LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting was held on July 13, 2015, at 6:03 p.m. with Chairman Hare presiding. Members present were Mr. Sudler (arrived at 6:08 p.m.), Ms. Maucher, and Mr. Shevock. Mr. Cole was absent. Members of Council present were Mr. Anderson, Mr. Neil (arrived at 7:02 p.m.), Mr. Lewis (arrived at 6:55 p.m.), Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Hutchison, and Mr. Slavin. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Mr. Shevock moved for approval of the agenda, seconded by Ms. Maucher and unanimously carried.

Fiscal Year 2014/15 Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program - Police Vehicle Computer/Video Technology Upgrades & SORT Firearms

Major Marvin Mailey, Deputy Chief of Police, advised members that the Dover Police Department recently submitted a grant application through the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) for the 2015 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG). He stated that the Dover Police Department intends to upgrade/replace nine (9) additional vehicle computer/video systems. Grant funding will be combined with $54,000 budgeted for the mobile data computer (MDC) portion of the system for this purchase. Major Mailey stated that these systems will be purchased for the nine (9) new vehicles that will be coming on line during FY16. The vendor for the purchase would be COBAN and was approved as a sole vendor last year when grant funds were used for the same purpose. This brand of equipment is currently being used by the State Police and other agencies throughout the state.

Major Mailey indicated that a portion of the funds would also be used to replace three (3) shotguns and night scopes for the department's Special Operations Response Team (SORT), noting that the weapons are more than 20 years old. This purchase would be awarded to a state contract vendor that is an authorized gun dealer.

Major Mailey stated that this grant request is for $48,891 from the state to assist with the purchase of these items. He informed members that the grant had been applied for; however, to date, it had not been approved. Major Mailey indicated that the police department was quite certain that the grant would be approved, since it is an annual application.

Staff recommended approval of the grant project, as requested.

Ms. Maucher moved to recommend approval of the grant project, as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

Disposal of Excess Property - Silver Lake Drive (East Lake Gardens)

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, informed members that the City Manager's Office had received a request to abandon a certain portion of right-of-way adjacent to property owned by Bruce and Della Parham at 107 Silver Lake Drive in the East Lake Gardens Subdivision. He stated that Mr. and Mrs. Parham wished to make various improvements to their property and would like to take ownership of an irregular piece of right-of-way adjacent to it.

Mr. Koenig reviewed a property survey for 107 Silver Lake Drive and explained that Mr. Parham's driveway is located off of the odd shaped right-of-way on Silver Lake Drive and Mr. Parham mows approximately 40 feet of grass before he gets to the actual edge of the roadway. Mr. Koenig stated that Mr. Parham contacted him to determine the City's interest in disposing of this excess right-of-way because he is desirous of expanding his house and adding on a garage.

Mr. Koenig reviewed the real property tax map for the subdivision outlining the varying widths of the rights-of-way for Silver Lake Drive, noting that the right-of-way adjacent to 107 Silver Lake Drive is 85 feet wide; whereas, other rights-of-way in the subdivision are only approximately 50 feet wide. Mr. Koenig informed members that approximately 39 feet of the 85 foot right-of-way is unimproved. He stated that Mr. and Mrs. Parham are currently maintaining this area adjacent to their property and the City of Dover has no plans to further improve or enhance this right-of-way. Mr. Koenig explained that the City may have previously desired to put in an additional boat ramp in this area; however, during his employment with the City, it has never been pursued, nor had there been any indication that the City would pursue adding a boat ramp or any type of parking in this area. He stated that Mr. Parham's request is essentially that the City allow him to hire a surveyor and create a deed to transfer this excess right-of-way to his property. Mr. Koenig explained that once this parcel is transferred, it would become part of Mr. Parham's lot and part of the taxable real property in the City.

Mr. Koenig stated that the excess right-of-way is not large enough to create a buildable lot in this subdivision; therefore, it was his recommendation that the excess property be conveyed to the abutting property owner in accordance with Exception C of the Procedures for Sale and Disposition of Real Property. He advised that all costs to survey the land and prepare a deed for the transfer of the area shall be the sole responsibility of Mr. and Mrs. Parham, if they wish to proceed, and that staff would review all of the documentation prior to signature.

Staff recommended the following: 1) determine that the property is excess property; and 2) authorize the City Manager to convey the excess property in accordance with Exception C of the Procedures for Sale and Disposition of Real Property.

Referring to the excess property to be conveyed to Mr. Parham, Mr. Shevock questioned the amount of money that this would add to the tax roll. Responding, Mr. Koenig explained that the amount was difficult to distinguish as an unbuildable lot by itself, noting that it would essentially be added to the land value of Mr. Parham's parcel and the assessor would appropriately value it.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig explained that if Mr. Parham were to build a garage, this would add another assessment.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig stated that he could not determine that the City had any use for this property; therefore, it is excess.

In response to Mr. Anderson and referring to the real property tax map for the subdivision, Mr. Koenig explained that Mr. Parham's property was labeled as parcel 06 and is located immediately adjacent to Silver Lake Drive, beginning where the right-of-way increases to 85 feet and running all the way to the lake.

Mr. Anderson questioned whether this property was near Sunset Drive, noting that residential complaints were previously received because people did not have access to get out of the driveway. Responding, Mr. Koenig referred to the real property tax map for the subdivision, explaining his understanding that Garden Lane used to extend further to the right of the word Garden as depicted on the map. He stated that the right-of-way was abandoned to a property owner in 1985 and became part of the subject property. Mr. Koenig indicated that this situation was similar but not quite the same. Referring to the complaints, he stated that staff had reviewed the surveys of at least one (1) of the property owners, as well as the Council minutes where the right-of-way was abandoned. Mr. Koenig stated that, based on his non-legal review, it appeared that the property owner had done things correctly in accordance with what he was granted by the City.

In response to Mayor Christiansen, Mr. Koenig advised that, to his knowledge, there were no utilities in this right-of-way and that the survey of the area would determine the existence of any utilities. Mr. Koenig explained that there was an overhead pole line on the east side of the property where the right-of-way becomes 85 feet, which carries electric, telephone, and cable. He stated his understanding that the water and sewer lines were in Silver Lake Drive. Mr. Koenig informed members that the City would maintain a utility easement over any utilities indicated by the survey.

Regarding the access issue referred to by Mr. Anderson, Mayor Christiansen stated that there is a fire hydrant that is located on private property due to the City conveying the property. Mr. Koenig stated that the fire hydrant in this area would most likely be abandoned or moved in the future.

Mr. Hutchison questioned whether the City had canvassed the neighborhood to determine what the feelings were regarding this matter. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the neighborhood had not been canvassed and letters were not sent to the neighborhood because this situation was different than when the City abandons the full right-of-way. He stated that if members would like that to be done, staff could do it just to make sure there are no objections.

Mr. Shevock moved to recommend, provided local property owners are surveyed and there are no problems, that a certain portion of right-of-way adjacent to property located at 107 Silver Lake Drive in the East Lake Gardens Subdivision, owned by Bruce and Della Parham, be determined to be excess property, and that the City Manager be authorized to convey the excess property in accordance with Exception C of the Procedures for Sale and Disposition of Real Property, as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maucher and unanimously carried.

Timeline for Review of Fiscal Year 2016/17 Budget (Deferred during the meeting of June 22, 2015)

Mr. Scott Koenig, City Manager, reviewed the FY16 Budget Calendar ***(Attachment #1)***. He explained that advancing the timeline would create challenges regarding revenue projection. Mr. Koenig informed members that City Council recently adopted the FY16 Budget which included the expected revenue projections, and the State did maintain the expected levels; however, it remained an unknown factor until the end of June. He stated that passing a budget in April would create uncertainty, noting that it would be difficult to provide accurate numbers and predict what would happen at the end of the State's session. Mr. Koenig indicated that there are ways for staff to provide additional information as the budget year progresses to try to fine tune expectations.

Mr. Koenig reminded members that staff had kept spending and costs down in the 20 and 30 series of the operating budget. He stated that staff had done a fair job of maintaining the capital plan during the last few years, noting that although staff had to adjust project budgets occasionally, the actual total funding stream was consistent. Mr. Koenig advised that staff expected to keep that trend going forward, explaining that large increases in the FY16 budget were the result of additional personnel and increased healthcare costs.

Mr. Koenig stated that if Council wanted to accelerate the budget schedule, he would comply; however, he reiterated that it would be more difficult for staff.

Mr. Shevock questioned if the City received funding other than municipal street aid from the State of Delaware. Responding, Mr. Koenig advised that, for FY16, the City received municipal street aid based on a formula; payment in lieu of taxes (PILOT), which remained fairly consistent; and realty transfer tax. He explained that when State budgets are very tight, PILOT is often an item that they think about adjusting. Mr. Koenig informed members that after Council completed their budget hearings for the FY16 budget, the State began discussing the possibility of adjusting the local share of the realty transfer tax. He stated that the vote taken by the State would have affected the FY17 budget; however, it highlighted the potential impact on local governments of the State voting very late in the budget year. Mr. Koenig indicated that any type of legislation being considered by various committees or legislators could potentially impact the City, especially if it affects property assessment, licensing, or any type of additional tax that the City may want to incorporate.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he had spent a few days at Legislative Hall during the last session and expressed his opinion that it would not hurt the City to have a preliminary budget that reflects the possible shortfalls that the State of Delaware is going to have. It was his feeling that staff should develop the budget ahead of time, not taking into consideration Community Transportation Funds (CTF) or transfer tax monies. Mayor Christiansen advised that the City may see an increase in PILOT from the State, since the City's delegation was asked to request the appropriate amount of PILOT. However, he noted that transfer tax is not sacred, healthcare costs continue to increase, and municipal street aid may disappear altogether. Mayor Christiansen suggested providing Council with a preliminary draft budget by the middle of March to give members a rough idea of the City's future and the revenues that will be available. It was his feeling that although this may place additional stress on staff, it would certainly relieve Council of surprises.

Mr. Hare stated that his primary concern was expenses, not revenues. He suggested that staff prepare a preliminary budget by the end of March using FY16 revenues and projected increases in expenses. He expressed his opinion that Council needed more than three (3) weeks to review and address expenses.

Mr. Shevock noted that the City may not receive funding from the State next year; therefore, he suggested that staff prepare a preliminary budget excluding State funding.

Mr. Anderson reminded members that in previous years, Council held their first budget workshop around February to discuss the status of the economy and City revenues and expenses. He stated that he would like to see this type of workshop resumed. Mr. Anderson expressed his opinion that Council did not need to pass a budget in March or April; however, Council could hold a workshop in February or March to set priorities, and staff could hold budget workshops beginning in April. It was his feeling that the workshops did not have to be held all at once; instead, he would prefer some in April and May, with the Council mark-up to conclude in late May.

Mayor Christiansen noted that having a preliminary budget in March would also allow members of Council, staff, and the public an opportunity to present an alternative budget.

Mr. Hare informed members that the PILOT the City receives from the State of Delaware had been addressed with the City's legislators. He explained that the City currently has approximately $300M worth of assessed State property; however, the City only received $270,000 in PILOT. Comparatively, Mr. Hare stated that the City of Wilmington has $188M worth of State property and they receive $2.7M in PILOT. Responding, Mayor Christiansen advised that a resolution had been submitted that would change this but he was not certain how far it would go.

Mr. Koenig reiterated that a lot of work goes into the budget, but explained that if members request a preliminary budget for all funds earlier, staff would meet the schedule. He stated that his only caveat was that the revenue numbers would be less solid as they moved further away from the end of the June.

Mr. Hare stated that he was really only concerned with the projected expenses and the preliminary budget could include the FY16 revenues.

Mr. Sudler moved to recommend that staff provide a preliminary FY17 budget between March 15 and March 31, 2016, to review expenses. The motion was seconded by Ms. Maucher.

Noting that the City of Dover relies on funds from the State of Delaware, Mr. Slavin questioned whether the City had ever examined the possibility of changing the fiscal year to align with the federal government, which begins October 1st. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that he would need to consult with Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, to determine if the fiscal year was related to an accounting standard.

Mayor Christiansen advised that the City's fiscal year used to be January through December.

Mr. Slavin stated that he was unaware of what might be involved in making the first adjustment; however, he believed it would require more than one (1) discussion by the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee, noting that he was not requesting a response at this time.

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, stated that changing the City's fiscal year would require research. She advised that most municipalities and the State of Delaware begin on July 1st; however, the federal government begins its fiscal year on October 1st and some municipalities may begin then as well. Mrs. Mitchell stated that another possibility would be to begin the fiscal year on January 1st, noting that the City of Newark does this.

Referring to Mr. Koenig's comment, Mr. Slavin stated that a two (2) year budget cycle may also have merit and suggested that the committee come back with pros and cons regarding these suggestions, including what confusion may be caused by having a different fiscal year than the State.

Mr. Hare stated that he liked the idea of beginning the City's fiscal year on October 1st, since all of the State monies would be in by then.

Mr. Slavin noted that the City does not receive a significant amount of funding from the federal government. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell advised that it is confusing that the federal fiscal year is different than the City's when dealing with grants and overlapping years.

Mr. Shevock noted that the City's tax bills go out on July 1st each year and are part of that fiscal year budget. He questioned how the tax year would be affected by a change in the fiscal year. In response, Mrs. Mitchell stated that everything, including taxes, would have to be changed to coincide with the new fiscal year. Mr. Slavin suggested that the City could have a 15-month tax year, followed by a 9-month tax year in order to implement the change.

The motion to recommend that staff provide a preliminary FY17 budget between March 15 and March 31, 2016, to review expenses, was unanimously carried.

Proposed Amendments to the City of Dover Code of Ordinances - Chapter 2 - Administration, Article IV - Officers and Employees, Division 4 - Controller/Treasurer and Division 5 - City Clerk; Chapter 54 - Health and Sanitation, Article I - In General, Section 54-1 - Health inspector Generally; Chapter 82 - Planning, Section 82-2 - City Planner; and Chapter 102 - Taxation, Article I - In General, Section 102-3 - Administrative reporting

Mrs. Traci McDowell, City Clerk, informed members that during the Regular Council meeting of March 23, 2015, City Council adopted a motion "to maintain a full time mayor and that all departments, excluding the City Clerk's Office and the Finance Department, will report to the City Manager who is appointed by and will report to City Council."

Mrs. McDowell reviewed proposed ordinance amendments which would change the selection and/or reporting of the City Planner and the City Assessor to the City Manager. She advised that the Economic Development Office is not referenced in either the City of Dover Charter or the Dover Code of Ordinances, and City Council's motion of March 23, 2015 effectively moved the Economic

Development Office from the Mayor to the City Manager. Mrs. McDowell stated that Charter amendments would be necessary to complete the transfer of the City Assessor and the Police Department to the City Manager. She informed members that the proposed amendments also remove the requirement for the annual reappointment of these positions.

Staff recommended directing the City Clerk to prepare the necessary ordinance amendments for presentation to City Council/First Reading.

Mr. Hare questioned whether members would want to leave the City Assessor as a Council appointee. Responding, Mrs. McDowell stated that would be a discussion for the next agenda item, noting that the proposed Charter amendments were suggestions based on Council's previous motion and comments.

Mayor Christiansen informed members that on March 9, 2015, City Council made a decision regarding the direction of the City, which gave the Mayor some responsibility; however, 14 days later, Council changed their mind. He questioned if any members knew or had researched why the City Clerk, Assessor, Planner, or Controller/Treasurer were put under the direction of City Council. Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that is was imperative that these departments remain under the control of City Council. While he stated that he did not want to appear self-serving, Mayor Christiansen expressed concern that the public had repeatedly told Council, in different ways and by different actions, that they want a strong mayor who works in consort with the Chief Operating Officer of the City, and for public safety to remain under the control of the Mayor. He stated that, through various elections, the public had reaffirmed that they want a strong Mayor who has the responsibilities of at least public safety and economic development. Mayor Christiansen reminded members that during the last municipal election, the two (2) top mayoral candidates debated the fact that the City needed a strong Mayor and a number of council members who did not believe in that are gone. He expressed his opinion that members should take a second look at the actions of March 23, 2015, give the Mayor some responsibility and allow him/her to work in consort with the City Manager on a daily basis, since the Mayor is the elected official who is present on a daily basis.

Mayor Christiansen informed members that the City Clerk, Assessor, Planner, and Controller/Treasurer were put under the direction of City Council because, at the time, the City Manager told members of Council that unless they came back with four (4) other Council members, he did not have to talk to them. Mayor Christiansen cautioned members not to give away their responsibility, noting that they could take his away, but to take away Council's responsibility would be a disservice to the public who had reaffirmed the direction they wished the City to take. He stated that his comments were no reflection on the current City Manager, explaining that the current City Manager and Assistant City Manager did a terrific job. Mayor Christiansen suggested that members take a long, hard look at the proposed ordinances and changes, rather than having one (1) committee meeting to discuss this matter.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison, Mayor Christiansen stated that he would not have a problem with the City Manager being the Chief Operating Officer of the City who reports to the Mayor and Council.

Mr. Hutchison stated that was the intent of this change. He explained that the City Manager is chosen based on education, knowledge, and skill sets that enable him/her to run a city and have responsibility for the budget, along with the City's Controller/Treasurer. Mr. Hutchison reminded members that he had served the City of Dover as the Police Chief, Mayor, and a member of Council and expressed great concerns regarding the day-to-day operations and loss of control compared to what the City used to have. He stated that giving the City Manager the authority to be the Chief Operating Officer does not mean that he would run the Police Department; rather, the City Manager would be responsible for the operations and the finances, and would report to the Mayor or Council. Mr. Hutchison noted that the City Manager has the expertise, while elected officials are here to listen and be guided by the information provided. He stated that the proposal could be fine-tuned, and noted the Mayor would still be the point person and serve on top with the Council. Mr. Hutchison explained that the City was very complex, including the overall operation, various departments, personnel issues, labor contract negotiations, etc. He reminded members that, most importantly, under the current structure, the Police Department does not report to the City Manager and has nothing to do with the City Manager from a financial point of view. As an example, he reminded members that the Police Department requested ten (10) additional police officers in the middle of FY15, noting that you cannot run a city that way and no business plan would justify that type of change.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison, Mayor Christiansen stated that the matter with the Police Department was something that should not have happened; however, he stated that the City knew that the need was there when Councilman Hosfelt was Chief of Police but the problem was deferred.

Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that no one, including himself, who could get elected to serve as Mayor would ever want to interfere with the daily operations of the City; however, the Chief Executive Officer should either work in consort with or report to the Mayor. He reiterated that it was imperative to maintain checks and balances through Council retaining responsibility over the City Clerk, Assessor, Planner, and Controller/Treasurer; otherwise, the Mayor and Council would become non-entities in the government, and the citizens did not elect the Mayor and Council to be non-entities. Mayor Christiansen informed members that the City's Charter was adopted in 1929 when people did not trust politicians; however, he stated that the Mayor and members of Council were not politicians but public servants, and the City's hybrid form of government allows the public to get the most out of their money.

Mr. Hutchison noted that it was important for the citizens of Dover to understand that the City Manager works at the pleasure of the Mayor and Council. He stated that the City Manager and other department heads do not have contracts; they perform their jobs on a daily basis and it is Council's job to ensure that the City provides the best service for its citizens. Mr. Hutchison explained that the City needed to make some modifications within the structure in order to make the City Manager a chief operating person with a greater authority to bring together all of the departments within the City, including the Police Department, to present and deal with issues and

accomplish the job that is asked by Council and the City's citizens. He requested that members consider these issues, noting that he believes that the City can become better and more efficient by putting better controls in place.

Mr. Sudler informed members that he had previously voiced his opinion in his proposal of Option A (a full-time Mayor's position, with consideration of changing the City's current form of government to a Mayor/Council form of government, where the City Manager and Chief of Police would be appointed by the mayor and confirmed by City Council, and that any positions which currently report to Council that are moved to report to the Mayor would only be removed for cause and with Council approval.) He stated his belief that the City is growing to the point where a strong mayor form of government is necessary. Mr. Sudler advised that this type of strong mayor/council form of government would allow Council to focus strictly on legislative issues and ordinances. It was his opinion that a city manager should be the chief administrative assistant, working with the Mayor and under his supervision, and they should work together to come up with departmental goals and ensure that those goals are met. He stated that this would also provide the criteria for a job description for the Mayor, which needs to be developed.

Mr. Sudler stated that he strongly believes that the City needs a strong mayor form of government, noting his belief that it could work. He agreed with Mayor Christiansen and Mr. Hutchison that it needs to be fine-tuned and requested that members work together on this matter. Mr. Sudler informed members that the people had spoken, noting that during previous Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meetings members of the public expressed that they wanted the Mayor to be the focal point. It was his thought that a lot more could be accomplished if the City were to allow the Mayor to have the City Manager under his supervision, explaining that the Mayor would be able to address, and help the City Manager address, issues that arise on a daily basis, even departmental issues, since he is here on a daily basis and members of Council are not.

Mr. Slavin stated that he has worked in the public sector for approximately 25 years and that reorganizations can certainly have value; however, especially in the public sector, they tend to be messy, confusing and often expensive. He stated that reorganizations are expensive in terms of actual dollars as well as in the trust that members build with the voters and taxpayers who support the positions. Mr. Slavin also stated that reorganization does not always work, noting that there is no guarantee that the new thing that members try will be successful.

Mr. Slavin advised that Council had never really achieved consensus regarding this issue. While he did not want to denigrate this matter, he expressed his opinion that this matter has been a distraction. Mr. Slavin stated that the new members of Council had inherited a suggestion on this issue, not a mandate. He explained that this issue is open for debate and decision by the current Council; however, it was his opinion that Council has a lot of bigger issues to get to. He stated that he did not desire further discussions regarding this matter and would prefer, with five (5) new council members, that Council leave things the way they are and focus their time, energy and efforts on running things efficiently and, more importantly, effectively for the City.

Mr. Anderson stated that this was a complicated situation and questioned whether leaving things the way they are would require a vote at this time, due to Council's motion of March 23, 2015. He expressed his opinion that the City did not need to rush into a decision. Mr. Anderson stated that this is a definite concern to him and, if he were to make a choice today, he would probably agree with Mr. Sudler.

Mr. Hare agreed that this issue had been on the table for a long time. He stated that he did not care what decision Council made on this matter; however, he urged members to make a decision. Mr. Hare reminded members that the City currently has a City Manager and an Assistant City Manager that are only responsible for half of the City, explaining that it is impossible to hold the City Manager accountable for the City's budget, which is his responsibility, since he is not responsible for all of the departments. Mr. Hare expressed his opinion that members give the City Manager responsibility for the budget and everything that happens in the City, in order to hold him accountable if there is a problem. Additionally, he noted that the City Manager is currently unable to make recommendations in regard to matters that are not his responsibility, regardless of whether they are good recommendations. It was Mr. Hare's thought that one (1) person should be responsible for the entire City so that Council can hold that person accountable. Referring to Mr. Hutchison's comment, Mr. Hare stated that the Mayor could be the chief of the City and be responsible for managing the Police Department, but not the financial side of it.

In response to Mr. Hare, Mayor Christiansen agreed that having one (1) budget was an important detail that may be lacking. He did not believe the City should have separate budgets for the City and the Police Department.

Mr. Hare reiterated that the City Manager is not responsible for the Police Department, economic development, or any of the other responsibilities that fall under the Mayor, and if the Mayor remains the chief executive, he could also deal with the Police Department, except for the financial part of it.

Mr. Hare suggested that this matter should be discussed during a separate meeting, in order for members to make a final decision.

Mr. Hosfelt stated that, unless something had changed drastically in the past one (1) and one-half years, as the Chief of Police he always worked directly with Mr. Koenig and Mrs. Mitchell in developing the budget. He explained that he knew that what he did in regard to the budget had to go through the City Manager's Office and Finance Department, and the Police Department did not operate independently from the rest of the City. Mr. Hosfelt noted that the Police Department was always deeply involved in the budget process, probably because it is the largest department. He did not think it was fair to say that the Police Department had a separate budget or were separate from the rest of the City because he did not believe that was ever the case. Mr. Hosfelt stated that the Police Department was always included as part of the package deal.

Referring to the discussions pertaining to a strong mayor, Mr. Hutchison reminded members that the Mayor was previously a member of Council, presided over Council meetings, and had a vote but no veto power. He stated that the Mayor was a member of the team then; however, now the Mayor has a voice but no vote. Mr. Hutchison suggested that if members want the Mayor to be in charge, then he should earn his/her income by presiding over the meetings. He informed members that, currently, the Mayor does not have to attend any committee or Council meetings.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison's comments, Mayor Christiansen noted that the Mayor is an ex-officio member of all of the committees and it is his responsibility to attend all of the meetings.

Mr. Hutchison indicated that when he served as Mayor he attended all of the meetings as well. He reiterated that years ago, the Mayor was really in charge and the responsibilities had been diluted over time. Mr. Hutchison stated that, as members review the issues and try to resolve the problems, if they choose to have a strong mayor, he would prefer to see the Mayor actively involved with the City every day.

Mr. Hutchison questioned if Mayor Christiansen thought that presiding over Council would make him a greater part of the City. In response, Mayor Christiansen expressed his opinion that it would not make him a greater part of the City because Council should be the legislative body of the City and not administrative.

Mr. Hare suggested that members continue this discussion at a separate meeting. He also indicated that the City could have the Mayor as the chief executive officer with no control over finances.

Mayor Christiansen suggested making the Mayor part of the budget process in order to hold him accountable, along with the City Manager. Responding, Mr. Hare reminded members that the City Manager would be reporting to members of Council.

Mr. Sudler expressed his opinion that the Mayor should have a vote since he represents the mass of the people in the City. He thought that the Mayor's vote is valid and that the Mayor should participate in the process since he/she is an elected voice for the people. Mr. Sudler stated that he was uncertain how it would work but thought that the Mayor should play a more significant role. He informed members that he had researched this topic and found that in a strong mayor form of government, the mayor can have veto power and a vote.

Mr. Hare moved to defer this matter as well as Item #5 - Proposed Amendments to the City of Dover Charter, and schedule a special meeting, without a time limit, to allow for further discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock.

Mr. Sudler suggested allowing for more input from the community, to provide the new members a new perspective. Responding, Mr. Hare indicated that the community could attend the meeting and share their comments during the open forum. He stated that he would also like to begin having quarterly town meetings again.

Mr. Hosfelt expressed his opinion that it is the responsibility of each member of Council to talk to their constituents to find out what they want, noting that they were elected to represent their district.

Mr. Hare stated that members could speak directly to their constituents and the public could also attend the meeting to speak.

Mr. Sudler suggested that members could have a survey orchestrated for each member of Council to provide to their constituents during their individual district meeting. He noted that this would provide some type of tangible scale and members could report the data, since any member of Council could misrepresent their constituency.

Mayor Christiansen reminded members that the Mayor had the responsibility to hold quarterly town meeting and stated that he would like to schedule a quarterly town meeting to discuss the issues and provide an opportunity for people to attend and give members their input.

Mr. Hare indicated that the Mayor should proceed with scheduling the quarterly town meeting.

The motion to defer this matter, as well as Item #5 - Proposed Amendments to the City of Dover Charter, and schedule a special meeting, without a time limit, to allow for further discussion was unanimously carried.

Proposed Amendments to the City of Dover Charter
This item was deferred during consideration of the previous item.

By unanimous consent, the meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

William F. Hare
Chairman

WFH/TM/dd
S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Committee-Minutes\2015\07-13-2015 LF&A - CORRECTED FY2016.wpd

Attachments
Attachment #1 - FY16 Budget Calendar

FISCAL 2015-2016
BUDGET CALENDAR*

10/17/2014	Budget Memo & Instructions to be distributed
10/20/2014– 2/13/2015	Departments' budget preparation; All inclusive of CIP, revenues & expenses
11/03/2014 – 12/12/2014	Personnel budget changes, including reclassifications are reviewed by the City Manager & Human Resources Director. Meetings held with Department Heads to discuss.
12/30/2014	Personnel budget file and instructions distributed
~~1/5/2015~~ 1/20/15	CIP Budget completed and entered into financial systems
1/20/2015	Completed personnel budget files due back to City Manager's Office
1/20/2015	CIP support documentation submitted to City Manager's Office
~~1/30/2015~~ 2/13/15	Entry lockout end of day; All budget items entered into financial systems
~~2/2/2015 –~~ 2/13/2015	Draft Budget summaries prepared by City Manager's Office
2/19/2015 – 2/20/2015	Draft Budget summaries and historical trend reviews by City Manager & Controller
2/23/2015– 3/20/2015	Draft Budget Review meetings held with Department Heads
3/23/2015 – 3/31/2015	Revised Draft Budget and CIP prepared; Organizational Charts due to City Manager;
Week of 4/6/15	Council workshop to review Draft Budget and Financial Forecast
4/13/2015 – 5/1/2015	Preparation of Draft Budget and Financial Forecast
5/11/2015	Final draft budget and CD to Council
5/18/2015 – 5/29/2015	Budget review meetings as needed (members of LF&A Committee invited)
6/8/2015	Electric public hearing; first reading of draft budget
6/22/2015	Second reading of draft budget
7/1/2015	Fiscal Year 2015-2016 budget goes into effect

**** All dates are tentative and subject to change.***