REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular Council Meeting was held on July 13, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. with Council President Slavin presiding. Council members present were Mr. Anderson, Mr. Sudler, Mr. Neil, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Hare, and Mr. Hutchison. Mr. Cole was absent.

Council staff members present were Deputy Police Chief Mailey, Mrs. Mitchell, Mrs. Townshend, Second Assistant Fire Chief Whitt, Mr. Koenig, City Solicitor Rodriguez, and Mrs. McDowell. Mayor Christiansen was absent.

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. Yolanda Bouyer-Bello, 1160 School Street, Houston, Delaware, addressed members regarding housing issues she experienced while living at Autumn Run apartments. Council President Slavin advised Ms. Bouyer-Bello that the City of Dover had no jurisdiction over Autumn Run apartments because they are just outside the City limits. He advised her that her concerns would be relayed to the County, which does have jurisdiction.

Ms. Faye White, 101 Babb Drive, noting that the Open Forum segment of the City Council meetings starts at 7:15 p.m. and the meeting is not televised until 7:30 p.m., requested that the City begin televising the Open Forum segment of the meetings. Council President Slavin stated that the decision not to televise the Open Forum segment of the meeting was made by a previous Council many years ago and suggested that the request could be considered by the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee.

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. Sudler and unanimously carried.

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 22, 2015

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of June 22, 2015 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Hare, seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

PUBLIC HEARING - VIOLATION OF THE DANGEROUS BUILDING ORDINANCE - PROPERTY LOCATED AT 200 NORTH WEST STREET, OWNED BY MARY LOU BASHORE

A public hearing was duly advertised for this time and place to consider a violation of the Dangerous Building Ordinance at 200 North West Street, owned by Mary Lou Bashore.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, explained that the property is a two (2) story, wood-framed single family home. The house has been vacant since January 11, 2013, and is registered with the City as a vacant building. The residential use is no longer permitted at this location, as the property is zoned M (Manufacturing). On January 15, 2014, the Board of Adjustment issued a variance to allow continued residential use. This variance expired as work did not commence and continue diligently within a year of the variance being granted. On May 7, 2014, staff from the Planning and Inspections Department condemned the home due to numerous code violations. The owner was ordered to board the property in May of 2014. Currently the home is still vacant, with no utilities and numerous outstanding code violations.

Mrs. Townshend reviewed a presentation depicting the condition of the structure ***(Exhibit #1)***.

Staff recommended that City Council take the following action for property located at 200 North West Street: 1) declare this building and all accessory structures on this property dangerous; 2) order the property repaired or demolished by August 13, 2015 by the owner or equity owner at their own risk; 3) order the Building Inspector to cause the demolition of the structures if not completed by the owner within 10 days of the date established by City Council; and 4) order the City Manager, with the assistance of the City Solicitor, to cause the cost of repairs or demolition to be charged against the land on which the building exists as a municipal lien or cause such cost to be added to the tax duplicate as an assessment, or to be levied as a special tax, or to be recovered in a suit at law against the owner.

Mr. Hare, noting that the utilities were terminated in 2008, asked why something had not been done regarding the property between 2008 and 2014. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that it was not until an inspector was assigned to enforcement in 2012 that the City began aggressively enforcing the vacant building ordinance. She advised that staff had the property boarded and were monitoring it; however, they had focused on bringing forward properties that were in much worse condition than this property.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend stated that she had not spoken with the owner, Mrs. Bashore, in several months; however, Mr. Tim Taraila, Inspector III, had spoken with her the previous week. Mrs. Townshend stated that she was not aware of the content of that conversation.

Council President Slavin declared the public hearing open.

Mrs. Mary Lou Bashore stated that she and her husband, John Bashore, owned the house until he unexpectedly died on August 24, 2014. She noted that at the time of his death her husband was in the process of restoring the house, which would have cost a lot less than hiring someone to do the work. Mrs. Bashore advised that her sons had tried their best to restore the house; however, they had to stop after spending $10,000 on the renovation.

Mrs. Bashore indicated that she is handling other properties that her husband owned in Chestertown and Elkton, Maryland. She stated that the properties that he owned in Dover are rented and bringing in an income. Mrs. Bashore noted that she is also maintaining the business that he owned, which is a 24-hour answering service for doctors.

Mrs. Bashore stated that she put the house at 200 North West Street up for sale when she realized that she did not have the finances to continue with the restoration. She noted that there are approximately seven (7) people who are interested in the house and that she has a signed contract with someone who wants to buy it and restore it.

Mrs. Bashore stated that she was not aware that it could not be restored and made a residential property. She noted that the person that wants to buy it is willing to start working on it and have the renovations done. Mrs. Bashore indicated that it would be a terrible waste to have the house torn down because a lot of work had been done inside. She indicated that it had been totally gutted and was ready for the drywall, and the electric had been installed and just had to be wired. Mrs. Bashore stated that it is going to be like a new house when it is finished.

Mrs. Bashore stated that her husband really had not wanted to see this house torn down, and if there was anything she could do to keep that from happening, she would like to. She requested an extension of 60 days to apply for the variance to allow it to be a residential property.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Townshend stated that the next application deadline for the Board of Adjustment is the second Friday in August and that application would go to the Board the third week in September.

Mr. Hare asked if the house was ever residentially zoned. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that she had not researched that far back; however, a lot of that area was developed before zoning. She noted that the west side of the street between the street and the railroad tracks is all industrial and the east side of the street is residential.

Mr. Hare asked if the property could be grandfathered. Mrs. Townshend advised that the zoning ordinance allows for a non-conforming use to continue as long as it remains consistently used for that use and does not discontinue for a period of more than one (1) year. She noted that the utilities were disconnected in 2008, and it had been vacant since then. The Board of Adjustment granted a variance on January 15, 2014; however, the variance had expired and the building permit cannot be extended for that reason.

Mrs. Townshend advised members that a use variance has a higher legal test than other variances and she could not make any assurances as to whether or not the Board of Adjustment would grant a variance for the residential use to continue.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend stated that the pictures of the exterior of the house were taken in the last week or so. Mr. Hosfelt stated that he drove by this property the day before and thought the pictures actually did the house justice compared with what he saw. He noted that if he lived in that neighborhood, he would be upset if this house was next to or across the street from his property. Mr. Hosfelt stated that if it had been in this condition since 2008 and something had not been done about it, it would be very upsetting to him as a resident of that area.

Mr. Rodney McKenzie, 725 Bacon Avenue, stated that he had a contract with Mrs. Bashore to purchase the property, pending the outcome of the hearing. He advised that he would like to begin work as soon as possible to do everything that is necessary to restore the home and make it a beautiful residence for another homeowner.

In response to Mr. Neil, Mr. Mackenzie stated that this would not be his residence but an investment property that he intended to fix up and sell or rent. He indicated that he would probably put it on the market for sale first, but if a buyer was not found, he had tenants who were ready to rent.

Responding to Mr. Neil as to how many houses he has for sale or rent, Mr. Mackenzie advised members that he works throughout the County buying houses, fixing and restoring them, and selling them and has a staff who is proficient in this. He indicated that they usually work on one (1) or two (2) such houses per month.

Mr. Slavin cautioned that whatever action Council takes has no bearing on what the Board of Adjustment may or may not do vis-a-vis the variance. If Mr. Mackenzie were granted extra time and began the work, it would be at his own risk because the Board of Variance would then have to rule on this matter.

This was confirmed by Mrs. Townshend, who stated that a permit cannot be issued for residential renovations until the Board of Adjustment takes action because the building codes relating to restoration as a commercial building are different than those for a residential building.

In response to Mr. Sudler, Mr. Mackenzie stated that he had not considered the possibility of restoring the building as a commercial building, but this could be considered.

Mr. Neil inquired if the ground could be sold for commercial purposes if the building were torn down. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that the property is zoned as manufacturing. It was her belief that a variance was granted previously because it is a very small property, and it would be very difficult to establish a new manufacturing use on it. Mrs. Townshend advised members that there are a lot of challenges associated with the property due to its size and zoning, noting that it is surrounded by industrial uses on two (2) sides. She indicated that, in theory, it could be developed under the manufacturing zone, but there would probably be very few uses that would really fit on the property once size is taken into account.

In response to Mr. Neil as to whether another residence could be built there with a variance if the building were torn down, Mrs. Townshend stated that this could be done with a use variance; however, the legal standard for a use variance is very difficult to meet. To her knowledge, the use variance granted for this property was the only one that had been granted since she began service with the City.

At the request of Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Townshend explained that a use variance allows a use that is not permitted by the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Hosfelt noted that Cecil Street extended is on the south side of the house and is currently a dirt lane. He inquired if the City would be responsible for paving and dedicating that roadway if the variance was approved and the house became a residence.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised members that this is a dedicated right-of-way and discussion had been held about paving at least a portion of it. He indicated that this would be a substandard pavement because it would not be the width of a normal road and would not have a curb,

and this roadway is technically an unimproved right-of-way that exists within the City. Mr. Koenig stated that there had been discussion about paving a 15-foot-wide swath for access and egress. It was his belief that the driveway for this house extends from that dirt/gravel road.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig confirmed that this unimproved road is used for access to Terrapin Recycling.

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

Mr. Sudler moved to grant a 90-day extension to the property owner in order to go through the variance process. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson.

Mrs. Townshend stated that the pictures of the property reflect foundation issues and a structural engineering report may be needed. She indicated that this would be part of the permit submission.

For clarification, Mr. Slavin stated that the extension would be granted until 90 days from today's date. He indicated that the motion was made with the understanding that this would be enough time to go through the variance process.

The motion to grant a 90-day extension to the owner of the property located at 200 North West Street in order to go through the variance process carried by a roll call vote of seven (7) yes (Anderson, Sudler, Neil, Lewis, Hosfelt, and Slavin), one (1) no (Hutchison), and one (1) absent (Cole).

PUBLIC HEARING - VIOLATION OF THE DANGEROUS BUILDING ORDINANCE - PROPERTY LOCATED AT 311 NORTH GOVERNORS AVENUE, OWNED BY JEAN E. MACDONALD

A public hearing was duly advertised for this time and place to consider a violation of the Dangerous Building Ordinance at 311 North Governors Avenue, owned by Jean E. MacDonald. Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, explained that the property is a two (2) story, wood-framed, single-family home. The house has been vacant since April 1, 2014, and is registered with the City as a vacant building. On April 3, 2014, staff from the Planning and Inspections Department condemned the home due to hoarding conditions within the home that are causing an excessive fire load to the structural members of the home. There are weak/loose floors around the rear door, laundry room and bathroom. The owner was ordered to obtain a structural engineer's report and to remove items causing the excessive load. Currently the home is still vacant, with no utilities and numerous outstanding code violations.

Mrs. Townshend reviewed a presentation depicting the condition of the structure ***(Exhibit #2)***.

Staff recommended that City Council take the following action for property located at 311 North Governors Avenue: 1) declare this building and all accessory structures on this property dangerous; 2) order the property repaired or demolished by August 13, 2015 by the owner or equity owner at their own risk; 3) order the Building Inspector to cause the repair or demolition of the structures if

not completed by the owner within 10 days of the date established by City Council; and 4) order the City Manager, with the assistance of the City Solicitor, to cause the cost of repairs or demolition to be charged against the land on which the building exists as a municipal lien or cause such cost to be added to the tax duplicate as an assessment, or to be levied as a special tax, or to be recovered in a suit at law against the owner.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend advised that the red placard with the white X indicates to the Fire Department that there are structural concerns, the property should not be inhabited, and they should use caution if responding to that property.

Mr. Lewis asked if there had been any contact with the owner. Responding, Mrs. Townshend stated that there had been contact and it was her understanding that the owner is currently out of state.

In response to Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Townshend stated that she thought the taxes were being paid on this property and she did not believe they were delinquent.

Mr. Anderson asked if Mrs. Townshend had any contact with the owner about their response to the structural engineer, noting that this was delaying the issuance of the building permit. Mrs. Townshend advised that staff had discussed their concerns regarding shifting, the weight, and structural stability. She stated that she believed this was the first application for a permit that they had received to address these violations. Mrs. Townshend advised that the structural violations cannot be addressed before the house is cleaned out.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Townshend stated that property owners frequently submit permit applications once they receive notice that their violations are scheduled for consideration by City Council.

Council President Slavin declared the public hearing open and, there being no one present wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Mrs. Townshend, correcting her previous statement, advised that there is a structural engineering report that discusses the steps necessary to begin removing items from the house.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Townshend stated that a building permit will be issued if there are outstanding violations and fines due if it is a dangerous building. She noted that they typically request payment at the time of permit issuance.

Mr. Sudler asked if the City has an engineer confirm that a building is dangerous or that the foundation is faulty. Responding, Mrs. Townshend advised that dangerous buildings are defined in the Dover Code of Ordinances and they do not necessarily have to be structurally unsound to be dangerous. She noted that in this case there are hoarding conditions, it is vacant, and it is a blight to the neighborhood. Mr. Sudler asked if there were any situation where an engineer would confirm the code enforcement officer's determination that a building is dangerous. Mrs. Townshend responded that the determination is made using the definition set forth in the Code. She stated that

they would require a structural engineering report if they observe conditions that lead them to believe there could be structural problems. Mrs. Townshend advised that the structural engineer's report would be required before they could issue a permit for repair.

Mr. Hosfelt moved that the structure located at 311 North Governors Avenue be declared a dangerous building and ordered that the property be repaired or demolished by August 13, 2015, in accordance with the process recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hutchison and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent).

DOVER HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION REPORT - MARCH 10, 2015

The Dover Human Relations Commission met on March 10, 2015 with Chairman Wilson presiding.

Presentation - Delaware Department of Justice, Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust

Ms. Smith introduced Deputy Attorney General Allison Reardon and advised members that Ms. Reardon was recently appointed as Director of the Delaware Department of Justice Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust, noting that this Office was designed to be a safe haven where the public can go to understand their rights in terms of housing, education, employment, and many other areas, and is also to be an advocate when there is a conflict of interest between the Department of Justice and the public.

Ms. Reardon advised members that she had been with the Department of Justice for 23 years, having started in the 1980s as a child support prosecutor. She stated that she went into private practice for approximately five (5) years and then returned to the State in a number of different capacities. Ms. Reardon indicated that she had worked with the State Human Relations Commission in the past and had also represented the Department of Labor, the Department of Finance, the Division of Professional Regulation, and a number of other State agencies.

Ms. Reardon stated that Attorney General Matthew Denn selected her to head up the newly created Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust and she was focused on getting it started in the right direction. The Office was now staffed at the level that is anticipated for the foreseeable future with two (2) attorneys, Ms. Reardon and one (1) additional Deputy Attorney General, two (2) public outreach and research specialists, and three (3) investigators. Ms. Reardon stated her hope that the Office could now move forward doing the business that they are charged with, noting that complaints were starting to come in more frequently since the Office was becoming known.

Ms. Reardon explained that the Office is responsible for various areas of statutory oversight, protecting the rights and liberties of Delawareans, and enforcement of related laws. It will be involved in discrimination cases, focusing on pattern and practice cases, and will not look at individual cases where there is already a place to have those concerns addressed, such as the Human Relations Commission and the

Department of Labor. She advised members that the Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust refers people to appropriate government resources and is looking for referrals from the State Human Relations Commission, Dover Human Relations Commission, and other organizations that see pattern and practice type cases that her Office would take charge of. The Office will also look into protecting the educational rights of children with disabilities, although they had not yet officially started in that track, and will enforce the laws designed to ensure citizen trust in government, such as those pertaining to election and campaign finance violations and governing the use of public funds and public contact. She indicated that they had already seen some complaints involving elections, as well public funds and conduct. Ms. Reardon explained that they would also focus on criminal prosecution of State and municipal actors who violate the public trust by engaging in criminal conduct, such as theft and bribery. She noted that they would work in collaboration with a number of other agencies, including the Public Integrity Commission, the State Auditor, and the Election Commissioner, and indicated that the Office is in the process of scheduling meetings to meet with those various agencies and individuals to see how they can work together.

Ms. Reardon explained that there might be an appearance of conflict if the Department has a prosecutorial role and relationship with an entity when conducting some investigations, for example, the use of deadly force by police officers, and this function of review had been shifted to the Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust. She advised members that she would be the person responsible for determining whether or not the use of force was justified, along with Chief Deputy Attorney General Danielle Gibbs. Ms. Reardon stated that she will write the associated reports and make decisions, which she indicated was an important issue and big responsibility that she would not take lightly. Having previously served in the Civil Division and as the former State Solicitor, Ms. Reardon stated that she provided legal advice to State agencies, noting that a State agency is often the subject of a criminal, ethics, or other violation. She noted that it is very difficult to be in the position of providing advice on both sides of the fence, and explained that the Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust would perform investigations, which would take away the conflict of interest that Justice Department attorneys often feel when they have to represent one (1) of the entities that is the subject of an investigation.

Ms. Reardon informed members that her Office was also embarking on educational programs and hoped in the very near future to reach out to various organizations with common interests. For the past two (2) months, her staff had been talking with offices of civil rights in surrounding states to fold some of their experience into the developing Office. They had talked to such offices in Massachusetts and New York and were continuing to reach out to other states to benefit from their experiences and to further their mission of protecting civil rights and public trust.

Ms. Reardon advised members that the Office's webpage can be accessed through a link on the Delaware Attorney General's website, and includes a contact information and an online complaint form.

Noting that the 50th anniversary of the 1965 Voting Rights Act was approaching, Mr. Henderson expressed concern that it was currently difficult for people to vote. He noted that license renewal now requires a birth certificate and other things and felt that some people, including the elderly and those who are not organized, may experience difficulty with this. Mr. Henderson expressed concern that this is a civil rights issue driven by politics, noting that Delaware had fallen in line with this and that some licenses state that they are not a valid ID for government. He questioned what Ms. Reardon's feelings were on this matter. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that she had not looked into this specific issue or how it would affect people's ability to vote. She stated her belief that a federally compliant driver's license is a federal requirement; however, she was glad that Mr. Henderson brought this matter to her Office's attention.

Ms. Smith requested clarification regarding Ms. Reardon's request for DHRC commissioners to share cases with her relating to pattern and practices. In addition, she noted that Ms. Reardon had served as a former protector of State agencies, and indicated that solid relationships are built with such protectors. She asked that Ms. Reardon explain the process of what she had formerly done versus what she was now assigned to do.

In regard to patterns and practices, Ms. Reardon stated that the Office was looking for certain situations. For example, she explained that if the DHRC received complaints that an apartment complex was routinely denying access to a particular race or gender, the Office would want to know about it. However, if one (1) person complained, they would be referred to the State Human Relations Commission to file a complaint and receive assistance. Ms. Reardon indicated that it would be helpful if the City or State Human Relations Commission reported to them if a number of similar cases builds up so it could be determined if this was a pattern and practice case.

In regard to Ms. Smith's question pertaining to the protection of State agencies, Ms. Reardon stated that she is responsible for issues pertaining to police shootings. She stated that she had never advised the police or worked with them on a daily basis in what they do as law enforcement officers, although attorneys under her supervision had worked with the State police and other police agencies; therefore, she felt that she could be independent in her assessment of situations. Ms. Reardon stated that it might be a little more difficult in a situation where a child has been abused in a State facility and this may have to be reviewed; however, she felt that protocols and laws would be in place. She would not be talking directly with the attorney representing that agency and would make her own assessment for her Office on the occurrence. She reminded members that the Office was still in its infancy and all protocols were not yet in place but were being worked on.

Referring to Ms. Reardon's comment about being involved with children with disabilities, Mr. Roach inquired if this pertained to mental health, school, or community issues. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that they were looking at all

types of complaints, for example, whether children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) were being treated fairly and if their concerns were being heard. She stated that the Office would be driven by what they hear from constituents and that these would also be issues pertaining to pattern and practice.

Mr. Ruane questioned when the Office would become involved in issues related to use of excessive force by police. He indicated that in the past there had been a perception that some of the investigating parties within the Attorney General's Office had entered into related decision making, perhaps because of their own groundwork with police. In response, Ms. Reardon stated that the Attorney General is sensitive to the fact that a number of investigators had developed relationships with police officers over the years. She explained that the investigators assigned to her Office would work exclusively with her Office and would not be on the ground with the police in other matters. She stated that if there were a police shooting and someone was injured or killed, an investigator would go to the scene, perform their own assessment and prepare a report for her, then she would issue a public report.

Mr. Ruane questioned the level of involvement of the local police force and if it would be a routine practice for those cases to be moved up to the Attorney General's level rather than being handled by the City police. Responding, Ms. Reardon indicated that a separate attorney who is not in an oversight position of personnel in the Criminal Division would now be involved in the review. She indicated that the Attorney General's Office had held that oversight role in recent history, noting that they had monitored and written reports on shootings involving injury or death for years, and their website contains a number of related decisions rendered by former Chief of Staff Timothy Mullaney. She stated that this responsibility would now be shifted away from those who have a closer relationship with the police.

Noting that Ms. Reardon had mentioned that she foresaw problems related to elections, Ms. Smith requested that she elaborate. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that, historically, there had been complaints involving elections, for example, laws relating to electioneering within a certain perimeter. She stated that her Office would be charged with ensuring follow-up on those complaints.

Mrs. Sadusky advised members that inmates in State prisons who feel they are being treated unfairly must address this within the prison or pay money for an outside lawyer. She explained that this may relate to issues such as prosecution for wrongful death or improper health care, and questioned if this was an issue that Ms. Reardon's Office could address. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that the Office's role on that issue had not been explored and she was unsure if there were partner organizations that would be better suited for that.

Mr. Ken Abraham, 430 Kings Highway, stated that he is a retired lawyer and serves as President of Citizens for Criminal Justice. He explained that he was familiar with the practice, pattern, and policy term, noting that it is a legal term that provides common sense meaning to a series of abuses or violations that might trigger an

investigation under appropriate circumstances. Mr. Abraham questioned who the other deputy in the office was, and Ms. Reardon stated that it was Mr. Dennis Kelleher.

Mr. Abraham stated that he wished to follow up on Ms. Sadusky's question regarding prisons, noting that he had a good look at what goes on in the Delaware Department of Corrections (DOC) and there were serious problems in the State of Delaware. He indicated that he did not know what partner agencies Ms. Reardon was referring to and expressed his opinion that nobody was doing anything about the cesspool of crime that exists in Delaware, stating that he was not talking about the prisoners. He expressed his hope that Ms. Reardon's Office would become involved. Mr. Abraham stated that he had contacted the U.S. Department of Justice, claiming a pattern, practice, and policy of serious abuse and criminal violations, and had received a form letter from them stating that they only investigate claims of pattern, practice, or policy, which were the very words he had used. Since that time, he stated that he had received three (3) such form letters in response to follow-up complaints. Mr. Abraham expressed his hope that the Office would do what it is designed to do and wished them success.

Referring to Ms. Reardon's comments regarding a lack public trust, Mr. Abraham stated his observation, based on being immersed in these matters over the last eight (8) years locally and nationwide, that the effect of the many problems in the criminal justice system, including prison abuse, was the erosion of public trust in government officials. He indicated his belief that Ronald Shoup, an inmate in the Delaware DOC, was murdered, explaining that the death certificate indicated homicide at the hands of DOC staff through blunt force trauma. Mr. Abraham inquired if a decision had been made on this matter.

Mr. Reardon stated that she had previously responded to Mr. Abraham's email regarding this matter and, as she indicated in that response, this was an active case and she could not comment on it. She stated that Mr. Abraham had emailed her this question repeatedly and that this would be her response to all such emails.

Mr. Abraham stated that he would probably continue to send emails about once per month.

Ms. Cynthia Smith, Felton, Delaware, questioned who protects whistle blowers from retaliation, how Ms. Reardon's Office would be transparent in regard to cases being investigated, and if information would available on their website. Ms. Smith also expressed concerns with regard to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), stating that there were problems with a lack of transparency. She felt that there was a conflict of interest in Ms. Reardon's Office and that if they were representing the public, they should use an outside, independent investigator so that there would not appear to be bias in the office. Ms. Smith expressed her opinion that law enforcement, social services, and the judiciary were three (3) important agencies that must work together. Ms. Smith indicated that false allegations should also be

addressed. She stated the desire to avoid becoming another Ferguson, Missouri. She concurred with Ms. Reardon's comments about patterns, stating the desire to know how much racial profiling is happening in Delaware and how many minority arrests. Ms. Smith felt it important to expose corruption and desired to leave the room knowing that there is protection, although she acknowledged the desire for transparency. Noting that she was a survivor of domestic abuse, she questioned what happened to funding in the Violence Against Women Act. Ms. Smith indicated that she had heard that Family Court wants a new building; however, she felt they should be merged together. Ms. Smith stated that the State actors are playing games with the people's livelihood and families, and emphasized the importance of discipline, transparency, and oversight in the judiciary.

Ms. Denise Tolliver, Camden, Delaware, stated that there was a series of rape cases in the Caesar Rodney School District spanning a number of years and questioned, when there is a pattern such as this, what the Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust would do to help the families in situations where the kids are systematically being abused by teachers. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that this would cross over into a number of areas, including criminal prosecution and the Family Division to assist with children who are being abused. She felt that if a public school teacher was abusing a child, this would be an issue of public trust and would be looked at by her Office.

Ms. Tolliver questioned what would cause the Office to act, since she estimated that the most recent case was less than three (3) months ago. In response, Ms. Reardon stated that she had been in this Office for two (2) months; therefore, she was not familiar with this case. Ms. Reardon explained that her Office is closely monitoring what is happening around them and there is nothing that would prevent them from opening their own inquiry into a matter, if they determine that it is appropriate.

Ms. Tolliver questioned if a citizen could file a complaint on behalf of children if they are not involved in the actual crime. Ms. Reardon stated that if her Office cannot help the person who files a complaint, they would try to direct the complainant to the appropriate resource, such as Family Court or the Family or Criminal Divisions of the Attorney General's Office. She reiterated that she did not know all the answers and was still learning.

Ms. Tolliver questioned the composition of Ms. Reardon's team in terms of ethnic background and diversity. In response, Ms. Reardon stated that there are two (2) women, one (1) of her investigators is an African American female, and there are four (4) white males. Ms. Tolliver suggested greater diversity in the office. Ms. Reardon agreed and stated that they would continue to build this as positions are added.

Mr. Raymond Paylor, Dover, questioned what the steps in the complaint process are once a complaint is accepted by the Office of Civil Rights and Public Trust. Responding, Ms. Reardon stated that constituents are initially directed to file an

online complaint form and two (2) public outreach and research specialists work with them to pool together as much information as they can. The complaint is then assessed by one (1) of the attorneys to determine whether or not it is something that is within the responsibilities of the Office and what needs to be done.

Chairman Wilson expressed thanks to Ms. Reardon for enlightening members on the mission of the newly created Office and stated his hope that they would be effective in Dover and throughout the State.

Presentation - Downtown Development District Incentives

Mr. William Neaton, Economic Development Manager, reviewed a presentation regarding the City of Dover Downtown Development District (DDD), which included information pertaining to the program incentives. Mr. Neaton informed members that this was one (1) of the most important revitalization efforts in the history of the downtown area. He explained that approximately one (1) year ago, Governor Markell added $7M the budget to revitalize downtown districts. The legislation was approved unanimously by the General Assembly in June 2014 and it was determined that three (3) cities in Delaware would be designated to utilize these funds for both large projects, with over $250,000 being invested, and small projects, involving investment under $250,000. There was an extensive application process and cities had to show the need and impact of the funds for the downtown area, develop a district plan demonstrating how the funds would be used, and develop additional local incentives above and beyond what the State was suggesting.

Mr. Neaton advised members that applications were reviewed by a cabinet committee and by the State Planning Office. The City of Dover's 300-page plan drew on two (2) plans that the City had utilized in the past: 1) the Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan and 2) the Restoring Central Dover Plan. He explained that the Dover Transit Center Neighborhood Plan was developed in partnership with the Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) approximately six (6) years ago, and involves the area surrounding the Transit Center on Queen and Water Streets as well as the downtown area. In reference to the Restoring Central Dover Plan, Mr. Neaton stated that a $75,000 planning grant was received from Wells Fargo, with the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor Research (NCALL) as the lead agency. Numerous partners were involved in this initiative, including the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP), faith-based participants, and the City of Dover. He stated that many good things came out of this plan, which was completed in the Fall of 2014, and an application had been submitted to reapply for an implementation grant.

Mr. Neaton stated that on January 11, 2015, Governor Markell announced District Designations for the cities of Wilmington, Seaford, and Dover. Mr. Neaton explained that this was a ten-year designation; therefore, it would be a long-term fix and Dover would be able to apply for funding for ten years. He stated his understanding that the Governor would recommend another round of $7M for the upcoming budget year.

Mr. Neaton informed members that the Dover DDD includes 220 acres in the Central Business District and adjacent neighborhoods. He explained that this area has an 84% rental rate and stated the need to balance this with more owner-occupied housing. Mr. Neaton stated that Dover's plan has two (2) revitalization components, a residential component and a commercial component. He noted that this is a high-crime area with 49 vacant buildings in the District. Mr. Neaton stated that the City was looking at strengthening code enforcement throughout the City, especially in this area. He advised that 25 buildings that did not meet code requirements had been demolished, nine (9) additional buildings were considered dangerous, and part of the revitalization would target these buildings.

Mr. Neaton explained that incentives would include cash rebates on construction costs, fee waivers, tax abatements and credits, historic tax abatements and credits, and facade improvement and architectural grants. Mr. Neaton explained, for example, that an applicant with a $100,000 commercial remodeling project would pay $25,000 out of pocket and would be eligible for a 20% cash rebate from the State on the remaining $75,000, which would amount to $15,000. In addition, Kent County had allocated $200,000 to match all incentives up to $10,000; therefore, the applicant would receive a total of $25,000 in State and County rebates.

In regard to City incentives, Mr. Neaton stated that building permit fees as well as sewer and water impact fees would be waived for DDD approved projects. He explained that the City's water and sewer impact fees are $4,000 for each equivalent dwelling unit (EDU), and a building constructed with two (2) bathrooms would have two (2) EDUs, amounting to $8,000 in water and sewer impact fees which would be waived. In addition, business license fees for new businesses would be waived for three (3) years in the DDD. The City would also rebate transfer fees once a certificate of occupancy is obtained for a building that is being purchased and remodeled.

In regard to tax benefits, Mr. Neaton informed members that the City would provide tax abatement on the value of improvements for ten years. As an example, he explained that if an owner of a building with a tax base of $200,000 completed $100,000 worth of improvements, typically the tax base would increase to $300,000; however, with this incentive, the City would continue to use $200,000 as the tax base for ten years. Mr. Neaton stated that there are also State historic preservation tax credits and City tax credits for historic properties.

Referring to homeownership incentives, Mr. Neaton stated that the City was offering a five (5) year phase-in for property taxes for owner-occupied homes in the DDD. In addition transfer taxes would be waived for first-time homebuyers in the DDD. Mr. Neaton explained that the City has had a down payment assistance program for first-time homebuyers for many years. He stated that on March 9, 2015, the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee had recommended that City Council approve $60,000 to continue this program through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

Mr. Neaton indicated that the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP) was offering funding for architectural design assistance. He explained that the DDP would fund 100% of the first $1,000 used for this purpose and would provide a 50% match for additional fees up to $5,000. It was hoped that this would assist new owners in bringing buildings up to code. Mr. Neaton stated that the DDP had a facade improvement program for a number of years and would provide rebates for this purpose as well. In addition, he noted that the Sustainable Energy Utility was reducing the cost of energy audits from approximately $400 to $50 and would also provide rebates for energy efficiency improvements. Mr. Neaton reiterated that strong code enforcement was needed to make sure that buildings are brought up to code.

Mr. Neaton reviewed an example of the value of incentives for a sample project with an initial construction cost of $350,000, noting that this project would qualify for incentives valued at $147,034, which would be approximately 40% of the cost. He noted that the expectation was that this would result in developers bringing forward projects that were previously postponed and starting development downtown.

Mr. Kirby Hudson, Assistant City Manager, advised members that two (2) workshops were scheduled for March 11, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. which would provide more detailed information regarding the DDD program. He indicated that three (3) similar workshops were held last month and attendance averaged 40 people; therefore, approximately 140 developers and investors had come to see the types of redevelopment incentives being offered in downtown Dover.

Mr. Hudson expressed his feeling that a key component of making the project work was cleaning up the area. He felt that all of the incentives and programs to spur development and redevelopment would not mean a thing unless this is done. Members were provided a flyer to be distributed to encourage residents to perform basic property maintenance for spring. Mr. Hudson noted that the flyer provided a synopsis of the types of code violations that code enforcement staff would be looking at.

Mr. Hudson advised members that he was the former City Manager for the Town of Cobleskill, New York. He indicated that he was new to the City of Dover; however, he quickly realized that there are a number of properties in the DDD in major disarray, reiterating that 84% of the properties were rental units, and there were 49 vacant buildings and 25 vacant lots that have become havens for dumping. Mr. Hudson stated that residents must be held accountable for bringing these properties up to code. He advised that the City would like to start a campaign and let everyone know in advance that Dover was fortunate enough to be designated as one (1) of three (3) cities to receive this opportunity. He stated that the City would use this to its advantage, and for those people who did not want to clean up their act, the City would help them to do so. Mr. Hudson stated that this would be done fairly, consistently, and by the book.

Mr. Ruane questioned if owners of multiple rental units had been identified and been given an invitation to meet with the City to incentivize them, so that there would be direct targeting of some of the ownership, rather than a general invitation. Mr. Ruane stated that he would like to see those people who are used to getting away with doing the wrong thing being targeted. In response, Mr. Neaton stated that in one (1) instance a person who has owned numerous properties had come to the City and met with the City Manager, the Assistant City Manager, the Director of Planning and Community Development, and Mr. Neaton to discuss what they could do to upgrade and how these incentives would impact them. Mr. Neaton indicated that he did not know how many property owners own multiple locations but assumed that there were a number of them.

Mr. Ruane strongly suggested getting this into place because he felt that individuals would make the effort to make improvements; however, in the past there were difficulties with those who own multiple properties.

Mr. Henderson stated that Mr. Matt Haley had planned to do quite a bit for Dover, including putting in a restaurant, before tragically being killed. He asked if that situation had been addressed. In addition, he questioned if there would be gentrification in the DDD and expressed concern about the poor, transient, and non-home owners in the area and where they would go if the area is upgraded.

Mr. Hudson explained that, by the broken window theory, properties that are in disarray, with boarded houses, broken windows, and abandoned cars, are the most targeted for criminal activity. He indicated that this program would do two (2) things: 1) bring local and out-of-town people to look at incentives throughout the State, County, and City, so that they would know the area is open for redevelopment business; and 2) clean up the area, which would also help to take care of some of the crime. If a property is picked up and remains clean, facade improvements are made, and new lighting is installed, this would demonstrate that people care about their property and criminal activity would move to another area. Mr. Hudson felt that if the root of the problem is not taken care of, efforts would only amount to putting cosmetics on the problem. He stated that property owners must be made to maintain properties and they were not being asked to do anything beyond what a normal person would do.

Mr. Henderson stated that most of the people who live in this area cannot afford property and that he respected broken areas because he grew up in broken areas. He asked that the City look after the needs of the people who will be displaced, and suggested trying to keep those who live outside of the District from building liquor stores in the community, as well as stores that have no nutrition and sell no vegetables to children. He stated that some people have no choice but to buy these items because that is all that is available. Mr. Henderson stated that it was easier to put up a liquor store than a church in this community. Responding, Mr. Hudson stated that there is a list of businesses that are not allowed or eligible for funding, including tattoo parlors, liquor stores, gentleman's clubs, etc.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager stated that gentrification had been discussed and that it was important to lay the groundwork to avoid that reality. He stated that in this area of the City, there would either be progress and people would want to live and do business there, or it would become the hollow heart of the City. Mr. Koenig advised members that nothing good is happening on vacant property and in vacant buildings from a community standpoint. He stated that this is a difficult subject because, as people come in and refurbish, rebuild, or build new structures, gentrification is an accusation that will have to be dealt with. Mr. Koenig indicated that the question is how to develop a full palette of affordable housing or offer pathways for homeowners who may not have economic backgrounds or means to keep their property or maintain it in the future. Mr. Koenig stated that the program does not provide all the answers. He noted that some property owners had attended the workshops and questioned what would be done for them; however, this program, as set up, was not the answer to their questions. These individuals would have to be directed to other programs or opportunities, and this had been discussed at the staff level.

In response to Mr. Ruane's question regarding multiple property owners, Mr. Koenig stated that strategies were being developed internally to address those owners with whom the City has had difficulty in the past. He noted that the DDD designation was received in early January, only eight (8) weeks ago. Mr. Koenig advised that the positive promotion campaign was being done right now. He stated that it was important to get the projects moving forward, the interest level up, and projects in the queue at the State because, in some ways, this is a competition for $7M of State money to be directed to the private sector. Mr. Koenig reminded members that the City or State cannot make application for these projects and it is not money that is in the City's coffer, noting that the City incentives actually take away potential revenue from the City. He explained that this is a long-term strategy to redevelop, refurbish, and reinvigorate this area of the City and there would not be not an instantaneous economic benefit to the City.

Mr. Koenig explained that if the City did not promote and get this program moving, the City would be incurring a lot of costs for code enforcement, policing, and other things that are not necessarily contributing to the overall community. He reiterated that the program was in its early stages and there had been staff-level discussions about developing public strategies for addressing concerns and getting buy-in from the community and groups like the DHRC that this is a good program for the City. Mr. Koenig indicated that there would be some potentially unintended consequences to adjust for as the program is implemented.

Mr. Koenig emphasized that the objective was not to push the problem somewhere else, so that at the end of the 10-year designation these 220 acres would be doing we1l, but things would be made worse immediately outside of the 220 acres. He stated the need for the DHRC and community organizations to understand that there are some potential negative effects and a need to figure out strategies on how to mitigate them and to achieve the goals of the entire palette; commercial, residential, low-to-moderate income, and potentially low-income housing, so that those who deserve to be there would not be pushed out.

Mr. Henderson stated that this was exactly what he wished to hear.

Mr. Ruane stated that one (1) of the purposes of the DHRC is to promote diversity and social inclusion and he felt that all of the commissioners would be supportive of a program like this. He reassured Mr. Koenig that the questioning should not be seen as negative or discouraging. He felt that the program was an attempt to improve the economic program in the City and to provide better housing, which are goals that the DHRC supports. He felt that this was a good program and that the DHRC would like to support it.

Mr. Koenig stated that City staff had not known how to work with the Commission on common subjects; however, that staff needed the DHRC's help and was asking for it by providing the presentation. He indicated that staff would like continued dialogue, advice, and ideas coming from the Commission to help to make this a successful plan. Mr. Koenig stated that when the City went to the cabinet committee on State Planning for its application, one (1) of the strong points of the application was the City's organizational capacity to make the plan successful. Several background plans had been completed with ideas and potential solutions to problems. In the application, the City was also brutally honest in stating that in this 220 acres there has been a high crime problem, a high rental rate problem, and a desire for additional home ownership. Mr. Koenig felt that these were goals that the DHRC would have for this community and expressed the desire to use the DHRC to partner in making this a successful program.

Commissioner Smith stated her agreement; however, she felt it important to understand the strategy, stating her feeling that the strategy was not completely laid out. She referenced Mr. Henderson's concern regarding a group of people that will be displaced and would have to move elsewhere. She felt it important to understand what is being endorsed before endorsing it. She suggested that this might mean having a conversation and helping to support staff in creating that strategy. Ms. Smith explained that she has a former client who is a contractor that has built many of these properties throughout the State and kept them affordable and is very familiar with how to navigate these difficult waters, and perhaps someone like that could be brought to the table. Speaking for herself, she stated that she did not want to back something that she was unclear on, or that those who are moving it forward are unclear on.

Ms. Stewart inquired if any projects had come forward yet. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised that the projects are submitted directly to the State.

Mr. Neaton stated that one (1) large project, in excess of $250,000, had been submitted and staff was currently working with half a dozen other projects. He explained that those applying for small projects will perform the renovations and repairs, and then submit their expenses to the Delaware State Housing Authority. Applicants for larger projects must submit a reservation for funds and those reservations would be due on March 20, 2015.

Mr. Ruane questioned if there is a citizens advisory group, including residents, associated with the program. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that there was not and that staff was looking for advice on how to get the correct messages out to the development community and the community in general. He noted that these things must be discussed because, while staff may think that the message is clear and correct, it may have to be adjusted if something is missing.

Chairman Wilson suggested holding a special DHRC meeting to discuss this issue in terms of strategies. He stated his feeling that it would be a good move to clean up the entire City, not just that target area. He indicated that clarity is extremely important and the idea of defining strategies that will not overlap one another, as far as the what the DHRC was doing versus the City and any other group within the City. He was in favor of Mr. Ruane's suggestion to have a group of people that represents the community be part of the initiative, noting the importance of hearing from those in the target area so they know what is going on and for transparency.

Mr. Ruane informed members that the DHRC Government Policy, Programs, and Practices Committee would have their first meeting with a group of senior City employees to begin examining the City's organization in terms of the status of its diversity and its role in promoting diversity and social inclusion in the Dover community on Friday, March 13, 2015, from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in the City Hall Conference Room. Mr. Wilson expressed his hope that many of the Commissioners could attend this important meeting.

By consent agenda, Mr. Hare moved for acceptance of the Dover Human Relations Commission Report, seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent).

SAFETY ADVISORY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE REPORT - JUNE 22, 2015

The Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee met on June 22, 2015 with Chairman Hosfelt presiding.

Discussion - Proposed Committee to Study the Basic Life Safety (BLS) Needs for the City of Dover

During the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee meeting held on April 27, 2015, members evaluated proposals for the ambulance service contract. Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised members that Council had ultimately voted to extend and renew the Prime Care, LLC contract through June 30, 2018. During the discussions, a member of the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee suggested creating a committee to study issues such as procedures and protocols, service delivery, and equipment needs to incorporate in the next request for proposals for ambulance services, which Mr. Koenig stated would take place close to 2017.

Mr. Koenig advised members that City Council would be considering an Authorization to Execute Agreement to Perform a Comprehensive Analysis of Police, Fire, and EMS Services for the City of Dover during their meeting scheduled

later in the evening. He explained that some recommendations regarding BLS may come out of that study, although BLS would be a relatively small component of the study.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison regarding internal mechanisms in place, Mr. Koenig explained that complaints are usually filed in writing with the Emergency Management Coordinator. Moving forward with the current and next budget years, he stated that there would be a file of complaints, remedies, and ultimate disposition which would be monitored to determine best practices for handling such situations. Mr. Koenig noted that this information would not be published, as it is considered to be private, unless specifically requested.

Request for Three-way Stop at the Intersection of Dwight Court and George Washington Drive

Mr. Christopher Rupp, 1203 Woodrow Court, advised members that a request was submitted to put in a three (3) way stop sign between Dwight Court and George Washington Drive, stating that there are currently no stop signs at this location and, as a result, drivers speed through. Mr. Rupp expressed concern for the safety of people in that area, particularly young children, and suggested that putting a three (3) way stop sign in place may cut down on some of the speeding.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison, Mr. Rupp stated that he had not had contact with the Police Department regarding this matter. Mr. Rupp noted that the topic was discussed with a neighborhood watch representative who mentioned putting a policeman at that location, but that was a year ago and this was not done.

Mr. Hutchison suggested reaching out to the Dover Police Department to ask that officers patrol the area and provide a recommendation on the best way to address the issue.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, indicated that the amount of traffic occurring at this intersection, from an engineering standpoint, would not support the installation of a three (3) or four (4) way stop. However, Mr. Koenig stated that the City had installed stop signs in areas of the City that may have not warranted it from an engineering aspect in the past because a community had submitted a petition that identified a need, and this was agreed upon by all the residents around the stop sign. Mr. Koenig stated that, often, once a stop sign is in place, there are complaints that people are running the stop sign. Then the Dover Police Department will ticket people who violate the stop sign; however, these are typically people that live in and around the area. He reiterated the importance that all members of the community be in agreement.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding an alternative solution, Mr. Koenig stated that people simply need to obey the speed limit. He explained that a lot of money is spent to put up three (3) and four (4) way stops signs and for policemen to patrol due to a relatively small group of people that are creating a major inconvenience for these

neighborhoods, but this often does not remedy the issue long term. He said if the community wants a stop sign put in place and will support it and obey it, 80% of the problem is solved; however, if the majority does not adhere to the rules once signage is in place, it is not effective.

Major Marvin Mailey, Deputy Police Chief, stated that the Police Department can increase police enforcement in that area which, once in place, usually improves the driving habits there. He concurred with Mr. Koenig that often the individuals in violation are those who live in the community where the street sign is put in place. Deputy Chief Mailey stated that he made note of Mr. Rupp's complaint and would forward the information to the rest of the Police Department to be addressed.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Deputy Chief Mailey advised that the Special Enforcement Unit could do a speed survey on George Washington Drive, which may help as well. Mr. Hosfelt explained that a speed survey can give an indication of the average rate of travel on the road, which could help identify the best way to address the problem. Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Rupp said he would be agreeable to a speed survey.

Proposed 15 MPH Speed Limits for Alley Ways

Mr. Hosfelt explained that Councilman Cole, Third District, had proposed a 15-mph speed limit for alley ways within the City of Dover.

Ms. Paula Kinsey, Owner of Tea for Two, 224 North State Street, advised members that her garage is located approximately four (4) feet from an alley and explained that on numerous occasions she scarcely avoided collisions in the alley. She stated concern for the safety of children that ride bikes in the alley ways. Ms. Kinsey expressed her opinion that the speed limit should be 10 mph to provide drivers enough reaction time to stop at a short distance and to allow residents to move about safely, as well as pedestrians, college students, and patrons of The Grocery Basket. Ms. Kinsey also noted that as a result of a house in the vicinity being torn down, a short cut was created which caused an increase in foot traffic in the alley, noting that pedestrians often appear to be intoxicated, adding another element of concern for pedestrians and drivers.

Mr. Paul Olsen, 301 North State Street, supported Ms. Kinsey's comments. He stated that he lives across the street from Ms. Kinsey and noted that approximately a year ago, Council approved a stop sign in the alley in the back of his house, which immensely reduced the speed of travel. Prior to that however, Mr. Olsen noted that a person was hit in the alley and he expressed support for whatever action could be taken.

Mrs. Kathie Siler, 229 North State Street, expressed her concurrence with Ms. Kinsey, supporting her request to place a 10 mph speed limit in the alley. She stated that she had lived on North State Street for 30 years and recalled a child being hit in the alley and that the homeowner that she purchased the property from was

nearly struck as well. She concurred with Mr. Olsen that the posting of a stop sign had been extremely helpful. Mrs. Siler stated that there are a great number of pedestrians that utilize the alley, including children walking home from school, people walking their dogs, etc., and that, with the way the alley is situated and how the garages are placed, the visibility is very poor, leaving very little time to react when traveling beyond 10 mph. She concurred that many people look at the alleys as short cuts and felt that posting signs would be helpful.

Ms. Susan Yost, 11 Cecil Street, stated that she also lives on the same alley as Tea for Two, which is between State and Bradford Streets, and expressed her agreement with the previous speakers. She shared her concern regarding speeding through the alley and the danger it poses to herself, children, and dogs.

Responding to Ms. Yost, Mr. Hosfelt stated his belief that the speed limit was 25 mph in a residential district.

Ms. Sarah Herbert, 223 North Bradford Street, stated that her step-daughter's vehicle was totaled by someone traveling in the alley approximately three (3) years ago, indicating a high rate of speed. She also pointed out that the "Watch for Children" sign in the alley was not placed where it could easily be viewed and this was the total signage in the alley. Ms. Herbert explained that it had been suggested that the residents place their trash cans out further to cause drivers to slow down; however, residents had not done so. Ms. Herbert stated she had written to area residents to ask them to send her their concerns, and there were issues that go far beyond the alley ways. People had expressed concerns regarding arrows pointing in the wrong direction on North State Street, drivers ignoring signs to stop for pedestrian, etc. She stated that signs should be posted low enough so that those speeding by could see them. She reiterated the need for a clear solution to the problems with alleys. Ms. Herbert said that she would provide information regarding the issues brought to her attention by the community to Councilman Cole and that members could review them.

Ms. Janice Gaddis, 448 North State Street, stated that although speeding was not an issue in her neighborhood, she grew up in Chicago where most homes had garages in the alley, not driveways. She recalled stop signs being posted in the alleys and expressed her thought that the speed limit must have been less than 25 mph.

State Representative Sean Lynn, 224 Columbia Avenue, advised the Committee that he had received a number of complaints about this topic, including the lists of constituents and respective emails that had been provided to Councilmen Cole and Neil. Representative Lynn asked the Committee to consider this information and find a way to provide some relief to the constituents.

Ms. Lynn Gold, 222 North State Street, expressed her support for everything that had been verbalized regarding this topic. She pointed out that accountability was also an

issue, stating that if the City were not accountable for enforcing the limits, they have no impact. Ms. Gold suggested speed bumps, stating that this would require less enforcement because people would either have to stop or wreck their cars.

Mr. Hutchison stated that the City does not utilize speed bumps because of fire apparatus and paramedics; however, he felt there were alternative solutions. He assured those present that he shared the safety concerns that were expressed.

Mr. Cole expressed his appreciation to Mr. Hosfelt for placing this topic on the agenda and thanked the residents of the Third District for attending the meeting and voicing their concerns.

Mr. Koenig advised that the City's code indicates that the speed limit is 25 mph unless otherwise posted and expressed his uncertainty as to whether this would prevent the City from reducing the speed limit to 15 or 10 mph. Mr. Koenig stated that the City has about 16 miles of alleys, and if signs were posted they would be needed at the beginning and likely at the end of each alley, and it was his belief that some posting would be needed in the alleys, which would be difficult from an operational standpoint. He stated that there are obstacles that may pose issues regarding posting and visibility because of the way the alleys are laid out. In addition, the cooperation of property owners would be needed to post signs since some of the alleys are not paved according to property lines. Mr. Koenig advised that alleys in the City are supposed to be 16 feet wide; however, in some cases may be slightly wider or narrower, which would ultimately require signage on private property. Mr. Koenig stated that some people had expressed concerns that alleys were very narrow, and noted that putting up a sign would further narrow the area, creating problems for larger vehicles. He indicated that it would be essential to consider these types of issues when determining if and where signs should be posted and it would take some time to accomplish. Mr. Koenig requested, if the City moved forward with this, that staff be given direction on a location for a pilot project to be tested before going City-wide with it.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt regarding whether there would be a difference in enforcement level if speed limits were reduced, Major Marvin Mailey, Deputy Police Chief, stated that 25 mph was faster than it should be, noting that streets with greater visibility and clearance for vehicles have a 25 mph speed limit. He concurred that alleys are tight, have blind spots, and a lot of opportunity for accidents. Deputy Chief Mailey stated that he did not oppose the drop in the speed limit and confirmed Mr. Koenig's statement that Delaware law would require posting at the beginning and end of the speed zone. This would present a problem with enforcement because of the area where officers would have to be stationed to enforce the speed limits. He indicated that if the Department could get its officers out there to enforce the limits safely, they would do so.

At the request of Mr. Hosfelt, Deputy Chief Mailey said he would ask the Special Enforcement Unit commander to look into this and perhaps provide some information to the Committee and Mr. Koenig regarding what had been done in other cities or locations in relation to this issue.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding how a reduction in speed limit would affect enforcement, Deputy Chief Mailey stated that, with the many tasks the Police Department has, alleys are not at the top of the priority list, especially considering that the Department is functioning with 88 officers, which was well below manpower standards. He indicated that speed in alleys had not been monitored in some time.

Responding to Mr. Cole regarding the requirements for posting, Deputy Chief Mailey stated that the operator must be given due notice of the posted speed so they can decelerate and come within the guidelines. It would have to be posted at the entrances at each end, unless it was a one (1) direction alley. In response to Mr. Cole's question as to whether an ordinance could be established declaring that all alleys within the City have a 15 mph speed limit, Deputy Chief Mailey stated that this would be a matter for the City Solicitor to address.

Mr. Cole advised members that many states had declared a 15 mph speed limit for alley ways throughout their jurisdictions unless otherwise posted and suggested this may be a possibility.

At Mr. Hosfelt's request, Deputy Chief Mailey agreed to research this possibility with the City Solicitor.

Ms. Sarah Herbert, 223 North Bradford Street, reiterated that she had provided a list of constituent concerns to Mr. Cole, noting that one (1) of the suggestions was to educate the City regarding pedestrian laws, possibly through the newspaper and schools. She felt that pedestrians do not know what to do on walkways and alleys.

Council President Slavin suggested that a motion be made to request staff to begin the process of preparing an ordinance as part of Deputy Chief Mailey's research.

The Committee recommended referring this matter to staff for review and recommendation to be followed up at the Committee's next monthly meeting.

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

Discussion - Increased Criminal Activity - Lincoln Park Subdivision

Mr. Stanley Richardson, 126 Reese Street, addressed the Committee about a group home located behind his residence. He stated that the facility had been there for a few years but had taken a significant downward turn in the last year and a half. He cited a recent incident where he had to have one (1) of the group home residents arrested for trespassing and threatening to destroy his property and blow his head off

shortly after a shooting that took place in the neighborhood. Mr. Richardson stated that the individual was later arrested. Subsequent to that, the director of the facility advised Mr. Richardson that a fence was scheduled to be put in place; however, this did not occur. Additionally, Mr. Richardson stated that he was told that he would be made aware when the individual who threatened him was released from jail but this did not occur. He was then told that this individual would be present no longer than a week; however, he was still currently present after three (3) weeks.

Mr. Richardson spoke of another incident where a resident of a group home on Bradford Street threw a brick at a neighbor's windshield and rocks at her car, and who also went to jail. Mr. Richardson stated that something needed to be done about the group home. He indicated that it was said that residents are mentally handicapped; however, based on having worked for the prison system for 27 years, in Mr. Richardson's experience, prisoners who wanted to be moved to a more private or more relaxed area of the prison would claim to have mental problems. Mr. Richardson felt that those types of individuals were being released to group homes.

Mr. Richardson stated that he was informed by a fellow prison retiree who was working with Connections Community Support Programs, Inc., the organization that runs the group home near Mr. Richardson, that inmates were being picked up and put into group homes without screening. He expressed his understanding that this organization was mainly concerned about the $1,500 that they receive per day per resident and they are not paid if these homes are unoccupied. Mr. Richardson said Connections has two (2) other locations in Dover, one (1) of which housed a sex offender until the community protested this individual's presence, at which time this person was moved out. Mr. Richardson questioned the types of disabilities the individuals being housed at the group home have and expressed his feeling that many do not have a mental disability and are only looking for a place to be housed. Mr. Richardson advised members that he is fearful in his own home and does not feel safe running his lawn care business, stating that he feels he is in a vulnerable position when he is performing tasks like lying down in his driveway while sharpening blades for his lawn care business in his driveway. He noted that when he cuts the grass of Ms. Gloria Gardner, 115 Bertrand Street, next door to the group home, one (1) of the residents gives him dirty looks. Mr. Richardson stated that he had been told that three (3) more group homes were popping up on Saulsbury Road and Forrest Avenue next to the Subway Restaurant.

Mr. Richardson suggested that the City notify the neighborhood when approval is sought for a group home. He mentioned again the shooting that took place and expressed his frustrations that no one is speaking up to help the Dover Police Department identify the shooter.

In regard to the recent shooting that he mentioned previously, Mr. Richardson advised that he and Detective Woods of the Dover Police Department attempted to obtain information from the father of one of the possible individuals involved who originally stated that he did not know the names of anyone involved, only their

nicknames. When pressed for the nicknames after being told the Police Department could likely identify them based on a known nickname, the individual was no longer willing to cooperate or provide any information. Mr. Richardson stated that the same individual whose name the neighbor refused to provide a nickname for, was later arrested, along with some other individuals as a result of an incident at Dover Downs. Mr. Richardson thought that there were weapons in the residence of the individual, referring to a shooting that took place eight (8) months ago that the same individual was involved in.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Richardson stated that the individual he was referring to regarding the shooting was not connected with the group home; however, Mr. Richardson felt something needed to be done about both situations because they were both problems and posed a danger to the neighborhood.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Richardson stated that he had called the Dover Police Department on numerous occasions and encouraged his neighbors to do the same. He noted that the Dover Police Department does a good job but more needs to be done about the group home and the violence in the neighborhood.

Ms. Gloria Gardner, 115 Bertrand Drive, expressed her concurrence with Mr. Richardson's concerns regarding the health-related group home next door, which opened approximately one (1) year ago. Ms. Gardner stated that when the home first opened, there were no problems with the residents as most of them were wheelchair-bound patients; however, recently, those types of individuals had been replaced by young 19 and 20-year-old men. Ms. Gardner noted specifically that starting on May 21, 2015 the police were called to that location four (4) times in one (1) week, and she no longer feels it is safe for her children to play in the yard. Ms. Gardner added that a couple of weeks ago she observed a young man using a brick to break a window in the group home and was later advised by one of the group's counselors that the windshield of Ms. Gardner's car had been broken out of her car and her car had dents from bricks. Her concern was this kind of damage, as well as the physical damage that could be caused to her, her children, or her grandchildren. Ms. Gardner suggested that the facility adopt some kind of screening process for the types of patients that are approved to be housed at the group home.

Ms. Gardner shared her understanding that in some cases if someone wants to build something in a neighborhood, a petition would be distributed to the members of the neighborhood to allow them the opportunity to give or deny their permission. She indicated that she was shocked to find that a medical facility was approved next to her house in a residential neighborhood with no one's knowledge until they started bringing patients in. She asked to be informed what the ordinance or requirement was for this. Responding, Mr. Hosfelt advised Ms. Gardner that her question would be brought to the attention of City staff to be answered. Mrs. Gardner stated that she thought it was very unsafe, noting that she had been in this house for approximately 35 years and she felt that serious changes needed to be made.

In response to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Gardner stated that she believed the address of the group home is 125 Bertrand Street, which is next door to her home at 115 Bertrand Street.

Mr. Charles M. Durham, 145 Irma Street, stated that he was from the neighborhood being discussed by the last two (2) speakers and lives a block away from the group home. He advised members that he was the former owner of the property next to Ms. Gardner, which he sold it to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who indicated that it would be a home for people who needed short-term assistance. He stated that he went to the neighbors about who would be buying the house and told them what the purpose was, feeling that this was his obligation. That house was torn down and the new one was built. He expressed his apologies to Ms. Gardner, Mr. Richardson, and the other neighbors, stating that had he known the type of facility that was going to be placed there, he would not have sold the property to the buyer.

Mr. Durham stated that there were additional issues. Approximately two (2) weeks ago, a 9mm bullet came into his home through a porch window, ricocheted off of the side wall, and landed in a door jamb in a rear room of his home and, based on the angle of entry, the bullet was believed to have come from Simon Circle. In addition, Mr. Durham cited problems with speeding, stating that people disregard the stop signs on Paul and Irma Streets. Mr. Durham stated that he and his wife put up a brand new fence around their yard the first of July, only to have it kicked down by individuals coming through the alley way. He advised members that people speed up and down that alley way and also down Irma and Paul Streets on dirt bikes. Mr. Durham advised that Mr. Richardson had been good enough to talk to the neighborhood about things to solve the problem and he and Mr. Richardson discussed finding a way to block off the entrance to Simon Circle from Reese Street, leaving just a walkway for kids going to school.

Mr. Durham recalled that years ago a neighbor by the name of Ms. Martha Woodfolk went around the neighborhood trying to get people to sign a petition to stop the building of Simon Circle and stated that he refused to sign it because he felt that poor people needed a place to live; however, he now wished he had signed the petition. He stated that he and his wife were too old to move, but there were shots fired through his house, another neighbor had two (2) bullet holes in his car and one (1) in the house, and Mr. Richardson had a bullet hole through his basement window. He noted that this was an expense as well. He did not know what could be done in regard to Simon Circle but emphasized that the concerns needed to be addressed.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding the location of the alley that he was referring to regarding the dirt bikes and speeding, Mr. Durham stated that he lives on the corner of Irma Street and Paul Street and the alley runs down the south side of his property and extends from Simon Circle to Davis Circle.

Mr. Hutchison stated that there are several group homes within the City and often no one is even aware of their existence, stating that in his experience as a former Mayor of the City of Dover and former City of Dover Police Chief, there are always going to be isolated incidents. He assured those present that the City could reach out to State leadership to address them. Mr. Hutchison stated that the issues and concerns shared tonight were unacceptable and felt that the City of Dover needed to take a leadership role.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated for the record and to make sure that members of Council and the Committee know that there are State and Federal laws that prohibit treating a group home for people with disabilities any differently than a single-family home, and there can be no differentiation by disability. Mrs. Townshend concurred with Mr. Hutchison that if issues arise, State licensing agencies can be contacted to address the issues. She advised members that Connections Community Support Programs, Inc. owns the home that had been discussed this evening and stated that Title 22, Chapter 3 of Delaware Code, which gives the City zoning authority, specifically states that group homes for people with disabilities cannot be treated any differently than a single-family home.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend stated that the City does not have licensing that is separate from the state licensing and offered to contact the City Solicitor to determine if a City license could be established, even if it were a non-charged license. This would enable the City to have the homes registered and be aware of their locations in order to follow up if an issue arises, but she cautioned that this is a gray area in terms of fair housing.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mrs. Townshend stated that representatives from Connections were present.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding how Ordinance 2013-04, adopted on April 8, 2013, would apply to the current situation with the Connections home, Mrs. Townshend advised that, based on the calls that the Police Department had received for this location, there was nothing to act on under that ordinance. Mrs. Townshend also stated, in response to Mr. Sudler, that if someone from the agency had exhibited nuisance behavior more than three (3) times within a 12-month period, the City would have to seek the guidance of legal counsel and reiterated that, to date, there had not been any incidences that would permit action under that ordinance.

State Representative Sean Lynn, 224 Columbia Avenue, advised members that this issue had been brought to his attention, stating that he had received numerous emails, originally starting from the Gardner family and then moving out through the Lincoln Park area from those concerned about the neighborhood. Mr. Lynn suggested that the neighborhood be looked at from a public works and public safety perspective, stating the easternmost part of the neighborhood, specifically Cherry and

Vine Streets, were in utter disrepair. He expressed his opinion that the streets were in deplorable condition and only suitable for traffic going in one direction (1), definitely not both. Mr. Lynn questioned how Cherry Street and Vine Street were approved, noting that they are not conventional City streets. Mr. Lynn shared his feeling that the neighborhood was in dire need of public works attention, noting that the easternmost part of Slaughter Street was also in disrepair, as well as the stream that borders Lincoln Park on the eastern side, and a culvert off Forrest Avenue is full of debris and waste. Mr. Lynn expressed his uncertainty as to who is responsible for maintaining the stream, but indicated that it was not being maintained at all, and the culvert that runs underneath Forrest Avenue was blocked and needed attention.

Mr. Lynn noted that Mr. Hosfelt had raised the issue of creating a homeowners association and a neighborhood watch and said he had tried to reach out to Mr. Richardson in this regard but had been unable to obtain his phone number. Mr. Lynn expressed his hope that Council could encourage the Dover Police Department to reach out to set up a neighborhood watch in Lincoln Park, expressing his belief that it would help drastically, as would increased police presence.

Ms. Kathy McCann, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Connections Community Support Programs, Inc., apologized to Mrs. Gardner for what happened to her car, stating that measures should have been in place to ensure this did not occur, and they were now attempting to remedy this. Ms. McCann stated that the reason the original home on the property was torn down was because it had a great deal of asbestos in it and could not be salvaged. She advised members that Connections built a very nice new house and stated that they are dependent on the State Division of Developmental Disabilities and the State Department of Health and Social Services to make referrals for people to live there. Ms. McCann stated that Connections is not funded with $1,500 a day, as someone asserted earlier, and that the people who live have developmental or intellectual disabilities. She explained that the people that live there right now are very young, and they are not very well socialized, and she agreed that they may not be the best people to live in a neighborhood that is so densely populated. Ms. McCann stated that she would go back and tell the State that the current location is not a good placement for those individuals. Ms. McCann noted that the people who live in the Connections' home were not involved in any shootings and are not speeding in cars or driving motorbikes, stating that those are issues in the neighborhood, but not related to Connections.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt regarding her responsibility to ensure that individuals living at the Connections facility are respectable, Ms. McCann stated that she believes it is Connections' responsibility that staff manage the people who are living there to the best of their ability. She indicated that if the people are not manageable in this setting, Connections can reach out to the State and ask them to do something different with those people. Ms. McCann stated that it is not possible to force an individual to do anything but, in the spirit of neighborliness, everyone has to be willing to work together because there have been a few incidents in which there had been people agitating on both sides.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Ms. McCann stated that the staff members receive a lot of training, but they are mostly people who have high school diplomas, noting that the people who manage the program are people with Master's degrees and professional training. Ms. McCann pointed out that, unfortunately, the funding that is available for the program is pretty much based on a rate of $10 an hour, which includes benefits. Ms. McCann stated that Connections pays people a little bit more than that in attempt to get people with a little more qualification, but reiterated that they do go through a State-prescribed training program.

In response to Mr. Hutchison, Ms. McCann stated that Connections does not put the individuals through a screening process, they are assigned to them by the State agency.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison's comment that this was a problem, Ms. McCann agreed, explaining that Connections does not have the right to say yes or no to a prospective resident; their only recourse is to explain to the State that it is not a good location because of the dense population, which is a problem for those who have issues getting along with other people, noting Connections' responsibility to be good neighbors.

In response to Mr. Hutchison regarding the State's responsibility to consider an individual's ability to be in a neighborhood setting when assigning them to the home, Ms. McCann stated that the problem is that many of these people would otherwise be institutionalized and federal law no longer permits that, so the State is now in the position of having to find alternative places for them to live, adding that funding is also an issue.

For the record, Mr. Anderson advised members that Mr. Sudler had previously suggested setting up a mobile substation that could be moved to different areas and locations. Mr. Anderson stated such a substation could stay at a location for two (2) or three (3) months, then move to another location. Mr. Anderson asked that the Committee put this up for investigation and research.

Mr. Hutchison stated his belief that Deputy Chief Mailey had heard the complaints and would take them back to Chief Paul Bernat, and together they would come up with a game plan to address some of the concerns regarding Simon Circle and Lincoln Park. Mr. Hutchison expressed his desire to revisit this issue.

The Committee recommended that the Dover Police Department increase their presence in the Simon Circle and Lincoln Park areas, as they had in the other location near State Street, and concentrate on the alley way and the areas of concern.

Deputy Chief Mailey stated that he wanted to advise Council, the residents from Lincoln Park, and all those present that the Police Department's Street Crimes Unit, which is overseen by Lt. Jason Pires, had been in place in Simon Circle,

Lincoln Park, Bertrand Avenue, and that whole area since June 17, 2015, and they had made numerous arrests. Deputy Chief Mailey urged the residents of that area to report immediately any criminal activity that they see or become aware of.

By consent agenda, Mr. Hare moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation that the Dover Police Department increase their presence in the Simon Circle and Lincoln Park areas, as they had in the other location near State Street, and concentrate on the alley way and the areas of concern. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent).

The Committee deferred the remaining agenda items until the July 27, 2015 Safety Advisory and Transportation meeting.

By consent agenda, Mr. Hare moved for acceptance of the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee Report, seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent).

UTILITY COMMITTEE REPORT - JUNE 22, 2015

The Utility Committee met on June 22, 2015 with Chairman Hutchison presiding.

House Bill No. 171 Amending Titles 9 and 22 of the Delaware Code Relating to Taxes on Special Betterments

Members were advised that House Bill No. 171 establishes a Telecommunications Tax Modernization Review Group to study and make recommendations for establishing a future funding mechanism to replace the property tax on telecommunications equipment and addressing the projected decrease in revenue to the counties, municipalities and school districts from the transition to new technologies throughout the State. The resulting mechanism should be revenue-neutral to the localities and competitively neutral to providers of like services. To encourage investment in broadband infrastructure, this bill also caps the amount of tax on telecommunications equipment at FY15 rates and eliminates the tax as of June 30, 2018.

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, advised members that a proposed revision for House Bill House Bill 171. Mrs. Mitchell stated that the revised bill eliminates the provisions of the original bill establishing the Tax Modernization Review Group and eliminates the repeal of the tax as of June 30, 2018. To encourage investment in broadband infrastructure, it retains the cap on the amount of tax on telecommunications equipment at 2015 levels, and clarifies that the cap only applies with respect to communication providers that are currently subject to the tax and specifies that the limitations on county and municipal taxation will apply as well to school districts and Business Improvement Districts. At the present time this tax is paid only by landline telecommunication providers and not cable companies.

Mrs. Mitchell explained that she served with former Representative Darryl Scott on a related committee several years ago and that those in the telecommunication industry felt that they were being taxed unfairly on the betterments tax versus other

providers. The committee was to look at different alternatives, but when Rep. Scott did not run again, this did not occur. The proposed amendments aimed for consistency among all providers of telecommunications equipment. Mrs. Mitchell stated her understanding that the current proposal was to work with each community to try to obtain consistency.

In response to Councilman Hutchison, Mrs. Mitchell confirmed that the General Assembly would be voting on the amendment on June 23, 2015. She indicated that she agreed with the proposed amendment but not the bill as originally written, and this is what she relayed to the parties that were involved in this.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mrs. Mitchell stated that she did not believe the bill would pass during the current session, stating that there did not seem to be enough support for it.

Overview of City Utilities

At the request of Chairman Hutchison and for the benefit of new members of Council, Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, provided a brief overview of the various utilities that the City of Dover provides to its residents and customers. Mr. Koenig stated that the City's power system had its 100th anniversary within the last few years and the water system dated back to roughly 1882; therefore, the City had been in the public utility business for many years, which had been a benefit to the City and its customers. *[City Clerk's Office Note: Subsequently during the meeting, Mr. Blakeman advised members that the City's electric utility came online and began generating power on January 1, 1900, and received a 100-year award from the American Power Association in 2000; therefore, the utility had been generating power for the City of Dover for 115 years.]*

Mr. Koenig explained that the City of Dover was granted a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity by the State of Delaware to provide electric services in a service territory. The City of Dover proper consists of approximately 24 square miles, and the City's electric territory is approximately 74 square miles, which extends to Little Creek, Port Mahon, down into Kitt's Hummock, which includes the Dover Air Force Base and areas south of Route 10, and then comes up and intertwines with the City limits. On the north side, the territory is in line with City limits. Mr. Koenig informed members that when property is annexed into the City, there is usually a letter of agreement where the franchise providing service prior to the annexation is transferred to the City's electric system. He noted that no financial transaction takes.

Mr. Koenig advised members that the City of Dover built a power plant in the 1960s at McKee Run which included two (2) 17 MW units called Unit 1 and Unit 2. In the early 1970s, Unit 3 was added, which is roughly 103 MW, and in approximately 1990, the VanSant combustion turbine was added. Mr. Koenig stated that at that point the City was producing power for the demands of its service territory; however, over the last two and a half decades the City had gravitated toward being part of a

regional power supply grid called the PJM system. The City is no longer a primary producer of power but produces power when called upon by the grid. He indicated that the City's generation capacity is approximately 170 MW.

Mr. Koenig explained that Council voted to retire Units 1 and 2, consisting of 34 MW of power, in Power Year 2018 for budgetary reasons. Council had considered replacing those units with either a purchase power agreement or new units that would offer Dover power generation well into the future. Related discussions had been ongoing for approximately four (4) years, and Mr. Koenig stated that it was hoped that staff would be bringing agreements regarding power supply forward to Council for consideration.

Mr. Koenig stated that the Calpine Corporation had come before Council to obtain authorization for a 618 MW facility for two (2) units, the first of which was for the Garrison Energy Center, which became commercially available on June 1, 2015, began producing power to the grid, and became the City's largest water customer overnight. Prior to the unit coming onto the grid, the thought was that once it did, Dover would not be called upon to generate power; however, that had not been the case.

Mr. Koenig reiterated that power generation is a very fluid and complicated environment, making it difficult to determine when Dover will be called upon to produce power. He stated that there are many producers inside the grid, but some are being retired and coming offline because they are old coal technology. Mr. Koenig stated that the call for who runs and who does not changes on a daily basis. When nuclear power plants are offline for maintenance, many more facilities are called up than when these plants are online and available. Mr. Koenig advised members that there had been some difficulty with gas supply in the last couple of weeks, and he hoped to find out more about that issue in meetings with The Energy Authority and Eastern Shore Natural Gas. He referenced to inconsistences with gas transmission and expressed his belief that this was due to the heavy demand of the new Calpine facility.

Mr. Koenig indicated that the Electric Fund is tagged at roughly $89M of revenue in this year's budget, and this money is used to cover the cost to purchase power from the system as well as the capital plan, which includes vehicle purchases, equipment purchases, line replacements, substation upgrades and/or replacements, and replacement of both large and small transformers. This revenue also supports needs related to facilities and infrastructure and a transfer from the Electric Fund to the General Fund. In the FY 16 budget, approximately $10.85M will transfer from public utilities directly into the General Fund, $10M from the Electric Fund and $850,000 from the Water/Wastewater Fund.

Regarding the electric utility, Mr. Koenig stated that the City serves approximately 23,000 customers, ranging from single-family houses all the way up to the Dover Air Force Base. A cost of service study was performed to properly allocate costs and

identify what the rates should be for each class of customer. Mr. Koenig noted that the City of Dover residential electric rates are the lowest in the State of Delaware but the commercial rates are not the lowest.

Mr. Koenig stated that the water and sewer system service territory is not quite as big as the electric service system. He noted that the City serves areas outside its corporate limits and has interconnection agreements with Tidewater Utilities, who purchases water from the City in the northwest portion of the City and supplies subdivisions northwest of the City. In addition, Tidewater purchases water from Dover through the Lakeland interconnection for the Lakeland Mobile Home Park and businesses on South State Street. Mr. Koenig stated that the City's relationship with Tidewater over the last decade had been very good, noting that Tidewater has four (4) of Dover's top 20 meters.

Mr. Koenig explained that the water and sewer systems are accounted for separately to ensure that the cost of water is covered by the water charge and the cost of sewer by the sewer charge; however, these funds are intermingled in a water and sewer enterprise fund. Total revenues expected in FY16 were $19.3M, including new revenue projected from the Calpine facility. Mr. Koenig advised that originally, the water system revenue was estimated to be about $1.6M and the sewer system in the $300,000 range. He indicated that the water system consists of approximately 14,000 to 15,000 meters, requiring a lot of manpower for care and maintenance. Water quality complaints were expected when Calpine came online but not many complaints were received. It was hoped that water quality would improve since water would be moving quickly through the system on that part of the City due to Calpine's demand.

Mr. Koenig stated that improvements were proposed over the long term for the water system, including potentially developing another aquifer, noting that if this will be necessary if Calpine builds a second generating unit. He indicated that the City has a 1.5M gallon water tower under construction presently at the Garrison Oak Technology Park, which is the City's largest tower by about 50 percent and another 1M gallon tower was scheduled to be built in the north middle quadrant of the City pending final resolution on a site. This would offset fire demands and provide additional elevated storage for supply. Additional improvements will be made to the system through pipe replacements.

Mr. Koenig advised members that staff expected to return to Council to review rates, explaining that efficiency had affected the City's water utilities. Plumbing codes had changed, and low-flow fixtures and low-flush toilets had significantly reduced household water usage. In the 1980s, a generic house used 300 gallons of water per day, and now a generic house uses 250 gallons per day, a drop of 50 gallons per day, which was a significant change when multiplied by 8,000 to 10,000 households.

Mr. Koenig stated other changes also affect the water/wastewater utility. In the early 1990s, Proctor & Gamble expanded their paper-making process, which put a significant demand on the water system of approximately 600,000 gallons a day.

However, in the last 10 years, they had stopped making that product at that location and water demand decreased by 600,000 gallons per day. He indicated that it is difficult to make up for these types of fluctuations in production and revenue. On the electric side, Mr. Koenig informed members that a push for more efficient air conditioning systems was affecting the electric utility. It was expected that electric load, even with growth, may be relatively flat over the next few years due to the implementation of systems using less power. He indicated that these are the types of variables used to set rates, determine how to recover fixed costs, develop revenue projections for future budgets, and review revenues for current budgets.

In regard to the sewer utility, Mr. Koenig stated that in the early 1970s, the City built a sewage treatment plant at the old PW2 warehouse location at the end of Water Street, which came online in about 1971. The plant was in operation for only a couple of years when the City transferred all of its waste to Kent County. Mr. Koenig expressed his opinion that the City was very fortunate to be with the County system because it is not necessary to do any of the related permitting or worry about the actual treatment of waste water coming out of of Dover. All flow from the City of Dover is sent to the County by contract and they have an obligation, under their Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) permit and Division of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) permits, to treat the City's waste and deliver it to the Murderkill River in a state that is equal to or better than drinking water quality. Mr. Koenig indicated that the City was benefitting today from not having to run its wastewater treatment plant.

In terms of infrastructure, Mr. Koenig stated Dover has approximately 40 pump stations, which vary from small stations serving eight (8) to 10 houses, to large pump stations like the Puncheon Run station that serves industrial flow coming out of Kraft and Procter & Gamble. Mr. Koenig pointed out that it is critical that those stations work, noting that Dover had gone through replacement and renewals on the wastewater side, and backup generation was being constructed at those facilities because the potential for overflows into streams and rivers or onto the ground would be significant if the power goes out. Mr. Koenig stated he is grateful that Dover has such a reliable system with very few system-wide outages, noting the impact a power outage can have, such as sewage backing up in people's homes.

Mr. Koenig pointed out that owning its own utilities places the City in a good position to attract businesses; however, it require a lot of hours and manpower to run those enterprises. Because of the enterprise funds, the City recovers at least the cost associated with running them, and the intent of Dover's public utilities is to return money to the General Fund as internal profit for going through the pain of having to run the utilities, noting that they are 24/7 operations that require a lot of manpower, capital, and time from the Mayor, Council, and staff to keep systems functioning. He expressed his opinion that the City is in much better shape through owning the utilities as it can better control its own destiny.

In response to Mr. Neil regarding the cost to buy power if the City were not a generator, Mr. Koenig explained that the City's power plant and combustion turbine act as a physical hedge for the City, which provides leverage in buying power. It was his belief that Mr. Harry Maloney, Electric Director, may have estimated this cost at roughly $2M. With no ability to generate, the City would be completely at the risk of the market sale price. Because the City has its own generation, the market stops at the City's cost to produce into the market. Even though this cost can be relatively high in some cases, it is much less than if the City were at risk in the market. He noted that during really cold days this past winter, the per megawatt hour cost exceeded $1,000, $1,500, or $1,800 per hour; therefore, having generation gave an actual physical hedge that provided leverage in buying in the market.

Responding to Mr. Neil regarding whether a deal had been attained with Calpine, Mr. Koenig advised that the City did not have a deal worked out with Calpine on paper at this time. He stated that some regulation issues are being discussed with the EPA that have a significant impact on the products and prices that would be offered in the marketplace. Although the framework was in place, no one was willing to strike a price until those issues are resolved. Mr. Koenig stated that once they are resolved, staff would come before Council with a proposed agreement.

Responding to Mr. Anderson regarding the City's industrial rates, Mr. Koenig advised that commercial and industrial rates are grouped together and the City's rates rank in the middle to upper end.

TEA/NAES Reports (*March and April*)

The TEA/NAES Monthly Reports for March and April 2015 were 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. Blakeman expressed his preference for having actual PJM invoices included in the TEA/NAES reports versus the format used in the April report. In response to Mr. Blakeman, Mr. Koenig stated that would contact TEA/NAES to make this request.

Discussion Item Proposed During the FY 2015/16 Budget Review - Cost-Benefit Analysis of Power Plant Operation

Mr. Scott Koenig. City Manager, stated that a motion was made during the FY 2015/16 budget review that the City consider performing a cost/benefit analysis of its power plant operation. Mr. Koenig stated that in the five (5) year forecast, the power plant was slightly negative in cash during one (1) year but positive in all other years. Mr. Koenig noted that a one (1) year cost/benefit analysis would not be beneficial since a decision could not be made based on a return of one (1) year and stated the need to define the timeline of the analysis. He stated that, without question, owning the physical plant and having the ability to contract its operation

and oversee its contracts would be the right thing to do for the benefit of customers. Mr. Koenig felt that reviewing it on an annualized basis would provide only a snapshot, whereas a profile over years showed it had been a benefit to the City and would continue to be in the foreseeable future.

Responding to Mr. Blakeman regarding the life expectancy of Unit 3, Mr. Koenig stated that Mr. Harry Maloney, Electric Director, estimated there would be approximately 10 years before there were concerns regarding its life expectancy. When discussing the life expectancy of Units 1 and 2, North American Energy Services (NAES) engineers had indicated that the units could last as long as desired, depending on what the City wanted to put into them. Mr. Koenig indicated that the projected life expectancy of the turbine was roughly 50 years. He advised members that the City was doing everything it could to get it to 50 years, and when closing in on this time frame, would make decisions on whether to maintain or replace that unit. Mr. Koenig stated that replacement would cost roughly $1M per MW; therefore, replacing it would be more than a $120M expense.

Mr. Blakeman questioned if decreased prices due to the impact of older coal-fired generation units being replaced with gas turbines had been a concern when considering the life expectancy of this unit. He felt that it may be priced out of the market and not be called to run. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that this was a concern; however, The Energy Authority (TEA) does a good job of looking at those numbers on an annualized basis. He reiterated that in spite of initial concerns that Dover would not be called upon once Calpine was on board, that had not been the case, but could potentially be in the future.

Mr. Blakeman stated his opinion that Calpine may be asking to put in a second unit a year from now. Mr. Koenig concurred that this was a possibility.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison regarding the projected cost associated with keeping Units 1 and 2 running, Mr. Koenig stated that the consensus was that it would be more cost effective to the City to build new generation versus maintaining the current units or to execute a purchase power agreement.

The Committee deferred Item #5, Updates, to the July 13, 2015 Utility Committee Meeting.

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

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE REPORT - JUNE 22, 2015

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee met on June 22, 2015 with Chairman Hare presiding.

Disposition of City Owned Land – Properties Located at 423 Collins Drive, 749 West North Street, and 29 South Governors Avenue

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, informed members that the City of Dover acquired properties located at 423 Collins Drive, 749 West North Street, and 29 South Governors Avenue at a monition sale due to liens for taxes and demolition expenses. He stated that these are excess properties, as the City has no use for them and would be better served by the properties being redeveloped and restored as taxable properties.

Mr. Koenig advised that the City has a procedure for Sale and Disposition of Real Property, which includes a "Standard Method of Disposition" that begins at the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee. As articulated in the procedure, the first decision by Council (after a favorable recommendation by the Committee) is whether or not to dispose of the surplus property and, subsequently, to determine the method of disposal (auction or sealed bid).

Mr. Koenig reviewed the City's expenses and other charges, as well as the City's 2015 Assessed Land Value for each property, as follows:

Address	City Expenses and Other Charges	City's 2015 Assessed Land Value
423 Collins Drive	$ 20,481.13	$ 39,200.00
29 S. Governors Avenue	$ 23,828.90	$ 13,600.00
749 W. North Street	$ 19,889.45	$ 52,300.00

Mr. Koenig noted that the City's expenses and other charges are inclusive of property tax, sheriff sale preparation fees, grass charges, utility charges, and demolition charges. He explained that for two (2) of the three (3) properties, the City's expenses are less than the land value, and staff was of the opinion that these properties should be put back on the market through sealed bid versus being gifted. The City could potentially recover additional costs and reduce the amount of the potential write-off by seeking bids on the vacant property. Additionally, these properties were not located in the areas where local housing non-profit organizations were focusing their efforts to acquire and develop properties.

Staff recommended the following action: 1) determine that the properties are excess property; and 2) authorize the City Manager to dispose of the properties using the "Standard Method of Disposition."

Mr. Koenig stated that the "Standard Method of Disposition" for these properties would be through sealed bid, explaining that staff had put together a very generic bid package, including property information and zoning information. He informed members that those packages go to the City's purchasing agent and are posted on the City's website, and the City would receive bids on a specified date. Mr. Koenig

explained that staff had talked to several developers, in the context of the downtown development district, that had expressed interest in these properties. He stated that since staff believed that, at a minimum, there would be several people interested in bidding on these properties, the recommendation was to dispose of them through sealed bid.

The Committee recommended that the properties located at 423 Collins Drive, 749 West North Street, and 29 South Governors Avenue be designated to be sold and determined to be excess property, and that the City Manager be authorized to dispose of the subject properties using the "Standard Method of Disposition."

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

Discussion Items Proposed During Budget Review

Due Diligence Research on Health Insurance Costs

Mr. Anderson stated that he was definitely a supporter of maintaining the quality of the City healthcare plan and ensuring that there is no diminution of that quality. He expressed his opinion that the City employees and taxpayers would welcome looking at opportunities to see if they can have the same quality of coverage and pay less money, particularly since there is cost sharing. Mr. Anderson advised that Kent County pays less money than the City does for similar coverage. He suggested that the City at least look at and study the process to determine whether or not the City and the taxpayers can save money, since this is one (1) of the largest line items in the City's budget. He noted that it would be irresponsible for the City not to do so.

In reference to Mr. Anderson's statement that Kent County pays less than the City for the same healthcare coverage, Mr. Sudler questioned what agency Kent County uses. Responding, Mr. Anderson stated that Kent County uses L & W Insurance.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Anderson stated that Kent County has the same Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield insurance coverage as the City.

Mr. Sudler questioned whether the City had received any bid proposals from L & W Insurance and inquired as to the City Manager's thoughts on this company. Responding, Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, recalled that in 2011 the City did either a request for proposals or a request for cost, and L & W Insurance did submit information; however, the recommendation was to stay with the State of Delaware. He advised that the playing field changes yearly, so it would be something that the City would have to pursue for FY 2017. Mr. Koenig reminded members that currently all of the City's collective bargaining agreements reference the State of Delaware plan. He explained that for the City to change plans, the contracts would have to be altered going forward, noting that two (2) of the contracts are up for negotiation now.

Mr. Shevock questioned whether the City had ever considered putting a cap on what the City pays to cover an employee's healthcare coverage. In response, Mr. Koenig indicated that prior to 2011, the City had a committee with multiple stakeholders in the City that discussed ways to control costs. However, he explained that one (1) of the difficulties was that none of the unions would recommend ways to control costs because they thought that was part of the collective bargaining process for those particular groups. Mr. Koenig advised that, essentially, the City has six (6) different groups in the healthcare plan, including the four (4) unions; non-bargaining employees, which includes approximately 40 employees; and all of the retirees that are on the plan, who are not represented directly by anyone. He stated that a cap would have to be negotiated for any of the union contracts, and it would be a challenging task to implement a cap, dealing with six (6) different groups

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig explained that the language in at least two (2) of the union contracts is very specific in reference to the State of Delaware plans. He advised that if the City were to change its insurance plan, even if the same coverage was provided at a lower cost, it would have to be accomplished through the collective bargaining process, noting that there is a price to pay for that, just like everything else in the contract.

Mayor Christiansen questioned how much the City's healthcare cost with the State of Delaware had increased. In response, Mr. Koenig advised that it was a little more than 16%.

Mayor Christiansen indicated that the increase in the City's healthcare cost was one (1) of the reasons for the increase in the City's tax rate and budget, and questioned whether Kent County had fewer employees than the City. Responding, Mr. Hare stated that Kent County had 350 people on their health plan, including employees and retirees.

Mayor Christiansen offered to lead a committee consisting of himself, a human resource person, the Assistant City Manager, and the City Treasurer to compare what is available in healthcare benefits with L&W Insurance and perhaps others, put out a request for proposals (RFP), and make sure that the City is getting the biggest bang for its dollar. Mayor Christiansen noted that it was his understanding that with the continued State contracts, there is a possibility that next year the City's cost could go up 20 to 25%. He stated that this committee would report back to Council within 45 to 60 days.

Mr. Hare stated that he would like to include other people on the committee as well, and expressed his opinion that, with her current workload, Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, may not need to be involved with this committee at this time. Responding, Mayor Christiansen suggested having the Assistant Treasurer serve on the committee, or someone who has the numbers.

Mr. Koenig stated that this would not be a 45 to 60 day undertaking, noting that it would probably take four (4) to six (6) months, at a minimum. He explained that the quotes would be for July of 2016 and an insurance provider may say that they can save the City money for one (1) year; however, they cannot guarantee anything after that. Mr. Koenig stated that this is currently one (1) of the most unstable areas in the economy to be reviewing. He reminded members that this was a huge issue related to the City workforce and would cause major strife moving forward.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig stated that no one could provide a guarantee on costs, even the State of Delaware; however, he expressed his opinion that being part of a larger group is more beneficial for the City of Dover.

Mrs. Mitchell clarified that the State is a self-insured plan; however, the insurance that Kent County has is not a self-insured plan. Mrs. Mitchell stated that Aetna and Blue Cross Highmark, and Blue Cross Blue Shield had gone to the insurance commissioner to request a 20% to 25% increase, which would affect the County plan, not the State self-insured plan.

Mr. Hare stated that he did not want to change the coverage or reduce it so that the deductible would be higher, etc. His concern was that the City did not know whether or not its insurance rates could have been reduced during the past four (4) to five (5) years. Mr. Hare stated that the rates were worth examining, even if it were to take four (4) to six (6) months, as long as the committee would be led by the Mayor.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he would take this responsibility and Council could set up the committee as it wants. He explained that the City had an obligation to the taxpayers and employees for maintenance of standards. Mayor Christiansen felt that the City needs to know whether the current insurance is the best deal available for all concerned, while maintaining the coverage employees had become accustomed to.

Mr. Shevock moved to recommend approval of Mayor Christiansen's proposal to go forward with the health insurance cost research, seconded by Mr. Sudler.

Mr. Cole questioned whether or not there would be a timeline or checkpoints associated with this recommendation, noting that, realistically, it would take a long time.

In response, Mr. Hare stated that the committee should have some results back by the first of the year. Mayor Christiansen suggested the beginning of the budget process.

Mrs. Traci McDowell, City Clerk, questioned whether the Committee wanted to define the number of members and the charge of the recommended committee, so that Council will know exactly what they are voting on when this recommendation is considered.

Responding, Mr. Hare suggested that the committee consist of at least two (2) members of Council, the City Manager, Mayor, Human Resources Director, and the Controller/Treasurer or her assistant.

Mr. Shevock and Mr. Sudler agreed to the amendment to the motion as recommended by Mr. Hare.

The Committee recommended approval of Mayor Christiansen's proposal to go forward with the health insurance cost research, as amended to include the creation of a committee to consist of at least two (2) members of Council, the City Manager, Mayor, Human Resources Director, and the Controller/Treasurer or her assistant.

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

Performance Audit of Civilian Side of City Government

Mr. Anderson suggested that members begin to look at city government from the perspective of efficiency and examine the benefits of a performance audit, noting that there are many ways to look at better ways of governing. He informed members that the State of Delaware has some processes with the Baldrige Awards, through which the City could get money to look at efficiency. Mr. Anderson stated that these excellence awards provide different goals, and there are options for various other performance audits. He recommended that the City explore these options since Council was considering tax and utility rate increases, and members need to be able to tell people, with assurance, that the City is using their money in the best way.

Mayor Christiansen reminded members that the City had an Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee; however, they seemed to have fallen by the wayside. He suggested that the City take advantage of professional people within the community, including citizens, retired business executives, etc. in order to complete a review of each department with in-house personnel. Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that the City should re-energize the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee with new members to review all departments and report back to Council with their findings. He stated that he would like to serve as the chairperson, noting that he had the time and could do an in-depth review. Mayor Christiansen reiterated that this review should be done in-house, although the committee could include a member or two (2) of Council, if the Committee so wished. He noted that this suggestion was not to be critical of any City staff; however, he felt it important to develop mechanisms to streamline some of the departments in the interest of the taxpayers.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Traci McDowell, City Clerk, stated that the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee consisted of seven (7) members.

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, expressed her appreciation of everyone's interest in this topic. She agreed that the City should look at some things to determine whether anything can be done differently or better. Mrs. Mitchell

requested that staff be allowed to brainstorm ideas and bring them back to Council, prior to the appointment of an ad hoc committee. She advised that throwing together a committee could result in the same issues that the City experienced with the previously ad hoc committee.

In response to Mrs. Mitchell's comments, Mayor Christiansen stated that this would be a different committee, and expressed his opinion that time was of the essence and the committee could coordinate its efforts before moving forward.

Mrs. Mitchell agreed that time was of the essence and requested an opportunity for staff to bring recommendations to the Committee within July or the first week of August. She stated that staff could work with Mayor Christiansen to include his thoughts prior to bringing it back to Council.

Mr. Anderson stated that Mrs. Mitchell had been working on some efforts with the City Warehouse and Finance Department, and the library had been conducting its own efforts. He questioned if Mrs. Mitchell had any success in her efforts with the City Warehouse or Finance Department. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that staff had not yet had success in those efforts and that is why she requested an opportunity for staff to meet to discuss the roadblocks they had experienced and potential bottlenecks so that they can try to resolve those issues and get everyone on the same page. This would allow staff to present solutions and/or processes which they believe will work and be accomplished in a timely manner.

Mr. Hare suggested that the Committee start by recommending a format for the ad hoc committee. He inquired as to Mayor Christiansen's opinion regarding having seven (7) people on the committee, noting that two (2) members of Council could agree to appoint one (1) member from each district, the at-large Council member could appoint one (1) member, and the mayor could appoint two (2) members. He suggested that the mayor would also serve as the chairperson.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that the committee format should serve the best interest of the citizens and include representation throughout the entire City, and preferably the members would not have predisposed agendas.

Council President Slavin advised that the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee was appointed by the Council President. He stated that he would not be opposed to having an appointment of that type, explaining that the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee could make a recommendation and the full Council would then take action on it to form the ad hoc committee. Mr. Slavin offered a Plan B, which would allow members of Council to provide him recommendations and he could simply reappoint the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee.

Mr. Hutchison reminded members that there were five (5) new members of Council and suggested that Council have an opportunity to discuss ideas in a workshop with staff in order to develop a master plan to help the City move forward.

Mr. Hare agreed that a workshop may be the best first step, noting that it would provide staff an opportunity to meet and bring their ideas forward to Council for discussion. He stated that Council could then decide if this committee is necessary.

Mr. Anderson stated that he did not have any objections to staff taking a month, noting the importance and benefits of staff buy-in. Referring to the potential of forming a committee, Mr. Anderson expressed his hope that Council would allow the City Manager's appointee and the finance director, or her appointee, to be ex-officio members.

Mr. Sudler stated that he liked both ideas, noting that the workshop idea would be very beneficial to the new members of Council and that it is also important to have buy-in from the community and involve them in the decision-making process.

Mr. Hosfelt requested clarification regarding the independent study which Council previously voted in favor of conducting. Responding, Mr. Hare stated that the independent study was for police and fire, and this study would include everything else.

Mr. Cole moved to recommend that staff and Council report back their findings in one (1) month. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Hare suggested that staff have their information ready by August 1, 2015 and that a workshop be scheduled for the first part of August.

Mrs. McDowell requested clarification regarding what type of findings the Committee was looking for. In response, Mrs. Mitchell explained that she was referring to strategic plans or strategic ideas that staff believes would improve processes and gain more efficiencies. She noted that these findings would not be all inclusive.

Mrs. McDowell questioned if members of Council would be bringing their ideas to a workshop. Responding, Mr. Hare clarified that Council would not do this; rather, Council would meet to review staff's ideas and proceed from there.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, expressed his opinion that members of Council should bring their ideas to the Council workshop in order to have a two-way dialogue, since staff and Council may have different ideas regarding efficiency improvements. He stated that he did not wish to present only staff's ideas and requested that members of Council provide staff with any specific ideas that they would like to discuss prior to the workshop, so that staff can bring information to the workshop.

In response to Mr. Koenig's comments, Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that the committee needs to move forward.

Mr. Sudler requested Mrs. Mitchell to provide five (5) sections or segments of the City that staff may consider first. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that one (1) example of the types of ideas she is considering is a central services fund which would centralize fleet and operations in an effort to inventory all of the fleets and implement cross-divisional fleet sharing. She explained that there would be a central services manager who would schedule the fleet, ensure that the City is not buying more equipment than necessary, and log the current equipment's usage to determine things like how often it is used and whether the City can rent equipment.

Mr. Sudler suggested that Mrs. Mitchell provide members of Council and the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee with the flowchart that she will develop to direct staff's focus, in order for everyone to focus on the same areas for discussion at the workshop.

Mr. Hare questioned whether Mrs. Mitchell required Council approval to move forward with her idea regarding a central services fund. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated that she did not require Council approval and that she had begun discussing her ideas with Mr. Koenig. She advised that she would like to include all department heads in the strategic discussion because many have ideas that they would like to share. Mrs. Mitchell explained that when you have a committee first, employees and the public attend the meetings. She expressed her preference for department heads to be given an opportunity to discuss their ideas and bring them together first.

Mayor Christiansen questioned what staff discusses during department head meetings. In response, Mrs. Mitchell stated that staff's current department head meetings are for the discussion of agendas, and the City Manager also has individual meetings with department heads.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Mitchell explained that she is not the operations person, and allowing for a group discussion of all department heads would enable staff to determine if there are reasons why these types of changes have not been implemented in the past.

Ms. Maucher questioned whether a committee format would be more conducive to open discussion between staff and Council. She favored the idea of a committee, stating that this format allows for collaboration and for ideas to be sorted out.

Responding to Ms. Maucher, Mrs. Mitchell stated that she would not mind a committee meeting; however, she requested the opportunity for staff to meet independently prior to the committee meeting. Mrs. Mitchell reiterated that she was in favor of a workshop that would allow everyone to be a part of the discussion.

Ms. Maucher questioned whether there is a public document that details the functions, workflows, etc. of each department. In response, Mrs. Mitchell explained that this was included in the budget document and indicated that she would provide Ms. Maucher with a copy.

Mr. Anderson stated that there was a review being conducted by the Mayor, Assistant City Manager, and others, and suggested inviting them to provide their input as well.

Mr. Cole moved to recommend that the staff strategic planning team and members of Council develop ideas by August 1, 2015 and that a workshop be scheduled after August 1st. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sudler.

Mr. Hare noted that the Committee's agenda for this evening also included an item regarding Review of All Lifecycle Items (Report to Committee in 90 Days) and questioned whether this could be part of the performance audit discussion.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig advised that these items were motions made during the Special Council - Budget Review meetings and could all be part of the performance audit discussion. He reminded members that the issue of the City's form of government still needed to be solidified. He indicated that he did not have the ability to impose his goals for the entire organization because it was still unclear who reports to whom, since the motions had been somewhat contradictory. Mr. Koenig stated that staff looks for efficiencies across the organization; however, Mrs. Mitchell's idea regarding the creation of a centralized fleet was not a simple undertaking because the City does not currently have that type of facility. He advised that it may require construction of a new facility at an existing or new location. Mr. Koenig thought it would be great to do a strategic plan in order to get these ideas out there; however, he noted that these would be long-term goals.

Mr. Koenig stated that the items proposed during the budget hearings would require a significant amount of staff time to develop and bring forward for consideration. It was Mr. Koenig's understanding that the Committee was prioritizing these items in order for staff to bring them forward to Council on a regular basis. He informed members that there was a lot of difficulty with the Ad Hoc Financial and Operational Advisory Committee because the workforce got extremely agitated by some of the discussion. Mr. Koenig reminded everyone that he must keep the organization moving forward and focused on the task while discussing all of these issues. He stated that this needs to have a very position spin, explaining that these are improvements to better the organization and service delivery, noting that everyone wants to provide services to the City at the lowest cost possible.

Mr. Koenig stated that the City needs to decide step by step how to move forward. He reiterated his request for a resolution to the form of government issue, so that there is a clear understanding of what items needs to be brought forward to Council. Mr. Hare agreed that the City does need to fix the form of government.

Mayor Christiansen concurred with Mr. Koenig; however, he stated that a new committee with responsibilities assigned by the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee and Council could prove to be very productive on behalf of the citizens.

Mrs. Mitchell stated that she did not go into all of the details with the Committee; however, when she discussed the idea of central services with the City Manager, it did include a building project. She expressed her thoughts that the list of proposed items discussed during the Special Council - Budget Review meetings could be prioritized first and then brought back to Council. Mrs. Mitchell agreed that many of these items could be included in the strategic plan discussion in August.

The Committee recommended that the staff strategic planning team and members of Council develop ideas by August 1, 2015 and a workshop be scheduled after August 1, 2015.

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

Proposed New Revenue Sources for FY 2016/17

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised that staff would be prepared to bring forward recommendations for new revenue sources in the August/September time frame.

Public Safety Fee Study

Mr. Hare explained that he had contacted the City Solicitor's office and has appointments with other people to determine the feasibility of the City moving forward with this study and requested that discussion of this item be deferred.

The Committee deferred consideration of this matter.

Review of All Lifecycle Items (Report to Committee in 90 Days)

Mr. Hare reminded members that this matter was previously discussed during consideration of the Performance Audit of Civilian Side of City Government and staff indicated that it would be included as part of that discussion in the future.

Review of Internal Applicant Hiring/Training Opportunities

Mr. Sudler advised that the purpose of this discussion was to ensure that City employees have the opportunity to apply for other positions within the City and if they are not awarded a position because they do not meet the qualifications, that training is provided to enable them to be awarded the job in the future or be in a better position to compete for the job.

Mr. Cole questioned the Committee's position on this item, noting that in his professional career, this is a collective bargaining issue. Responding, Mr. Sudler stated that this would be for all employees because any employee can apply for an

internal position, whether or not they are in a union. Mr. Sudler advised that management previously indicated that the City does provide employees with opportunities for professional enhancement training.

Mr. Hare clarified that the City provides employees training for their current positions. He explained that an accountant who was interested in become the finance director could go to school and take accounting classes; however, the City would not send an accountant to school to become a city planner. Mr. Hare also noted that the employee must take the initiative; management does not approach them regarding their desire to move up within the organization.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, explained that this is a two-way street. Referring to some of the City's labor positions, he stated that there is always follow-up with an employee who is not selected for a position to help prepare him/her for the next job opportunity with the City; however, there are issues, such as the ability to use computers or basic software.

Mr. Koenig advised that it is somewhat incumbent on the employee to make management aware of their desire to move up, to find out exactly why they were not selected for a position, and to ask about future training opportunities. He explained that the City does not pre-select employees to go to training or move up; an employee must identify themself as someone who wants to move up and meet the qualifications.

Mr. Koenig reminded members that training and travel had been cut from the City budget for several years; however, that approach impaired the City and the employees from being in a position to understand current trends and technology, as well as being prepared for the next round of supervisory positions and promotions. He stated that funding for training had been added back into each division budget over the past four (4) fiscal years to allow for at least a basic level of training. Mr. Koenig noted that once employees have met the basic level, they can seek more advanced levels of training. He explained that this funding had been reinstated, with the understanding of each department head that it must be used for training. Mr. Koenig stated that managers had generally met challenges and sent people to training. He reiterated that employees must meet managers halfway, and managers have to hold employees accountable to get training to qualify for the next level within the organization.

Review of the Pay System

Mr. Hutchison recommended that the City complete an internal review of the market value of all City of Dover employees to assess whether or not they are at market value. He suggested that the City compare the market with the State of Delaware, Kent County Levy Court, City of Wilmington, City of Newark, and City of Milford. Mr. Hutchison expressed his opinion that once an individual reaches market value, they should be redlined. He explained that the individual would be entitled to bonuses but not an increase in base salary. Mr. Hutchison suggested that the Committee should meet with the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer to address this issue.

Mr. Hare questioned whether Mr. Hutchison would be opposed to including additional cities, such as Smyrna and Lewes, to the review. Responding, Mr. Hutchison stated that he would not be opposed to additional cities; however, it was his opinion that the comparison should be done within Delaware.

Mr. Hare suggested that the cities should have similar tax situations as the City of Dover, noting that the City of Wilmington's tax bracket was a little higher than the City of Dover and they also have a City wage tax. He stated that the City of Newark would be a good comparison.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Hutchison explained that he had suggested the cities of Wilmington and Newark because they are the same size as the City of Dover, in terms of land, and they also face many of the same issues as the City of Dover.

Mr. Sudler moved to recommend that the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee review other cities in order to complete a comparison of the pay for the City's employees versus other cities' employees. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maucher.

Mr. Sudler moved to amend the motion to include a recommendation to create a list of cities that members deem appropriate to review for recommendations. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maucher.

Mr. Shevock questioned who would compile this information and bring it back to the Committee. Responding, Mr. Hare clarified that the motion before the Committee was to get the list of positions from Mr. Hutchison before moving forward.

The Committee recommended that the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee review other cities in order to complete a comparison of the pay for the City's employees versus other city employees, as amended to include that a list of cities be created that members deem appropriate to review for recommendations.

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

Review of Planning Application, Zoning Verification, Itinerant Merchant, Safe Communities, Residential Vacant Building and Housing Violation Fees

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that this item and the next item, Review of Planning and Inspections Fees (by December 31, 2015), were really the same item. She advised that she had begun work on this and would be prepared to bring a recommendation forward to the Committee in late July.

The Committee deferred consideration of this matter.

Review of Planning and Inspections Fees (by December 31, 2015)
Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that this item and the previous item, Review of Planning Application, Zoning Verification, Itinerant Merchant, Safe Communities, Residential Vacant Building and Housing Violation Fees, were really the same item. She advised that she had begun work on this and would be prepared to bring a recommendation forward to the Committee in late July.

The Committee deferred consideration of this matter.

Timeline for Review of Fiscal Year 2016/17 Budget
Mr. Hare proposed having a preliminary budget by February 1, 2016, to allow more time for review.

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, advised that any request to compress the time would create a set of challenges for staff. He informed members that it takes staff several months to compile and review the information, which must then be formatted for members of Council. Mr. Koenig stated that changing the budget timeline would add more uncertainty, explaining that if Council would like to see a budget in February, all of the numbers would have to be finalized by January, which would result in the budget being compiled based on only five (5) to six (6) months of current year revenue and expense. Based on his experience over the last four (4) years, Mr. Koenig stated that the compressed period would cause the City to make decisions in a strict time frame.

Mr. Hare stated that his intention was not to have a full budget or even exact numbers by February or even March 1st. He simply wanted to know what the department heads were projecting for the fiscal year, explaining that he would like a head start if the City was going to have an unexpected $2M expense.

Mr. Koenig advised that the FY 2015/2016 operating budgets were basically status quo because that was the budget direction that was provided to staff last fall. He explained that the original budget direction was for a 2% reduction in operating budgets; however, that got off track when the City added officers mid-year. Mr. Koenig stated that he could provide a projection in February, noting that his expectation would be status quo. He noted that there should not be any unplanned $2M increases to any budget unless there is a drastic change in some market, which Council would be made aware of.

Mr. Hare suggested having a preliminary budget by April 1, 2016.

Mayor Christiansen questioned if a preliminary budget could be delivered by the end of March that would provide a more realistic view of what staff would present at the end of April.

Mr. Koenig requested that this item be deferred until the next meeting to allow time for him and Mrs. Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, to discuss the possibility of delivering the draft budget on April 2, 2016.

The Committee deferred consideration of this matter until their next meeting.

Mr. Hare requested the addition of an item to the next Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting for discussion of the City's form of government. Responding, Mrs. Traci McDowell, City Clerk, advised that the proposed ordinances and charter amendments related to the City's form of government were included on the draft agenda for the July 13, 2015 Committee meeting.

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

MONTHLY REPORTS - MAY 2015

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

City Assessor's Report
City Manager's Report
City Planner's Report
Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report
Economic Development Office Report
Fire Chief's Report
Police Chief's Report

GRANT APPLICATION EVALUATION - WATER TREATMENT PLANT PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, explained that, in Fiscal Year 2015, the City began working on a project to improve the treatment processes at the Long Point Road Water Treatment Plant, which began operation in approximately 1994. The treatment equipment is original and it has aged over time. Mr. Koenig noted that it has gone from being state-of-the-art equipment to being obsolete in the treatment industry.

Mr. Koenig advised that the original intent was to replace the existing treatment methods with similar technology and more state-of-the-art machinery. After the consulting engineers visited the site and began the sampling, as well as trying to anticipate how the City's treatment methods will coincide with current standards and regulations, it was determined that the methods they originally intended to use will not function at the level anticipated, so the design requirements were modified at an additional cost.

Noting that the anticipated design budget had increased from $175,000 to $310,275, Mr. Koenig advised members that staff was requesting authorization to submit a drinking water matching planning grant in the amount of $79,744. He advised that staff intends to apply for the grant, complete the rest of the design in FY16, and then reevaluate the construction costs once the final design is complete. Mr. Koenig stated that they believe the construction costs will be significantly higher than the anticipated $1.2M, which will require a funding plan for the capital improvements associated with the construction costs. He advised that they will evaluate the project with the FY17 budget and the five (5) year plan going forward.

Mr. Koenig explained that this treatment facility is one (1) of the primary sources of production for the new Calpine plant. He noted that when the Long Point Road Treatment Plant was originally constructed, it was anticipated that this would be the baseline flow for the system. Mr. Koenig stated that, in the 20 years since it was constructed, it has been used as a peaking plant, especially in the summertime for the increase in water usage across the system. He stated that, now that the Calpine facility is in operation, this is an important facility for stable production across the City.

Staff recommended authorization to submit the grant application to Delaware Health & Social Services (DHSS) for a Drinking Water Matching Planning Grant for the second phase of design for the City of Dover Water Treatment Plant Process Improvements project in accordance with the Finance Department's Grant Application Procedure F317.

Mr. Anderson asked if this was a state grant or if it was a pass-through from the federal government. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that it was part of the state revolving fund, similar to the money that was used for the tar ditch project.

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, stated that several of the revolving loan funds include federal funds and would be included in the annual federal audit.

Mr. Anderson asked what obligations would be attached to the grant. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that he did not believe that there were specific obligations with the planning grant. He noted that construction financing would obligate the City in regard to wage rates.

Mr. Anderson asked if this was a grant or a loan. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the City would pay the contractor or the engineering firm and then submit the bills for reimbursement. He noted that repayment to the state was not required.

Mr. Hutchison moved to authorize staff to submit the grant application to Delaware Health & Social Services (DHSS) for a Drinking Water Matching Planning Grant for the second phase of design for the City of Dover Water Treatment Plant Process Improvements project in the amount of $79,744. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent).

COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS - YOUTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE - ONE (1) YEAR TERMS TO EXPIRE MAY 9, 2016

By consent agenda, Mr. Hare moved for approval of appointments to the Youth Advisory Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hosfelt and, by a unanimous roll call vote (Cole absent), the following appointments were made for a one (1) year term to expire May 9, 2016:

Jordan Harmon
Rocher Hopkins
Zorana Ilic
Michael Kosior
Theresa Morris
Lauren Scott

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Anderson announced that on Monday, July 20, 2015, the Delaware Attorney General's Office will be holding a housing workshop at the Modern Maturity Center between 1:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. He noted that they will have educational sessions on housing rights, how to avoid scams, and how to find certified housing counselors and mortgage lenders. Mr. Anderson stated that there would be services on-site, along with representatives from the Attorney General's office, the police, the Housing Authority, and other agencies. He noted that more information was available at DelawareHomeownerRelief.com.

Mr. Sudler announced that he and Councilman Anderson, in partnership with Mt. Zion AME Church Social Action Commission, will conduct a roundtable dialogue concerning the City of Dover's off-road vehicle ordinance and constituents' reports of shots fired in residents' homes on Kirkwood, Queen, and New Streets in Dover. The dialogue will be held on Thursday, July 16, 2015 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the Solid Rock Baptist Church Community Outreach Center, 113 North West Street, Dover. Mr. Sudler suggested calling either him or Councilman Anderson for additional information.

Mr. Sudler moved to adjourn into the Special Council meeting to discuss legal matters. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

TRACI A. McDOWELL
CITY CLERK

All orders, ordinances, and resolutions adopted by City Council during their Regular Meeting of July 13, 2015, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/TM
S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Council-Minutes\2015\07-13-2015.wpd

Exhibits
Exhibit #1 - Presentation - Violation of Dangerous Building Ordinance - 200 North West Street
Exhibit #2 - Presentation - Violation of Dangerous Building Ordinance - 311 North Governors Avenue

Violation of Dangerous Building Ordinance 200 N West St

Planning & Inspections Department

Dover, Delaware

July 13, 2015

200 N West St
Case History

- 20 code enforcement cases since 2002
  - Abandoned/Junked vehicles – junk & debris
  - Parking on the grass – old tires in yard
  - Numerous grass violations – tree overgrowth
  - Closing of a vacant structure, busted doors & windows
- The utilities were terminated on January 28, 2008 and remained off until new services were connected on August 4, 2014.
- Registered vacant by the city on January 11, 2013
- Condemned by City Staff on June 6, 2013 due to no active utilities, open code violations, busted windows and doors. City Staff had the windows and doors boarded.

200 N West St
Case History

- Residential use not permitted in the M (Manufacturing) Zone.
- January 15, 2014 – Board of Adjustment issued a variance to allow residential use to continue
- December 9, 2014 – Building Inspection – work was disapproved.
- Variance has expired, as work has not commenced and continued diligently within the year since variance was issued.

Dangerous Building Code – Chapter 22 Article XI, Sec. 22-381

(5) *Unfit for habitation.*

(9) *General welfare.*

(10) *Code violations.*

(12) *Unoccupied buildings.*




FOR
SALE
BY OWNER
200




WIDE LOAD












05/07/2013 09:20


05/07/2013 09:20


05/07/2013 09:20


05/07/2013 09:20


05/07/2013 09:20


05/07/2013 09:21


05/07/2013 09:24


05/07/2013 09:22


05/07/2013 09:22

Recommended Council Action

- Declare this building and all accessory structures on this property dangerous.
- Order the property repaired or demolished by **August 13, 2015** by the owner or equity owner at their own risk.
- Order the Building Inspector to cause the repair or demolition of the structures if not completed by the owner **within 10 days of the date established by City Council**.
- Order the City Manager with the assistance of the City Solicitor to cause the cost of repairs or demolition to be charged against the land on which the building exists as a municipal lien or cause such cost to be added to the tax duplicate as an assessment, or to be levied as a special tax, or to be recovered in a suit at law against the owner.

Violation of Dangerous Building Ordinance 311 N Governors Ave

Planning & Inspections Department

Dover, Delaware

July 13, 2015

311 N Governors Ave
Case History

- 16 code enforcement cases since 2002
  - Exterior code violations – trash/debris in yard
  - Vehicles parked on the grass – flaking paint
  - Interior violations – excessive load to the structure caused by the hoarding conditions within the home – weak floors
- Utilities were terminated on April 1, 2014.
- Condemned by City Staff on April 8, 2014
- Registered as a vacant building.
- A renovation permit has been submitted and approved by staff.
- $400.00 in unpaid Code Enforcement Fines.

Dangerous Building Code – Chapter 22 Article XI, Sec. 22-381

(5) *Unfit for habitation.*

(9) *General welfare.*

(10) *Code violations.*

(12) *Unoccupied buildings.*


POSTED
KEEP OUT
















CATS PRIDE
CATS PRIDE


WASH/RINSE TEMPERATURES




MORTON
ORIGINAL
OLD BAY
Black
Pepper


SEQUENCE
Fabreze


bingo
336V
State News


Please Ship To Pharmacy
CL-43
1-Clic Closures






FIRE
MARSHAL

U-HAUL
Moving and Storage Boxes
www.uhaul.com
1-800-GO-UHAUL
1-800-468-4285
UP
EUREKA


UP
EUREKA
BigSingt
ENVIRO STEAMER


Sterilite
Sterilite
HOMELAND HOUSEWARES
www.HomelandHousewares.com


HOMELAND
HOUSEWARES

Recommended Council Action

- Declare this building and all accessory structures on this property dangerous.
- Order the property repaired or demolished by **August 13, 2015** by the owner or equity owner at their own risk.
- Order the Building Inspector to cause the repair or demolition of the structures if not completed by the owner **within 10 days of the date established by City Council**.
- Order the City Manager with the assistance of the City Solicitor to cause the cost of repairs or demolition to be charged against the land on which the building exists as a municipal lien or cause such cost to be added to the tax duplicate as an assessment, or to be levied as a special tax, or to be recovered in a suit at law against the owner.