REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular City Council Meeting was held on June 08, 2026, at 7:18 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Council members present were Ms. Hall, Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Pillsbury (via Webex), Ms. Arndt, Mr. Rocha, Dr. Sudler, and Mr. Lewis.

Staff members present were Police Chief Kuntzi, Ms. Marney, Ms. Duca, Ms. Melson-Williams, Fire Chief Carey, Mr. Griffith, and Ms. Bennett. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

OPEN FORUM

The Open Forum was held at 6:15 p.m., prior to the commencement of the Official Council Meeting. Council President Neil declared the Open Forum in session and reminded those present that Council was not in official session and could not take formal action.

Jeannie Anderson, 217 Cecil Street, spoke regarding the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance and stated that 158 individuals were in favor of passing the ordinance and 51 individuals were opposed. She also mentioned that there was a Change.org petition with an estimated number of verified signatures of 618 individuals. She emphasized that individuals could not keep walking in front of vehicles and banging on windows since it was dangerous, and stated that they needed to keep the citizens safe.

Kim Petters, a Magnolia resident, expressed concerns about a homeless shelter that was close to her daughters' dance on South Governor's Avenue. She expressed frustration that she had to take her daughters out of dance because a homeless shelter had been set up, and after a few weeks, there was open prostitution, drug use, and defecating in the parking lot where she had to walk by to her daughters' dance studio. She stated that the situation was unsafe because someone could be armed, could feel threatened, and no one should lose their life over asking for a few dollars. She further stated that while a solution needed to be found that worked for everyone, including support for homeless and low-income individuals, there were also concerns about business owners, investors, and homeowners, particularly the decline in property values.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, stated that public safety has always been a concern, but until the Attorney General started prosecuting, the Police Department's hands were tied. He emphasized that he supported the police officers 100%. He stated that the way the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance was written was going to prove safety anywhere unless council addressed the homeless, mental health issues, drug issues, and the gun violence, because no ordinance was going to "band aid" fix everything. He emphasized that the budget was only keeping the lights on and paying the staff, and stated that there were no extra police officers on the street. He further stated that if they were going to push through the ordinance, they needed to show the public the emails and let them review the signatures on the petition for and against.

Gina Bloom, a Dover resident, expressed concerns over individuals who were not being held accountable in the community but were allowed to walk and defecate on the city's sidewalks and take away the citizens' ability to enjoy the city.

Sherry Kemp, a Magnolia resident, expressed concerns over homeless individuals in her parents' home while she was trying to put the house on the market. She emphasized that those individuals were damaging the property and noted that they had burnt the garage down.

Belinda Main, 142 Reese Street, stated that she was in opposition to the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance. She noted that the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance was not going to work, and mentioned that they needed to take the trouble and do something with it.

Michelle Walls, a Dover resident, expressed concerns about experiencing ongoing crime and safety concerns. She asked council for immediate commitment, providing the community with exact details of how the promised summer enforcement would address the illegal drugs and prosecution on her block. She emphasized that the department needed to be held accountable to a real strategy so they could see what the plan meant for their safety in her neighborhood.

Carol and Michael Potanovich, Dover residents, asked that as homeless individuals, why they should be stopped for asking for help when they have nothing for themselves. He stated that they were trying to make an honest living and getting by the best they could.

Jessica Potanovich, a Dover resident, stated that she was a homeless individual, studying nursing, and chose not to work because the social security she received was too high and she did not want to lose that money. She emphasized that individuals needed to stop judging others by their appearance before they get to know someone.

Ronald Eads, Jr., a Dover resident, stated that he was a panhandler and that he received disability. He noted that when he does work, he works under the table, so he does not lose his disability checks. He mentioned that he was just trying to make it from one (1) day to the next, and sometimes he cannot even do that. He stated that individuals have mentioned to him about going to shelters, but his wife has to be 13 miles away from him, and that does not work for him. He added that when they have extra food to give back, they take it to Hopes and Dreams or to the red cabinet, so they were trying to give back to the community, but the community does not help them.

Ronald Eads, Sr., a Dover resident, shared his personal story with members of council and talked about his son, Ronald Eads, Jr., being a panhandler.

Chelle Paul, 501 Silverside Drive, stated that the same neighborhood concerns have been discussed repeatedly since 2021. She noted that she sent out in an email, there were laws already on the books, and that there was an ordinance set in place that Chief Johnson gave instructions to every single individual that if they had an issue and someone was breaking the law, they needed to call the police. She emphasized that they do not make unlawful laws to enforce the law and stated that the ordinance was derived from the framework of a law that could not be enforced. She mentioned that anybody who would vote for the ordinance that knew the framework that was built on an unlawful law, they would be putting the city into a bigger deficit, because it would end up in a lawsuit. She noted that there were already laws on the books to enforce the laws for aggressive panhandling.

Cleveland Wilson, 234 North Kirkwood Street, expressed frustration that there were other facilities that could have been used for the meeting since the city enforced the Fire Marshal's occupancy requirements. He mentioned that the city was aware that Mr. Anders was planning a rally before the Regular Council Meeting, yet no other arrangements were made, and as a result, citizens were left outside and denied the opportunity to be heard and participate in the proceedings.

Reagan Coder, a Dover resident, expressed concerns that residents should not feel afraid to drive or walk in their own community due to fear of crime or victimization. He also expressed concerns about the budget deficit and the impact of raising taxes to address it.

Stephan Pierce, 437 Barrister Place, emphasized the importance of showing care and concern for the community through meaningful action.

Reginald Daniels, a Townsend resident, expressed concerns about the recurring homelessness causing problems. He stated that he has been to the meetings several times to discuss addressing their long-term institutional shortcomings in addressing homelessness, affordability, drug use, and community economic development. He noted that it seemed that the change was not being made. He further stated that they needed to address what was happening currently and that they still do not have open wound treatment centers and places for individuals to detox. He asked what they could do to address long-term community development and not deal with individual street by street. He further added that they were having the same conversation because they were not building the infrastructure, and that they were just tearing at each other's throats.

David Lewis, a Dover resident, stated that his concerns were not with panhandling but with public safety issues. He described instances such as fights in the street or individuals impaired by drugs obstructing traffic. He also mentioned the raises in taxes, utilities, and the public safety fee.

Tish, a Dover resident, expressed concerns about the violence at Irish Mike's and described an incident that happened to her at the establishment.

Via Webex, Shyanne Miller, a Wilmington resident, stated that she was in opposition to the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance. She further stated that it would be a waste of time, energy, and money to pass the bill that would not only result in a lawsuit, but would also result in individuals who could not pay bills having fines. She urged council to reject the legislation and start to work on long-term plans for homelessness, and to increase the number of shelter beds that existed in and around the city limits.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Elder Ellis B. Louden.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilwoman Hall.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Boggerty moved for adoption of the agenda as written, seconded by Mr. Lewis, and

unanimously carried.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

All Consent Agenda items are considered routine and non-controversial and will be acted upon by a single roll call vote of the Council. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of Council requests, in which event the matter shall be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered a separate item.

Mr. Anderson requested that Item #18, Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report, be removed from the consent agenda.

Dr. Sudler requested that Item #20, Police Chief's Report, be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to remove Item #18, Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report, from the consent agenda, seconded by Mr. Rocha.

Dr. Sudler made a motion to remove Item #20, Police Chief's Report, from the consent agenda, seconded by Mr. Rocha.

Mr. Anderson moved for adoption of the consent agenda as amended, seconded by Mr. Boggerty, and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

PROCLAMATION – NATIONAL GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH 2026

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, every person deserves to live in a safe community, free from the threat of gun violence; and

WHEREAS, gun violence continues to impact individuals, families, schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods across the United States, leaving lasting emotional, physical, and economic effects on communities; and

WHEREAS, communities throughout the nation recognize the importance of raising awareness about gun violence prevention, supporting victims and survivors, and encouraging meaningful dialogue and action to reduce violence; and

WHEREAS, National Gun Violence Awareness Month is observed each June to honor the lives lost to gun violence, support survivors, and promote efforts that foster safer communities through education, advocacy, responsible practices, and community engagement; and

WHEREAS, individuals, organizations, educators, first responders, healthcare professionals, faith leaders, and public officials all play an important role in working together to promote peace, safety, and respect for human life; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover joins communities nationwide in recognizing the importance of awareness, prevention, and unity in addressing gun violence and supporting those affected by it;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robin Christiansen, Mayor of the City of Dover, Delaware, do hereby proclaim June 2026 as **National Gun Violence Awareness Month** in the City of Dover, and encourage all residents to honor the memories of victims, support survivors and their families, and work together to help build a safer and more peaceful community for all.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the proclamation to Kaligah Parker and Cammerin Norwood.

Cammerin Norwood, Founder and Executive Director of Our R.O.O.T.S. Foundation (Reclaiming Our Own Through Support), expressed gratitude toward Mayor Christiansen, City of Dover, and all the leadership for being a part of and acknowledging June's Gun Violence Awareness Month. Kaligah Parker, Founder and Executive Director of The Carry Their Light Project, thanked everyone and the community for their continued support of community-based organizations.

PRESENTATION – PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 2026-08 – CITY OF DOVER SILVER MEDAL – ROBERT MOXLEY

The City Clerk read the following Resolution into the record:

WHEREAS, on Wednesday, February 18, 2026, officers responded to 2 Stoney Drive, Dover, Delaware, in reference to a domestic incident where one of the individuals had displayed and discharged a firearm. Eventually, on-scene Special Operations Response Team leadership determined that electrical power to the involved residence needed to be disconnected to safely manage the situation and protect responding officers, emergency personnel, and surrounding residents; and

WHEREAS, following a request from the Dover Police Department to the Electrical Department, Robert "Connor" Moxley voluntarily agreed to approach a residence knowing that an armed individual was inside and that the situation presented a significant risk to his personal safety. While in the process of disconnecting electrical service, the individual inside the residence discharged a firearm, firing a round through the wall in the immediate vicinity of Connor's position. Despite the imminent danger, Connor remained calm, composed, and focused, successfully completing the electrical disconnect necessary to support ongoing police operations. Following the safe resolution of the incident, Robert "Connor" Moxley once again demonstrated exceptional professionalism, courage, and dedication by returning to the residence to restore electrical service; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council recognized that the selfless action of Mr. Robert "Connor" Moxley, without concern for his own personal safety, deserves special recognition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and Council award Mr. Robert "Connor" Moxley the City of Dover Silver Medal in recognition of his self-sacrificing actions and direct the City Clerk to make this resolution a part of the permanent records of the City of Dover.

ADOPTED: JUNE 08, 2026

By motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Rocha, Resolution No. 2026-08 was adopted by unanimous consent.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen and Mr. Paul Waddell presented the resolution to Mr. Robert Connor Moxley.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Mr. Moxley stated that he has been working for the city for seven (7) months.

Mr. Moxley expressed appreciation and thanked everyone for everything, especially the police officers.

PUBLIC HEARING – ELECTRIC REVENUE FUND BUDGET

A public hearing on the Electric Fund Budget is required for compliance with the City of Dover Electric Revenue Bonds Resolutions prior to the adoption of the budget. Notice of the public hearing was properly advertised for this time and place.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Neil stated for the record that Ms. Duca was no longer Acting City Manager; she was now considered the City Manager.

Mr. Paul Waddell, Electric Director, briefed members on the Electric Revenue Fund Budget.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that they have purchased equipment and supplies overseas.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that if the price was right, but their percentage of products that have been purchased overseas, specifically transformers, increased a lot more based on availability and price. He noted that the transformers were more expensive and the lead times were longer with stateside.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that if five (5) transformers were to fail, they would be able to replace those transformers. He noted that the supply chain issues they had experienced during and after the COVID-19 pandemic had been resolved, but the economic costs have remained elevated compared to pre-pandemic levels.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that in the instances that they purchased large transformers, they would receive better pricing overseas. He added that the overseas purchase had an earlier delivery time, which was around four (4) to five (5) months earlier, then they were allowed a new customer to be up and running and have an additional four (4) to five (5) months of additional revenue.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that there were no incentives for power purchases. He explained that The Energy Authority (TEA) worked to secure long-term contracts whenever possible, but the city was subjected to the pricing set by the energy generators. He noted that the market dictated the energy prices, and that was the price that the market was going to sell the power at. He added that The Energy Authority (TEA) had been successful in obtaining proposals below the budgeted rate per megawatt-hour, allowing them to purchase power for less than the amount authorized.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell clarified that the city was locked into what the market dictated for energy prices.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that the power plant at Garrison Oak could not be utilized because it was not the city's facility.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that the facility was a for-profit industry, whereas the city was not. As a result, he noted that the plant's power was put into the market prices, which was going to have its profit line built into it. He explained that the city could receive power more cheaply from somewhere else, if that place could beat the price, and if the power was available for the city to purchase from them.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that the city could pursue negotiations with Garrison Energy Center as an option to address its energy needs.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that, in the past, the city had agreements with power suppliers; however, when the city entered into a power purchase agreement with a company such as Calpine, that company could fulfill its obligation using generation from another facility, potentially located in a different state. He explained that power was being pumped into the regional system to meet a certain level, and the city was not getting it directly from those individuals from whom they purchase the power. He noted that it could be a thousand miles away, and the power was pumping into the system, and the city was using it. He added that it was how PJM Interconnection balanced supply and demand across the market on a minute-by-minute basis.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Waddell stated that all the utilities, especially public power utilities, were very concerned about data centers due to the amount of loads they consume. He explained that the electricity they generate could vary depending on the size and location of a data center. Referring to Northern Virginia as "Data Center Alley," he noted that the area contained gigawatts of electrical load from data center operations. He stated that if a data center were to come to the local area, his power purchase budget would have to increase accordingly to fill that demand. He further stated that he only had a certain amount of capacity, since their system was limited, before major improvements had to be put into their system, and the dynamic between the utility and the data center would be responsible for funding the necessary improvements. He noted that the costs would not fall solely on the ratepayer.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Waddell stated that solar could help to an extent. He explained that a smaller solar project, such as a three (3) to four (4) megawatt field, would have an impact on customers, but it would not have an impact on the effect of a 50 megawatt or a 100 megawatt solar field that they would have. He noted that their peak load that they experience was generally around 158 to 160 megawatts, which typically occurred during the most demanding hour of the year, often in the summer and the month of July. He further noted that in some places, the peak demand patterns were changing, with some regions now experiencing winter peaks, which was uncommon. He explained that instead of seeing a high peak during the summer followed by a lower usage, the system was beginning to see a more constant flat demand curve throughout the year.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Waddell stated that, as an associate member with Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation (DEMEC), the city does not have full power purchase member status.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Waddell stated that the full power purchase status would need to be looked at. He believed that it had been done in the past before he took over to have DEMEC take over the role of The Energy Authority (TEA), but they were still with The Energy Authority (TEA). He noted that it was not viewed as beneficial at that point, but he could not speak on that in detail.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Waddell stated that he did not have the figures available with him regarding the number of residents who have taken advantage of the Energy Smart program. He noted that DEMEC had recently sent him a slide last week for the month, and he would share that with council.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Mr. Waddell clarified that Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation (DEMEC) offered an efficient smart service.

Mayor Christiansen stated that Dr. Harold Stafford had brought two (2) programs to council about weatherization and an energy audit program, including Lights On Dover Strong. He noted that there were programs out there to help residents to check on the efficiency and the air tightness of the home. He recommended to Mr. Neil that they need to advertise more about those programs. He explained that they were able to rejoin Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation (DEMEC) after a previous city manager had pulled them out of the organization, and one (1) of the smartest things that the city had done was to go back with Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation (DEMEC). That was because of the accessibility to the information that the city needed and the mutual aid that was quickly available to the residents from other Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation (DEMEC) municipal utilities. If the city has a disaster, it would have expertise and services available to it.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell stated that he used an average residential usage of approximately 850 kilowatt-hours (kWh), which was based on last year's usage. The increase would be calculated by multiplying $0.01 per kWh by that usage. He noted that $0.01 times 850 equaled $8.50.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Waddell clarified that the calculation was $8.50 and that would be the average. He explained that some customers use 2,000 kWh a month and others use kWh a month, but it fell in between. He noted that whatever the customer's average consumption was for the month, multiply that by $0.01, and that would be the increase.

Council President Neil declared the Public Hearing opened at 8:08 p.m.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, spoke against the Electric Revenue Fund Budget. He emphasized that he was against the $0.01 increase. He stated that the elderly, who were most vulnerable, could not take a $0.01 increase. He further stated that council needed to find a way of getting revenue into the city, because they were not bringing enough revenue in. He emphasized that he supported the city workers and the police department 100%.

Bonnie Pennington, a Dover resident, spoke against the Electric Revenue Fund Budget. She expressed concerns about residents having to choose to pay their electric bill or buy food. She stated that there were several residents who could not afford the increase to their electric bill.

Belinda Main, 142 Reese Street, spoke against the Electric Revenue Fund Budget. She asked where the money was going that was being spent by the city. She stated that residents could not afford high electric bills or other bills, and at times could not even afford the groceries they needed. She further stated that they all needed to take accountability for things that other individuals did not take accountability for. She emphasized that they needed to find other ways to bring revenue to the city.

Stephan Pierce, 437 Barrister Place, spoke against the Electric Revenue Fund Budget. He expressed concerns for his mother's financial struggles, particularly regarding being able to afford her electricity, food, and child care. He stated that council needed to show that they cared for their constituents and help them have access to better-paying opportunities and programs; he believed that the community would improve its trust.

Council President Neil declared the Public Hearing closed at 8:19 p.m.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF MAY 11, 2026

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of May 11, 2026, were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Boggerty, and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT – MAY 12, 2026

The Council Committee of the Whole met on May 12, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Members of Council present were Mr. Anderson, Ms. Arndt, Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Hall (arrived at 6:03 p.m.), Mr. Lewis (arrived at 6:03 p.m.), Dr. Pillsbury, Mr. Rocha, and Dr. Sudler. Mayor Christiansen was absent. Civilian members present for their Committee meetings were Dr. Iriowen (via WebEx), (*Utility),* Mr. Garfinkel, and Mr. Shevock *(Legislative, Finance, and Administration).* Mr. Wilson *(Utility)* was absent.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Arndt moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury, and unanimously carried.

<u>State Joint Resolution 8 – Land Use Reform – Overview and Schedule (Jason Lyon, Water/Wastewater Director, and Ann Marie Townsend, ACIP, Senior Project Manager, Rossi Group)</u>

Mr. Jason Lyon, Water/Wastewater Director, and Ms. Ann Marie Townsend, Rossi Group, reviewed the presentation regarding the Senate Joint Resolution 8 for the land use reform project.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Mr. Neil stated that affordable housing means different things depending on income level and expressed concern that current housing initiatives do not adequately address the needs of low- and fixed-income residents. He discussed manufactured housing as a potential option because of lower construction costs and long shelf life, but noted that rising land and lot rental costs continue to create affordability challenges. Mr. Neil further stated that private equity ownership and rising rents in lease-land communities and apartment complexes prevent tenants from saving money to purchase homes, and argued that the State Legislature has failed to address those issues.

Mr. Neil referenced the need for greater oversight of rental practices, including rent justification measures similar to utility regulation. He stated that property owners should receive a reasonable profit while maintaining affordability for residents. He also discussed concerns regarding profits leaving the State through corporate ownership structures, citing examples from manufactured housing communities and increasing monthly lot rents. Mr. Neil concluded that while expanding manufactured housing opportunities may help address part of the housing shortage, additional action is needed to protect low-income and fixed-income residents from escalating housing costs and preserve long-term affordability.

Dr. Pillsbury recounted receiving two separate phone calls from residents of senior housing whose rents had substantially increased. She recommended asking the state to put a limit on senior housing and how much the rent can be increased because it is becoming unaffordable. Dr. Pillsbury also recommended utilizing row homes. She explained that they make great starter homes, they are affordable, and the utility costs are lower due to the shared walls.

Mr. Boggerty echoed Dr. Pillsbury’s statement, noting that one of the women she mentioned had her rent increase by 25%, equating to $200. He also explained that one individual did complain and take action, and her lease was not granted in retaliation.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Townsend stated that tiny homes would fall in the missing middle category. She noted that the biggest issue is the cost of land. She explained that she and Ms. Melson-Williams were attempting to identify what zoning districts might be appropriate to allow for a cottage community. She noted that it would allow for density in small homes without a lot of overhead. The units could be owner-occupied, like a condo, or they could be rentals.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Townsend stated that the city is working to correct the Planning Department staffing issue and that it typically completes the process faster than other agencies. She explained that to go through the land development process with the City of Dover, the applicant must obtain approval from the Planning Department, Public Works, the Fire Marshal, the Electric Department, the Kent Conservation District, and DelDOT. She noted that they encourage applicants to begin conversations with DelDOT and the Kent Conservation District before submitting to the city, because they often do not have those conversations until after they have submitted, which adds time to the process.

Ms. Townsend stated that the Governor has signed an Executive Order that should have the state departments streamline their reviews.

Responding to Ms. Hall, Ms. Townsend stated that she has not seen any legislation introduced regarding rent stabilization.

Ms. Arndt stated that she was supportive of all the options presented, and she would like to see them all explored. She recommended that during the public engagement, the public should be able to see what the denser housing communities look like. She noted that the city does not have many townhouse communities, and it would be beneficial to have a visual of those, duplexes, triplexes, and accessory dwelling units (ADU).

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Townsend stated that the Housing Resource Committee (HRC) has been discussing the importance of making sure people understand what the communities can look like and that they do not all have one look.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Townsend stated that they have not yet begun discussions about the square footage for the tiny homes. She noted that they are reviewing the code, researching the different types, and will be bringing forward options. She explained that she has seen them as small as 450 square feet, while others start at 800 square feet. However, to be considered an accessory dwelling unit under the code, it requires bathing facilities, cooking facilities, and sleeping quarters.

Dr. Sudler noted that surrounding municipalities list a tiny home as 100 to 400 square feet. However, they also have accessory dwelling units of 400 to 1,000

square feet. He expressed concern with how close the square footage is and if it would create a problem for those who are building a tiny home, and it does not meet the accessory dwelling unit criteria, but is close to the square footage.
Ms. Townsend stated that an accessory dwelling unit can be within the principal structure, it can be over a garage, or a tiny home in a yard.

Council Reports – April 2026

First District
Dr. Pillsbury reported addressing concerns from senior citizens whose rent has been significantly increased. She also noted reporting on participating in the Dover Days Parade.

Mr. Rocha reported participating in the committee for the Governor's Prayer Breakfast, which was held the previous Thursday.

Second District
Ms. Hall reported working collectively with some members of council to organize a Town Hall Open Forum. She noted that it was very informative and that they were able to gather lots of feedback. She stated that there was an online survey, and she is looking forward to publishing the results and pulling together recommended steps for moving forward. She stated that a lot of the concerns centered around code enforcement.

Mr. Lewis reported attending the sixth anniversary ribbon-cutting of Burns and Ellis on April 29, 2026, and the Dover Days Parade and festivities. He noted addressing a constituent complaint on Holmes Street and referred the complaint to Ms. Duca and Mr. Kopp.

Third District
Ms. Arndt reported attending the Dover Days festivities, which had amazing fireworks. She also reported having several conversations with constituents regarding Silver Lake Park and what they would like to see as far as future park amenities. Lastly, she reported having conversations regarding some employee issues as an employee liaison for council.

Fourth District
Dr. Sudler reported working on budget concerns to potentially decrease the probability of a utility user fee increase. He also conducted a Mayor's Blue Ribbon OUD Task Force Committee meeting, where they forwarded individual agencies' information to the state level for consideration in the application of OUD funds. He also addressed concerns with basketball courts and vehicles being in residential areas. He reported reviewing ordinances with Mr. Eddie Kopp. Lastly, he reported looking forward to having extensive dialogue regarding addressing the seven-million-dollar deficit through a zero-base budget approach.

Mr. Anderson reported attending a number of events, including the National Day of Prayer, Dover Days, and ribbon cuttings for businesses. He reported receiving a number of parking concerns surrounding parking enforcement in places like The Green, Cecil Street, West Street, and Woodcrest. Woodcrest residents would like to work with the city to repaint the curbs where the yellow paint has faded. Additionally, residents in Mill Creek have expressed interest in adding a basketball court to their city park, especially after the talks of the enforcement of basketball courts on the streets. He noted that the park is not geared towards preteens or teens, and Representative Busch is interested in participating in the discussion. Lastly, he noted that the residents on South Bradford Street seem to be pleased with the community police officer who established rapport with them at their first meeting.

At-Large

Mr. Boggerty reported addressing the signs that should be going up in Lincoln Park to help reduce the ongoing speeding issues. He also reported addressing the rent increases in the 55-plus community. He reported attending the Governor's Prayer Breakfast and addressing various employee issues as an employee liaison.

Council President Neil

Council President Neil reported riding in a 1937 fire engine through the Dover Days Parade and attending a Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals Meeting. He reported sending out a Third District alert on behalf of Councilwoman Arndt and himself covering the upcoming NASCAR race, roadway issues, and scam warnings.

UTILITY COMMITTEE

The Utility Committee met with Chairman Rocha presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Arndt moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.

Evaluation of Proposals – Underground Utility Locating Services (Jason Lyon, Water/Wastewater Director)

Mr. Jason Lyon, Director of Water and Wastewater, reviewed the background and analysis of the evaluation of proposals for the underground utility locating services.

Staff recommended awarding a three (3) year contract with the option of two (2) one (1) year extensions to Century Engineering LLC, a Kleinfelder Company, as per the proposal submitted in response to RFP #26-0017COD.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that Century Engineering LLC has been used in different circumstances but not for the requested task. He explained that they are an engineering firm with experience in street design and water/wastewater design, which the city has used many times.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated the vendor had very low damage rates. He explained that if a utility gets hit and it is the fault of the utility locator, then the utility must take on some of the resulting problems. The city must take on informing the public that they are out of service, resolving any restoration issues, and sending their team out to assess the damage. He explained that the low damage rates were one of their high marks, and it was one of the criteria that they looked at when evaluating the companies.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that the contract is for a three-year contract with two additional one-year contractual obligations at the city's discretion. For the first two years, it is an hourly cost for the locator to do the work that is required by state law. He explained that the hourly rate is the same for the first two years of the contract that was provided by the proposer. The third year, it will increase by three percent, which will require budgeting in the third year. He also noted that the project does not start until July 1, 2027.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that the three percent was not mandated, but the location of the utilities is.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that Century was the only vendor that provided the three percent pricing structure. He noted that the other two vendors provided increases every year.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Lyon explained that he has served on the board of Miss Utility of Delmarva for approximately 16 years and currently serves as its president. He provided background on the State’s utility locating system, noting that a 1974 state law requires utility companies to locate and mark their utilities at their own expense when excavation work is planned. He explained that calls made to 811 are distributed to utility companies within the affected area, and those companies are responsible for the cost of locating and marking utilities. Mr. Lyon stated that the system was designed to encourage contractors and residents to use the service in order to prevent damage to gas, electric, and other utility lines during excavation activities.

Dr. Sudler moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation to award a three-year contract with the option of two one-year extensions to Century Engineering, LLC. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for approval of the Committee’s recommendation, seconded by Mr. Boggerty, and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

Mr. Rocha moved for adjournment of the Utility Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee met with Chairman Anderson presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Rocha moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.

Proposed Ordinance #2026-05 – Amending Chapter 70 – Offenses and Miscellaneous Provisions, Sec. 70-4. – Throwing and kicking objects and playing games in streets and public places (Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer)

Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed Proposed Ordinance #2026-05.

Staff recommended forwarding Proposed Ordinance #2026-05 to council for approval.

Ms. Hall expressed opposition to the proposed restrictions on portable basketball courts, stating that many children rely on them as one of their only recreational outlets due to the removal of courts from local parks. She noted that, despite traffic concerns near her residence, she supervises her children while they play and believes families should have the right to allow their children to play outside on their property. Ms. Hall further stated that the proposal would likely generate significant public opposition and emphasized the importance of maintaining accessible opportunities for youth recreation and athletic development.

Mr. Boggerty expressed opposition to the ordinance, stating that playing games such as basketball, football, two-square, and other neighborhood activities in the street are a common part of childhood and community interaction. He acknowledged that there are risks involved but stated that recreational opportunities for youth are already limited due to the lack of nearby parks, community centers, and accessible facilities, and he emphasized the importance of neighborhood camaraderie and outdoor activity for children and families.

Ms. Arndt stated that she had previously provided comments to Mr. Kopp expressing similar concerns. She noted that the existing ordinance already contains provisions prohibiting athletic games, throwing balls, and similar activities in the street, including quoits, indicating that the ordinance was drafted many years ago. She questioned the need for additional regulations, stating that existing provisions may already address the issue. Ms. Arndt expressed support for children playing basketball outdoors rather than staying inside playing video games, but stated that parents and homeowners should be responsible for removing and properly storing basketball hoops after use so they do not remain in the street. She further commented that homeowners or parents could potentially be cited under existing regulations for impeding traffic rather than expanding the ordinance.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Kopp stated that the adopted ordinance contains only line-item A, which says that it shall be unlawful for any person to throw, kick, or project. The addition is the equipment being stored in the street. Mr. Kopp noted that even if the ordinance is not passed, it is still unlawful to play games in the street unless the committee chooses to amend the ordinance as is currently written.

Dr. Sudler stated that while many residents, including himself, have played basketball in the street, the issue remains a legitimate traffic and public safety concern. He noted that basketball apparatuses placed in the roadway can obstruct drivers' visibility and create hazards for motorists, children, seniors, and visually impaired individuals, particularly after dark. He suggested the city consider a compromise, such as requiring basketball equipment to be removed from the street during nighttime hours.

Dr. Sudler emphasized that the current code already appears to prohibit such activity and that individuals playing basketball in the street are technically in violation under the ordinance as written. He expressed support for further clarification and possible amendments to establish a reasonable "happy medium," and recommended additional discussion and community input before taking final action.

He further suggested that a discussion for broader youth recreation needs within the community, including affordability of youth programs and summer activities are needed and encouraged the Parks and Recreation Committee to explore additional initiatives and solutions to better support youth engagement and recreation opportunities.

Mr. Rocha stated that while he personally played basketball in the street growing up, often on dead-end streets, he also recognizes the concerns raised by residents regarding late-night noise, safety, and the appearance of basketball goals left in the roadway. He expressed support for considering a curfew and requiring goals to be moved off the street and onto private property when not in use. Mr. Rocha acknowledged the need to balance neighborhood safety and respect for residents with the lack of recreational opportunities available to youth. He noted the limited accessibility and affordability of youth recreation programs and suggested that the committee explore revisions to the ordinance that could provide a reasonable compromise benefiting all parties.

Mr. Kopp clarified that the wording set up or store is what code enforcement is focusing on, as they are concerned with the storage of the equipment on the street. He noted that the word set up was in the preexisting ordinance, and it was included in conjunction with the ordinance as written. He explained that it is currently unlawful as written and recommended amending the first sentence and providing clarity. He noted that the reason for the changes was to address the storage of the equipment on the street rather than the kids playing in the street.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend sending the proposed ordinance back to staff for revisions based on the discussion. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall.

Mr. Shevock expressed concerns regarding children playing basketball unsupervised in heavily traveled streets, particularly where vehicles are parked along the roadway and visibility is limited. He stated that young children running between parked cars to retrieve balls creates a significant safety hazard for both motorists and pedestrians. Mr. Shevock indicated he would have fewer concerns if basketball activity occurred on cul-de-sacs or less traveled streets, but felt it was irresponsible to allow children to play in busy streets under those conditions.

Mr. Anderson stated that the issue of basketball courts in streets has been divisive within the community, noting that opinions are often evenly split. He noted that not all streets present the same safety concerns. Roads heavily traveled, such as Governors Avenue, are inappropriate locations for basketball activity, although light residential streets or cul-de-sacs may be more suitable. Mr. Anderson further noted the city's limited ability to provide recreational facilities in every neighborhood and suggested that, if changes to the current prohibition were considered, reasonable limitations such as compliance with noise ordinances and restricting play after dark could help address resident concerns and improve public support.

Dr. Sudler stated that his primary concern was not the proposed time restrictions, noting that daylight can extend until 9:30 p.m. during the summer months. He emphasized that the core issue remained the placement of basketball apparatuses in the street, which would still be unlawful under the ordinance even with the proposed amendment. He noted that returning the ordinance for restructuring only addressed the amended portion and did not resolve the underlying concern of the adopted verbiage.

Mr. Kopp asked for clarification in relation to item A. He questioned if the committee wanted to put a timeline in place, dusk to dawn, a specific time, or strike the item altogether.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Kopp stated that there is no code against the equipment being stored on the property. He noted that code enforcement is concerned with the equipment being stored in the street. He explained that it is not only a traffic concern, but it also prohibits public works from completing waste collection.

Mr. Rocha recommended placing dusk to dawn as the timeline.

Mr. Anderson recommended using 7:00 a.m.

Ms. Arndt stated that she would support not allowing the equipment to be stored on the streets, as it should be stored on the property. She agreed with the timeline being dusk to dawn. She also clarified that the noise ordinance states that yelling, shouting, hooting, whistling, or singing in public streets is not permissible between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Mr. Garfinkel said that dusk to dawn is not a good choice because it cannot be measured. Mr. Garfinkel expressed concern about noise and quality-of-life impacts on residents, particularly during evening hours when people are returning home from work. He emphasized that basketball activity in the street presents safety concerns, including balls entering the roadway, vehicle traffic conflicts, and interference with trash collection. Mr. Garfinkel suggested the city consider requiring developers to construct basketball courts in lieu of granting park fee waivers as an alternative solution. Mr. Garfinkel stated that the proposed ordinance changes appeared rushed and supported the Council President’s motion to refer the matter back for further consideration rather than adopting what he characterized as “knee-jerk” legislation.

Mr. Rocha stated that while he understood the safety concerns associated with basketball goals and playing in the street, he believed they should find a balanced approach that still allowed children opportunities for recreation close to home. He expressed concern that children often lack accessible places to play and opposed completely prohibiting neighborhood basketball activity. Mr. Rocha suggested they explore measures such as “Children at Play” signage and stated he would support reasonable time restrictions for play. He emphasized the importance of keeping youth engaged in safe, constructive activities within their neighborhoods.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kopp stated that the act of playing in the street is not enforced by code enforcement. The Dover Police Department would be responsible for the enforcement. He noted that he only added the amendment regarding the storage of the equipment because that is what code enforcement is responsible for. He explained that he would be happy to make amendments to item A, but code enforcement is not responsible for that enforcement.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kopp explained that the proposed amendments were limited to the storage of basketball equipment, as that falls within the scope of code enforcement responsibilities. He stated that item A was not amended for that reason, but noted that if the committee wished to amend that section as well, he would make the necessary changes. He further clarified that code enforcement does not enforce the activity itself, but is primarily concerned with the storage of the equipment.

Mr. Lewis noted that children are often outside playing sports in neighborhoods late into the evening under streetlights. He expressed support for establishing time restrictions to address noise concerns affecting nearby residents, including disturbances at night. He also stated he would be open to exploring amendments related to limiting the placement of basketball equipment, particularly where it may create obstructions or interfere with sanitation truck access.

Ms. Hall stated that she agreed with the proposed time limitations and raised an additional concern regarding practical enforcement during the day. She noted that children may need to briefly go inside for bathroom breaks, and questioned whether the equipment would then be repeatedly moved in and out of the roadway throughout the day. She emphasized that if designated play hours are established for safety reasons, then the storage requirements should align with those same hours to avoid continuous movement of equipment and to ensure consistency with the intended schedule.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Kopp recommended aligning item A with the existing noise ordinance, as read by Councilwoman Arndt, which restricts noise between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. He explained that the noise ordinance already addresses activities such as yelling, screaming, and other loud disturbances associated with outdoor play, including basketball. Therefore, he suggested it would be more appropriate to reference the existing ordinance rather than create separate standards, unless the committee chooses to revise the noise ordinance itself. He noted he is willing to amend item A accordingly at the pleasure of the committee.

Dr. Sudler expressed concern that, during the period while amendments to the ordinance are being drafted and processed, the current rules still make it unlawful to play basketball in the street. He noted that even if the committee advances a recommendation, it would not take effect for at least two weeks. He emphasized that this gap leaves the existing prohibition in place and asked how the council could resolve the issue so that basketball activities in the street are not technically unlawful during the interim.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Anderson stated that, per the charter, the ordinance would need to go through a first and second reading after additional discussion regarding the revisions. He noted that the changes will likely not be adopted until July.

Dr. Sudler recommended holding a special meeting to expedite the process so that the ordinance could be adopted before the end of the summer.

Dr. Pillsbury questioned whether the police department is aware that they are responsible for the enforcement. She also questioned whether the citizens are aware that the police department is responsible for the enforcement and not council. She stated that there appears to be a perception that council can internally enforce the regulation; however, enforcement is an interagency matter, and residents need to understand the appropriate agency to contact if they have concerns within their community. Dr. Pillsbury expressed interest in knowing how often the police department receives related complaints.

Responding to Dr. Pillsbury, Mr. Anderson stated that they could put the request into the police department to obtain how often they receive complaints regarding basketball. Mr. Anderson also asked for clarification on whether code enforcement was responsible for the apparatus being out and whether the police department was responsible for the actual activity.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kopp stated that he was correct. He explained that code enforcement refers people to the police department with complaints.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Kopp explained that, in a broad sense, various personnel such as fire marshals, code enforcement officers, and cadets all serve as code officials. However, Delaware law establishes specific limits on enforcement authority. He provided the example of towing vehicles from private property, noting that although it had been done for many years, further legal review determined that state law specifically authorizes only municipal police to perform that function. He stated that ordinances are reviewed alongside Delaware Code to determine what actions are legally permissible, and that ordinance language is sometimes written in a particular manner to ensure compliance with state law and to protect the municipality from exceeding its authority.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend sending the proposed ordinance back to staff for revisions based on the discussion. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

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

Proposed Ordinance #2026-06 – Amending Chapter 106 – Traffic and Vehicles, Article III. – Stopping, Standing, and Parking, Division 1. – Generally, Sec. 106-123. – Vehicle parking time limited where carrying capacity is in excess of one ton, and trailer and recreational vehicle parking (Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer)

Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed Proposed Ordinance #2026-06.

Staff recommended forwarding Proposed Ordinance #2026-06 to council for approval.

Dr. Sudler moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation and forward Proposed Ordinance #2026-06 to council for approval. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried.

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

Mr. Anderson moved for adjournment of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Neil moved for adjournment of the Council Committee of the Whole meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for acceptance of the Council Committee of the Whole Report, seconded by Mr. Boggerty and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

MONTHLY REPORTS

By motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Boggerty, the following quarterly reports were accepted by consent agenda:

City Council's Community Enhancement Fund Report
City Manager's Report
Fire Chief's Report

Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report

During the Regular Council Meeting, Mr. Anderson directed his questions to Ms. Marney regarding the audit schedule.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney stated that they were completing the fiscal Year 2025 audit, at which time they were working very closely with the auditors to prepare the upcoming audit schedule for Fiscal Year 2026. She explained that they were planning to present that schedule in either July or August and that staff had met with SMB Associates as of last week. She noted that they were compiling additional information regarding the proprietary funds that they had requested and were working with PFM Asset Management to compile data from their bank records for cash flow analysis. She further noted that in August, they would have an investment hearing at the Legislative and Finance Committee.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney stated that SMB Associates from Owens Mills, Maryland, does the independent audits currently.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney stated that when she came to the Finance Department, the Fiscal Year 2023 was behind and that they were already starting to work on Fiscal Year 2024. She explained that they typically would start working on the budget about three (3) to six (6) months ahead to prepare, so coming in two (2) cycles behind, they were playing catch-up for the audits.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney clarified that they were catching up with their audits.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney clarified that they did not find any missing money when looking at the audits for the year.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Marney stated that the cost for an audit ranges from a low level of $20,000 and up every year.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Marney stated that the independent auditor reviewed all departments, including the police department. She noted that the auditor evaluated all departments for reasonableness in the financial reporting.

Mr. Anderson moved for the adoption of the Controller/Treasurer's Budget Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried.

Police Chief's Report

During the Regular Council Meeting, Dr. Sudler asked Ms. Bennett to read the motion from the last Regular Council Meeting regarding the Dover Police Academy into the record.

Ms. Bennett, City Clerk, read the motion: Dr. Sudler amended his motion to remove the suspension of all operations, funding, and administrative support for the Dover Police Department Police Academy, but to have the requested information sought regarding the Dover Police Academy be provided to council by June 8th at the Regular Council Meeting without suspension. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis with a roll call vote of six (6) yes, two (2) no, and one (1) absent.

Dr. Sudler stated that the requested information that he asked for was regarding the operational status, whether it was sustainable or feasible, and all the standalone items that were supposed to be reported to the City Manager.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca stated that she had reviewed the information that was provided by Chief Johnson, which included his memorandum and attachments from the end of March, as well as spreadsheet information that was provided at the end of April. She noted that after reviewing those documents, she had several questions throughout May through this past Friday. She stated that one (1) of the things that was important when considering what he asked for was to evaluate the actual service or program costing. She explained that it was important to remember that the personnel costs were a critical function of, and that going through the information that was provided by the police department and the spreadsheet, they had originally provided three (3) individuals who were dedicated to the police academy and provided overtime. The overtime also represented some additional officers who were involved in the academy. She stated that, going through Appendix H of Chief Johnson's report, there was a detailed listing of different officers who supported the academy. She noted that some days, such as opening day, there were over 10 officers involved for that day, but the daily cost for those officers was not included. It was for overtime only. After her discussion with Chief Johnson, to get the final cost, he recommended looking at it per academy because they did not flesh out the fiscal year, which she did not object to. Since there were only two (2) academies per year, the cost could be extrapolated, but she believed it was important to get those additional costs for the other officers. She stated that the initial information that she had for him was that the direct revenue that was provided was close to $95,000, and it appeared to be a bit higher when they ran some of the actual expenses. She noted that if she included the projected expense for the other officers who were involved in the academy, it would be over $500,000 in expenses.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca clarified that, after subtracting $95,000 from $500,000, the expenses were greater due to personnel costs. She noted that proper service costing included the personnel expenses.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca stated that it was about $405,000 annualized.

Dr. Sudler moved for the adoption of the Police Chief's Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried.

2026/2027 APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY COUNCIL PRESIDENT NEIL (DEFERRED DURING THE ANNUAL MEETING OF MAY 11, 2026)

Council Committee of the Whole Subcommittee Chairs – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Legislative, Finance, and Administrative Committee – Councilman David L. Anderson
B. Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee – Councilwoman Donyale M. Hall
C. Safety, Advisory, and Transportation Committee – Councilman Andre M. Boggerty
D. Utility Committee – Councilman Gerald L. Rocha

City Chaplain – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Elder Ellis B. Louden

Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilman Andre M. Boggerty
B. Councilman Fred A. Neil
C. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha, Sr.

General Employee Pension Plan Board – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha, Sr.

Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Board – One-Year Term to Expire

May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha, Sr.

Police Pension Plan – Retirement Committee – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha, Sr.

Downtown Dover Partnership Board of Directors – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Tricia K. Arndt
B. Councilman David L. Anderson

Economic Development Committee – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilwoman Donyale M. Hall

Kent County Tourism Board – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Donyale M. Hall

Kent Economic Partnership Board of Directors – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Mayor Robin R. Christiansen (Council President Designee)

Human Relations Commission Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Donyale M. Hall

City/County Committee – (Liaison to Kent County) – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Mayor Robin R. Christiansen
B. Council President Fred A. Neil
C. Councilwoman Tricia K. Arndt
D. Councilman David L. Anderson
E. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha
F. Sharon Duca, City Manager

Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilwoman Donyale M. Hall

Education Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury

Healthcare Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury

Dover Air Force Base (DAFB) Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilman Andre M. Boggerty

Community Engagement Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilman Andre M. Boggerty

Unsheltered and Affordable Housing Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilman Gerald L. Rocha, Sr.

Higher Education Liaison – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Tricia K. Arndt

Code Board of Appeals – One-Year Term to Expire May 2027

A. Councilwoman Julia M. Pillsbury
B. Councilman Roy Sudler, Jr.
C. Councilman Fred A. Neil

Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee

A. Charles A. Cunningham IV (Recommended by Chairwoman Hall)
B. Michael W. Lewis (Recommended by Council President Neil)

Safety, Advisory, and Transportation Committee

A. Christine Kemp (Recommended by Chairman Boggerty)
B. Chanda P. Jackson (Recommended by Council President Neil)

Utility Committee

A. Esosa Iriowen (Recommended by Chairman Rocha)
B. Glen Wilson (Recommended by Council President Neil)

Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee

A. William Garfinkel (Recommended by Chairman Anderson)
B. Daniel T. Shevock (Recommended by Council President Neil)

APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY CITY COUNCIL

Board of Assessment Appeals – Four-Year Term to Expire March 2030

A. Cecilia A. Jones

Appointment of City Manager – Sharon J. Duca

SETTING OF ELECTRIC, WATER, AND WASTEWATER RATES AND TARIFFS (SHARON DUCA, CITY MANAGER, AND ANDREA GRIFFIN, CUSTOMER SERVICE DIRECTOR)

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, and Ms. Andrea Griffin, Customer Service Director, briefed members on the Setting of Electric, Water, and Wastewater Rates and Tariffs.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. Duca stated that there would be a $0.01 electrical rate.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. Duca stated that the city sewer fees were not changing. She noted that the Kent County Sewer adjustment fee was going up to $4.24 per thousand gallons from $3.82. She further stated that the groundwater inflow adjustment and the water rates were not changing.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. Duca clarified that the rates that were not changing included the public safety fee.

Mr. Anderson stated that he would vote no, even though he believed the measure was probably necessary, because of how his district had voted.

Dr. Sudler stated that his constituents, whom he has spoken with, could not afford the rates, so he voted no.

Mr. Neil moved to adopt the Rates and Tariffs as presented for Fiscal Year 2027. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt, carried by a roll call vote of six (6) yes (Hall, Boggerty, Pillsbury, Arndt, Rocha, Neil) and three (3) no (Anderson, Sudler, Lewis).

FIRST READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-06 – AMENDING 106 – TRAFFIC AND VEHICLES, ARTICLE III. – STOPPING, STANDING, AND PARKING, DIVISION 1. – GENERAL, SEC. 106-123. – VEHICLE PARKING TIME LIMITED WHERE CARRYING CAPACITY IS IN EXCESS OF ONE TON, AND TRAILER AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARKING (EDDIE KOPP, CHIEF CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER)

Council President Neil reminded the public that copies of the proposed ordinance were available on the City's website at www.cityofdover.com under "Government," or by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 302-736-7008 or cityclerk@dover.de.us. Final action by Council on the proposed ordinance will take place during the Council Meeting of June 22, 2026.

Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed the Proposed Ordinance #2026-06, Amending Chapter 106 – Traffic and Vehicles, Article III. - Stopping, Standing, and Parking, Division 1. - Generally, Sec. 106-123. - Vehicle parking time limited where carrying capacity is in excess of one ton, and trailer and recreational vehicle parking.

In accordance with Section 1-9 of the Dover Code, Council acknowledged the First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-06, as read by the City Clerk, by title only, as follows:

> PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-06, AMENDING CHAPTER 106 – TRAFFIC AND VEHICLES, ARTICLE III. - STOPPING, STANDING, AND PARKING, DIVISION 1. - GENERALLY, SEC. 106-123. - VEHICLE PARKING TIME LIMITED WHERE CARRYING CAPACITY IS IN EXCESS OF ONE TON, AND TRAILER AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARKING.

FIRST READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-11 – FISCAL YEAR 2026/2027

CITY OF DOVER BUDGET ORDINANCE

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, reviewed the Proposed Ordinance #2026-11 – Fiscal Year 2026/2027 City of Dover Budget Ordinance.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffin stated that it was up to council to determine how they would collect fees and taxes.

Responding to Mr. Griffin, Dr. Sudler asked if, as an option, if council could choose to be at a standstill if they chose not to raise the current rates, monitor the budget quarterly, and address financial challenges as they arose while preparing broader and diversified revenue sources. Mr. Griffin clarified that council had the authority to make that decision.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Bennett stated that, per the City of Dover Charter, the city would have to have a balanced budget to start the fiscal year, just like the General Assembly.

Mr. Griffin stated that they could not pass a budget that had liabilities that exceeded assets.

Mr. Neil stated that it could be dangerous to have a budget that had liabilities that exceeded assets because if that did not work, the city would have to come back and raise fees. He noted that there were concerns already with residents that if the city could not generate enough revenue, an additional increase of $0.05 or $0.10. He supported maintaining a balanced budget.

Mr. Anderson stated that he appreciated what Dr. Sudler was suggesting, but there were practical reasons why they would not be workable. He explained that the property tax was an annual tax and fee, which, once they go beyond July, doing so would be horribly disruptive if it required a partial-year increase. He further explained that they had to raise the amount that was projected; residents' escrows would double in order to make up for a mid-year increase. He also added that there would be other fees, such as business license fees and other fees that were set annually. He noted that with the electric fee, the problem with that was that the peak and most extensive time would be summer, and that would be when the city would need the money the most. He further noted that he voted to keep the pressure on to see if they could keep the costs down and that they could make sure to give some of that money back, but they would not know. He recalled Mr. Waddell's comment that they were now primarily a purchaser, not a producer, and they do not control their destiny in that sense. He mentioned that the only way he could see if working would be significant reductions in expenses, which they would need to cut most of the expenses except labor, and that would be a disruption that could be recovered from quickly. He added that they should look into some solutions for next year and suggested priority-based budgeting. He also suggested a municipal service fee and how that would function as a budgeting decision.

Mr. Griffith stated that in the City of Dover Ordinance, Part I – Charter and Related Laws, Subpart A – Charter, Article IV, Section 44: The city manager shall prepare and submit to the council a draft budget presenting a financial plan for conducting the affairs of the city for the ensuing fiscal year. He stated that the budget cannot be done quarterly, as previously stated. He further stated that the budget had to be done annually.

Dr. Sudler expressed concern that he had not heard a sustainable financial plan. He believed that they were to keep things at a standstill, and the constituents were aware that it would be a risk, just like in business. He wanted to raise the idea for consideration since many constituents expressed concerns about being unable to afford their bills.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he understood where Dr. Sudler was coming from if they were a smaller community, but he did not want to "roll the dice" with their citizens. He explained that their profit margin was zero when they look at all of their expenses that have to be covered, their bond covenants, requests for the money that needed to be put aside, and depreciation funds. He noted that they were given back advice to get out of the electric business and should never have been decommissioned. He added that the funds spent on decommissioning could have been used to keep one (1) of the three (3) units. He suggested that, even if the unit was not producing all of the city's electricity needs, it may have been able to sustain a portion of the demand and reduce the amount of electricity that needed to be purchased through PJM Interconnection market bids. He explained that because of a bad decision that was made, the City of Dover had spent over $7 million to decommission the plant. He stated that, as they stood at a crossroad, where they had an issue that needed to be addressed, they could not take a lot of advice from individuals who were depending on them to make the right decision. He noted that they have 12 months before the next budget needs to be adopted to make all adjustments and have the opportunity currently to be good stewards of the monies that they were given, and that they needed to be more vigilant because a city has expenses that sometimes they have no control over.

In accordance with Section 1-9 of the Dover Code, Council acknowledged the First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-11, as read by the City Clerk, by title only, as follows:

> PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-11 – FISCAL YEAR 2026/2027 CITY OF DOVER BUDGET ORDINANCE.

FIRST READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-12 – AMENDING CHAPTER 2 – ADMINISTRATION, ARTICLE V. – FINANCE, BY ADDING SEC. 2-428 – PUBLIC SAFETY FEE (SHARON DUCA, CITY MANAGER)

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, reviewed the Proposed Ordinance #2026-12 – Amending Chapter 2 – Administration, Article V. – Finance, by Adding Sec. 2-428 – Public Safety Fee.

In accordance with Section 1-9 of the Dover Code, Council acknowledged the First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-12, as read by the City Clerk, by title only, as follows:

> PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-12 – AMENDING CHAPTER 2 – ADMINISTRATION, ARTICLE V. – FINANCE, BY ADDING SEC. 2-428 – PUBLIC SAFETY FEE.

FIRST READING REFERRAL – ANNEXATION/REZONING REQUEST/FIRST READING OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-13 – PROPERTY LOCATED AT 102 FOX HALL DRIVE

A request was received for annexation and rezoning of property located at 102 Fox Hall Drive, consisting of 1.6390 acres +/-, owned by Frances and Bruce Johnson. This property is currently zoned RS-1- Residential Single Family Zone (Kent County zoning classification), and the proposed zoning is R-20 – One Family Residence Zone (City of Dover zoning classification.

Staff recommended that the request be referred to the Utility Committee on June 23, 2026, for a public hearing/recommendation at the Planning Commission on July 20, 2026, and that a Public Hearing/Final Reading before Council be set for August 10, 2026, at 6:30 p.m. (Tax Parcel: ED-00-076.05-01-06.00-000; Planning Reference: AX-26-03; First Council District)

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

Ms. Dawn Melson-Williams, Principal Planner, briefed members on the Proposed Ordinance #2026-13 – Amending the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map of the City of Dover by changing the zoning designation from RS-1 – Residential Single Family Zone (Kent County zoning classification) to R-20 - One Family Residence Zone (City of Dover zoning classification) on that property located at 102 Fox Hall Drive, consisting of 1.6390 acres +/-, owned by Frances and Bruce Johnson.

In accordance with Section 1-9 of the Dover Code, Council acknowledged the First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-13, as read by the City Clerk, by title only, as follows:

> ORDINANCE #2026-13 – AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF DOVER BY CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 102 FOX HALL DRIVE

<u>FINAL READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-09 AMENDING CHAPTER 102 – TAXATION, ARTICLE I. – IN GENERAL, SEC. 102-1 – VALUATION AND ASSESSMENT (SHARON DUCA, CITY MANAGER)</u>

The First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-09 was accomplished during the Council Meeting of May 11, 2026. The ordinance is available at the entrance of the Council Chamber and on the City's website at www.cityofdover.com under "Government."

Ms. Arndt moved that the Final Reading of the proposed ordinance be acknowledged by title only, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and unanimously carried.

Ms. Sharon Duca, City Manager, briefed members on the Proposed Ordinance #2026-09 – Amending Chapter 102 – Taxation, Article I. – In General, Sec. 102-1 – Valuation and Assessment.

Mr. Anderson moved for adoption of Ordinance #2026-09 - Amending Chapter 102 – Taxation, Article I. – In General, Sec. 102-1 – Valuation and Assessment, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and carried a unanimous roll call vote.

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

That Chapter 102 – Taxation, Article I – In General, Section 102-1 – Valuation and assessment, be amended by inserting the text indicated in bold, blue, italics, and deleting the text indicated in red strikeout as follows:

Sec. 102-1. – Valuation and assessment.

Section 47 of the Charter provides that an impartial valuation and assessment of all real property within the city may be conducted by the city assessor or assessors. The council may also direct that, in lieu of the assessment and valuation by the city assessor, a reassessment and revaluation may be done by Kent County Levy Court, the assessor or assessors, or an outside mass appraisal company or a consortium of appraisers chosen by the council. Such contractor and tax office staff will be under the supervision of the city manager or his/her designee.

Commencing with the Fiscal Year 2026 City re-assessment values from the 2020 assessment will be used to calculate the 2025 tax bills, starting in Fiscal Year 2028 the City will use the Kent County values which will be reassessed in Fiscal Year 2029 and every 5 years after, unless otherwise directed, the revaluation and reassessment of all real property may be conducted, under the supervision of the assessor or in conjunction with the assessor and/or the city manager or his/her designee, by an outside mass appraisal company or a consortium or appraisers chosen by the council or by Kent County Levy Court. The mass appraisal company or consortium of appraisers shall be licensed to conduct business in the State of Delaware and the City of Dover and shall employ appraisers who are licensed by the Delaware Division of Professional Regulations. All property shall be valued as to its status; as of its ownership; as of its current market value as of the January 1 assessment date, and shall reflect fair market value.

ADOPTED: JUNE 8, 2026

CITY MANAGER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Duca announced that the Water Quality Improvement Project was currently on Queen Street near Mary Street. She stated that there would be a Water Street Stormwater project near the new family court building, which would begin around June 22nd, and would have Water Street closed from Governors to State Street. The roads would be closed for approximately a month or so. She also mentioned that the Kenton Road project through DelDOT has a substantial detour due to the roundabouts being installed by DelDOT, and a super fun cleanup project adjacent to the Victrola Museum that was scheduled to start this week and will be active for two (2) years. She explained that if additional information was needed regarding the project, please contact the Department of Water and Wastewater, which was coordinating with them through their engineering services. They could be reached at 302-736-7025.

MAYOR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Christiansen had no announcements.

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Sudler expressed his appreciation to Ms. Duca for stepping into the role and for her willingness to provide leadership and dedication to the City of Dover. He stated that he believed she was an excellent candidate for the position of City Manager.

Mr. Anderson reminded everyone that the African American Festival on June 27th, the fourth Saturday of every year, was a Dover celebration, and was for everyone celebrating a part of American heritage, which was its 250th year. The location was at Legislative Mall from 11:00

a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He also mentioned that there was a Juneteenth event that starts at 12:00 p.m. on June 19th, starting with a parade at Legislative Mall.

Mr. Neil thanked those individuals for their kind words for the loss of his sister. He noted that she was very distinguished in a tremendous career.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

ANDRIA L. BENNETT, CMC
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by the City Council during their Regular Meeting of June 8, 2026, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/AB