REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular City Council Meeting was held on April 27, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Council members present were Ms. Hall (in at 6:22 p.m.), Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Anderson (in at 6:20 p.m.), Dr. Pillsbury (via Webex in at 6:44 p.m.), Ms. Arndt, Mr. Rocha, Dr. Sudler (in at 6:20 p.m.), and Mr. Lewis (left at 9:55 p.m.).

Staff members present were Police Chief Johnson, Ms. Marney, Ms. Duca, Fire Chief Carey**,** Mr. Griffith, and Ms. Rivera. Ms. Melson-Williams was absent. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

OPEN FORUM

The Open Forum was held at 6:18 p.m., prior to 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.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, expressed concerns with Item #36, which was Mr. Anderson's proposed Ordinance #2025-21 that was placed at the bottom of the agenda. He believed that the issue deserved proper attention and should be investigated further. He requested that the Mayor and Council move Item #36 to the top of the agenda rather than placing it at the end, where it may not receive full attention. He pointed out that the State News published an article about the budget meeting that included comments made by Mr. Anderson, stating that the city was not currently in a deficit. He further noted that Mr. Anderson had projected a $7 million shortfall in the next budget. He questioned the Mayor and Council and asked how, if they were facing a $7 million deficit, they were not already in a deficit. He stated the only way to balance the budget was through major cuts and by shifting costs onto residents, which would hurt the most vulnerable people, those on Section Eight (8), seniors, and low-income individuals, the most.

Dr. Joseph Zingaro, a Dover resident, a member of People's Church, and on the Board of the People's Community Church, read his statement into the record (**Exhibit #1**).

Yolande Jackson, a Magnolia resident and a volunteer at the People's Community Center, read her statement into the record (**Exhibit #2**).

Pastor G.D. Hodge, President of the Board of Directors of People's Community Center, stated his concern was not the funding decision, since council had the right to decide how City funds were spent, but how the People's Church was treated. He expressed frustration with Mr. Neil's inaccurate and offensive remarks, including calling the organization a "mess downtown that needed to be cleaned up" and relying on questionable claims, such as false accusations of fraud and misleading statements about homelessness and drug use. He also noted that complaints were mentioned but not shared and later appeared unreliable. He stated that the People's Church is willing to offer a truce: if the city stops pursuing unfounded code violations, they can all focus on helping Dover residents in need of jobs, housing, and support services.

Broncea Jackson, 30 North Governors Avenue, expressed her support for the People's Church.

She emphasized that the problems were coming from the Dover Police Department getting the individuals who were coming from out of town coming into Dover.

Sue Harris, 241 Pine Street, read her statement into the record (**Exhibit #3**).

Chelle Paul, 501 Silverside Drive, expressed that the city was experiencing several issues, especially a projected $7 million deficit. Regardless of what Mr. Anderson had previously stated, a deficit is a deficit. She explained that even if there was once a surplus, the city was now in a financial shortfall, and it needed to be addressed. Ignoring or downplaying it did not help, and they could not pass a budget without dealing with the gap, which meant cuts would be necessary. She directed her comment to Chief Johnson and stated that they needed more officers on the street. Regardless of rank, she noted that every officer had a duty to act when they saw a crime. She stated that officers assigned to the academy could be better used in the community at the moment and that funding should be prioritized for visible policing to protect residents. She understood that grant funding existed, but the priority should be reducing crime. The community has stepped up when asked, but there is frustration when reports are made and not acted upon. She emphasized that stronger direction and accountability were needed to ensure officers were doing their jobs and addressing crime effectively. At this time, she stated that resources should be redirected from the academy to place more officers on the street to improve public safety.

Cleveland Wilson, 234 North Kirkwood Street, expressed concerns that questions from the community were not being answered by the council. He stated that if the setting was not right, then council needed to set up a proper community meeting where residents could get those answers. He emphasized that residents were frustrated and that their frustrations would only grow if concerns continued to go unanswered. He further stated that if the city does not organize a meeting, the community would. He noted that he reviewed parts of the budget and was concerned about raising electric rates when several residents could not afford them. He suggested that before increasing costs, all non-essential programs should be temporarily frozen. He stated that the city needed a full audit of all departments. Residents, including council members, have been asking questions but not getting clear answers, and that needs to change. He further stated that questions about the budget should be answered clearly, including how much the city is behind and how it plans to fix it. He stated he had limited interaction with the People's Church but believed they were helping people. He added that if that support was taken away without alternatives, it would make things worse, and that individuals needed hope and opportunity.

Jill Quinn, 26 Split Rail Road, Smyrna, read her statement into the record (**Exhibit #4**).

Melinda Weber, a Dover resident, spoke on behalf of her daughter, who has lived on South Bradford Street near the People's Church. She explained that her daughter had been unable to feel safe or comfortable on her porch or street because of the activity connected to individuals coming from the People's Church. The issue was not just homelessness, but individuals struggling with addiction who were causing disturbances, including sleeping on porches, overdosing nearby, and damaging property. She questioned why the needs of People's Church attendees were being prioritized over the safety of her daughter and neighbors. She also expressed concern about funding, stating her daughter was not receiving funding while the church was. She mentioned that some children had stopped going to the church because it felt

unsafe. While she believed the church was trying to help, she felt it was not addressing the negative impact happening around it.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION – DOVER HIGH SCHOOL – UNIFIED 2025-2026 BASKETBALL TEAM

The City Clerk read the following Certificate of Recognition into the record:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION

Presented to

The Dover High School Unified 2025 Basketball Team

In recognition of an outstanding season filled with dedication, teamwork, and sportsmanship. Your hard work, perseverance, and unity on and off the court have made the entire Dover community proud.

Players:

Ramsey Robinson	*Jordan Baker-McCollister*	*Michael Danley*
Ah'tari Sample	*Lawrence McGuire*	*Kaleb Atkins*
Tyson Fenderson	*Dustin Suessegger*	*Carl Phillips*

Coaches:

Andi Woolley (Head Coach), Kim Johnson (Assistant Coach), Katie Simonetti (Assistant Coach)

Your commitment to excellence has not gone unnoticed. Keep striving, keep growing, and keep playing with heart.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the Certificates of Recognition to the Dover High School Unified 2025 Basketball Team and Coaches.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Mayor Robin R. Christiansen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Council President Neil.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Anderson requested that Item #36, Ratification of Vote of Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026, be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Anderson moved for adoption of the agenda, with the removal of Item #36, Ratification of Vote of Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026, seconded by Mr. Rocha.

Mr. Lewis stated that he objected to removing Item #36, Ratification of Vote of Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026, from the agenda. He explained that a legal opinion from the

Delaware Attorney General indicated the item needed to be ratified at the next Regular City Council meeting to comply with Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) open meeting requirements. He also stated that FOIA had been violated regarding Item #36 and that the item should remain on the agenda for a required Council vote. He noted that he had a copy available for anyone who wished to review the document.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Griffith stated that the remedy was for someone to challenge the action that council took at the February 25, 2026, Regular Council Meeting. He explained that because the action violated FOIA, it was considered voidable, not void. He stated that if someone wanted to file an action in the Court of Chancery and argued that the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance should not have been voted down, that individual could challenge the council's decision as void because it was not in compliance with FOIA.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Griffith stated that the parties would file the action and that those who wanted the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance upheld would seek a revote.

Mr. Lewis stated that he would not violate the Attorney General's directive and would vote on Item #36 as they were instructed to do.

Mr. Anderson stated that they were not instructed to vote on Item #36. He explained that the item had been placed on the agenda like any other item had become part of the regular order of business, and could therefore be removed. He stated that any action the council took would be in compliance.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffith stated that Item #36 was placed on the agenda at his request, using language from the Attorney General's opinion. He noted that the opinion recommended the City Council discuss the ordinance and ratify its vote at the next regular meeting in compliance with FOIA's open meeting requirements, and he suggested following that recommendation. He stated that Mr. Anderson was correct and that any future challenge was unlikely to succeed. He added that it was simply a minor housekeeping matter to follow the recommendation.

Dr. Sudler stated that clarity was better than confusion and ambiguity. He was in favor of voting on Item #36 for minor housekeeping.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Neil clarified that the request to approve the agenda also included removing Item #36.

Mr. Rocha retracted his second because he wanted to vote on the item and do the housekeeping as recommended by the City Solicitor.

Ms. Hall moved for adoption of the agenda as written, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and unanimously carried, with Mr. Anderson voting no.

Mr. Lewis called for a Point of Order.

Mr. Lewis moved to have Item #36, Ratification of Vote of Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026, be moved and placed after Item #7, Dover Police Department 2025 Annual Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried, with Mr. Anderson voting no.

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.

Dr. Sudler requested that Item #28, The Mayor's Blue Ribbon Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) Taskforce Committees Recommendations, and Item #29, City of Dover Municipal Police Academy Cost Review, be removed from the consent agenda.

Dr. Sudler moved for adoption of the consent agenda as amended, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

PROCLAMATION – COMMUNITY ACTION MONTH 2026

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, Community Action Month is observed annually in April to recognize the vital work of community action agencies and partners dedicated to helping individuals and families overcome barriers to economic stability and self-sufficiency; and

WHEREAS, Community Action programs were established to provide services and opportunities that help residents achieve greater independence through education, workforce development, housing support, and community resources; and

WHEREAS, these organizations and their dedicated staff, volunteers, and partners work diligently to empower residents, strengthen families, and promote opportunity throughout our community; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover recognizes the important role that community organizations, nonprofit partners, and local leaders play in addressing the needs of our residents and building stronger neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, Community Action Month serves as a reminder that when communities work together to support those in need, we strengthen the social and economic fabric of our city;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robin R. Christiansen, Mayor of the City of Dover, Delaware, do hereby proclaim April 2026 as **Community Action Month** in the City of Dover and encourage all residents to recognize the contributions of community action organizations and to support efforts that promote opportunity, self- sufficiency, and a brighter future for all members of our community.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the proclamation to Bruce Wright, First State Community Action Agency Community Development Program Manager.

Mr. Wright expressed gratitude towards the proclamation and for the strong partnership they have with the City of Dover.

PROCLAMATION – YOUTH WEEK 2026

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, the young people of the City of Dover represent the promise, energy, and future leadership of our community; and

WHEREAS, Youth Week provides an opportunity to recognize the achievements, talents, and contributions of Dover's youth in education, community service, athletics, arts, leadership, and civic engagement,· and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover is committed to supporting programs and organizations that empower young people to develop confidence, responsibility, and a lifelong commitment to service; and

WHEREAS, the guidance of parents, guardians, educators, mentors, and community leaders plays a vital role in nurturing the character and potential of our youth; and

WHEREAS, encouraging youth participation in community activities strengthens the social fabric of Dover and helps build a brighter, more inclusive future for all residents; and

WHEREAS, Youth Week serves as a time for the citizens of Dover to celebrate the accomplishments of our young people and to reaffirm our commitment to supporting opportunities that allow them to grow and succeed.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robin R. Christiansen, Mayor of the City of Dover, Delaware, do hereby proclaim May 4-10, 2026, as **Youth Week** in the City of Dover and encourage all residents to recognize and celebrate the outstanding contributions and bright future of our youth.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the proclamation to Jourdan Wright.

Mr. Wright thanked the City of Dover for the proclamation and stated it has been his honor to serve the community and the citizens of Dover.

PROCLAMATION – DRINKING WATER WEEK

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, clean and safe drinking water is essential to the health, safety, and well-being of the residents of the City of Dover; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover is committed to providing a reliable supply of high-quality

drinking water through the dedication and expertise of the professionals who operate, maintain, and protect our water system; and

WHEREAS, the observance of Drinking Water Week provides an opportunity to recognize the vital role that drinking water plays in our daily lives and to acknowledge the importance of protecting our water resources for present and future generations; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover Water Department works diligently to ensure that our community receives safe and dependable drinking water through ongoing maintenance, testing, infrastructure improvements, and adherence to strict state and federal standards; and

WHEREAS, public awareness and responsible stewardship of water resources help ensure the continued availability of safe drinking water for the citizens of Dover; and

WHEREAS, Drinking Water Week is celebrated nationwide to recognize the vital importance of water to our community and to honor the dedicated individuals who safeguard this essential resource.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robin R. Christiansen, Mayor of the City of Dover, Delaware, do hereby proclaim May 3-9, 2026, as **Drinking Water Week** in the City of Dover and encourage all residents to recognize the importance of protecting our drinking water and to thank those who work to provide this vital service.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the proclamation to Jason Lyon, Director of Water and Wastewater.

Mr. Lyon expressed gratitude for the proclamation and noted that this was the sixth time their team had been recognized. He stated that they had 42 dedicated professionals working behind the scenes to keep operations running smoothly. He emphasized that water was a vital resource and stated that they followed strict regulations and worked daily to meet required standards. He also noted that they ensured wastewater was properly collected and treated to support public health and the environment.

PROCLAMATION – MILITARY SPOUSE APPRECIATION WEEK

The City Clerk read the following Proclamation into the record:

WHEREAS, the City of Dover proudly recognizes the courageous men and women of the United States Armed Forces who defend the freedoms we cherish; and

WHEREAS, military spouses provide unwavering support to their service members and families, often facing unique challenges including frequent relocations, extended separations, and the responsibilities of maintaining households during deployments; and

WHEREAS, the strength, resilience, and sacrifice of military spouses contribute greatly to the readiness and morale of our Armed Forces; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover is honored to be home to many military families, including those connected to Dover Air Force Base, whose dedication and service strengthen our community; and

WHEREAS, Military Spouse Appreciation Day provides an opportunity for citizens to recognize and express gratitude for the commitment, patriotism, and sacrifices made by military spouses on behalf of our nation; and

WHEREAS, the City of Dover joins communities across the country in honoring military spouses for their vital role in supporting our service members and preserving the freedoms we hold dear.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Robin R. Christiansen, Mayor of the City of Dover, Delaware, do hereby proclaim May 8, 2026, as **Military Spouse Appreciation Day** in the City of Dover and encourage all residents to recognize and honor the dedication and sacrifices of military spouses in our community.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the proclamation to Dede Musa and Colonel Jamil I. Musa.

Mrs. Musa was honored to accept the proclamation on behalf of military spouses at Dover Air Force Base. She explained that many spouses continued their daily routines, jobs, and family responsibilities while their loved ones were deployed on missions. She stated that it was important to recognize their sacrifices and also their strength, wisdom, creativity, and empathy. She encouraged the community to include military spouses in social activities, church, playgroups, and sports teams, and to consider hiring them. She also encouraged everyone to simply thank them for their service.

Colonel Musa thanked the Mayor, council, and the City of Dover and stated that one (1) of his privileges as wing commander at Dover Air Force Base was being able to meet and speak with everyone who came onto the installation. He noted that their priorities were airmen, mission, and community, not necessarily in that order. He stated the community was important because individuals came from all over the world and, regardless of how long they stayed in Dover, it would be a meaningful part of their lives. He encouraged everyone to embrace that experience and emphasized the importance of human connection at all levels, from squadrons to the installation, and in relationships with the mayor, the city, and the broader community.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION – DOVER HIGH SCHOOL – VARSITY BOYS' 2025-2026

The City Clerk read the following Certificate of Recognition into the record:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
Presented to
The Dover High School Varsity Boys 2025 Basketball Team

In recognition of an outstanding season filled with dedication, teamwork, and sportsmanship. Your hard work, perseverance, and unity on and off the court have made the entire Dover community proud.

Players:

Braylon Williams	*X'Zavior Walters*	*Joseph Taylor*
Troy Spencer	*JayVion Denis*	*Kameron Jackson-Dickson*
Chance Fagan	*Chase Little*	*Myaire Wright*
Kareem King	*Tarrance Williams*	

Managers:

Sanai Bethea *Desiree Ingram* *Aalyah Robinson* *Serena Rodrigue*

Coaches:

Stephen Wilson (Head Coach), Randal Fogan (JV Head Coach),
Jakai Simmons (Head Freshman Coach), Jason Woolford (Assistant Coach),
Darien Robinson (Assistant Coach), Ty Joyner (Assistant Coach),
Jordan Allen (Volunteer Coach), Kendal Williams (Volunteer Coach),
Ann Devine (Statistician)

Your commitment to excellence has not gone unnoticed. Keep striving, keep growing, and keep playing with heart.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen presented the certificates to the Dover High School Varsity Boys 2025 Basketball Team and Coaches.

Mr. Stephen Wilson, Head Coach, thanked the mayor, city council, parents, players, and managers. He expressed appreciation for everyone's support of the team and coaches.

ANNUAL REPORT – DOVER POLICE DEPARTMENT 2025 ANNUAL REPORT

Chief of Police Thomas A. Johnson, Jr., reviewed the Dover Police Department 2025 Annual Report.

~~the~~ property crimes were still up. He explained that the state had not yet finalized the audit of the crime numbers, so the exact figures were not available. He noted that shoplifting, petty theft, and other low-level offenses were still occurring based on current information from records staff.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Chief Johnson stated that most individuals removed from areas of concern and involved in serious offenses were processed through the judiciary's matrix, which was used to determine who was held in custody. He explained that the judicial system had two options for individuals. An unsecured bond allowed a person to sign a document and be released with a promise to appear in court. A secured bond required posting a percentage of the total bail amount, and if the person failed to appear in court, they would owe the remaining balance. He stated that in both cases, there was a significant number of individuals that they take off the street. He complained about the effectiveness of prosecution and the effectiveness of the court follow-through.

Ms. Chelle Paul, 501 Silverside Drive, stated that when discussing crime and arrests, the judicial system was a judicial system all throughout the country. She explained that there was a process when an individual was arrested and committed offenses; depending on the offense, there were certain rights that an individual had within the judicial system. With regards to safety and arrests that have to be done, regardless of how many times individuals commit offenses, officers need to make those arrests. She emphasized that it was a process, so they could not make excuses as to why they were not making those arrests. She also added that they needed feedback on the questions that they had asked questions about.

Chief Johnson explained that he did not state he was not going to stop making arrests; he was expressing his disappointment that the delayed justice was creating more potential victims in the community. He expressed frustration that there was a significant crime problem and that officers could only arrest individuals so many times. He noted that when individuals resisted arrest, officers sometimes had to use force and were then subject to greater scrutiny for doing so. He emphasized that they would continue to make arrests and continue to do their due diligence. He further added that they would follow through and do what they could do until the rest of the system figured it out.

Responding to Ms. Paul, Chief Johnson stated that there was a protocol for what they were allowed to publicize on their website and a protocol for their low-level offenses when an individual's face goes on the internet. He noted that once a mugshot goes on the internet, that photo stays on the internet forever, so he was trying to make sure that individuals did not have to chase their own image off the internet for the rest of their lives. He reported that in the first 90 days of 2026, there were 140 enforcement actions, with some involving the same individuals but most involving different individuals. He noted that those included drug offenses, violent offenses, and warrant arrests, and that officers focused on areas of community concern.

Responding to Chief Johnson, Ms. Paul stated that when discussing gang-related activity and individuals, there needed to be a more proactive approach rather than a reactive one. She emphasized the importance of guiding and supporting children in the right direction.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, emphasized that Chief Johnson was doing a great job and stated that some individuals were being released before paperwork was fully processed. He stated that the Mayor and Council needed to raise the issue to the Attorney General and Governor’s Office, noting that “a bullet does not discriminate.” He argued that they should push for stronger prosecution of repeat offenders and keep them in jail until they go to court.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson stated that shootings do not fit in the Uniform Crime Reports.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson stated that crime reporting data went through multiple stages. He explained that crime reporting began in the 911 system, then moved into a statewide reporting system. He noted that the detectives, the Records Unit, and the state all used the information for various purposes. He noted that they tracked their local shootings in the Investigative Unit before they were officially disposed of in the Uniform Crime Report. He explained that the numbers were reviewed by the State Bureau of Identification (SBI), which

finalized the crime reports. He noted that if an incident did not involve a victim, it might be classified as a shooting but would not meet the criteria for reporting and would be set aside.

Bonnie Pennington, a Dover resident, stated that she understood both the situation in Dover and Chief Johnson's perspective. She stated that police could make arrests repeatedly, but judges often released individuals, and prisons were already overcrowded. She added that the issue required collaboration, stating that everyone needed to come and work together rather than placing blame.

Mr. Neil stated that they had previously written about the issue and discussed the four (4) pillars of justice, noting where the system was failing. He further stated that without action at the state legislature, meaningful change would not occur, as laws were needed to support enforcement, incarceration, and access to treatment programs.

Cleveland Wilson, 234 North Kirkwood Street, stated that, after listening to the report, he expected more detailed information, including statistics, budget details, shortcomings, and plans for the future. He mentioned that he wanted answers and solutions rather than general discussion. He further mentioned that the community was divided and emphasized the need for the community to work together. He urged officials to listen to residents and provide answers and conclusions, but instead, he was getting politics.

Faye White, a Dover resident, believed the issue began at the top of the judicial system, specifically with the Attorney General. She stated that when she sought help, she was told the police had limitations, and she felt the Attorney General's office refused to prosecute. She stated that Chief Johnson could only act within what the Attorney General allowed and described the system as a "revolving door" for crime.

Responding to Ms. White, Chief Johnson clarified that the Attorney General was the Chief Prosecuting Law Enforcement Officer of Delaware, and that she was not a Judicial Officer.

Ms. White suggested inviting the Attorney General to come speak locally. She stated she had already mentioned sending an invitation to one of her Deputies, but she would like to send an invitation to come visit the Dover Human Relations Commission. She noted she has yet to receive an answer.

Ms. Arndt moved for acceptance of the Dover Police Department 2025 Annual Report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

RATIFICATION OF VOTE OF ORDINANCE #2025-21 FROM FEBRUARY 25, 2026

Dan Griffith, City Solicitor, briefed council members on why Ratification of Vote on Ordinance #2026-21, from February 25, 2026, was necessary per Attorney General Opinion No. 26IB15.

Mr. Lewis moved to ratify council's vote on Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boggerty.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Griffith clarified that council could vote yes to ratify and that

they did not have to vote the same as they voted on February 25, 2026. He stated that what council would be explaining on why they were in favor of ratifying the Ordinance was because it would be in accordance with the Attorney General's recommendation.

Mr. Lewis moved to ratify council's vote on Ordinance #2025-21 from February 25, 2026. The motion was seconded by Mr. Boggerty, carried by a roll call vote of eight (8) yes (Hall, Boggerty, Pillsbury, Arndt, Rocha, Sudler, Lewis, Anderson), and one (1) no (Neil).

Mr. Anderson moved to reconsider and have the motion entered on the minutes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury.

Mr. Anderson stated that according to Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (RDNR), Section 37-47, they continue with the meeting because they were not allowed to consider that motion until a future meeting.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Anderson clarified that there was no discussion regarding reconsideration to the minutes.

Mr. Anderson clarified that reconsideration and entering on the minutes were two (2) separate motions.

Responding to Mr. Griffith, Mr. Anderson clarified that the motion was for the reconsideration and entering on the minutes of the vote that was just taken. He noted that information was in Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (RDNR), Section 37-46. He explained that it was a motion that could be made by any member of the majority and seconded by any member to allow reconsideration at a later time. He stated that it was not voted on or debated at that time, and that any discussion would occur when the item was brought back later.

Responding to Mr. Griffith, Mr. Anderson stated that he wanted to bring back the roll call motion.

Responding to Mr. Griffith, Mr. Anderson stated that he wanted council to reconsider the decision they had just made on the ratification at a future meeting.

Mr. Griffith stated that Section 37-46, council would reconsider the motion that was just decided at some point in the future.

Mr. Boggerty questioned the reasoning for continuing to revisit the same issue, stating that it was dragging down morale. He stated that there were already enough issues to address, including the budget. He further stated that some issues should be allowed to end rather than be continued, and added that he was becoming frustrated with the repeated discussion.

Responding to Mr. Griffith, Mr. Anderson clarified that the motion to reconsider had been made and entered on the minutes. He stated that Dr. Pillsbury has seconded the motion.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffith stated that the motion that the reconsideration was being

made tonight would be under the current Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (RDNR).

Dr Sudler stated for the record that he concurred with the sentiment of the constituents and understood their frustrations because they had discussed healing, the community moving forward, and working together. He expressed frustration as this was a move to undermine the city council, the majority of which wishes as a whole. He stated that he did not see what purpose it served other than to give more time for individuals to come and change other individuals and council members minds to get a more favorable response.

Mayor Christiansen stated that the issue should be let go, noting he had been told the motion was moot because the seconder was part of the prevailing vote. He further stated repeated votes on the measure were damaging public confidence in the council and urged members to focus on more important upcoming decisions. He shared his experience of losing elections but continuing to move forward, and noted that council should accept outcomes and focus on the public's business in a more effective, business-like manner. He apologized for speaking but urged everyone to focus on priorities and do their homework.

Mr. Anderson stated that several individuals had requested the matter be reconsidered and that it was not his idea to challenge the February 25th vote, but rather the opponents'. He further stated that they brought the issue back forward. He added that those who requested to speak, including members of the business community and the public, had a right to be heard. He noted that many emails and petitions had been ignored, so an opinion was requested, and those individuals would now have the opportunity to speak and be heard.

Mr. Griffith explained that he reviewed what a motion to reconsider and enter on the minutes meant under Robert's Rules. The purpose was to prevent a temporary majority from taking advantage of unrepresentative attendance to pass an action that was opposed by the overall membership. He noted that if the motion was made on the same day as the original vote, it could not be taken up until a later day. He clarified that its purpose was to ensure that decisions were made with a more representative majority.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Griffith clarified that the motion does need a second and a vote.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Dr. Sudler stated that he did not second the motion.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Dr. Pillsbury stated that she seconded the motion.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Griffith stated that under Section 37-48, once a motion to reconsider and enter on the minutes was called up, it was treated the same as a regular motion to reconsider.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Griffith explained that a motion to reconsider and enter on the minutes could be made on the same day as the original vote, but it could not be taken up until a later date, even if another meeting was held that same day.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Griffith explained that "object" referred to the purpose of the

motion, stating that the purpose of a motion to reconsider was for the body that voted on a motion to revisit and potentially change its vote.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Griffith explained that "different" referred to the purpose of a motion to reconsider and enter on the minutes was in those situations where the person or people moving believe that the people at the meeting at the moment do not represent the majority view of the issue.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Griffith clarified that "different object" meant a different goal and explained that a regular motion to reconsider was intended for the same body to revisit and possibly change its decision.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffith explained that an example would be a situation where only a portion of the full council was present and voted in favor of a measure, but it was believed that the full body might not support it if all members were present.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffith clarified that reconsideration would require members who previously voted in favor to change their votes.

Mr. Anderson called for a Point of Order and noted that it was time to move to the next item.

Mr. Griffith stated that the effect of the form of the motion arose from the fact that when it was moved, so long as it was the same day on the vote that was to be reconsidered, it could not be called up until another day, even if another meeting was held on the same day. He noted that the motion could not be taken up on the same day.

Mr. Rocha stated that one (1) of the key procedures required a two (2) thirds vote to close debate immediately. He asked if that matched what was being found in the research and noted that, if the matter came up again, it would require a two (2) thirds vote.

Ret. Lt. Timothy Mullaney, Sr. stated that only someone who voted on the prevailing side, the winning side, was allowed to make a motion to reconsider.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Griffth stated that he did not see a two (2) thirds requirement.

Mr. Anderson stated that he voted in favor.

Mr. Rocha stated that he would retract his previous statement.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 13, 2026

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of April 13, 2026, were unanimously approved by motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Rocha, and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen (Pillsbury absent).

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT OF APRIL 14, 2026

The Council Committee of the Whole met on April 14, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Members of Council present were Mr.

Anderson, Ms. Arndt, Ms. Hall, Mr. Lewis (out at 10:04 p.m.), Dr. Pillsbury (arrived at 6:17 p.m.), Mr. Rocha (via WebEx), and Dr. Sudler (via WebEx). Mr. Boggerty was absent. Mayor Christiansen was also present. Civilian members present for their Committee meetings were Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Lewis *(Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement),* Mr. Wilson *(Utility),* Mr. Garfinkel, and Mr. Shevock (via WebEx) *(Legislative, Finance, and Administration)*. Dr. Iriowen was absent. (*Utility*)

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Council Reports – March 2026

First District

Mr. Rocha reported that he participated in the Delaware Scripps Regional Spelling Bee and attended a ribbon-cutting for IQ Fiber, a company that is bringing a new option of high-speed internet at a fair cost to Dover. He also emceed the St. Patrick's Day Parade and participated in the Delaware Laborers Local 199 workforce recruitment open house. Mr. Rocha further reported that he fielded a constituent complaint off Mifflin Road about trash on the city sidewalk that leads to the Village of Westover.

Dr. Pillsbury was absent; no report was given.

Second District

Ms. Hall reported that last month she participated in the Vietnam Board of Veterans Memorial Service for the memory of the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice and served as a panelist with the local Eunity Day Program and was asked to speak on a panel at the Eunity Event this upcoming weekend. Ms. Hall also reported that she and Mr. Lewis fielded several constituent complaints regarding various issues in the second district.

Mr. Lewis reported that he attended the ribbon-cutting of the YMCA and attended the 50th anniversary of Dover Pools, supporting the Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Lewis held a meeting in coordination with Ms. Hall concerning crime in the Stoney Creek development with resident Larry Arellano. Mr. Lewis reported the meeting included Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, Ms. Duca, Acting City Manager, and Captain Roswell, Dover Police Department, to resolve some of the issues in Stoney Creek. He further explained they are trying to obtain a camera for placement in an alleyway due to the drug transactions and illicit activity going on in the area. He stated that Ms. Duca, Acting City Manager, is working on funding the camera. Mr. Lewis stated that he addressed issues with resident William Faust pertaining to the city not picking up shrubbery in his area. Mr. Lewis reported that he has been appointed as Honorary

Commander at the Dover Air Force Base in the medical group and is excited to be a community liaison at the base.

Third District

Ms. Arndt reported that her interaction this month with the residents of the third district have been positive. She has had several conversations with neighbors and constituents who have stated that they are pleased with the look of the city, commenting that the tulips are blooming and the trees look great. She thanked the public works department for addressing concerns that were addressed swiftly and completely. She attended a DDP Board meeting, and she is meeting with a constituent tomorrow evening to discuss youth opportunities at city parks.

Fourth District

Dr. Sudler reported that he spoke to residents who reside on Bradford Street regarding the activity in the alleyway behind the People's Church. Dr. Sudler reported that he was able to observe the activity and witness some of the undesirable behavior, and has been working with the residents, church staff members, and pastor to come up with a solution. Dr. Sudler stated that he is working with Mr. Anderson to conduct an ADR/mediation process between the community, as well as the People's Church, to attempt to come up with a mutual agreement moving forward with benchmarks. Dr. Sudler and Mr. Anderson will be facilitating the meeting. Reverend Rita Mishoe Paige will be the mediator and will be working together to come up with a solution using a proactive collective approach. Dr. Sudler reported that he met with Dr. Allen, Delaware State University's president, who inquired about the process of having a utility easement being dedicated to the city of Dover. Dr. Sudler lastly reported that he is joining with Ms. Hall and Mr. Lewis to assist in facilitating the safety concerns meeting that has been scheduled.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that he and Dr. Sudler are working together on several issues and will be working on a couple of other forthcoming issues. He explained that he appreciates the partnership that they have had over many years. Mr. Anderson reported that there have been many events mentioned, but he added attending the prayer breakfast. Mr. Anderson thanked the city crews for some of the great work they have done repairing different items around the city, whether it is in the parks or over on the green, where they repaired sidewalks in preparation for Delaware's 250th. He reported that Silver Lake Boulevard and the barrier are getting very high marks. Mr. Anderson thanked Senator Paradee and Representative Lynn for the community transportation funding. He stated he is also thankful for their cooperation in dealing with the Lincoln Park speeding issues. Mr. Anderson reported that he will be submitting a list of potholes from around the fourth district.

At-Large

Mr. Boggerty was absent; no report was given.

Council President Neil

Mr. Neil reported that he attended the Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals meeting on April 9, 2026, with Chairman Boggerty. Mr. Neil reported attending funeral services for former Council President Bill Hare on Friday, April 10, 2026, with council colleagues. Mr. Neil reported that he responded to numerous email inquiries regarding the People's Community Center, as well as media inquiries on the mayor's illness. Mr. Neil reported that he responded to a constituent complaint about painted markings for a 5K charity run in the Town Point community. A resident was concerned about the upcoming race and whether the painted markings would result in a form of street graffiti. Mr. Neil thanked Mark Nowak, Public Works Director, who swiftly resolved the issue. Mr. Neil explained that the sidewalk replacement that has been reported was the result of a petition signed by citizens in the area. Mr. Neil gave kudos to Sharon Duca and Mark Nowak for making it happen swiftly. Mr. Neil reported receiving a third district complaint about pallet damage that was swiftly handled by Jeff Dill.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

The Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee met with Chairwoman Arndt presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Lewis moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

Annual Report from the Silver Lake Commission (Kathy Doyle, Chair)

Ms. Kathy Doyle, Silver Lake Commission Chair, reviewed the annual report for the Silver Lake Commission

Staff recommended acceptance of the Silver Lake Commission annual report.

Mr. Michael Lewis stated that as a fellow Silver Lake Commission member, he commented that Kathy's knowledge and passion on these issues are unmatched, and the city is lucky to have her in this position, and thanked her.

Mrs. Arndt thanked Ms. Doyle for her interest in the master plan and for helping to push it forward. She stated that the Silver Lake Commission is going to be great in terms of public outreach with the master plan. Ms. Arndt asked that when DNREC presents water quality at the May meeting of the Silver Lake Commission, she would like to be invited and have the invite extended to all council members.

Dr. Sudler moved to recommend acceptance of the annual report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Input Discussion on the Future Planning for Silver Lake Park (Councilwoman Arndt and Roger Ridgeway, Director of Parks and Recreation)

Mr. Roger Ridgeway, Director of Parks and Recreation, reviewed the proposed survey and master plan regarding Silver Lake Park.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Ms. Arndt stated that the surveys are located in the back of the chamber and included in the packet and requested that all council members fill one out and leave them on the table so they can be collected. She further stated that, as it pertains to mailing out the surveys to residents, after seeing how much the city spends on postage, and that mailing it out may not get as many returned as we would like, maybe having QR codes at different locations, including city hall, the park, and different locations where people can take the survey online. Ms. Arndt explained that Earth Week is coming up, and there could be some opportunities to solicit feedback from people actively using the park for those events.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Ridgeway, Parks Director, stated that in regard to a timeline for issuing the RFP and getting that process moving, he spoke to Barry Wolfgang, Procurement Manager, and was notified that it is roughly a 45 to 60-day window to get those returned and then have to review all submissions and decide which is going to be best for the city.
Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Ridgeway stated that he would look into possibly having volunteers help deliver flyers to the houses around Silver Lake. Roger further explained that he will be working with Kay Sass about getting the survey onto the city's website, hopefully within 24 hours.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Ridgeway explained that, regarding security measures at Silver Lake, they have installed cameras and are working with the police department to make sure that the gates are shut every night. He explained that gates were the biggest issue because there were cars entering the park after hours, so the gates being closed and locked every night have helped the situation, and further explained that the cameras are helping to monitor the area when staff cannot physically be present. Mr. Ridgeway stated that they have also developed a parks crew so that staff monitors the park at least twice a day.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ridgeway explained that there is $75,000 in the current budget for the Silver Lake Master Plan.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Ridgeway explained that a main concern right now is at the entrance off of Kings Highway. He further explained that there is a large

dip in the road where the stream used to run, and it is progressively getting worse over time.

Jen Rini, 44 Washington Street, spoke to share her support and excitement for the Silver Lake master plan. She explained that she has personally used the park throughout all phases of her life, and especially now, having a 2-year-old. Ms. Rini explained that she is very excited about the potential of the park and sees it as an untapped resource and gem for the city, and would love to help spread the word in her neighborhood and volunteered to help pass out the surveys.

Responding to Mr. Garfinkel, Mr. Ridgeway explained that migratory animals, specifically turtles, are an area that the city really would like to focus on and expand as much as possible. He further explained that the city is confined to where we are with Silver Lake. He stated that there is a large issue right now with geese further down the St. Jones on the Mirror Lake side. He stated that they would really like to make sure all these issues are encompassed in the scope of the work so that they can be addressed in the master plan.

Ms. Doyle stated that it is her understanding that the master plan from 2020 never went through the RFP process, and so that master plan got pushed aside, and all items that were supposed to be addressed are still being considered. She posed the question, " Is the master plan only for the park, or is it also focusing on the watershed?" She asked that it focus from Washington Street down to Loockerman Street and work in conjunction with the Downtown Dover Partnership's vision for Mirror Lake because that is considered part of the Silver Lake area. She suggested taking advantage of input from DNREC and their finances, input from folks on the county and state levels of parks and rec, because they have a lot of expertise in doing the master plans and can save time and money, rather than using the $75,000 so consultants can interview them. She stated that $75,000 is a small amount of money for a lot of these items, especially with no stormwater utility at this time. She stated that hopefully matching generic funds can be sought and that the master plan has plans for more native trees and plants, repairing buffers, permeable parking, land preservation along the watershed, and continued assessment of water quality.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ridgeway explained that the full scope of the master plan will be gauged by the survey responses from the residents and what we can get included for the amount that is budgeted.

Revisit Request for Review of Cash-in-Lieu Payment for Active Recreation Area Requirement for Cecil Street Townhouses at 207 N. West Street (Dawn Melson-Williams, Principal Planner)

Ms. Dawn Melson-Williams reviewed the background and analysis of the revisited request for a cash-in-lieu payment for the active recreation area requirement for the Cecil Street Townhouses at 207 North West Street.

Staff recommended approval of the active recreation report.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Melson-Williams stated that there are several exemptions under which this project could be considered. She explained that there are exemptions for what are called small developments, explaining that one of them is related to acreage and number of units, and there is also one that is because of location within the downtown redevelopment target area. Ms. Melson-Williams explained that if you do the straight calculations for what the cash-in-lieu would be based on, following it under the area and number of lots versus the development in the downtown redevelopment target area, the second exemption ends up with an even bigger number of what cash-in-lieu would be. She further explained that they defaulted to the exemption of small development, which is less than five (5) acres of land and less than ten (10) dwelling units.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Melson-Williams explained that the exemption refers to a different method of calculating the cash-in-lieu. She stated that this exemption is the five (5) acres and less than ten (10) dwelling units goes to a cash-in-lieu of 10% of the gross land area value and the other exemption is a different calculation and is based on a land area, but the minimum, while the land area is 75 square feet per dwelling unit and there is a minimum amount of land area, and that amount ends up a bigger number. Ms. Melson-Williams further explained that the determination made originally in selecting the exemption was based on land area and the number of dwelling units.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Melson-Williams stated that Mary Street Park is located a block to the north, and there are sidewalks from the park to where the units are proposed for development.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Melson-Williams stated that, in the past, cash-in-lieu has been used most recently for much larger projects where not all the land area could be accommodated as part of the development. She further stated there were at least two apartment projects that utilized cash-in-lieu for part of their active recreation requirement. Ms. Melson-Williams explained that The Edge at Dover, which is under construction now, while having amenities, including a dog park, clubhouse, pool, and other game court surfaces, did not include enough land areas, so they did a cash-in-lieu for part of the requirement. She confirmed those projects were much larger projects that included a cash-in-lieu payment.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Marney stated that she would defer to the recommendation of Ms. Melson-Williams, as she is not familiar with the code in this case and will review it and respond to council via email.

Cameron Llewellyn, 117 West Reed Street, stated that they have almost put their porch back together. Mr. Llewellyn stated that this has been a process for him, and if his daughter and son-in-law were not moving into unit four (4), he would have given up the project altogether and placed them for sale. He further explained, for context, that the Raising Cane's restaurant was at the same

application meeting as the first meeting for this project, and that the whole restaurant had been built and opened, and he is still trying to get this project going. Mr. Llewellyn commended Sharon Duca, Acting City Manager, for her efforts in three (3) weeks since taking the position. He now has a recorded site plan and is really close to being able to submit for a building permit. He further explained that right now, there is the SJR8 Housing Reform Program, an initiative to figure out how to make homes more affordable in Dover, Delaware; however, it seems there isn't the ability to make a two-by-four or two-by-six cost less money at Lowe's or any supply house. He stated that when looking at affordability and homes, the only thing that can be done to make it cost less is to get to the point where the shovel is placed in the ground and pour the concrete. Mr. Llewellyn proceeded to go over the site plan of the townhomes. He further explained that they have lost buyers due to the time it has taken to go through this process. He explained that the cost has been substantial, at over $50,000 worth of engineering costs to bring in the water, sewer, electric, and all utilities. Mr. Llewellyn explained that there is a need to figure out a way so that these homes do not take this much effort to get to the point where they can start building. Mr. Llewellyn explained that he met with Jason Lyon and Sharon Duca, and they went through the cost of what it was going to take, and they came up with alternative solutions to bring the sprinkler lines into the backyard and not have to dig up half of Cecil Street at a cost of approximately $30,000. Mr. Llewellyn stated that this process is failed and we need to reexamine it and need to make sure that it is looked into, if nothing else, the large amount of money and time that has been spent trying to get a project approved, and make sure that it is looked at when we look at housing reform and find another way so that it doesn't take two years to get to the point that you say okay you can build.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Melson-Williams explained her interpretation of the code is that council, as the recommending body to the Planning Commission, could say full cash-in-lieu as it is calculated out to be $8000, or could be a lesser amount, including zero.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Ms. Melson-Williams stated that previously, there was a large single-family detached house, and it was divided into multiple units.
Mr. Neil stated that there was one building that was there, and now there will be four desperately needed homes. He further stated that each will be paying property taxes annually, so to bring this down to zero, the city loses nothing because the recreation is a block away. He explained it makes sense to put people in the center of the city, where there is trouble finding housing, and get four houses for the price of one in terms of property tax for the future yield.

Responding to Dr. Pillsbury, Mr. Ridgeway explained that currently, Mary Street Park is in very good condition and that there is nothing that needs to be replaced as of right now. He further explained that the park is being looked at by NeighborGood Partners to potentially donate funds to help expand the park to the property next to the park.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Melson-Williams explained that the zoning ordinance does not lay out specific criteria. She further explained that in the statement of reference that construction of recreation is not practical due to and then gives the list of three things; proximity to existing available recreation facilities, not feasible due to the natural characteristics of the land, such as being totally wooded or very heavily sloped, or that it will not benefit the residents of the development. Ms. Melson-Williams explained that the three criteria are subjective, and the code is set up so that the matter comes before this body as a technical review on the recreation side, and then the Planning Commission has to look at all the information on a case-by-case basis and make a decision on the matter.

Dr. Sudler stated that he was concerned about the process, specifically how to be able to withstand scrutiny moving forward, and making sure that there is some uniform criteria that is being followed in the process.

Ms. Arndt suggested the possibility of putting the $1,000.00 towards street trees, as there is not a very strong tree canopy in that area, and that would be a benefit to the residents in the immediate area and to the purchasers of the townhomes.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend a partial waiver of the fees down to $1,000.00 for the cash-in-lieu. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocha and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Review of Active Recreation Plan – Lands of Fuller at 7 Nixon Lane (Dawn Melson-Williams)

Ms. Dawn Melson-Williams reviewed the background and analysis of the active recreation plan for the Lands of Fuller at 7 Nixon Lane.

Staff recommended approval of the active recreation report.

Responding to Dr. Pillsbury, Ms. Melson-Williams showed the proximity of the park to the project and explained that the main entrance of the park is actually from White Oak Road, which you could access from two separate roads and that there is a shoulder and sidewalk that could be used if you wanted to reach the park from the proposed properties.

Mr. Anderson agreed that when doing the revisions that are being worked on in the code, council needs to revisit what is considered a small development.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend a partial waiver of the fees down to $750.00. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Review of Active Recreation Plan – Bay Village Residential Planned Neighborhood Design on the south side of White Oak Road (Dawn Melson-Williams, Principal Planner)

Ms. Dawn Melson-Williams reviewed the background and analysis of the active recreation plan for the Bay Village residential planned neighborhood design.

Staff recommended approval of the Active Recreation Area Plan for the project, subject to the conditions outlined in the Active Recreation Review Report.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Melson-Williams confirmed that the amenities proposed are just for what is on this site plan, and if the apartments are built in a separate phase, it would require additional recreational opportunities due to the calculation of the land area.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Melson-Williams confirmed that the location of this development tract is on the south side of White Oak Road, directly opposite part of the Garrison Oak Business and Technology Center. Ms. Melson-Williams stated that the easter entrance of Garrison Oak Drive will align with the main entrance going into this neighborhood.

Dr. Pillsbury moved to recommend approval of the Active Recreation Area Plan subject to the conditions outlined in the report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Silver Lake Dam – Annual Inspection Review (Jason Lyon, Water & Wastewater Director)

Mr. Jason Lyon, Director of Water and Wastewater review the background and analysis of the Silver Lake Dam annual inspection.

Staff recommended acceptance of the Silver Lake Dam 2025 Dam Safety Inspection Report and the FY2026 Silver Lake Dam Inspection update memorandum.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that $22,000 to $24,000 is the amount that is included in the annual budget for this inspection.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon explained that although he is a licensed professional engineer, he is a water/wastewater engineer, not a structural engineer. Mr. Lyon further explained that he does not have his scuba certification, which is also a part of the requirement.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that they do not have estimates yet for the 22 recommendations in the report. He further stated that everything listed in the report is a non-immediate repair, so it will be part of the 2028 capital improvement program.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lyon stated that he appreciated Mr. Lewis providing the funding information from the federal government to potentially help cover the cost of the upcoming repairs. He explained that the deadline had passed for the FEMA grant that Mr. Lewis provided, and when they asked about future grant opportunities, they did not know at this point.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the report as recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Proposed Grant Recommendations for 2026 (Debbie Obrien, CDBG Program Manager)

Ms. Debbie Obrien, CDBG Program Manager, reviewed the background and analysis of the proposed grant recommendation for 2026.

Staff recommended approval of the recommended funding amounts.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Ms. Obrien explained that the information has been in the draft action plan, and she is before council to receive approval of this report to include the recommendations for the funding plans.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Obrien explained that to remain code compliant, some items that are not a code violation, such as a window that doesn't lock from the inside, code enforcement may not enforce that unless it is a rental, but that is still a safety issue.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Ms. Arndt moved for adjournment of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee meeting, hearing no objection, the meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

UTILITY COMMITTEE

The Utility Committee met with Chairman Rocha presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

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

Evaluation of Proposals – Manganese Removal Systems for Drinking Water (Kate Mills, P.E., Assistant Director of the Department of Water & Wastewater)

Ms. Kate Mills, P.E., Assistant Director of the Department of Water & Wastewater, reviewed the evaluation of the proposal for the manganese removal systems for drinking water.

Staff recommended awarding the contract to Verdantas for the Manganese Removal Systems for Drinking Water, RFP #26-0012WW, for the amount of $449,500.)

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Mills explained that two proposals were received and, after grading each, Verdantas was chosen. Ms. Mills further explained that their proposal was also the lowest cost between the two proposals, so that was factored into the grading.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Mills explained that one of the items submitted with proposals is references; these are required to see if they work with other municipalities. She further explained that prior to advertising this proposal, they reached out to other municipalities or water systems to see what they had done to treat manganese, so they used that information to guide what was placed in the proposal.

Ms. Hall moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation to award the contract to Verdantas for the Manganese Removal Systems for Drinking Water, RFP #26-0012WW, for the amount of $449,500. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and unanimously carried by a roll call vote (Boggerty and Iriowen absent).

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Presentation – Safer Community Campaign HELP Initiative (Charles Kistler, HELP Initiative)

Mr. Harold Stafford and Ms. Rosalynd Rodriguez reviewed the Safer Community Campaign presentation.

Staff Recommended approval for the Acting City Manager to sign and submit a letter of authorization.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Stafford explained that in order for residents to take advantage of the credit to reduce their utility bill, they would have to allow them to go inside their home to complete the home energy check-up and counseling, and they would have to have an all-encompassing assessment that includes the exterior and interior. Mr. Stafford explained that it is different than before due to a different funding source; it was 100% funded by specifically interior, now that the funding is different, the focus is different. It is necessary to have the entire project completed.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Stafford explained it is not considered a summer jobs program, they are trying to prepare people to get careers into trades by hiring people at $18.00 an hour and have them work with the program for at least 20 hours a week and in order for them to be able to be hired as an intern, they have to commit to pursue a trade at one of the vocational schools. Mr. Stafford further explained they have just entered into an agreement with the Carpenters Union and plan to work with all of the unions because a lot of the interns, due to a lot of the interns, have had an interest in the trades. He stated the goal is for those who meet the requirements to be referred to the unions and hopefully stay on the pathway to certification, not just a summer job, and end up with high-paying jobs. Mr. Stafford further explained that they also have funding to pay for the interns taking classes and getting their certifications.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stafford explained that they have started to work with Neighborhood Crime Watch programs, stating that the City of Seaford has been their concept working with Chief Craft, and would like to expand and cover more areas.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stafford stated that they had funding for cameras, and they purchased the first LPR device in the City of Dover with that funding. However, they do not have that funding anymore, as the original funding was through ARPA funds.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stafford stated that they have installed a lot of lights in Barrister's Place, and he explained that when he was approached by Councilman Boggerty for additional lights, the funding had run out, and they were not able to provide any additional resources. Mr. Stafford further explained that they have grant applications pending and are hopeful that by July 1, 2026, they will have been approved for further funding.

Responding to Ms. Hall, Mr. Stafford stated that even if they have installed exterior lighting in the area, they would still be eligible to receive the homeowner's check-up and counseling, as well as become eligible for the $300.00 credit for their energy bill.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Stafford stated that they do not currently partner with the DEMEC Efficiency Smart Program but are open to partnering with that

program or anyone else that might be able to help with better leveraging the limited resources so that the impact is greater for the residents.

Dr. Sudler moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation to approve the Acting City Manager to sign and submit a letter of authorization to the HELP Initiative. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Mr. Rocha moved for adjournment of the Utility Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

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

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Garfinkel moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

Review of Snowstorm Budget Costs (Sharon Duca, Acting City Manager)

Ms. Sharon Duca, Acting City Manager, reviewed the snowstorm budget costs presentation.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca explained that they place snow response staff up in local hotels if there is going to be difficulty with them being able to come and go from their homes, further explaining that some staff live in more rural areas and it can be challenging to get to work. Ms. Duca stated that it is only used when there are larger storms that could potentially create an issue, but they are placed so that the city can ensure there are enough personnel on duty during the storm, confirming this has been a common practice throughout the years.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca explained that Kay Sass, Emergency Management Director, keeps a very close eye on what qualifies for federal assistance. Ms. Duca explained that the two storms were not bad enough this year to qualify for federal funds.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca stated that, as noted during the presentation, the personnel expenses were covered with what was budgeted. Ms. Duca further stated that it is the overtime costs that the budget analyst and the finance department are working to balance out those costs. Ms. Duca explained that the

contractor's assistance came from the reserve fund and that the amount was for salt and snow melt in the grounds division and public works. Ms. Duca stated that it was due to the cost of contractors that it was necessary to find savings in other areas in the operational fund that had not been utilized in order to cover those costs. Ms. Duca further stated that there may be money left in the grounds budget to purchase more ice melt, but the funds are pretty much depleted.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Duca explained that when the snow plan is updated in the fall, prior to the winter season, one of the tests in the plan is to call different contractors to check their availability. She further explained that they try to avoid actually having someone under contract that we have to pay regardless of what occurs; therefore, they have certain people available. Ms. Duca stated that some contractors cannot respond until 24 hours after the storm starts because they have contracts with other facilities or the state, so they make calls to follow up to see who is available.

Consideration of Restoring an Alderman's Court (Council President Neil)

Council President Neil reviewed the background and analysis regarding the restoration of an Aldermen's Court.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Mr. Lewis stated that he believes this matter is worth exploring; however, he has concerns about costs, as well as whether the city has sole jurisdiction over the court. Mr. Lewis also asked if the state would assist with funding to help establish the Alderman's Court. Mr. Lewis suggested conducting a feasibility study.

Dr. Sudler stated the reason he is not supportive at this time is not that he believes in the status quo; it is to be financially and fiscally responsible in making this decision. He further explained that he would like to see the financial picture before moving forward with this matter. He asked if all the Alderman's court decisions would be final, if there were an appeal process, and if appealed, would it go to the State of Delaware court system. He stated he is worried about whether this implementation will result in an increase in residents' property taxes. He stated he is ready to explore this matter; however, moving forward would be premature.

Responding to the concerns, Mr. Anderson explained that they are not looking to authorize the expenditure of any funding at this time. He further explained that it would not be a commitment of any funding; it is about getting the authorization of what other cities around the state are doing. He further explained that this doesn't have to be implemented in nine (9) to twelve (12) months; it would take two (2) to three (3) years to get set up and established.

Mr. Anderson further explained that tonight they would be authorizing the city solicitor to create a resolution and a charter amendment that would go to the state legislature and if it is not done now, there would be a waiting period of a year to have it be considered and that this is step one, with many other steps taking place in the overall discussion that will not be able to be rushed. He stated that there is no reason to rush this matter, as it is necessary to get it done correctly.

Mr. Garfinkel stated that he has a better understanding of why getting the authorization now is imperative to the process; however, he does agree that this is an incredibly complex matter, and we don't want to move along too quickly. He stated he believes that the authorization to start the process should be done immediately.

Dr. Sudler stated his concerns about staying aligned with constituents' needs due to it being they who will bear the financial brunt of the decision. He stated he is worried that he doesn't believe this is a constituent-driven matter. He explained that it is for innovative ways to deal with the problems that are plaguing the city, but believes that there needs to be data to support further discussions. He believes this matter should be community-driven.

Mr. Neil stated that this initiative is being driven by the constituents who are tired of seeing their homes and businesses destroyed due to the quality-of-life issues happening around the city. Further stating that residents are moving out of the city due to these issues. Mr. Neil further explained that there are hurdles to the process, and he has asked the acting city manager to review the budget and decide if it is possible this year, and if not, possibly next year. Mr. Neil explained that we need to raise the quality of life as the city is crumbling.

Ms. Arndt requested additional information from other municipalities that have an Alderman's Court to be able to support this matter.

Vonderlear Smack, Dover, DE, read a written statement of public comment on Alderman's Court and submitted it for the record **(Attachment #1)**.

Responding to Ms. Smack, Mr. Anderson asked that she recommend someone to sit on the ad-hoc committee.

Chelle Paul stated that she has been part of the conversations regarding Alderman's Court and believes it is wonderful in concept; however, the issue is the marginalized people and communities it affects. Ms. Paul stated that if it does move forward, code enforcement violations are not brought to Alderman's Court. Ms. Paul explained that the way the council is handling matters in this chamber is creating distrust among black and brown communities. Ms. Paul has concerns that the Alderman's Court be utilized as intended, not to make money for the city. Ms. Paul explained that she is on the fence with this initiative, as it could have unintended consequences on marginalized communities.

Mr. Neil stated that he cannot support the motion to create an ad-hoc committee until there is a resolution to begin the process with the state legislature. Mr. Neil stated that he believes everyone should show a sign of faith to the people who are paying property taxes who have approached council and then work on the details as funding decisions, etc., are made. Mr. Neil stated that he has assured everyone that code enforcement items will not be considered at Alderman's Court; they will remain within the Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals.

Responding to Ms. Hall, Mr. Anderson explained the timeline of when the resolution would need to go to the state legislature to begin the charter change to allow the discussion to begin.
Dr. Sudler stated he believes that council needs to take time and consideration of this matter prior to submitting a resolution to the state legislature.

Mr. Rocha stated that he agrees with the motion by Mr. Lewis and believes that rushing into sending a resolution to the state legislature seems premature. He stated that he believes that the concept is good and worth exploring, but there are too many details that need to be figured out. He further stated that he would not feel comfortable voting for a resolution that has not been reviewed by the council. He suggested taking the time necessary to include facts and figures needed to make an informed decision.

Mr. Shevock stated that he understood that there is a need to take the step of completing the resolution to the state legislature to then have the ability to move forward, but then it would take time to go through the process of setting up the entire process. He further explained that taking the time to go forward with the ad-hoc committee and get the ball rolling without having the resolution passed by the state legislature could end up being a waste of time if they don't approve

Mr. Lewis moved to recommend conducting a feasibility study of an Alderman's court and establishing an Ad Hoc committee to obtain input from the community. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garfinkel and passed by voice vote with one abstention (Neil).

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Anderson confirmed that if the charter is amended by the state legislature and it is decided that it cannot be done currently, the option will remain in the charter going forward and give the flexibility to bring the matter forward in the future.

Dr. Sudler stated that he will not be supporting the motion because he believes resolutions should come from constituents, and he does not see any constituents here in support.

Mr. Anderson stated that he has heard from approximately 200 people stating that the system is broken and the city needs to do something.

Bonnie Pennington, Dover, DE, stated that she rejects this initiative. She stated she believes it would be a waste of money on something that will not work.

Mr. Faust, Dover, DE, stated that if someone can appeal to a higher court, why is this necessary? He further stated that with the current budget concerns where the funding is going to come from. Mr. Faust explained that council needs to be realistic and practical about this matter.

Responding to Ms. Smack, Mr. Anderson explained that charter changes are normally easily passed through the state legislature, and there are elected officials willing to sponsor this initiative.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend creating a Resolution to change the charter, drafted by the City Solicitor, which would be brought back for review and discussion at the committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and failed by a roll call vote of five yes (Anderson, Pillsbury, Neil, Shevock, Garfinkel), five no (Hall, Arndt, Rocha, Sudler, Lewis), and one absent (Boggerty).

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for approval of the Committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

Consideration of an Alderman's Court – Speed Control (Council President Neil)

Agenda Item #3, Consideration of an Alderman's Court – Speed Control, was not addressed due to the failure of Agenda Item #2, Consideration of Restoring an Alderman's Court.

The Mayor's Blue Ribbon Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) Taskforce Committee's Recommendations (Councilman Dr. Sudler)

Ms. Arielle Rivera, Assistant City Clerk, reviewed the committee's proposed recommendations.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Mr. Lewis moved to recommend acceptance of the report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

During the council meeting, Dr. Sudler asked Mr. Neil to call for a roll call vote on Item #28, the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) Taskforce Committee's recommendations, to accept the report and recommendations.

Mr. Anderson stated that there was no motion, only discussion, and that the item was ready for a roll call vote.

Mr. Neil clarified that they were at the point of discussion.

Mr. Anderson thanked the Opioid Task Force for their work, noting the significant time and research they put into the recommendations. He stated the recommendations should be adopted with an amendment to include funding to expand the behavioral health unit by hiring one (1) additional individual. He further stated that this should be included in the application and that the proposed programs should be part of the amendment.

Mr. Anderson moved to amend the Mayor's Blue Ribbon Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) Taskforce Committee's recommendations to add a behavioral health individual to the Dover Police Behavioral Health Unit from the Opioid Settlement Funds, so they could expand to a second individual and have coverage for more than 40 hours a week. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil.

Dr. Sudler stated they had already done the work and that the six (6) recommendations came from the committee. He further stated that the item was not for allocating funds to any department at that time, but was only to present the committee's findings. He disagreed with assigning funding to departments, especially the police department, before receiving the academy report and budget. He noted that the process should be allowed to continue and Mayor Christiansen should be permitted to submit applications to the state before any funding decisions were made. He argued it would be improper to decide how funds should be used in advance, stating other organizations and programs should also have the opportunity to compete for funding. He emphasized that community needs relief efforts should be considered first. He asked that the process be allowed to proceed, stating that the recommendations should be accepted without prematurely allocating funds. He also requested that Mayor Christiansen be allowed to speak and present information before any motions or funding decisions were made.

Mr. Anderson stated that the deadline to submit applications to the state was May 18th and that there was one more meeting. He further stated that he wanted the body to consider how funds were allocated, noting that it was the council's responsibility to make those decisions. He requested that a recommendation be considered, whether or not it was decided that night, and said it was important to keep it on the table. He stated the community had expressed a desire to expand the behavioral health unit and suggested it could be funded through grants or other sources. He added that he believed the expenditure was an approved use of funds.

Dr. Sudler stated that they had demonstrated that the state was eager to partner with them and referenced previous budget hearings about integrated services and partnering with the county and state. He questioned why the council should move quickly to spend money when partnership

opportunities were available. He noted that the state had resources such as a mobile unit, a registered nurse, and a mobile hospital, shown in a previous presentation. He stated that council should consider saving money by using existing services and forming partnerships instead of duplicating services that were already available.

Mr. Anderson stated that he was not going to make a motion originally because he wanted council to consider that when they meet in May, the decision has to be made and not be put off. He noted that he would withdraw the amendment if the secondary allowed. Mr. Neil withdrew his second.

Mayor Christiansen stated that, in relation to the settlement, he had previously suggested a swimming pool as a therapeutic option, but acknowledged it was not the appropriate solution. He said the opioid committee was formed to develop a plan for using the $259,000 allocated for community use. He explained that, in his role as mayor and head of the police department, he requested $155,000 from the county, pending approval to return to council. He noted that the request included funding for two (2) additional clinicians to provide 24/7 services and a 29-hour data collection position to track costs and funding. He added that the application also aimed to extend services to smaller communities in Kent County that lacked access to clinicians, allowing them to benefit from similar support as the city. He mentioned he would bring the proposal back to council if approved and emphasized that the funding would support expanded clinical services. He concluded that the situation was urgent and should be treated as a crisis.

Mr. Anderson voted in favor of the acceptance of the recommendations from the report, as long as they received the money for the clinicians that was needed.

Mr. Lewis moved to recommend acceptance of the report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

City of Dover Municipal Police Academy Cost Review (Thomas Johnson, Chief of Police)

Mr. Thomas Johnson, Chief of Police, reviewed the background behind the City of Dover Municipal Police Academy.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Chief Johnson explained that the City of Dover Municipal Police Academy is the only commuter academy below the canal. He explained that Delaware State Police Academy is five (5) days a week, including overnights, and that they do accept municipal police recruits and that they are brought back to their own organization. He explained that the costs are approximately the same for either academy. He stated that he has found that most of the time, agencies prefer the City of Dover model of academy.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson referred to page three (3), Item nine (9) of the binder of information that explains the return on investment of the academy and officers produced.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson explained that there are three (3) officers assigned to the academy as the core instructional team, and if the supervising officer was not over the academy, he would be reassigned to another supervisory role, and that would leave two (2) corporals.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson explained that they are not getting additional pay to staff the academy; that is just their assignment for the week. He further explained that they flex officers from unit to unit to solve organizational problems all year long, from motorcycles to patrol to community policing, if there is a void in a particular area. He stated they will also fill in an SRO for a school day if the assigned officers cannot be there. Chief Johnson stated they are constantly shifting staff around to whatever role they need to perform to make sure that all mission objectives are met. He further explained that it is a constant, flexible model to allow as much efficiency as possible.

Dr. Sudler stated he would like to resume the conversation about budgetary constraints of the Dover Municipal Police Academy as they work through the upcoming budget issues.

Responding to Mr. Garfinkel, Chief Johnson explained that poaching is a touchy subject in their industry. He further explained that he is militant about the idea that if another agency sends a recruit to them to be trained, that conversation does not take place. He stated that he had two officers that have been trained and then went elsewhere and then returned.

Responding to Mr. Garfinkel, Chief Johnson stated that the idea that they retain more people who are trained brings stability to the organization. He further stated that they have had turnover, as well as attrition, in the last few years. Chief Johnson explained that they are doing well at retaining officers, further explaining that trying to project as the harder to see number is economical for Dover when it comes to retention and reducing all the costs that we currently are struggling with through the hiring process and turnover. He stated that retention is paramount because recruitment is still a struggle; however, they are not going backward any longer, as they were in 2023 and 2024. He believes they are starting to see a little bit of the return and interest, not just in the profession but in Kent County as a destination.

James Overton, Delaware State University Police Superintendent, gave an overview of his experience with his recertification process, attending the City of Dover Municipal Police Academy, and gave his support.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Chief Johnson explained that it is longer if they send recruits to another police academy and explained that a longer academy is less return on investment.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Chief Johnson explained that the State Police Academy is a live-in academy and they build troopers, not shovel-ready municipal officers.

Responding to Chelle Paul, Chief Johnson did not give the costs of the police academy. Chief Johnson stated that if the city wants enough officers on the street, training their own officers helps us achieve authorized strength and maintain it.

During the council meeting, Dr. Sudler stated that he wanted Item #29 - City of Dover Municipal Police Academy Cost Review to be removed from the consent agenda because he had wanted to ask some questions and to make a motion on the item.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson stated that the city was already using lateral hiring, including hiring officers through reciprocity from in-state and out-of-state agencies. He explained that the current job market for certified officers was limited due to staffing shortages and competition from other agencies offering higher pay and signing bonuses. He added that lateral hiring remained an option, and he would continue to consider certified applicants to bring officers on duty more quickly and reduce the need for academy training.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson explained that the city had a strong retention rate and did not typically see new academy graduates leaving for other agencies. It was noted that Delaware law already required a four (4) year, prorated repayment structure for training costs if officers left early. He further explained that the city had paid other agencies when hiring lateral officers with less than four (4) years of service, but did not usually experience repayment going the other way. He added that officers sometimes transferred between agencies and returned later. He also stated that, despite those costs, hiring trained officers remained beneficial because it was still less expensive than recruiting and training new officers from the academy.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson explained that the situation did not happen often, occurring roughly once every 24 months and only a few times in five (5) years. He stated that when it did occur, he would inform the city manager about the cost required to hire a lateral officer under the four (4) year requirement. He noted that the city administration then handled the payment.

Responding to Chief Johnson, Dr. Sudler requested that he give that information to Ms. Duca so she could be informed of the process. He also asked for clarification on how the funds were labeled and allocated for both past and future reference to ensure proper budgeting.

Dr. Sudler moved to accept Item #29 on the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

Mr. Anderson moved for adjournment of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting, hearing no objection, the meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

Mr. Neil moved for adjournment of the Council Committee of the Whole meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

By consent agenda, Dr. Sudler moved for acceptance of the Council Committee of the Whole Report, seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried by a unanimous roll call vote (Pillsbury absent).

QUARTERLY REPORTS

By motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Rocha, the following quarterly reports were accepted by consent agenda (Pillsbury absent):

Quarterly Revenue Report as of March 31, 2026
Quarterly Report – Capital Investment Plan (CIP) (January, February, March)

SEMI-MONTHLY REPORTS

By motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Rocha, the following semi-monthly reports were accepted by consent agenda (Pillsbury absent):

Semi-Annual Inspection by Acting City Manager – Robbins Hose Company (Sharon J. Duca, Acting City Manager)

APPOINTMENTS RECOMMENDED BY MAYOR CHRISTIANSEN

By motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Mr. Rocha, the following appointments were accepted by consent agenda (Pillsbury absent):

Board of Adjustment – William "Bill" Holmes – Three-Year Term to Expire July 2029 (to fill the expired term of Clarence Wagner, II)

POLICE PENSION PLAN INCREASE REQUEST (RET. LT. TIMOTHY MULLANEY, SR., CHAIR)

Ret. Lt. Timothy Mullaney, Sr., Chairman of the Police Pension, reviewed the Police Pension Plan Increase Request.

Mr. Rocha moved to accept the committee recommendation for the Police Pension Plan for 5% pension increase on July 1, 2026, and an additional 5% pension increase effective on July 1, 2027. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Marney clarified that there would be no impact on the General Fund, as the Police Pension trust fund was fully self-funded, and no additional contributions were required through the city budget per the actuary.

Responding to Ms. Marney, Mr. Anderson stated that before voting, he wanted confirmation since this approach could not be applied to the General Employee Pension Fund, as the city did not have the funds, and could affect them by millions of dollars.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca confirmed that the Police Pension Trust Fund was separate and would not impact the upcoming budget.

Mr. Rocha moved to accept the committee recommendation for the Police Pension Plan for

5% pension increase on July 1, 2026, and an additional 5% pension increase effective on July 1, 2027. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and carried unanimously.

FINAL READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-03 - AMENDING CHAPTER 22 – BUILDING AND BUILDING REGULATIONS, ARTICLE XI – DANGEROUS BUILDING (EDDIE KOPP, CHIEF CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER)

The First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-03 was accomplished during the Council Meeting of April 13, 2026. The ordinance is available at the entrance of the Council Chambers or on the City's website at www.cityofdover.gov under "Government."

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

Mr. Eddie Kopp, Chief Code Enforcement Officer, reviewed the Proposed Ordinance #2026-03, Amending Chapter 22 – Building and Building Regulations, Article XI – Dangerous Buildings.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kopp stated that he does not report to Mr. Todd Stonesifer, so he was unaware whether he had signed off on the changes. He noted that the Proposed Ordinance #2026-03 has been vetted and approved by the City Manager's Office and legal counsel.
Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kopp clarified that those individuals had not contacted him, but he has received feedback on the vacant building ordinance, not on the current Proposed Ordinance #2026-03.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Griffith clarified that the City Charter makes clear whether the Downtown Dover Partnership could authorize or sign off on council decisions; those decisions were the exclusive responsibility of the city council.

Dr. Sudler moved for adoption of Ordinance #2026-03 - Amending Chapter 22 – Building and Building Regulations, Article XI – Dangerous Buildings, seconded by Ms. Hall, and unanimously carried (Lewis absent).

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

That Chapter 22 – Buildings and Building Regulations, Article XI – Dangerous Buildings, be amended by inserting the text indicated in bold, blue, italics, and deleting the text indicated in red strikeout as follows:

ARTICLE XI. – DANGEROUS BUILDINGS

Sec. 22-381. – Definitions.

The following words, terms**,** and phrases, when used in this article, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:
Dangerous buildings mean all buildings or structures that have any of the following defects or uses:

(1) *Leaning interior walls.* Those of which the interior walls or other vertical structural members list, lean, or buckle to such an extent that a plumb line passing through the center of gravity falls outside of the middle third of its base.

(2) *Damaged walls, etc.* Those that exclusive of the foundation show 33 percent or more damage or deterioration of the supporting member or members, or 50 percent of damage or deterioration of the non-supporting enclosing or outside walls or covering.

(3) *Load on roofs.* Those that have improperly distributed loads upon the floors or roofs, or that are overloaded, or that have insufficient strength to be reasonably safe for the purpose used.

(4) *Fire damage, etc.* Those that have been damaged by fire, wind, or other causes which have become dangerous to life, safety, morals, or the general health and welfare of the occupants or the people of the city.

(5) *Unfit for habitation.* Those that have become or are so dilapidated, decayed, unsafe, insanitary, or so utterly fail to provide the amenities to decent living that they are unfit for human habitation, or are likely to cause sickness or disease, so as to cause injury to the health, morals, safety, or general welfare of those living therein.

(6) *Light, air, sanitation.* Those having light, air, and sanitation facilities that are inadequate to protect the health, morals, safety, or general welfare of human beings who live or may live therein.

(7) *Fire escapes, etc.* Those having inadequate facilities in case of fire or panic, or those having sufficient stairways, elevators, fire escapes, or other means of communication.

(8) *Loose parts.* Those that have parts thereof which are so attached that they may fall and injure members of the public or property.

(9) *General welfare.* Those that, because of their condition or use, are unsafe, insanitary, or dangerous to the public health, morals, safety**,** or general welfare of the people of this city.

(10) *Code violations.* Those existing in violation of any provisions of the adopted codes of this city, or any provision of the fire prevention code, or any other ordinances of this city.

(11) *Drug sales, use, etc.* Those that are being used for the unlawful selling, serving, storing, giving away, or manufacturing (which includes the production, preparation, compounding, conversion, processing, packaging or repackaging) of any drug, which consists of all narcotic or psychoactive drugs, cannabis, cocaine and all controlled substances as defined in the Uniform Controlled Substances Act (16 Del. C. § 4701 et seq.).

(12) *Unoccupied buildings.* Those **t**hat are left unoccupied and unattended for periods of three months or more, so that decay is being accelerated by natural or other causes, or which may be attracting trespassers and vagrants, increasing the probability of fire and danger to human life.

(13) *Incomplete buildings.* Those under construction are considered incomplete if the authorized work is substantially suspended or abandoned for of three months or more.

Sec. 22-382. Standards for repair, vacation, or demolition.

The following standards shall be followed in substance by the code official in ordering the repair, vacation, or demolition of dangerous buildings:

(1) *Repair.* If the dangerous building can reasonably be repaired so that it will no longer exist in violation of the terms of this article, it shall be ordered repaired.
(2) *Vacation.* If the building is in such a condition or is being used to make it dangerous to the health, morals, safety, or general welfare of its occupants, it shall be ordered to be vacated and closed. Buildings ordered closed shall not be reopened until a certificate of occupancy is issued.
(3) *Demolition.* The following shall be cause for demolition:
    (a) In all cases where a dangerous building is 50 percent damaged, decayed, or deteriorated from its original value or structure, or
    (b) In all cases where a building cannot be repaired so that it will no longer exist in violation of the terms of this article, or
    (c) In all cases where a dangerous building is a fire hazard, it poses a risk to public safety as determined by the fire marshal or any code official, or
    (d) Any existing or erected structure in violation of the terms of this article or any ordinance of the city or statute of the state.

Sec. 22-383. Nuisance declared.
All dangerous buildings within the terms of section 22-381 are hereby declared to be public nuisances, and shall be repaired**,** vacated, closed**,** or demolished as hereinbefore and hereafter provided.

Sec. 22-384. Duties of a code official.

The code official shall:
(1) *Inspect public buildings.* Inspect or cause to be inspected semiannually all public buildings, schools, halls, churches, theaters, hotels, tenements, or commercial, manufacturing, or loft buildings to determine whether any conditions exist which render such places a dangerous building within the terms of section 22-381.
(2) *Complaints.* Inspect any building, wall**,** or structure about which complaints are filed by any person to the effect that a building, wall**,** or structure is or may be existing in violation of this article.
(3) *Reported violations.* Inspect any building, wall**,** or structure reported (as hereinafter provided for) by the fire or police departments of this city as probably existing in violation of this article.
(4) *Dangerous buildings.* Inspect such other buildings as shall from time to time come to the inspector's attention as possibly dangerous buildings within the terms of section 22-381.
(5) *Notice to owner.* Notify, in writing, the owner, occupant, lessee, mortgagee, agent, and all other persons having an interest in said building, as shown by the land records of the recorder of deeds of the county, of any building found by the inspector to be a dangerous building within the standards set forth in section 22-381, that:

a. *Duties of the property owner.* The owner must vacate and close, or repair, or demolish said building in accordance with the terms of the notice and this article.

b. *Duties of occupant.* The occupant or lessee must vacate and close said building, or may have it repaired in accordance with the notice and remain in possession.

c. *Persons with interest.* The mortgagee, agent, or other persons having an interest in said building, as shown by the land records of the recorder of deeds of the county, may, at their own risk, repair, vacate and close, or demolish the said building or have such work or act done; provided that any person notified under this subsection to repair, vacate and close, or demolish any building shall be given such reasonable time, not exceeding 30 days, as may be necessary to do, or have done, the work or act required by the notice provided for herein~~;~~**.**

d. *Appeal.* The person or entity receiving notice by the code official shall have the right to appeal his decision directly to the council and have a hearing conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 22-385 before the city council, provided that the notice of appeal is filed with the city clerk no later than five days after receiving notice from the code official.

(6) *Order to remedy conditions.* Set forth in the notice provided for in subsection (5) hereof a description of the building or structure deemed unsafe, a statement of the particulars which make the building or structure a dangerous building, and an order requiring the same to be put in such condition to comply with the terms of this article within such length of time, not exceeding 30 days, as is reasonable.

(7) *Non-compliance with notice.* Report to the council any non-compliance with the notice provided for in subsections (5) and (6) hereof.

(8) *Testify at hearings.* Appear at all hearings conducted by council and testify as to the conditions of dangerous buildings.

(9) *Notice on buildings.* Place a notice on all dangerous buildings, reading as follows:

" This building has been found to be a dangerous building by the code official. This notice is to remain on this building unit until it is repaired or demolished in accordance with the notice which has been given to the owner, occupant, lessee, mortgagee, or agent for this building, and all other persons having an interest in said building, as shown by the land records of the recorder of deeds of Kent County. It is unlawful to remove this notice until such notice is complied with.

(10) *Orders of council.* Carry out all orders of the council to cause the repair, vacation**,** closure, or demolition of dangerous buildings pursuant to section 22-385. In causing the vacation of the dangerous building, the code official may order the city utilities to be disconnected. In causing the closure of dangerous buildings, the code official may direct the removal from the building of all furniture, equipment**,** and other personal property left by occupants.

Sec. 22-385. Hearing before City council.

The City council shall:

(1) *Notice of hearing.* Upon receipt of a report of the code official as provided for in section 22-384(7), give written notice to the owner, occupant, mortgagee, lessee, agent, and all other persons having an interest in said building, as shown by the records of the recorder of deeds of the county, to appear before it on the date specified in the notice to show cause why the building or structure reported to be a dangerous building should not be repaired, or demolished in accordance with the statement of particulars set forth in the code official's notice provided for herein in section 22-384(6).

(2) *Conduct of hearing.* Hold a hearing and hear such testimony as the code official or the owner, occupant, mortgagee, lessee, or any other person having an interest in said building, as shown by the land records of the recorder of deeds of the county, shall offer relative to the dangerous building. Hearings relative to reported dangerous buildings as defined in section 22-381(11) shall include the testimony of the city chief of police, who may submit arrest records, complaint records, and affidavits relative to the property as evidence for the hearing.

(3) *Findings.* Make written findings of fact from the testimony offered pursuant to subsection (2) of this section as to whether ~~or not~~ the building in question is a dangerous building within the terms of section 22-381.

(4) *Order.* Issue an order based upon findings of fact made pursuant to subsection (3) of this section, commanding the owner, occupant, mortgagee, lessee, agent and all other persons having an interest in said building, as shown on the land records of the recorder of deeds of the county, to repair, or demolish any building found to be a dangerous building within the terms of this article, setting the time not exceeding 30 days which said building shall be repaired, or demolished, and provided that any person so notified, except the owners, shall have the privilege of repairing said dangerous building; or any person not the owner of said dangerous building but having an interest in said building as shown by the land records of the recorder or deeds of the county may demolish said dangerous building at their own risk to prevent the acquiring of a lien against the land upon which said dangerous building stands by the city as provided in subsection (5) hereof.

(5) *Failure to comply.* If the owner, occupant, mortgagee, or lessee, fails to comply with the order provided for in subsection (4) hereof within ten days, cause such building or structure to be repaired, vacated and closed, or demolished, as the facts may warrant, under the standards hereinbefore provided for in section 22-384, and shall, with the assistance of the city solicitor, cause the costs of such repair or demolition to be charged against the land on which the building existed as a municipal lien or cause such costs to be added to the tax duplicate as an assessment, or to be levied as a special tax against the land upon which the building stands or did stand, or to be recovered in a suit at law against the owner, provided that in cases where such procedure is desirable and any delay is thereby caused will not be dangerous to the health, morals, safety, or general welfare of the people of this city, the council shall notify the city solicitor to take legal action to force the owner to make all necessary repairs or demolish the building.

(6) *Report to solicitor.* Report to the city solicitor the names of all persons not complying with the order provided for in subsection (4) hereof.

Sec. 22-386. Violations and penalties for disregarding notices or orders.

(a) *Violations by the property owner.* The property owner of any dangerous building who shall fail to comply with any notice or order to repair, vacate and close, or demolish said building given by the council shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined as provided for in Appendix F – Fees and Fines.

(b) *Violations by occupant or lessee.* The occupant or lessee in possession who fails to comply with any notice to vacate and close or who fails to repair said building in accordance with any notice given by the council as provided for in this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined as provided for in Appendix F – Fees and Fines.

(c) *Removal of notice.* Any person removing the notice provided for in section 22-384(9) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be fined as provided for in Appendix F – Fees and Fines.

Sec. 22-387. Duties of the city solicitor.

The city solicitor shall:

(1) *Prosecutions.* Prosecute all persons failing to comply with the terms of the order provided for in section 22-385(4).

(2) *Hearings.* Appear at all hearings before the council **regarding** dangerous buildings.

(3) *Collections.* Bring suit to collect all municipal liens, assessments, or **all** costs incurred **with any abatements regarding** dangerous buildings.

(4) *Other legal action.* Take such other legal action as is necessary to carry out the terms and provisions of this article.

Sec. 22-388. Emergency cases.

In cases where it reasonably appears that there is an immediate danger to the life or safety of any person, unless a dangerous building is immediately repaired, vacated, and closed, or demolished, the code official shall report such facts to the council, which may cause the immediate repair or demolition of such dangerous building. The costs of such emergency repair or demolition of such dangerous building shall be collected in the same manner as provided in section 22-385(5).

Sec. 22-389. Procedure when the property owner is absent from the city.

In cases, except emergency cases, where the owner, occupant, lessee, or mortgagee is absent from the city, all notices or orders provided for herein shall be sent by registered or certified mail to the owner, occupant, mortgagee, lessee and all other persons having an interest in said building, as shown by the land records of the recorder of deeds of the county, to the last known address of each, and a copy of such notice shall be posted in a conspicuous place on the

dangerous building to which it relates. Such mailing and posting shall be deemed adequate service.

Sec.22-390. Administrative liability.

No officer, agent, or employee of the city shall be held personally liable for any damage that may accrue to persons or property as the result of any act required or permitted in the discharge of official duties under this article. Any suit against any officer, agent, or employee of the city as a result of any act required or permitted in the discharge of **such** duties under this article shall be defended by the city solicitor until the final determination of the proceedings therein.

Sec. 22-391. Duties of the fire marshal and city employees.

The fire marshal, all members of the fire department, all officers of the police department, and all other employees of the city shall report, in writing, to the Division of Code Enforcement all buildings or structures within the city which shall come to their knowledge or attention as being dangerous buildings within the terms of this article.

Secs. 22-391-22-399. Reserved.

ADOPTED: April, 27, 2026

ACTING CITY MANAGER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Duca announced that she wanted to share that the FY26 Street program began last week on Bicentennial Boulevard. She noted that this year's Water Quality Improvement Program started this week on Queen Street, and the regular flushing program is ongoing through May 1, 2026.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Christiansen announced that the 93rd Annual Dover Days Festival would begin on May 1, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. with events on the Green and Legislative Mall. The train from Winter Fest would return, which many of the kids enjoyed. He explained that there were food trucks, a concert, and fireworks featured on Friday evening to kick off Dover Days. day. On May 2, 2026, Wesley Methodist Church would host a pancake breakfast at 7:00 a.m., followed by a downtown Dover parade featuring Maypole dancing, historic reenactors, Native American drummers and dancers, along with food and activities throughout the day. He noted that it was always a great celebration of everything that makes the City of Dover special.

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council members had nothing to report.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

.

ANDRIA L. BENNETT, CMC
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by the City Council during their Regular Meeting of April 27, 2026, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/AB

Exhibits
Exhibit #1 – Dr. Joseph Zingaro Statement
Exhibit #2 – Yolande Jackson Statement
Exhibit #3 – Sue Harris Statement
Exhibit #4 – Jill Quinn Statement

Member - Peoples church
Board Member PCC
Lives next Psy Ch a the Brandford Apt Neighbors
Zingaro

Good evening. My name is Dr. Joseph Zingaro. I am retired but worked as a psychologist for 42 years. I moved to Dover in 1984. I often told my patients that feelings are not facts. But sticking to the facts is sometimes hard. As I'm sure members of the Council can agree, our emotions affect our perceptions. And perceptions aren't facts either.

There was an observation made that a school bus was bringing people to the Peoples Community Center for drug treatment services. The school bus brings 18–21-year-olds who participate in the Strive program. This is a program for young adults with autism to help them with job skills and socialization opportunities. They help prepare meals.

How you define a problem has a direct effect on the solutions you consider. You are not likely to be open to or even consider solutions that are outside the problem as you defined it.

Please don't raise your hand, but have any of you been speeding in your car and not gotten caught? When did you speed? When you were being followed by a police car? How about when you saw a police car parked on the side of the road? A cop on the corner is a better strategy to prevent criminal behavior than a cop who is in the police station, ready as ever to respond to a call.

As I understand it, the Chief of police has stated he needs more individuals on his police force. The Fire Chief is asking for over a quarter of a million dollars ($299,600 to be exact) for a fence around the fire department parking lot to prevent individuals who have no business being in the parking lot from entering it. How long before someone spray paints the fence? How many police officers could the city hire for a quarter of a million dollars? Could this put more cops on the corner to prevent problems?

Eddie Kopp, the Chief Code Enforcement Officer, spoke at the Council Committee of the Whole meeting in March of this year, that there were 145 vacant building cases, 22 were vacant for 5 years and 2 of buildings for 14 years. In 2025, there were 1,700 inspections in reference to vacant sites. Does the City just tolerate vacant buildings with no recourse? Vacant sites might be pretty tempting for individuals to use for nefarious activities, don't you think? Ask the Fire Chief if vacant buildings increase the risk of arson.

In a Bay-to-Bay Newspaper article, dated April 18, 2026, it was reported that "a multi-law enforcement agency human trafficking operation in Kent County on April -brought the arrests of three men...Authorities said the operation was conducted in Kent County, with a focus in Dover. The men were all charged with patronizing a prostitute and released. Dover Police said they partnered with the FBI's Delaware Violent Crime and Safe Streets Task Force, Delaware Probation and Parole, and the Smyrna Police Department. During the operation, police said, investigators contacted 13 females engaged in commercial sex work. Each individual was offered various support services through FBI Victim

From: Yolande Jackson yolande_jackson@progressive.com
Subject: Dover City Council meeting public comment
Date: Apr 24, 2026 at 7:56:14 AM
To: Yolande Jackson yolande1965@comcast.net

I'm following up on my prior comments regarding the potential closure of PCC. I speak as a volunteer who prepares and serves meals at the shelter.

When I serve meals, I'm not serving a problem to be managed—I'm serving people. Seniors. Veterans. Individuals who are polite, grateful, and trying to survive a difficult chapter of their lives. For many of the people I serve, that meal is the only hot food they will receive that day, and PCC is the only place where they feel safe and treated with dignity.

Through my service, I see firsthand how essential this shelter is for people who truly have nowhere else to go. Closing PCC does not mean fewer people in need. It means fewer places for them to go. It means people eating outside, sleeping in unsafe conditions, and losing what little stability they have.

I understand concerns related to resources, regulation, and neighborhood impact. Those concerns deserve thoughtful solutions. But from what I see every time I serve a meal, shutting this shelter down does not resolve those issues—it shifts the burden elsewhere and makes the situation worse, not better.

I also want to reiterate a concern I raised previously—one I believe the community deserves clear answers to. There are members of this council who are closely affiliated with other shelters serving the same community and who are not speaking in support of PCC.

This raises reasonable questions about transparency. When council members openly support or are connected to other service providers but remain silent or adverse toward PCC, the public deserves clarity on how those affiliations are being managed and whether potential conflicts of interest are being disclosed and addressed.

This is not about questioning intentions. It is about ensuring that decisions affecting vulnerable people are made openly, fairly, and in the best interest of the entire community. Public trust depends on transparency, especially when the outcome of this decision directly impacts people who have the least ability to advocate for themselves.

How we treat people when they are hungry says something about who we are as a community. For me, serving meals is an act of care and dignity.

I respectfully ask this council to slow down this decision and work with service providers, volunteers, neighbors, and those who rely on PCC to find a solution that preserves safety, transparency, dignity, and care.

Yolande Jackson
Progressive Insurance Claims
Sr. Multi-Line Rep
(302)222-3495
Yolande_Jackson@progressive.com

Letter # in list	Letter dated	Addressed to	Common 1st para	Common last para
1st letter	02/04/2026	Dear Mayor Christiansen and Members of the City Council	We understand that the PPC, is currently proposing to add workforce development service	We request that Dover City Council follow the present zoning regulations and not grant the PPC's request for expanded services
2nd letter	02/04/2025	To Whom it May Concern	I understand that they are proposing to add workforce assistance at their community center	
3rd letter	02/04/2026	_____" sent me this email to answer the request for a letter from the neighbors/owners around People's Church"		
4th and 5th	9/11/2025 And 10/8/2024	letters are jumbled together, and they are from prior years complaining about crime in general appear to be sent to Roy Sudler		
6th letter	02/03/2026	Dover City Council	I am aware that the Peoples Community Center currently is seeking to expand its services to include workforce development programs	I respectfully urge the Dover City Council to uphold current zoning laws and deny approval for the expansion of services at this location
7th letter	01/30/2026	The Honorable Mayor and Members of Dover City Council		As you consider possible grant funding and expansion of social services on offer at the People's Community Center (PCC), an enterprise sponsored by the People's Community Church
8th letter	02/03/2026	City of Dover	People's church is looking to expand their operations into new services	This is why I encourage you to resist the temptation to give them even more flexibility
9th letter	02/04/2026	Honorable Mayor Christiansen and Members of Dover City Council	This on has some CRAZY accusations about us.	
10thletter	12/02/2025	Failure to respond Email		
11th letter	02/04/2026	unequal enforcement	This is confusing	
12th letter	02/12/2026	Mayor Christiansen and Members of Council	GREAT letter	
13th letter	02/06/2026	Mr. Mayor & City Council persons	It has been brought to my attention that People's is proposing to add workforce development services	I ask that the City Council enforce the existing zoning regulations and deny any request for expanding services at the PCC,

14th letter	02/04/2026	Honorable Mayor and Members of Dover City Council	I understand the People's Community Center is proposing to add workforce development services	I ask the City Council to enforce the existing zoning regulations and deny any requests for expanding services at the Peoples Community Center
15th letter	02/04/2026	Honorable Mayor Christiansen and Members of Dover City Council		I respectfully urge City Council to enforce existing zoning, occupancy, and operational requirements, and to deny any further expansion of services
16th letter	5/13/2024	Mayor, City Council, City Manager, Downtown Dover Partnership Board		
17th letter	02/06/2026	Letter directed to Mr Neil regarding firehouse funding request for a fence		
18th letter	02/03/2026	Members of the Dover City Council	I am fully aware that the People's Community Center (PCC) is currently operating in our residential zone and is seeking to expand its services to include workforce development	I respectfully ask the Dover City Council to prioritize the safety of our families and the integrity of our residential zoning. Please deny the request for expanded services
19th letter	02/03/2026	Honorable Mayor Christiansen and Members of Dover City Council		We respectfully ask City Council to deny any further expansion of services at this location and to enforce existing zoning
20th letter	02/01/2026	City of Dover City Council	I understand that Peoples Community Center expansion into workforce development programming is coming in the near future.	Please deny approval for expanded services at Peoples Community Center and enforce existing zoning regulations
21st letter	02/02/2026		Adding more programs will only increase the extent of the problems on our street	I respectfully request that Dover City Council enforce existing zoning regulations and deny approval for expanded services at this location
22nd letter		Dover City Council	I understand that the People's Community Center, operating out of People's Church, is proposing to add workforce development services to the already extensive range of services	I respectfully request that Dover City Council enforce existing zoning regulations and deny the People's Church's request for further expansion

Letter #1 The problems they lay out are valid the only problem is this isn't our problem to address. These are crimes in the streets on ou block, that doesn't mean we caused them. They have migrated from nearby streets and the city is well aware of the history of this crime

the neighboring area. We agree with this statement and really don't have any else to add to that "complaint". "In closing, our low to midd income diverse neighborhood should not have to bare the brunt of this problem. We dare say that if these same circumstances existed in other residentially zoned areas of the city, say in Fox Hall, Pennwood, or other areas, the outcry would have been louder and come much sooner. Why should downtown Dover have to tolerate all of this with no relief?

Letter #2 "I am extremely disappointed in the handling of trespassing issues on police department. The ongoing violations have become unbelievable. Trespassers have been making camp on my porch, having dinner, using drugs, and leaving behind trash, needles, drug ba and even unconscious and inebriated individuals, all at my place of business. "

Letter #3, , "sent me this email to answer the request for a letter from the neighbors/owners around People's Church I will put a letter together ...." Not sure what this means?????

Letter #4 dated 09/11/2025 "The continuous violations on my properties is unbelievable. They are making camp on my porch, having dinner, getting high, leaving trash, needles, drug bags and all sorts *of* undesirable items at my active place of business"

Letter #5, dated 10/2024 "This past weekend and two times yesterday, we had to encounter perpetrators on the property, on the decki and behind structures engaging in public lewdness, acts of prostitution, public defecation & urination, destruction of our properties, to na a few. We called the City of Dover police to handle the situation. To our disappointment, the individuals were not arrested but allowed to leave. " **from Sudler** "I am forwarding your subject matter to the Mayor and Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee Chairperso (At-Large Councilman Boggerty) so that you can present your concerns to the City Council Committee as a Whole. I will also forward yc concerns to District 4 Councilman/Vice-Mayor/Council-President Anderson. "

Letter #6... the same continuous complaints that are not our responsibility "continuous violations on my properties is unbelievable. They are making camp on my porch, having dinner, getting high, leaving trash, needles, drug bags, and all sorts *of* undesirable items" "open d use, suspected drug transactions, overdoses, prostitution, and behaviors that suggest human trafficking. There has also been a noticeab increase in police and emergency medical responses, as well as other forms of criminal or disruptive conduct. These events have occurre at various times and locations throughout the neighborhood." "I am deeply concerned that, given the current direction of downtown Dove this possibility is slipping away. I respectfully ask for your help in restoring our community to the vibrant and safe place it once was, so tha future generations can thrive here as my family has for decades"

letter #7 "The empty tiny plastic zip-locs and the empty single-ounce plastic liquor bottles are a feature of every-morning clean-up. Shouting bursts at all hours. Parked cars linger like old- fashioned market wagons on the street, with various decibels of sound, with arrivals and departures of various persons, until the car moves on. Prostitutes claim their corners, with their pimps keeping an eye on them." "It's part of the outdoor circus of despair in which trespassing, littering, mobile drug markets, drug dealing, crack lighting, shooting up, loud shouts and garbled utterances from fast walkers going... somewhere, the overdosed splayed on the ground and on stair steps of homes"

Letter #8 "The most obvious activity is the constant and unapologetic open-air drug use. I constantly find used needles all over my property at least once a week. Most of this activity can be seen in the old Wells Fargo Parking lot. I have personally had to call 9-1-1 services on 10 or so occasions for persons that are unresponsive and barely alive. I have also found 3 individuals who were shivering from either an overdose or going through withdrawals. I have also witnessed on many occasions, women engaging in what I can only imagine is prostitution. These are women who I see frequently walking aimlessly in the street, having conversations with people from the window of the car, and ending up inside the vehicle, only to be dropped back off later."

Letter #9 This is most disturbing. We have no idea what they are talking about. None of this involves us!!!! "On a routine basis, we observe two to five individuals per day, often young women, being dropped off at or near People's Community Church carrying luggage or personal belongings. We have spoken with many of them directly. They frequently state they were brought to Dover under the belief they would enter some form of rehabilitation or recovery program. In practice, there is no such program available to them at that location. Within days, many of these individuals are back on the street experiencing withdrawal symptoms. At that point, drug dealers are visibly present nearby. These individuals are then exploited-told they can avoid withdrawal by earning money through sexual acts and returning it for drugs. This pattern is repeated frequently and openly. At a minimum, this demonstrates a dangerous lack of supervision, structure, and accountability surrounding the concentration of vulnerable individuals."

Letter #10 and #11 old things blended together confusing nothing to do with us

Letter #12 Great letter We agree with most all of this letter

Letter #13 "The increased amount of homelessness, prostitution, drug use, panhandling, etc. in Dover, Delaware is outrageous. Our office now has a security guard come" "Attempts to make the Downtown Dover area more attractive and bring businesses back to the area are in the works through the Downtown Dover Partnership, but it feels like they take one step forward and then are pushed three steps back with the inability to control the vagrant behavior"

Letter #14 "It is not a surprise to have individuals near death of consuming drugs, we've had our building back door used as a bathroom facility numerous times, needles and drug paraphernalia laying around our parking; a view of a certain area at where individuals camp, exchange drugs and use them in groups. I have also had to go out to the front of the building where one of our clients could not get out of his car as a young woman became aggressive and would not remove herself from his car door unless he would give her money" "I used to treasure events downtown, eating at restaurants, taking walks during lunch times but the last time

letter #15 " On one occasion, as I was getting into my truck to leave for a meeting, approximately 15 rounds were fired on Governor's Avenue in plain sight of our parking area. The very next day, there was another shooting at Reed and New Street, both incidents widely understood to be drug-related." ". I have repeatedly encountered human feces in our flower beds, as well as on our siding, porch *floor*, and front steps. There have been countless instances of people sleeping on **our** porch, side entry, and in our flower beds." "Despite repeated efforts to protect our property, enforcement has been inconsistent. We have submitted "No Trespass" authorization forms to the Dover Police Department on multiple occasions, yet when we call to report trespassing, we are repeatedly told the forms cannot be located" "a man was attacked with a piece of metal fencing material. Officers responded to the scene, but the individuals present did not appear to be Dover Police officers. To my knowledge, no related arrests or public incident information have been made available, and **there** has been no follow-up guidance provided to us regarding ongoing risk or precautions we should take to protect our staff and tenants."

Letter #16 dated 5/13/2024 "The issues we once saw occasionally, became nightly activities and now, those issues are taking place during the day as well. The homelessness, loitering, drug activity, prostitution, shootings, and trash in general is deteriorating the area. "

Letter #17 funding request from firehouse for fence

Letter #18 "Over the last five years, I have watched this area spiral downward. My property is subject to near-constant trespassing, loitering, and open-air drug use. The lack of basic decency has reached an untenable level; I have personally witnessed and documented individuals urinating and defecating on my building nearly a dozen times. Even more disturbing, I have caught multiple people engaging in sexual acts and oral sex in broad daylight-"

Letter #19 "As the environment around our building deteriorated, we began experiencing daily situations that made operating a traditional walk-in business unrealistic. Individuals regularly lingered outside our storefront, and we frequently encountered

behavior related to drug use, sexual solicitation, and visible mental instability". "On one occasion, witnessed a man attempting to coerce a clearly impaired woman to leave with him outside our building. When intervened and told the woman she did not need to go with him, the man became aggressive, cursed at her, and told her to "mind your own business." back inside, locked the door, and remained there until the situation passed."

Letter #20 "there were prostitutes on all four corners of Bradford and Reed, and two of them refused to move out of the street so I could get by. Rather than mow them down, I turned my car around to go the other way, only to witness another girl bending over the Peoples Church fence with her skirt pulled up and absolutely nothing underneath. I have gone out to take my garbage to my cans in the alley behind my house, and there were numerous people sleeping in the space behind my garage, despite No Trespassing signs. I opened my front door recently to find human blood smeared all over my porch

Letter #21 "I have observed multiple, daily, instances of prostitution, drug use, individuals unconscious on the sidewalks, stairs and porches of private homes and businesses, as well as probable criminal activity. I have witnessed the constant traffic from vehicles trolling *for* prostitutes to the point I can identify several of them. They continually circle Bradford St from Loockerman St to Reed St to Governors Ave. Many of them pick up and drop off the prostitutes near our homes, increasing both vehicular and pedestrian traffic." "Seeing the prostitution, drug use and loitering, is unavoidable. We shouldn't have to be apprehensive about walking around our own neighborhood. It is also very embarrassing to me for family and guests visiting my home to see the drug abusers and prostitutes all over our street."

Letter #22

"**Prostitution, sex** work, and **human trafficking:** These activities now occur daily and openly. Individuals frequently loiter across from the church, trespass on nearby properties, and engage in disturbing behavior. Recently, a young woman arrived at in the middle of winter during the day without pants or underwear, appearing to have been ejected from a vehicle"

Drug overdoses and medical emergencies: There have been multiple overdose deaths and countless ambulance visits on this block in recent years, including incidents at the church itself. Drug addiction and severe mental illness are pervasive. Individuals often receive services and then circulate between South Bradford Street and Governor's Avenue, which has become an increasingly open-air drug market. In summer months, people routinely wander around like zombie ragdolls into traffic or collapse in public spaces

Litter and **drug paraphernalia:** I regularly pick up trash and can fill multiple large bags in a single evening, only to see the street return to its prior state by the next morning. Shopping carts are constantly being discarded in the middle of the sidewalk. At one point I had 7 shopping carts in my backyard that I had collected that were strewn

Good evening. I am here representing the People's Church Center for Neighbors in Need.

My name is Jill Quinn, and I volunteer at the Center, helping to prepare and serve meals. Although I am not a resident of Dover, I felt it was important to share my firsthand experience because I believe this program provides meaningful value to the community.

During my time volunteering, I have not observed illegal activity, loitering, or other disruptive behavior in or around the facility. The Center maintains clear expectations: guests must treat one another and volunteers with respect, and any inappropriate behavior is not tolerated. In my experience, guests have consistently been polite, cooperative, and genuinely appreciative of the support they receive.

I understand that nearby residents may have concerns. However, the challenges of homelessness and substance use are complex issues that exist independently of the services provided by the Church. The Center is not creating these problems—it is responding to them with compassion and structure, offering support that helps individuals stabilize and work toward better circumstances.

There is also concern that services like these may attract individuals from outside the area. Practically speaking, individuals experiencing homelessness or extreme hardship often lack the resources for long-distance travel. More importantly, even if there were an increase in need, reducing services would not resolve the underlying issues—it would only make them less visible and more difficult to manage.

If anything, expanding access to support services across multiple locations would reduce concentration in any one area and allow for more effective, balanced assistance throughout the community. Addressing these challenges requires thoughtful solutions, not the removal of resources.

Ultimately, the individuals served by the Center are members of our broader community who are facing difficult circumstances. In today's economic climate, many people are closer to hardship than they might expect. Providing support is not only compassionate—it is practical and responsible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.