LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting was held on August 8, 2011 at 5:30 p.m. with Chairman McGlumphy presiding. Members present were Mr. Anderson, Mr. Hare, Dr. Jones, and Mr. Shevock. Members of Council present were Mr. Bonar, Mr. Hutchison, Mr. Lynn (arrived at 6:52 p.m.), Mrs. Russell (arrived at 6:11 p.m.), and Council President Leary (arrived at 6:00 p.m.).

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

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

Reconsideration of Review and Recommendation - Filling of Critical Positions as a Standing Agenda Item and Review of Necessary Documentation for Requests for Filling Critical Positions

Members were reminded that during their Regular Meeting of March 9, 2009, City Council approved the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee's recommendation to approve a Hiring Freeze for Fiscal Year 2008-2009, but to allow the hiring of critical positions through the review and approval of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee and City Council. It was suggested that, in order to avoid issues involving prior notice for agenda items, there could be a "standing" agenda item to consider the filling of critical positions and, if there were no positions to consider, the item could be removed.

In light of the current economic conditions, Dr. McGlumphy, Chair of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee requested that members reconsider retaining the Filling of Critical Positions as a standing item on the agenda and instead adopt the following process with regard to vacancies:

- If a position becomes vacant that will affect public or employee safety or cause financial harm to the City, Permission to Recruit, Hiring Justification Outline, and Wage and Benefit Information for Employee Hiring and Transfers forms will be submitted to the Legislative, Finance, and Administrative Committee.

- The justification to fill a position is to include the exiting employee's salary and benefits, estimated salary and benefits for the new employee, and how the department will fund this position within the realm of their current budget for salary and benefits, with cost to include any vacation, sick leave, or compensatory time paid out to the exiting employee. If the department cannot cover the cost due to terminal leave or lump sum payouts, then the position cannot be filled until such time as the cost can be covered in the current budget.

- If Council decides to cover the cost overages, then the method of funding is to be determined by the City Manager, Council, or the Council/Mayor appointee.

- To fill the needs of a department that has vacancies, staff from other departments or staff within the department that has vacancies will be utilized while Council is working through the current and future budget constraints.

Dr. McGlumphy requested that the Filling of Critical Positions be removed as a standing agenda item and the affirmation and adoption of the current and proposed hiring process. It was his opinion that this process would provide more transparency and accountability within departments.

Mr. Hare moved to recommend removing the Filling of Critical Positions as a standing agenda item and affirmation and adoption of the current and proposed hiring process for filling vacant or new positions, including submission of a Permission to Recruit Form *(Attachment #1)*, a Hiring Justification Outline Form *(Attachment #2)*, and a Wage and Benefit Information for Employee Hiring and Transfers Form *(Attachment #3)*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

Formation of Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee

Mr. Hare proposed the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee to compare salary and benefit information from approximately ten (10) municipalities in the State of Delaware: New Castle, Sussex, and Kent Counties and the cities/towns of Wilmington, Newark, Middletown, Smyrna, Lewes, Seaford, Milford, and Dover. He stated that, to his knowledge, such research has never been conducted and he felt that such information would be useful, particularly with union contract negotiations scheduled for the near future. Mr. Hare suggested that this Committee consist of five (5) members from varied backgrounds and advised members that individuals have already been selected to serve on the Committee and have agreed to participate.

Responding to Mr. Shevock, Dr. McGlumphy stated that a Health Benefits Committee has been formed and a meeting is scheduled for the week of August 15, 2011. Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, explained that the Health Benefits Committee was formed specifically to review medical insurance options due to new accounting standards affecting Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability. Mr. Shevock questioned if these committees should be combined. Responding, Dr. McGlumphy stated that the committees would have separate responsibilities, explaining that the Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee would be established to review salary and benefit information similar to that provided previously through the MAG Pay-For-Performance Study; however, rather than utilizing corresponding municipalities in other states, the desire is to determine how the City compares with local municipalities. He reminded members that this recommendation was made during the recent Budget Hearings.

Mr. Anderson inquired if the Committee would be temporary in nature, how members would be selected, and to whom the Committee would report. Responding, Mr. Hare felt that the Committee would be temporary; however, if there is a need for such research in the future, another committee could be established. He stated that the Committee's findings would be reported to the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee and that the individuals proposed for membership have varied backgrounds in human resources, business, law, and accounting.

Mr. Anderson indicated his support for obtaining such information outside of the constraints of a timeline associated with the budget development process. However, it was his feeling that the goal for reviewing this information should not be to compete in a "race to the bottom" in establishing salary levels and that the City's pay scale should remain competitive.

Mr. Hare moved to recommend approval of the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee, seconded by Dr. Jones.

Mr. Lester Blakeman (former City Electric Director) advised members that, in the past, no such comparison has been performed for Electric Department employees. He explained that no other municipality in Delaware has a utility the size of the City's; therefore, there is no comparable electrical function on the Delmarva Peninsula. Responding, Mr. Bonar stated that there are a few utility organizations in the State of Delaware with comparable positions and suggested obtaining information from Delmarva Power and the Delaware Electric Cooperative.

Responding to Mrs. Kim Hawkins, Human Resources Director, Mr. Hare stated that the research would be conducted on all levels within the City (to include both bargaining and non-bargaining employees). Dr. McGlumphy stated that five (5) individuals have agreed to serve on the proposed Committee; however, members would not be appointed until Council authorizes the formation of the Committee. Mrs. Hawkins questioned how the membership selection process occurred. Responding, Dr. McGlumphy stated that two (2) of the proposed members are presently serving on the City's Compensation Commission and the other three (3) members are from the community.

Mr. Scott Koenig, Interim City Manager, informed members of a website (Sperling's Best Places at www.bestplaces.net/col) that compares cost of living and salaries. He requested that this website be used as a tool to compare "apples to apples" when the Committee is reviewing the data obtained.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, noted that the City of Newark is the only municipality in Delaware that compares to the City of Dover in terms of population. In addition, she noted that the City of Milford outsources their engineering work and, although they have a Planner, some of their planning functions are also outsourced. Mrs. Townshend noted that the City of Harrington outsources all planning and has a consultant who performs all planning activities. She expressed her concern that positions in smaller towns perform very different functions from those within the City of Dover. She questioned if the size of the population served would be considered when assessing each position's level of responsibility. Responding, Mr. Hare stated that the Committee members would be provided a charge and felt confident that they would take such issues into consideration.

Mr. Anderson requested that the salaries and benefits of State of Delaware employees also be considered when conducting the comparison.

Dr. Jones suggested that if the proposed Committee is formed, their charge will be stated and all discussions, considerations, and concerns could be addressed at that time.
On a call for the question by Mr. Anderson, the recommendation to approve the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee was unanimously carried.

Mr. Anderson requested that the minutes of this meeting be forwarded to members of the proposed Committee for their review and consideration. Dr. McGlumphy requested that staff compile minutes of all meetings of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee during the past year

which included discussion of salaries and benefits and provide them to members of the proposed Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee. In addition, he requested that the Human Resources Director provide members of the proposed Committee with any additional information that would be beneficial in their consideration of this matter.

Proposed Ordinance #2011-21 - Appendix B - Zoning, Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zones, Subsection 1.15 - Accessory Uses, Limited to and Appendix B - Zoning, Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Section 1 - Supplementary Regulations Applying to Residence Zones

Mrs. Anne Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, presented a proposed Ordinance amending Appendix B - Zoning, Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zones, as it relates to the keeping of animals in one-family residence zones, and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, relating to swimming pools in residence zones.

Mrs. Townshend explained that the proposed Ordinance would prohibit the keeping of farm animals and establish a maximum number of cats (five (5)) in a one-family residence zone. She advised members that currently, the Zoning Ordinance allows for keeping up to 25 fowl, up to three (3) dogs over six (6) months old, and sets no limit on cats. Mrs. Townshend explained that, as the City has become more urbanized, the allowance for up to 25 fowl and the absence of a maximum number of cats have become outdated.

In addition, Mrs. Townshend explained that the proposed Ordinance would move the regulations regarding swimming pools from Article 3 - District Regulations, to Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations. She stated that the proposed amendment would more closely align the regulations regarding swimming pools with the provisions of the Building Code. Mrs. Townshend advised members that conflicts between the two (2) codes have been a source of confusion for residents in recent years.

Staff recommended adoption of Proposed Ordinance #2011-21.

Rather than prohibiting farm animals in one-family residence zones, Mr. Hare suggested the need to prohibit the keeping of farm animals within City limits. He stated that he was aware of a business that is adjacent to a residential zone that has chickens. Mrs. Townshend noted that the City has an agricultural zone that allows for farm animals. Mr. Hare felt that the agricultural zone should be an exception. Responding, Mrs. Townshend suggested that, in addition to the proposed amendment, there could be an amendment to the Supplementary Regulations that the "keeping of farm animals in any zone except the Agricultural Zone shall be prohibited."

Responding to Mr. Bonar, Mrs. Townshend confirmed that if a City resident currently raises chickens for organic eggs, they would be given 12 months before the ordinance goes into effect. Although he felt the intent of the proposed Ordinance was very good, Mr. Bonar suggested that staff conduct additional research.

Mr. Anderson expressed his opposition to the proposed Ordinance, explaining that the raising of chickens is a part of the culture of some City residents. He stated his concern with the current economy and felt that there may be a need to allow for individuals to raise their own food, which the proposed ordinance would prohibit. With regards to the number of cats and dogs permitted, Mr. Anderson did not feel that it was within the realm of the government to make such a determination if it does not affect others. He also questioned the City's ability to enforce the rules that would be created if the Ordinance were adopted.

In response to Mr. Shevock, Mrs. Townshend stated that adoption of the proposed Ordinance, as presented, would not affect Delaware State University (DSU); however, if members approve an amendment to the Supplementary Regulations to expand prohibiting farm animals in any zone except the Agricultural Zone, DSU would be affected. Mr. Shevock suggested that if DSU has a program involving farm animals, an exemption for the University should be included. In addition, he suggested that the number of cats and dogs should be equal and relayed concern regarding breeders of pedigreed dogs, stating that these dogs may produce puppies that may not sell within a specific time period. In addition, he suggested that individuals who currently have farm animals be "grandfathered" and not subject to the proposed Ordinance.

Concurring with Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Russell advised members that there are several residents of the Fourth District that have farm animals and, to her knowledge, this has not created any problems. She relayed her opposition, feeling that the proposed Ordinance is directed toward certain individuals and that there are instances when having farm animals or raising pets is a means of "making ends meet."

As a result of the concerns relayed, Mr. Bonar suggested that the Committee table action to allow staff to redraft the proposed Ordinance.

Mr. Anderson requested the division of the question for Ordinance #2011-21 so that Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zones, relating to keeping of animals in one-family residence zones, be separated from the proposed amendments to Article 3 and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, regarding swimming pools in residence zones.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend that Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zones (relating to keeping of animals in one-family residence zones) be referred back to staff for additional research and development. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hare and unanimously carried.

Referring to the proposed amendment to Paragraph (b) of Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zone and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Mrs. Townshend explained that the amendment would move the regulations for swimming pools to the supplementary regulations for residence zones. She stated that the proposed amendment aligns the zoning requirements for pools with the building code requirements, which she felt was more logical. As an example, Mrs. Townshend explained that the Residence Zone allows for accessory structures; however, the Supplementary Regulations provide the details of such structures. She noted that the proposed amendment also includes the deletion of a portion of Paragraph (g) - Customary Home Occupations and explained that the referenced section is no longer in existence.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Townshend stated that the building code requires a four (4) foot safety barrier for swimming pools and the zoning ordinance requires a five (5) foot screening for swimming pools. This conflict is causing confusion for those erecting swimming pools and has become problematic during the past few years.

Mrs. Russell felt that the language in the Dover Code is confusing and suggested that staff reword the amendment to provide a better understanding.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend adoption of Proposed Ordinance #2011-21, amending Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zone and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations as it relates to swimming pools, as amended *(Attachment #4).* The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

Amendment to Personnel Policy - Compensatory Time

Mr. Scott Koenig, Interim City Manager, advised members that with the implementation of ADP, it is necessary to create a simplified, City-wide policy for compensatory (comp) time. He stated that during a staff meeting on July 12, 2011, the general consensus was to eliminate the 90-day time limit and implement a maximum accumulation. Members were provided the proposed amendments to Article III - The Pay Plan, Section 9 - Overtime.

Staff recommended approval of revised Section 9 - Overtime in the City of Dover Personnel Policy as presented.

Mr. Anderson questioned why bargaining employees are provided comp time at 1½ times the number of hours worked and non-bargaining (exempt) employees accumulate comp time at a 1 to 1 rate. Responding, Mr. Koenig stated that the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) determines those employees who are exempt from the provisions of the Act and those who are not. The rates for earning comp time are based on whether an employee is exempt or non-exempt from the FLSA. Only non-bargaining, non-exempt employees receive the 1½ time rate.

In response to Dr. Jones, Mr. Koenig stated that a standard work week consists of 40 hours; however, special schedules for employees such as police officers and fire and police dispatchers may require more than 40 hours per week. He stated that employees have varying schedules, depending on the department for which they work. He confirmed that there could be employees in the same job classification in different departments who work different schedules. Dr. Jones relayed concern that eliminating the time frame for requiring the use of comp time earned could have a major impact on the budget.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mr. Koenig stated his opinion that a City Manager is a contract employee and not eligible for comp time. With regard to other department heads, he stated his opinion that if the employee works ½ hour late to finish a job or project, this would not qualify for comp time; however, if the department was required to attend an evening meeting, this would qualify for comp time.

Dr. McGlumphy relayed concern with providing comp time for management employees, including department heads.

Disagreeing, Mr. Bonar advised members that he, as a management State employee, is provided comp time; however, he is required to take the time within a certain time period and may not carry forward any more than a certain number of hours (26 hours). He suggested that City employees be required to take the time within a certain time period (perhaps during the next pay cycle) and not be permitted to "bank" the time.

Responding to concerns relayed by Mr. Bonar, Mr. Koenig stated that such requirements would create difficulties in several departments, such as the Police Department and City Clerk's Office. Such requirements would drastically change the way comp time is currently accounted for and would probably create operational concerns for several departments.

In regard to the concerns of Mr. Hare regarding "management" employees, Mr. Koenig stated that the distinction is between exempt and non-exempt employees, explaining that some management, non-bargaining employees are exempt and others non-exempt. Mr. Hare stated his opinion that comp time should be eliminated completely and that employees should be provided overtime pay. He stated he felt that department heads should manage their departments and be responsible for their budgets. Mr. Hare indicated he had never heard of upper management being provided comp time and that these employees have always been able to adjust their workday based on employee and personal needs.

Responding to concerns of Mrs. Russell, Mr. Koenig indicated that the proposal would provide for accumulation of a maximum of 80 hours for comp time, thus limiting the City's exposure to 80 hours. He noted that for exempt employees, the procedure specifies that any accumulated comp time shall be forfeited upon employment ending. Mrs. Russell stated her concern that there are different rules for different employees, feeling that all employees should be treated equally in this regard.

In response to Dr. McGlumphy, Mr. Koenig confirmed that the proposed amendments would allow for the City to begin utilizing the ADP system and that adjustments could be made subsequently.

Mr. Hare moved to recommend eliminating comp time, paying overtime, and making department heads more accountable for their budgets, thus eliminating the need for ADP to track comp time. The motion failed due to the lack of a second.

Dr. McGlumphy felt that it would benefit the City to have the comp time module of the ADP system implemented and then, once up and running, have staff conduct a cost/benefit analysis to determine whether or not comp time should be provided or if it should be transferred to overtime. He reminded members that many of the employee benefits provided by the City are based on salary and overtime.

Noting that the Committee previously recommended the formation of a Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee, Mr. Hutchison suggested that this matter be referred to that Committee for their review and recommendation.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend that the proposed policy revision to Section 9 regarding overtime be referred to the new Salary and Benefits Compensation Comparison Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hare.

Responding to Mr. Shevock, Mrs. Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, indicated that although staff can move forward with the ADP System, they would not include information for the comp time module at this time. She noted the purpose of utilizing ADP for comp time is to eliminate manual tracking. Mrs. Mitchell explained that ADP has a schedule and must show an employee as either sick, on vacation, working, or on comp time. Since there would be no comp time in the ADP system, she stated that it will be necessary to show the employee as working when they are utilizing comp time. Mrs. Mitchell estimated that the City should be utilizing the time and attendance module by the end of August and stated that Human Resources (HR) and Payroll modules of the ADP system have been in place since January.

In response to Dr. Jones, Mrs. Hawkins, Human Resources Director, indicated that the last comprehensive review of the Employee Handbook was conducted in 2004 after a 20-year lag. She stated that such a review has been one of her goals and that it is approximately 60% complete. Responding to Mrs. Russell, Mrs. Hawkins indicated that once a comprehensive review is completed by staff, it will be forwarded to the Committee for review. She noted that the review conducted by the Committee in 2004 was quite extensive.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend tabling the matter, with the intent that members be provided an opportunity to discuss this issue further over the next two (2) weeks and resolve difficulties, with the intent of possible implementation prior to the end of the August 2011. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and unanimously carried.

Dr. McGlumphy stated that the delay in the comp time module should not affect staff's ability to move forward with the implementation of the time and attendance module of the ADP system.

Review of Grant Application - FY08 Mobile Field Force Development Grant Program (DEMA BearCat)

Members reviewed a Grant Application Analysis Form for the Delaware Emergency Management Agency (DEMA) - FY08 Mobile Field Force Development Grant Program. Police Chief James Hosfelt advised members that this grant would allow for the purchase of one Lenco BearCat Armored Vehicle. He explained that this is a vehicle asset that would be purchased by the Delaware Emergency Management Agency (DEMA) for the Dover Police Department using funds received from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Chief Hoselt stated that the funds for this purchase were reallocated from reverted funds previously awarded to the Delaware State Police and that DEMA would complete all purchase actions for the vehicle awarded through this grant, in the amount of $235,089, and that the vehicle would be provided to the Dover Police Department for use.

Chief Hosfelt indicated that the vehicle to be supplied is a Lenco BearCat Armored 4WD vehicle which is a specialized vehicle that runs on a V10 gasoline powered engine using regular unleaded fuel. It is capable of detecting radiation and explosive gases as well as providing protection for passengers from live fire rounds.

Staff recommended approval of the project and to allow for the purchase of one Lenco BearCat Armored Vehicle by DEMA.

Mr. Hare moved to recommend approval of staff's recommendation to allow for the purchase of one (1) Lenco BearCat armored vehicle by the Delaware Emergency Management Agency (DEMA) for the use of the Dover Police Department, seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

Discussion - Review of Other City of Dover Insurances

Mr. Hare suggested that the City issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to review the other City of Dover insurances (commercial, property, auto, etc.). Responding, Mrs. Kim Hawkins, Human Resources Director, stated that the commercial and power plant policies are bid each year by a broker and assured members that the broker is active in this regard.

Mr. Hare felt that all insurances should be bid at a minimum of every two (2) years and that different brokers should be utilized.

Mr. Hare moved to recommend that the City issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for all City insurances, seconded by Dr. Jones and unanimously carried.

Discussion - Health Insurance RFP Questions

Mr. Hare questioned if the date for the Request for Proposals (RFP) will be extended for prospective bidders who sent information to the City, because they have not received information back yet. Responding, Mrs. Hawkins, Human Resources Director, stated that, as she has personally relayed to four (4) respondents who are intending to bid, August 12, 2011, was the deadline for questions. She explained that the questions will be gathered and submitted to the State of Delaware in one (1) timely submission rather than piecemeal through the RFP process. Mrs. Hawkins indicated that, once submitted to the State, the State will provide an estimated turnaround time, since some of the data will be provided by the carriers (Blue Cross and Aetna). The date for the RFP was published as August 31, 2011, and Mrs. Hawkins advised bidders that this date may be extended based on the turnaround time provided by the State. She assured members that the bidders will be provided ample time and that all those who have requested information as of the August 12, 2011 will be included in the extension.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Bob Hartman, 35 Lotus Street, stated his support for Mr. Koenig's discussion regarding compensatory time, explaining his feeling that such a policy would provide the City an opportunity to save money.

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

Meeting Adjourned at 7:08 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

William P. McGlumphy
Chairman

WPM/DD/jg/js/ac/tm
S:\AGENDAS & MINUTES\Committee-Minutes\2011\08-08-2011 LFA.wpd

Attachments

Attachment #1 - Permission to Recruit Form
Attachment #2 - Hiring Justification Outline
Attachment #3 - Wage and Benefit Information Form for Employee Hiring and Transfers
Attachment #4 - Proposed Ordinance #2011-21 Amending Article 3 - District Regulations, Section 1 - One Family Residence Zone and Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations as it Relates to Swimming Pools

Permission to Recruit

To: City Manager Date:_____

From:_____

Permission to recruit:_____(number)

Type of Position: PF PP TF TP (circle one)

Title of Position:_____

Start employment on:_____

Opening is due to:

Termination, Transfer, Promotion, Other_____
(circle one) (explain)

_____
(Name of previous employee)

Type of recruitment desired:

All out-of-house job postings will be advertised/announced in the Delaware State News, Dover Post, News Journal and the Air Lifter, Dover website, DoverTV, and other general recruitment sites.

Please indicate additional websites or professional organizations:

_____
_____
_____

_____
Department Head

☐ APPROVED ☐ DENIED

_____
City Manager

P: Human Resources/Recruitment/Permission to Recruit

Hiring Justification Outline

1. Explain the principal function of this job.

2. Explain why this position is critical and cannot go unfilled or postponed.

3. How would City services diminish if this position were not filled or postponed at this time?

4. Are there other employees whose ability to perform would be diminished by not filling or postponing this position?

5. Is there a person that can be promoted into this position and whose position is less critical at this time and can go unfilled permanently or temporarily?

6. Can one or more existing employees absorb the duties of this position?

7. Could a temporary person be hired to fill this position for 60 days?

8. Grade/Salary Information

Attachment #3
LF&A Committee Meeting of 08/08/2011

City of Dover
Wage and Benefit Information for Employee Hiring and Transfers

Department/Division Originating Request _____

Date _____

(Form has been developed to handle multiple departments/multiple funds to cover allocated departments and funding sources)

Current Positions	Current Grade/Step	Separation Date *	Wages Budgeted	Benefits Budgeted	Annual Wages & Benefits	% Year Wages Paid	# Mos. Benefits Paid	To Date Wages Paid	To Date Benefits Paid	Lump Sum Wages & Benefits Paid	Paid To Date (I, J, K)	Current Fiscal Year Balance	Remarks
Position(s)													
Dispatcher	18/13	7/20/11	48,826.57	13,393.43	62,220.00	5.2%	1	2,534.71	1,116.12	327.74	3,978.57	58,241.43	
Dispatcher	18/13	7/7/11	48,826.57	14,024.65	62,851.22	1.6%	1	800.44	1,168.72	4,073.34	6,042.50	56,808.72	
Custodian	10/13	1/31/12	34,800.00	14,100.00	48,900.00	58.5%	7	20,347.54	8,225.00	-	28,572.54	20,327.46	
H/R Coordinator	121	7/24/11	54,754.00	18,252.00	73,006.00	6.3%	1	3,440.83	1,521.00	1,176.12	6,137.95	66,868.05	
Totals					**$246,977.22**						**44,731.55**	**$202,245.67**	

Replacement/ Transfer Position	Proposed Grade/Step	Projected Hire Date	Estimated Wages	Estimated Benefits	Estimated Total Compensation	% Year Wages Needed	# Mos. Benefits Needed	Wages	Benefits	Estimated Amount Needed	Remarks
Position(s)											
Dispatcher	18/1	9/1/11	33,136.56	11,933.93	45,070.49	82.8%	10	27,432.73	9,944.94	37,377.67	
Dispatcher	18/1	9/1/11	33,136.56	20,836.73	53,973.29	82.8%	10	27,432.73	17,363.94	44,796.67	
Custodian	10/1	1/1/12	33,136.56	23,121.00	56,257.56	49.5%	6	16,387.21	11,560.50	27,947.71	
H/R Coordinator	121/Entry	10/1/11	43,973.28	24,070.53	68,043.81	74.6%	9	32,799.74	18,052.90	50,852.64	
Totals					**$223,345.15**					**$160,974.68**	
Balance					**$23,632.07**					**$41,270.98**	

Department Summary	Increase/ (Decrease)
Police - Civilian	($32,875.81)
Central Services - Facilities	7,620.25
Human Resources	(16,015.42)
Total	($41,270.98)

Funding Source: (See below Fund Budget)	
General Fund	($44,342.72)
Water/Wastewater Fund	(808.91)
Electric Fund	3,880.65
Grant Fund	0.00
Total	($41,270.98)

Description of funding source	General Ledger Account
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A
Describe	Account
N/A	N/A

Fund Budget - Increase/(Decrease)

Fund	Increase/ (Decrease)	Department/Division Police/Civilian Allocation %	Department/Division Police/Civilian Increase/ (Decrease)	Department/Division Central Services/Facilities Allocation %	Department/Division Central Services/Facilities Increase/ (Decrease)	Department/Division Human Resources Allocation %	Department/Division Human Resources Increase/ (Decrease)
General Fund	($44,342.72)	100.0%	($32,875.81)	10.3%	784.89	76.5%	(12,251.79)
Water/Wastewater Fund	(808.91)	0.0%	$0.00	8.3%	632.48	9.0%	(1,441.39)
Electric Fund	3,880.65	0.0%	$0.00	81.4%	6,202.88	14.5%	(2,322.24)
Grant Fund	0.00	0.0%	$0.00	0.0%	-	0.0%	-
Total	($41,270.98)	Total	($32,875.81)	Total	$7,620.25	Total	($16,015.42)

Allocated Department percentages can be found in Budget Document, obtained from Finance or the City Manager's Office

City of Dover

Wage and Benefit Information for Employee Hiring and Transfers

This form is to be completed when requesting to fill vacant positions or to transfer staff between divisions or operating funds. The purpose of which is to determine how changes in personnel will affect the budget for each operating fund. If the changes increase operating expenses then the funding source to cover the increase is to be included.

Directions for Completing Wage and Benefit Information for Employee Hiring and Transfers

Column	Description	Instructions
A	Position Title	Current Position Section - Title of position vacated; Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Title of replacement position, or title change if applicable of employee transferred.
B	Current Grade/Step	Current Position Section - Current grade and step (if applicable) of current position; Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Proposed grade and step;
C	Separation Date	Current Position - Last day paid. If employee elects to take terminal leave, then separation date must be date terminal leave ends. Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Proposed hire date of this position.
D	Wages Budgeted	Current Position Section - Annual wages budgeted for the current employee in this position. If unknown, contact City Manager's Office or Finance Office; Replacement/Transfer Position - Proposed hourly rate times 2080 hours. FY12 has 366 days so use 2088 hours.
E	Benefits Budgeted	Current Position Section - Annual wages budgeted for the current employee in this position. If unknown, contact City Manager's Office or Finance Office. Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Calculate by multiplying wages time benefit rates. If this is a new position use the highest benefit rate to insure budgetary funding. See below for benefit rates. If this is an existing employee then use actual benefits;
F	Annual Wages & Benefits	Current Position Section - Column D plus Column E; Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Column D plus Column E;
G	% Year Wages Paid	Current Position Section - Number of days paid for in current fiscal year; Formula set up to automatically calculate based on 366 calendar days in FY12; Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Number of days from estimated date of hire through the end of the fiscal year.
H	# Mos. Benefits Paid	Current Position Section - Number of months benefits have been paid out for the current fiscal year; Replacement/Transfer Position Section - Number of months estimated benefits to be budgeted for in the current fiscal year;
I	To Date Wages Paid	Both Sections - Column D times Column G; If actual amounts are available for current employees use actual amounts rather than calculation;
J	To Date Benefits Paid	Both Sections - Column E divided by 12 (months) times Column H; Column H is number of months paid to date for current employees and number of months from projected date of hire through June 30 for replacement employees.
K	Lump Sum Wages & Benefits Paid	If paid, contact Finance for amount; If not paid estimate - Hourly rate X hours to be paid plus benefits; Benefit rate = Sum of percentages for FICA, Worker's Comp and Pension times wages to be paid out; (I.e. $18.00 hourly rate x 760 hours = $13,680 Wages x 13.65% (employee with 401a plan) $1,867; $13,680 plus $1,867 = $15,547 estimated lump sum wages and benefits); FY12 - no Worker's Compensation
L	Paid to Date	Current Position Section - Sum of Columns I, J, & K as calculated above
M	Current Fiscal Year Balance	Current Position Section - Current estimated balance of funds in departmental budget for this position to apply towards new hire or transfer; Replacement/Transfer Position - Amount needed to fund replacement or transferred position. Sum of Column I & Column J.
N	Remarks	Any comments you would like to add
Bottom Section	Department & Fund Summaries	Formula based calculations of financial impact on individual departments and funds. Describes funding sources for budget increases.

CITY OF DOVER
DRAFT ORDINANCE #2011-21

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DOVER, IN COUNCIL MET:

That Appendix B - Zoning, Article 3 – District Regulations, Section 1 – One Family Residence Zones, Subsection 1.15 – Accessory Uses, be amended by deleting text shown in red bold strike-through and inserting text shown in blue bold italics, as follows:

1.15 Accessory uses, limited to the following:

(a) Professional office or studio of an artist, dentist, musician, teacher, or physician, but not including veterinarians, provided that:
   i. Such office or studio is incidental to the residential use of the premises and is carried on by a resident thereon with not more than one nonresident assistant; and
   ii. Such office or studio shall occupy not more than 30 percent of the area of one floor of the main building.
   iii. Studios where dancing or music instruction is offered to groups in excess of four pupils at one time or where concerts or recitals are held are prohibited.
   iv. Medical centers, barbershops, beauty parlors, real estate offices, funeral homes or similar uses shall not be considered permitted accessory uses.

(b) Garden house, tool house, playhouse, greenhouse or pool incidental to the residential use of the premises and not operated for gain~~**, provided that pools of 30 inches deep shall be subject to the following requirements:**~~
   ~~**i. The edge of the pool shall be kept a distance of not less than ten feet from all property lines.**~~
   ~~**ii. If located within 50 feet of any property line, such pool shall be screened from the view of abutting properties. Such screen shall be at least five feet high.**~~
   ~~**iii. Such pool shall be completely surrounded by a fence or wall not less than 3½ feet in height and so constructed as not to have openings larger than four inches in at least one dimension. All gates or doors opening through such enclosure shall be equipped with a self-closing and self-latching device for keeping the gate or door securely closed at all times when not in actual use.**~~
   iv. ~~**Swimming pools shall be permitted to be established in the side and rear yard, but shall be prohibited from placement within the required front yard**~~.

(c) Private garage, provided that, in the case of a one-family dwelling, such garage shall have a capacity of not more than three passenger automobiles. One such space may be leased to a person not [a] resident on the premises.

(d) Keeping domestic animals (except pigs) for individual domestic purposes or as pets, provided not more than three dogs over six months old and not more than 25 fowl shall

DRAFT

be permitted, and no animals (except dogs) or fowl shall be penned or housed within 20 feet of any lot line.

(e) (Reserved.)

(f) Dormitories accessory to schools, provided that such dormitories conform to the bulk regulations of the RG-1 zone. For purposes of computing bulk requirements, each four rooms shall be considered one dwelling unit. Parking shall be calculated as identified in Article 6—Off-Street Parking, Section 3—Required off-street parking spaces, Paragraph 3.1—Schedule of requirements.

(g) Customary home occupations, provided that:

i. No display of products, goods and/or signs shall be visible from the street~~, except as set forth in item [subsection] (e) of this subsection [1.15]~~.

ii. Such home occupation shall be incidental and secondary to the residential use of the premises and shall be conducted in the principal building by the resident or residents that reside therein.

iii. Nonresident assistants or co-workers shall be prohibited.

iv. Such home occupation shall not occupy more than 30 percent of the area of one floor in the principal building.

v. There shall be no exterior effect such as noise, traffic, odor, dust, smoke, gas, fumes, radiation, or electromagnetic interference.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED:

That Appendix B – Zoning, Article 5 – Supplementary Regulations, Section 1 – Supplementary Regulations Applying to Residence Zones be amended by adding a new subsection 1.11 Swimming Pools, as follows:

1.11 Swimming Pools

1.111 Definition – For the purposes of this section, swimming pools shall be defined as any pool, tank, depression, or excavation in or above ground, or other structure which shall cause retaining of water over a greater depth than twenty-four (24) inches.

1.112 Safety - All swimming pools as defined in this section must conform to the requirements of Dover Code, Chapter 22 – Buildings and Building Regulations.

1.113 Placement - Swimming pools shall be permitted to be established in the side and rear yard, but shall be prohibited from placement between the principal structure and the street.

1.114 Setback – The edge of the swimming pool, specifically referring to the edge of the water containment portion of the pool shall be no less than fifteen (15) feet away from all property lines. All associated structures, buildings, and pavement related to the swimming pool shall be no less than five (5) feet away from all property lines.

DRAFT

SYNOPSIS

The proposed ordinance would move the regulations for swimming pools into the supplementary regulations for residence zones and more closely align the requirements with the requirements of the building code.

ADOPTED: *

Actions History:
August 22, 2011 – Proposed First Reading
August 8, 2011 - Considered by Legislative, Finance and Administration Committee

DRAFT