Habitat for Humanity, Inc. had not placed a high priority on them. Mr. Koenig stated that it was Staff's belief that a higher market value could be recovered using the "Standard Method of Disposition" to dispose of the properties, either through sealed bid or auction, in hopes of recovering in excess of the demolition liens associated with them.

Staff recommended the following: 1) determining that the subject properties are excess properties; and 2) authorizing the City Manager to dispose of the subject properties using the "Standard Method of Disposition" of the Procedure for Sale and Disposition of Real Property.

The Committee recommended approval of staff's recommendation.

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

Proposed Ordinance #2015-13 Amending Appendix B - Zoning, Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 2 - General Residence Zones (RG-1 and RG-2); Article 4 - Zoning Bulk and Parking Regulations, Section 4.2 - RG-1 (General Residence Zones); and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Section 1 - Supplementary Regulations Applying to Residence Zones

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, explained that proposed Ordinance #2015-13 was one (1) of the implementation measures for the City's Downtown Development District program and the Restoring Central Dover plan. One (1) of the measures called for in the Restoring Central Dover plan, as well as a number of other planning documents that preceded it, was to allow flexibility of housing styles within the downtown area. Mrs. Townshend advised members that the downtown neighborhoods were largely zoned RG-1 (General Residence Zone). The proposed ordinance would allow townhouses and duplex dwellings as a conditional use. She indicated that several restrictions were included to make sure that these dwellings would be on individual lots. The

ordinance also stated that no more than four (4) dwelling units would be allowed in a group of townhomes and there would be separation between groups of townhomes. Shared access or access from the alley would be encouraged when appropriate.

Referring to Lines #101-104 of the proposed ordinance, Mrs. Townshend stated that the language was changed so that multiple dwellings, which is another term for apartments, would be permitted only in the RG-2 (General Residence Zone) district, not in the RG-1 district. She noted that this addressed one (1) of the challenges that Staff had been dealing with for a number of years. As of 2006, the conversion of homes to apartments was no longer allowed, but the ordinance amendment would make it clear that apartments would not be a permitted use in the RG-1 zone, and any such use there would be legal nonconforming.

Mrs. Townshend advised members that additional administrative waivers were included in the ordinance. One (1) would allow minor lot line adjustments among a finite piece of land as an administrative process as long as it meets the bulk requirement, the minimum lot size, and the minimum lot width. Mrs. Townshend noted that many lots in the downtown area do not meet the requirements; therefore, there was a need to go to the Board of Adjustment just to reapportion existing land. She explained that Section 2.6 (b), beginning on Line #152 of the ordinance, would allow administrative discretion to make these adjustments if the number of lots was not being increased. Mrs. Townshend explained, for example, that there may be three (3) lots that are together and that have widths of 20 feet, 30 feet, and 25 feet. This provision would allow these lots to be distributed more evenly without having to go to the Board of Adjustment.

Mrs. Townshend advised members that the waiver recommendation in Section 2.6 (c) on Line #158 would allow parking surfaces other than hard-paved, dust-free surfaces, as long as those parking areas were located in the rear yard. She explained that there were many areas downtown where people were parking on the grass or dirt. It was being suggested that staff be granted administrative discretion to allow stone in the rear yard if these areas were off an alley. Mrs. Townshend stated that staff was looking at the bulk standards, which are the lot area and lot width, and bulk standards were proposed that would be more compatible with what was in the area rather than being more suburban in nature.

In reference to Line #194, Mrs. Townshend explained that an infill lot is a vacant lot in a developed area. She stated that supplementary regulations would be amended to develop infill standards that would make it clear that on an infill lot, sidewalks, some degree of landscaping, and a primary façade that fronts on the street would be required.

Mr. Townshend stated that, as an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, the proposed ordinance would go to City Council for First Reading, to the Planning Commission for a public hearing, and then would return to City Council with a recommendation

from the Planning Commission for a public hearing and final action. She noted that there may be minor amendments during that process, but she did not expect significant changes.

In response to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that recycled asphalt that is tamped and packed would be sufficient for alternative rear parking under the ordinance amendment.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison regarding how many people can live in a townhouse, Mrs. Townshend stated that the City does not regulate this number. She explained that no more than five (5) unrelated people can live in any type of single-family dwelling, whether attached, detached, or semi-attached. She noted that staff planned to review all residential zones and some of the definitions that go with them in the next year or so. Mrs. Townshend indicated that the provision regarding five (5) unrelated people can, at times, create problems and Staff planned to look at how other jurisdictions had treated this.

Mr. Hutchison stated that he supported the concept; however, he cautioned that Staff should be very careful moving forward in this regard, noting that five (5) people can mean five (5) cars.

In regard to Lines #172-#173 referencing lot width (ft.) per dwelling unit, Mr. Anderson questioned if this referred to the total lot width. In response, Mrs. Townshend stated this referred to the width of the house plus the land that goes with that house. For example, noting that each house in a duplex has a side yard, she stated that the lot width would include the side yard plus the house area. Mrs. Townshend stated that townhouses do not have side yards, so the lot could not be narrower than a 20-foot townhouse.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that a 20-foot wide townhouse would not need 40 feet of parking but would need one (1) off-street parking place. She indicated that the proposed ordinance would encourage access off the alley and preserve the on-street parking. In this way, the rhythm of the downtown neighborhoods would not be so intersected with driveways. Mrs. Townshend noted that staff would have to deal with the definition of family when reviewing the residential zones.

In response to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that the size of the average parking space for one (1) individual would be 9 feet by 18 feet.

The Committee recommended adoption of proposed Ordinance #2015-13.

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

Semi-Annual Review - Statistics Regarding Jobs and Businesses Gained and Lost in the City of Dover Since January 2015
The Committee deferred this item until the next meeting.

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

By consent agenda, Mr. Neil moved for acceptance of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee Report, seconded by Mr. Cole and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

DISCHARGING THE AD HOC FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

During the Regular Council meeting of November 12, 2013, the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee members were appointed to one (1) year terms to expire November 10, 2014. The Committee was created to advise the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee, who would in turn advise City Council as a whole on operations, financial issues, and organizational structure within the City of Dover.

The Committee met four (4) times, the last time being April 17, 2014, and had since become inactive. It was recommended that the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee be formally discharged.

Mr. Anderson expressed concern with discharging the committee without receiving their final report. Responding, Mr. Slavin stated that he reached out to the chair of the committee and they indicated that a final report would not be forthcoming.

Mr. Anderson expressed hope that the new committee of staff and City Council members that will be reporting on cost savings in government will do due diligence and meet soon.

Mr. Anderson moved to discharge the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sudler and unanimously carried.

FIRST READING OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2015-13 AMENDING APPENDIX B - ZONING

Council President Slavin reminded the public that copies of the proposed ordinance were available at the entrance of the Council Chambers or could be obtained from the City Clerk's Office. Since the ordinance amends the Zoning Code, a public hearing is required. Staff recommended referral of the amendments to the Planning Commission on September 21, 2015 and that a public hearing take place during the Council Meeting of October 12, at 7:30 p.m., at which time, final action by Council will take place.

Mr. Anderson moved to refer the amendment and set a public hearing before City Council for October 12, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

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

- Proposed Ordinance #2015-13 Amending Appendix B - Zoning, Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 2 - General Residence Zones (RG-1 and RG-2); Article 4 - Zoning Bulk and Parking Regulations, Section 4.2 - RG-1 (General Residence) Zones; and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Section 1 - Supplementary Regulations Applying to Residence Zones

ANNEXATION/REZONING REQUEST/FIRST READING OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2015-14

A request was received for annexation and rezoning of properties located on the easterly side of Nixon Lane consisting of $.5171^{+/-}$ acres (Lot 1) and 121 Acorn Lane, consisting of $.4609^{+/-}$ acres (Lot 2), owned by Paul C. Phillips and Theresa HoShue. This property is currently zoned RS-1-Single Family Residential (Kent County zoning classification) and the proposed zoning is R-8 - One Family Residential (City of Dover zoning classification). Staff recommended that the request be referred to the Utility Committee on September 14, 2015; to the Planning Commission on September 21, 2015; and that a public hearing be set for October 12, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. (Tax Parcels: ED-00-068.19-01-25.00-000 (Lot 1) and ED-00-068.19-01-25.01-000 (Lot 2); Council District: 3; Planning Reference: AX-15-01).

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

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

ORDINANCE #2015-14 AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF DOVER BY CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF PROPERTIES LOCATED ON NIXON LANE AND AT 121 ACORN LANE.

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sudler announced that there will be a second 4th District Quarterly meeting in partnership with Dover Community Action Forum (DCAF) and Mount Zion AME Church and Social Action Commission on Tuesday, September 8, 2015 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Mount Zion AME Church, 101 North Queen Street. He stated that the topic is the current form of government versus the proposed strong mayor/city council form of government and encouraged all residents from all districts to participate.

Mr. Lewis announced that the 2nd District will be having a community meeting on Saturday, September 12, 2015 at 2 p.m. at Victory Christian Fellowship, 18 Greenhill Avenue. The meeting is being held to hear the concerns of the constituents in the 2nd district.

Mr. Anderson announced that the Kent County Economic Summit would be held on September 22, 2015 at Delaware Tech. He noted that it is an important event and encouraged members of the city and the business community to be well engaged in the summit.

Mr. Sudler announced that, as a newly elected Council person, he is very proud of the City Manager, the Department Head, the City Planner, and all the City officials and State legislators who participated in the Lincoln Park and Simon Circle walk through the previous Saturday. He noted that they not only had a really good time, they were also able to identify issues that can be rectified. Mr. Sudler especially thanked 1st District Councilman Hosfelt and Council President Slavin for taking on a role of leadership and keeping them together and focused. He stated that he feels very proud to be a City Councilman and he hopes that they continue the momentum and continue to function as one, united.

Mr. Hutchison announced that the State Firemen's Parade would be held on September 19, 2015 from noon to 4:00 p.m. beginning in front of Legislative Hall. He also announced that the Dover Fire Department will have open house on October 10, 2015 beginning at noon.

Mr. Sudler moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:17 P.M.

TRACI A. McDOWELL
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by City Council during their Regular Meeting of August 24, 2015, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/TM
S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Council-Minutes\2015\08-24-2015.wpd