REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

The Regular City Council Meeting was held on June 22, 2026, at 6:40 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Council members present were Ms. Hall (via Webex), Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Anderson, Dr. Pillsbury, Ms. Arndt, Mr. Rocha, Dr. Sudler (out at 9:28 p.m.), and Mr. Lewis (out at 9:28 p.m.).

Staff members present were Police Chief Johnson, Ms. Marney, Ms. Duca, Ms. Melson-Williams (via Webex), Deputy Chief Iannucci**,** Mr. Griffith, and Ms. Bennett. Mayor Christiansen was also present.

OPEN FORUM

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

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, questioned where the funds came from to send two (2) Dover Police Officers to Texas for a seminar. He emphasized that the city has financial issues with revenue. He stated that reading a news article by Maggie Reynolds, dated May 29, 2026, that it showed that the city's leaders were rallying around Police Chief Johnson, mid-controversy. He inquired about the investigation by 21st Century Police Solutions and when the public could review the results and recommendations from that investigation. He stated that the taxpayers paid $50,000 for the independent investigation and should be entitled to the findings.

Jeannie Anderson, 217 Cecil Street, read a letter from Shaniyah Burton, a concerned citizen, who supports the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance and urged that the proposed ordinance be passed. She stated that they have 684 signatures in support of the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance and over 158 letters in support of the proposed ordinance that went to the City Council.

Taylor Beck, 1700 North DuPont Highway, was concerned with the Sheraton building being converted to the Dover Hope Center and stated that it would affect her daily life. She stated that she would like to see those individuals receive the help they need through government services, which the Hope Center would facilitate.

Tim Stout, 559 Roberta Avenue, supported the Hope Center and was encouraged to see that the city was investing in some sort of institutional support for the homeless. He stated that he briefly interned at People's Church or Center for Neighbors in Need, and something that he would continuously hear from several individuals who worked and cared for the unhoused population was that there were not enough resources. He believed that investment in any and all resources for the unhoused population should be an absolute priority.

Larry Arellano, a Dover resident, shared concerns about the city budget, raising taxes, and electrical fees. He stated that he was on a fixed income and would not like to see any taxes raised because the budget was out of control. He questioned whether Mayor Christiansen oversaw the Quarterly Reports and how staff arrived at the numbers for the budget.

Responding to Mr. Arellano, Mr. Neil stated that it was not several years, but only one (1) year that came with a $7 million deficit. He noted that the city lost $12 million on electricity because it was sold at rates well below what it cost the city to purchase.

Responding to Mr. Arellano, Mr. Neil stated that electricity costs had increased significantly. He explained that when rates were set, they could not be changed until the following year. As costs continued to rise, the city incurred a major deficit. He further explained that they were raising their rates by $0.01 per kilowatt in order to recover what the city had lost in the past.

Mr. Arellano directed his comment to Chief Johnson. He asked whether he was aware of a shooting incident at Barrister's Place in which gunshots were fired into a house located approximately 90 feet from his property. He noted that police officers arrived at the location and caught the individuals. He emphasized that the problems were not getting resolved but getting worse. He asked whether there would be regular nightly police patrol between 10:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m. He questioned Mayor Christiansen about a comment he made in which he referred to Councilman Lewis as a "thug."

Lachelle Paul, 501 Silverside Road, shared concerns about the Pedestrian Safety Ordinance and how constituents felt with regard to council, and why council should not be switching their vote from no to yes because it was going to cost taxpayers money. She reminded council that the city had a deficit of $7 million and stated that she had told them that in 2025, the deficit from $3.1 million would be estimated to be double for this calendar year. She emphasized that the citizens could not afford the increases that the city wanted to impose. She stated that if council had listened to Mayor Christiansen some years ago, the city would not be in the predicament they were currently in.

Bonnie Pennington, 200 North Kirkwood Street, expressed frustration about charging residents additional fees for the fire department when firefighters were not being paid. She stated that residents had already paid enough. She further stated that she was tired of paying taxes for projects that had not been completed and where no progress was being made. She also expressed frustration that panhandlers were discussed at every meeting and felt they should be left alone.

Karen Speakman, 101 Maple Glenn Drive, Chief Executive Officer of Neighborhood Good Partners, stated that she was in favor of the Hope Center. She believed that the Hope Center would provide services for those individuals who were homeless. She noted that Neighborhood Good Partners would be willing to help in any way they could to provide financial literacy and other opportunities to those individuals.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given by Mayor Robin Christiansen

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Boggerty.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Dr. Pillsbury moved for adoption of the agenda as written, seconded by Ms. Arndt, and

unanimously carried.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

Mr. Lewis requested that Item #10, Sole Source – *ZeroEyes* Gun Detection Solution, be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Anderson requested that Item #7, Presentation on the Transfer on Death (TOD) Deeds, be removed from the consent agenda.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Anderson stated that his clarification would become apparent at the time, as the rule stated that any member could pull an item off the consent agenda. He explained his reasoning for pulling Item #7, Presentation on the Transfer on Death (TOD) Deeds. He noted that the Council Committee of a Whole believed that the public needed to be aware of the important change in the law because it was a vital issue for working-class citizens, and citizens who may not necessarily have funds for bigger estate planning. He stated that they needed to know about the new option that recently took effect and that there was a deeper discussion in committee, which explained the policy implications that it had for affordable housing, etc. He noted that, in the presentation at the council meeting, the public could understand what happened, why the law changed, and the benefits of looking at different options.

Mr. Lewis stated that his reasoning for pulling Item #10, Sole Source – *ZeroEyes* Gun Detection Solution, off the consent agenda was that he had several questions that he needed answered.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to remove Item #7, Presentation on the Transfer on Death (TOD) Deeds, from the consent agenda, seconded by Ms. Arndt.

Mr. Lewis made a motion to remove Item #10, Sole Source – *ZeroEyes* Gun Detection Solution, from the consent agenda, seconded by Dr. Sudler.

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

PRESENTATION – RECOGNITION OF SERVICE – VONDERLEAR E. SMACK – SAFETY, ADVISORY, AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (JUNE 2023 THROUGH JUNE 2026)

CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Presented to

Vonderlear E. Smack

Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee

June 2023 – June 2026

The City of Dover extends sincere appreciation for your public service.

On behalf of the Mayor and Council, Mayor Christiansen and Mr. Boggerty presented the certificate to Vonderlear E. Smack.

Ms. Smack expressed appreciation for being allowed to be a voice on the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee. She thanked Mr. Lewis for introducing her to the Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee and thanked Mr. Boggerty as well. She stated that during her three (3) years of service, she had learned a great deal and had become more thorough about reading information and verifying what individuals are saying.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES - REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 08, 2026

The Minutes of the Regular Council Meeting of June 08, 2026 were unanimously approved by motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Dr. Sudler, and bore the written approval of Mayor Christiansen.

Board of Assessment Appeals
June 4, 2026

The Board of Assessment Appeals was called to order at 10:20 A.M. by Chairman William Garfinkel. Board Members present were Chairman William Garfinkel, Board Members Doug Doyle and John Davis. Staff present were Andréa Griffin – Customer Service Director.

Agenda Additions/Deletions

By unanimous vote, the agenda was approved as presented.

Exempt Requests

Central DE Housing Collaborative Inc.

Location:	**Exempt Request:**
238 N Governors Ave	$183,900

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

An exemption request for the above-mentioned property was submitted to the Assessor's Office.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend that the request for exemption be reviewed.

No representative appeared on behalf of the applicant.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Doyle to deny the request due to the applicant's failure to appear before the Board.

Motion carried 3-0.

Neighborgood Partners Inc.

Location:	**Exempt Request:**
1. 16 N New St.	$83,400
2. 29 S New St.	$107,500

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

An exemption request was submitted to the Assessor's Office.

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Feltz stated that:

- NeighborGood Partners works with participants in its housing counseling program to promote homeownership.
- Completed homes are typically sold within approximately 60 days of project completion.
- Four passive homes completed during the previous year were sold within 60 days of completion.
- The homes were the first passive homes constructed in Delaware.
- Passive homes are designed to meet strict energy-efficiency standards, including reduced air leakage and advanced HVAC systems, resulting in significantly lower utility costs.

Mr. Feltz further explained that:

- The organization generally seeks to break even on projects rather than generate profit.
- Construction costs may exceed sales prices; however, grants and rebates from organizations such as the Delaware State Housing Authority (DSHA) and downtown redevelopment programs help offset expenses.
- Buyers often enter homeownership with built-in equity as a result of these subsidies.

Board Discussion

Board members asked questions regarding:

- The passive home construction standards and energy efficiency features.
- The financial structure of the projects and whether demolition costs were incorporated into resale values.
- How NeighborGood Partners identifies properties for redevelopment.
- The organization's history and operational focus.

Mr. Feltz explained that:

- The organization primarily focuses on redeveloping vacant properties in downtown Dover.
- Vacant structures are often demolished promptly to reduce safety and liability concerns.
- NeighborGood Partners operates primarily throughout Delaware and the Delmarva Peninsula and has additional housing initiatives underway in Sussex County.
- Homes are sold to owner-occupants through the organization's housing counseling program, which assists participants with credit improvement, savings plans, and homeownership readiness.

Board members discussed the likelihood that the properties would return to the tax rolls within approximately one year following redevelopment and sale.

Motion

A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Doyle to approve the tax exemption request for:

- 16 North New Street
- 29 South New Street

Motion carried 3-0.

Elizabeth W Murphy School Inc.

Location:	**Exempt Request:**
1. 1045 S Bradford St.	$197,900
2. 914 S State St.	$144,700

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Applicant Presentation

Mr. Michael Kopp provided an overview of the organization's Transitional Living Program, which supports youth aging out of foster care. He explained that the program originated in 1987 to address the challenges faced by young adults leaving foster care without family support, employment history, housing, or financial resources. The program has since expanded through a state contract that provides mentoring and independent living services to foster youth ages 16 and older throughout Kent County.

Mr. Kopp described the organization's efforts to provide stable housing for program participants. Due to housing barriers and increasing landlord requirements following the COVID-19 pandemic, Murphy School began acquiring residential properties to serve as transitional housing. The homes are located near the Murphy School campus to ensure accessibility and ongoing support from

mentors and case managers.

The properties discussed, located on South Bradford Street and South State Street, are designated for young women participating in the transitional living program. Residents are generally between the ages of 18 and 23 and receive support in developing life skills, employment readiness, financial responsibility, and housing stability. Participants pay a monthly program fee of $300, which helps cover utilities and supports program operations. The properties are maintained by Murphy School staff and contracted service providers to ensure they remain in good condition and do not become a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Kopp explained that all Murphy School property acquisitions are purchased outright without financing, in accordance with organizational policy. He outlined the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of both properties and noted that grant funding was utilized to complete the purchases.

Additional discussion highlighted the program's emphasis on helping participants establish credit history, maintain employment or educational enrollment, obtain driver's licenses, secure transportation, and develop practical life skills. Program staff provide ongoing mentoring and support to assist residents in achieving long-term independence.

Board Discussion

Board members inquired about:

- The number of residents housed at each property.
- Whether participation in the program helps residents build credit history.
- Future plans for acquiring additional properties.
- The current and projected demand for transitional housing services.

Mr. Kopp responded that each resident receives a private bedroom and that occupancy varies by property size. He also noted that approximately 80 young adults are currently served through the broader transitional living program, although housing needs fluctuate based on state foster care trends and participant circumstances.

Motion

A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Doyle to approve the tax exemption request for:

- 1045 South Bradford Street
- 914 South State Street

Motion carried 3-0.

Dover Interfaith Mission of Housing Inc

Location:	**Exempt Request:**
630 W Division Street	$1,564,900

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

An exemption request was submitted to the Assessor's Office.

Mr. Peter Oldziey, Treasurer of the Board of Directors of the organization, was present for the hearing.

Mr. Oldziey explained that the property will serve as an expansion of the organization's mission to assist vulnerable populations within the City of Dover by providing transitional housing and supportive services.

The proposed facility will be developed as part of the organization's "Interfaith Campus" and will include:

- Transitional housing units for individuals working toward self-sufficiency.
- Administrative offices for Dover Interfaith Mission for Housing.
- A resource center and training rooms.
- A healthcare clinic operated in partnership with Bayhealth.
- Housing units designated for medically fragile individuals.

Mr. Oldziey explained that the organization currently provides emergency shelter services to men and women experiencing homelessness. Residents receive case management and support services aimed at achieving self-sufficiency. The organization maintains strict eligibility requirements, including employment, program participation, and compliance with a zero-tolerance drug and alcohol policy. Residents are subject to random drug testing and may be removed from the program for violations.

The transitional housing model is designed to bridge the gap between emergency shelter and permanent housing. Participants typically remain in the program for approximately two years while building savings, employment history, and housing stability. Program fees paid by residents support case management services and are not considered traditional rent.

Mr. Oldziey noted that the organization serves a diverse population, including:

- Individuals transitioning from incarceration.
- Persons recovering from substance abuse.
- Individuals facing economic hardship, divorce, or other life crises.
- Women with children who cannot afford market-rate housing.
- Medically fragile individuals who require supportive housing.

The proposed facility is expected to contain approximately 20 housing units, many of which will be shared accommodations, with an anticipated capacity of 50 to 60 residents. Staff will be present onsite to provide supervision and support.

Construction is anticipated to begin in early fall following completion of the design process.

Board Discussion

Board members asked questions regarding:

- The demographics and circumstances of individuals served by the organization.
- Transitional housing operations and resident requirements.
- Drug and alcohol screening procedures.
- Plans for serving medically fragile individuals.
- Project construction timelines.
- Potential coordination with correctional institutions for reentry services.

Mr. Oldziey provided additional details regarding program operations, housing capacity, and support services available to residents.

Motion

A motion was made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Doyle to approve the tax exemption request for:

- 630 W Division Street

Motion carried 3-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT – JUNE 09, 2026

The Council Committee of the Whole met on June 09, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. with Council President Neil presiding. Members of Council present were Mr. Anderson, Ms. Arndt, Mr. Boggerty (left at 6:39 p.m.), Ms. Hall, Mr. Lewis (via WebEx), Dr. Pillsbury (via WebEx), Mr. Rocha, and Dr. Sudler (left at 7:49 p.m.). Mayor Christiansen was also present. Civilian members present for their Committee meetings were Mr. Shevock (via WebEx) *(Legislative, Finance, and Administration.* Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Lewis *(Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement),* and Mr. Garfinkel *(Legislative, Finance, and Administration)* were absent.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Hope Center in Kent County Presentation (Matthew Heckles, DSHA Director)

Mr. Matthew Heckles, DSHA Director, reviewed the presentation entitled "Road to Hope – Delaware State Housing Authority" **(Attachment #1)**.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Heckles stated that there would be approximately 160 rooms, given the center's current configuration. He explained that they are still reviewing how to manage occupancy of the building by families, mothers, children, husbands, wives, and so forth. He noted that there is a difference from the building in New Castle County, as the hotel in New Castle County had more suites, larger rooms, and adjoining rooms. Mr. Heckles stated that modifications to the facility layout may be needed to better accommodate larger families, including potential renovations to connect certain rooms and create larger family units before opening. He noted the intent to ensure family accommodation remains available and mentioned consideration of incorporating discharge respite beds into the project.

Mr. Heckles further explained that the Rural Health Transformation Grant is intended to support improvements to the healthcare system by reducing reliance on emergency rooms, ambulance services, and other high-cost healthcare resources. He stated that the project would seek to provide housing and onsite medical services for individuals who are frequent users of those services, with reduced utilization serving as part of the program's performance measures.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Heckles stated that plans for food services have not yet been fully developed. He noted that concepts under consideration include an on-site restaurant-style dining option for residents, potentially utilizing a meal card access system, as well as a fresh food market to improve access to fresh food in that area of the city. He emphasized, however, that food service is not intended to be the primary function of the facility or the primary service provided to residents.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Heckles stated that individuals currently receiving services outside of their home county may have opportunities to access services closer to where they live as additional resources become available throughout the state. He explained that, as services expand in Sussex and Kent Counties, individuals and families may be better served locally rather than traveling to New Castle County. He noted that students attending schools in Dover would benefit from having local housing options available and emphasized that reducing long commutes would create a more supportive environment for children and families. Mr. Heckles stated that the project would provide Kent County with an option that does not currently exist to better serve residents locally.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Mr. Heckles stated that policies regarding whether registered sex offenders would be permitted to stay at the facility have not yet

been finalized and that he was not prepared to make a commitment on that issue. He noted that similar facilities in New Castle County do not permit individuals with sex offense histories, but acknowledged that such restrictions can create barriers to access.

Mr. Heckles further explained that the project is anticipated to follow a housing-first and low-barrier-to-entry approach. He emphasized that these models do not eliminate rules or expectations for residents but instead focus on ensuring individuals do not lose housing solely due to noncompliance unrelated to the housing arrangement itself. He stated that behavioral concerns may still be addressed and appropriate action may still be taken when necessary, and clarified that the approach is intended to increase accessibility while maintaining structure and accountability rather than creating an unrestricted environment.

Mr. Rocha expressed support for the idea of incorporating a restaurant component into the project and referenced a model similar to those done by Jon Bon Jovi, in which community members who are able to pay for meals help support meals for individuals who cannot. He suggested that a similar approach could be considered for the Hope Center and further proposed that food service operations could create workforce development opportunities by allowing residents to gain training and work experience in hospitality or food service.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Heckles stated that the concept was consistent with the type of community-oriented programming being explored for the Hope Center and referenced examples of Jon Bon Jovi's philanthropic ideas and homelessness outreach efforts that incorporate similar approaches. He noted that the existing commercial kitchen at the former Dover Sheraton facility represents a significant asset and stated that the space was previously capable of serving large numbers of people, creating opportunities for future food-related programming.

Mr. Heckles stated that plans for use of the kitchen and cafeteria space are still being developed and emphasized that food and nutrition programming are not areas of the organization’s expertise. He explained that the Hope Center intends to focus on housing and supportive services while partnering with organizations that specialize in food services, healthcare, job training, and other programming areas. He stated that Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and future partnership opportunities will be used to identify qualified organizations to operate and support those services as the project develops.

Mr. Rocha asked whether outreach efforts would be developed for individuals experiencing homelessness who may be unwilling to seek shelter or participate in available programs.

Mr. Heckles acknowledged that even with a fully operational Hope Center, there will continue to be individuals who choose not to participate in shelter services. He stated that experience has shown that not every individual will engage with

available programs; however, he expressed the belief that participation may increase if individuals view the program as one that treats them with patience, tolerance, and dignity and provides meaningful opportunities for long-term success through supportive services and best practices.

Mr. Heckles further explained that he envisions the Hope Centers serving as central locations for intake, outreach operations, mobile health services, and coordination of resources. He stated that outreach teams could operate from the Hope Center while maintaining connections to housing, food, healthcare, and other supportive services located onsite. He described the concept as creating a centralized hub for service delivery that strengthens coordination across programs and improves the overall system of care for individuals experiencing homelessness. He noted that effective outreach requires patience, understanding, time, and the development of trust over an extended period. He explained that many individuals experiencing homelessness may be hesitant to engage with available programs because prior attempts to seek assistance have not produced successful outcomes or because they feel the system has not adequately supported them. He acknowledged that individual circumstances may vary, but emphasized that rebuilding trust requires more than offering services; it requires demonstrating how current approaches and resources differ from past experiences and showing that participation can lead to better outcomes.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Heckles stated that they hope that after the acquisition and rehabilitation process takes place, they will be ready to open in four to six months, so that they can bring people in before the weather gets bad in the winter.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Heckles stated that available data generally does not support the perception that large numbers of individuals experiencing homelessness relocate from outside the state to access services. He stated that most individuals experiencing homelessness in Delaware have existing ties to the state or region, although defining residency can be complex depending on how long an individual has lived in the area and when housing instability occurred.

Mr. Heckles referenced research conducted in Wilmington that examined concerns regarding individuals relocating from outside Delaware and noted that the findings indicated relatively few people had moved from outside the area. He further emphasized that homelessness affects a broad range of populations, including families and senior citizens who may lose housing due to rising costs, fixed incomes, or changes in household circumstances.

Mr. Heckles stated that the population of individuals relocating specifically to seek services at the Hope Center is expected to be limited and emphasized that the project is intended primarily to serve individuals and families experiencing homelessness within their local communities. He stated that residency requirements and related eligibility policies have not yet been finalized. He

explained that the organization is currently reviewing policies and procedures used by other shelters in the region, as well as best practices from national organizations, to help inform development of its operating guidelines. Mr. Heckles stated that, while policy decisions remain under consideration, his preference would be not to impose unnecessary limitations and expressed the view that individuals experiencing homelessness who are present in the community are likely in need of assistance.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Heckles stated that privacy, design, and security considerations are a significant part of the project planning process and will be evaluated both inside and outside of the facility. He noted that security was identified early as a priority and stated that one of the first Requests for Proposals (RFPs) issued would be for security services to support the program.
Mr. Heckles explained that the facility is expected to operate with separate service and residential functions and noted that while service areas may operate with limited hours, residential access will likely need to remain available around the clock to accommodate varying resident schedules, requiring continuous security coverage in those areas. He further stated that existing security systems, including camera systems installed at the property, may remain in place and be incorporated into operations.

Regarding the exterior of the site, he noted that improvements under consideration include redesigning parking areas, curbing, and creating clearer property boundaries and separation features. He added that engaging an architect will be among the initial project steps to evaluate the facility and provide recommendations related to design, security, and site improvements.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Heckles stated that specific requests may develop as planning progresses but emphasized that the project's success will depend significantly on whether the city serves as a collaborative partner. He expressed hope that the Hope Center will be viewed as a community asset intended to create positive impacts for both the city and its residents and stated that a cooperative approach would improve the likelihood of successful outcomes.

Mr. Heckles noted that initial discussions had already occurred with the Dover Police Department, including officers involved in outreach and community policing efforts, and stated that the Hope Center could serve as an additional resource to support those efforts. He further stated that, at this time, he was not anticipating financial requests from the city but indicated that future support may include ideas, community connections, partnerships, and assistance in identifying organizations or providers for services such as workforce development and job training. He emphasized that collaboration with community partners will be important as the project continues to develop.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he was encouraged by elements of the proposed Hope Center model and noted similarities to strategies used during the Mayor's

Challenge to End Veteran Homelessness, including rapid housing placement paired with supportive services. He shared past experiences conducting outreach to individuals living in encampments, including veterans who were hesitant to engage with services due to prior experiences, and emphasized the importance of continued outreach and building trust.

The mayor noted that the facility's kitchen and food service capabilities create opportunities for workforce development and suggested potential partnerships with organizations that provide culinary and workforce training opportunities. He expressed support for developing programs that promote both resident self-sufficiency and long-term success.

Mayor Christiansen thanked Mr. Heckles for his leadership and collaboration efforts and stated that the city supports the project's success because of its potential to address community needs. He noted that while direct financial support may not be available, the city remains willing to provide support through partnerships, resources, and community connections to assist with the implementation of the Hope Center initiative.

Mr. Heckles thanked Mayor Christiansen for his participation in the collaborative effort and stated that the collaborative has since been divided into ten committees to allow for more focused work on specific areas related to homelessness. He explained that topics under review include Code Purple, centralized intake, shelter capacity, exit strategies, and other targeted issues, with recommendations expected to be brought forward in October. He stated that breaking the work into smaller groups allows for more detailed evaluation and development of solutions than addressing homelessness through a single committee structure.

Mr. Heckles also expressed interest in continuing discussions regarding potential food service and workforce development opportunities associated with the Hope Center. He reflected on lessons learned through efforts to address veteran homelessness and emphasized that successful outreach requires actively engaging individuals, building trust, identifying needs on an individual basis, and connecting people with stable housing and supportive services.

Mr. Heckles stated that the Mayor's Challenge to End Veteran Homelessness demonstrated that focused efforts, coordinated resources, and active participation from local governments can produce measurable results. He noted that veteran homelessness outcomes improved because the initiative concentrated attention and resources on a defined population and stated that those strategies provide examples of approaches that could be applied more broadly to homelessness initiatives.

Mr. Neil stated that housing affordability and rising housing costs continue to contribute to homelessness, particularly for individuals with low or fixed incomes. He noted that employment does not always prevent housing instability and

referenced examples of individuals who remain employed while experiencing homelessness.

Mr. Neil expressed concern about the potential impacts that homelessness and related challenges may have on surrounding businesses, commercial property owners, public safety resources, and overall community conditions. He discussed concerns raised by commercial property owners regarding property conditions and impacts on property values and noted the additional demands placed on law enforcement and public systems in responding to homelessness-related issues.
Mr. Neil further stated that homelessness often intersects with substance use disorders, mental health needs, and economic hardship, creating challenges that extend beyond the city's direct authority and financial capacity. He acknowledged limitations on the city's ability to provide certain services directly and emphasized the importance of partnerships and supportive programming.

Mr. Neil stated that, despite those concerns, he supports development of the Hope Center and views it as an important community resource that could provide housing, supportive services, and opportunities to help individuals stabilize, reconnect with services, and improve long-term outcomes.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Heckles stated that funding and facility design are two key components that distinguish the proposed Kent County program from similar models. He explained that while the New Castle County Hope Center utilized ARPA funding for acquisition, it did not have additional funding dedicated to sustaining operations. In contrast, Kent County has funding available through the Rural Health Fund, which will allow the program to develop services, operate over an initial five-year period, and establish sustainable funding sources through medical and supportive services over time.

Mr. Heckles further stated that the proposed facility is better suited to support the vision of providing residential services and shelter. As an example, he noted that the inclusion of on-site laundry facilities addresses a challenge experienced by the New Castle County Hope Center, where residents must travel off-site to complete laundry. He explained that providing these services on-site is intended to reduce barriers and allow residents to spend more time focused on education, employment, job training, family support, and other personal goals.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Heckles stated that the intake process policies have not yet been created. He explained that they are currently gathering information and will be put in place before the opening. He emphasized that those decisions would affect people, keeping some from wanting to go there and others from being able to go there, while letting others in. These are all important factors they need to weigh.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Heckles stated that his vision would include on-site mental health services as part of a broader healthcare component, although

specific programming and partnerships have not yet been determined. He noted that the intent is to provide both physical and mental health resources and expressed interest in potentially incorporating dental services to address challenges often experienced by low-income populations. Mr. Heckles emphasized that these concepts remain aspirational at this stage and that final decisions will depend on future partnerships and guidance from subject matter experts regarding appropriate on-site services and program structure.

Regan Coder, Dover, questioned why it would be beneficial to build a homeless outreach center when places like the People's Community Church could use the funding for the programs they already provide.

Mr. Heckles stated that the proposed Hope Center is intended to serve both as a direct provider of services and as a catalyst for broader system improvements. He explained that the scale and capacity of the facility could enhance service delivery in Kent County and support community organizations that may currently face resource limitations. He further stated that the model could help establish standards and accountability for state-funded programs by evaluating whether participants are receiving appropriate supportive services and progressing successfully through available programs. Mr. Heckles emphasized that he is not advocating for any specific provider or existing program but views the Hope Center as an opportunity to facilitate evaluation and discussion regarding service effectiveness and outcomes.

Mr. Coder asked if the new Hope Center would ever expect to partner with current centers.

Mr. Heckles stated that his biggest concern regarding homelessness in Delaware is that services are too fragmented, with too many groups operating independently. He noted that there are faith-based organizations, nonprofits, municipalities, counties, and other entities all doing work in this area; however, efforts are not coordinated effectively. He further stated that even the centralized intake system required by HUD is not functioning as well as it should and is only participating in and referring to certain homeless services.

Mr. Heckles stated that Delaware needs to rebuild the system by identifying organizations that are doing effective work, understanding why their approaches are successful, and empowering those efforts to expand and be shared across the state.

As an example, Mr. Heckles referenced a recent visit to Family Promise of Northern Delaware, which is opening a newly constructed shelter for families. He described the facility as beautiful and noted that it is part of a broader network of organizations across the state that are doing meaningful work. He stated that these organizations need continued support because the Hope Centers will not be able to address homelessness on their own.

Mr. Heckles concluded that the focus should be on creating a coordinated network and system to ensure the entire State of Delaware responds consistently to individuals in need, rather than having varying levels of resources and services available depending on location.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Heckles stated that the New Castle County Hope Center is not located near a retail area, which he noted has both advantages and disadvantages. He stated that outreach has been conducted with surrounding businesses and that several conversations have taken place, with additional discussions ongoing.

Mr. Heckles expressed hope that they can ensure they are good neighbors to nearby businesses, both in the immediate vicinity and throughout the corridor. He stated that through security measures, facility design, and supporting infrastructure, they aim to create a positive experience for everyone.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, questioned how they will maintain the funding since the city has funding issues and cannot provide financial support.

Responding to Mr. Faust, Mr. Heckles stated that the acquisition is associated with DSHA, and that operations will primarily be covered through the Rural Health Transformation Grant, which he believes has sufficient funding for the first five years.

He stated that the overall goal is to ensure sustainability over a 20-year period, which he described as a reasonable planning horizon. He expressed confidence in the funding stability for the first five years, noting that this period will also allow the development of financing mechanisms, including reserve funds and capital reserves for the building, to support long-term sustainability.

Mr. Heckles further stated that while the specific provider or program, such as food service delivery, may change over time, the intent is to maintain a consistent base of operations throughout the 20-year period.

Bonnie Pennington, Dover, questioned if the facility would have a cafeteria or individual eating areas, who would provide the funding for cleaning staff, doctors, and cooks, and how medication would be disbursed.

Mr. Heckles stated that he did not have answers to all of the questions raised, noting that some operational details still need to be developed. He stated that one issue regarding food service is whether food can be stored or kept in rooms, as this may create pest or infestation concerns in some facilities, and will need to be addressed through policy.

He noted that there are larger rooms on each floor that may allow for the placement of microwaves and potentially serve as communal spaces. He stated

that while challenges are expected, policies and procedures are still being developed.

Mr. Heckles further stated that the facility includes approximately five floors, and that certain floors may be designated for specific populations based on need, including individuals requiring higher levels of medical care and a potential respite care floor. He stated that floor access could be managed through badge-controlled elevator access, limiting residents to designated floors.

He compared aspects of the facility design to hotel industry practices and stated that lessons can be learned from that sector. He also noted that a small number of suite-style units already exist with multi-room layouts, which would likely be used to accommodate families initially. He expressed hope that, following opening, adjoining rooms could be arranged to provide separate spaces for adults and children.

Mr. Heckles stated that first-floor space is being considered for storage of personal belongings, recognizing that individuals experiencing homelessness often have possessions that may not be suitable for in-room storage. He also noted the need to consider transportation-related needs, including parking, scooters, and bicycles.

He concluded by stating that these issues will require ongoing collaboration with partners experienced in this work, both locally and nationally, and emphasized the importance of learning from best practices in other jurisdictions, including examples from Seattle, Washington, by engaging with organizations that have implemented similar solutions.

Mr. Anderson moved to defer the Council Reports of May 2026 to the next meeting. Hearing no objection the motion was unanimously carried.

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

PARKS, RECREATION, AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

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

Adoption of Agenda

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

Revitalization of Mary Street Playlot (Roger Ridgeway, Parks and Recreation Director)

Mr. Roger Ridgeway, Parks and Recreation Director, reviewed the background and analysis regarding the revitalization of the Mary Street playlot.

Staff recommended approving to proceed with the revitalization plan.

Dr. Sudler moved to recommend approval to proceed with the revitalization of the Mary Street playlot. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

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

Ms. Hall moved for adjournment of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

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

Adoption of Agenda

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

Presentation on the Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds (Eugenia Thornton, Recorder of Deeds)

Ms. Eugenia Thornton, Recorder of Deeds, reviewed the presentation on the Transfer of Death Deeds.

This item was informational; committee action was not required.

Dr. Sudler thanked Ms. Thornton for her presentation.

Mr. Anderson thanked Ms. Thornton for lobbying the state legislature and being a leading force in implementing the Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds in the State of Delaware.

Responding to Ms. Hall, Ms. Thornton stated that, currently, there are no programs that assist with the financial costs of filing for a Transfer on Death Deed. She explained that Kent County Levy Court supported her in recommending that the filing fee be $88 rather than $105. She noted that the law requires that all fees be collected before recording a document. She has been working with the CenDel Foundation to try to create a fund that will assist with legal issues that are associated with a TOD deed and property fraud, because clearing the title falls on the victim.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Thornton stated that Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds do not provide protection from Medicaid estate recovery or other outstanding debts. She explained that if sufficient debts exist at the time of the property owner's death and cannot be satisfied by those inheriting the property, the property may be required to go through probate to resolve those obligations. In Delaware, those matters would be administered through the Register of Wills.

Ms. Thornton noted that Delaware's process differs from some other states due to the role of the Register of Wills in handling probate matters, whereas in other states those matters may involve the courts, attorneys, or funeral directors. She emphasized that individuals who inherit property also inherit the responsibilities associated with the property and may ultimately need to decline or dispose of the interest if they are unable to maintain it.

She further stated that Delaware's law includes a provision allowing insurance coverage on the property to remain in place for the first 60 days after transfer to provide time for the beneficiary to determine whether they can assume ownership responsibilities. Ms. Thornton added that while some individuals use TOD deeds due to financial circumstances, others have used them simply as a means to avoid probate.

Mr. Coder asked about the procedure for someone revoking a TOD.

Responding to Mr. Coder, Ms. Thornton stated that the law regarding a transfer-on-death (TOD) deeds is very clear. She explained that a TOD deed may be revoked at any time, including up until the time of death; however, it must be recorded in her office in order to be valid and effective.

She noted that the timing of recording is critical. If a TOD deed is changed and recorded prior to death, the most recently recorded deed governs distribution. However, if a revised TOD deed is submitted but not yet recorded at the time of death, the previously recorded TOD deed remains controlling, even if the newer version designates a different beneficiary.

Ms. Thornton compared TOD deeds to wills, noting that while both may be updated, TOD deeds function as deeds rather than testamentary instruments and therefore require recording to take effect. She also referenced the ability in some jurisdictions to safeguard wills through storage programs in the Register of Wills office, and noted that in the case of wills, the most recently executed valid document generally prevails, even if multiple versions are discovered.

She further stated that TOD deeds are more limited in flexibility than wills and do not include the same contingencies or protections. She noted that wills may include requirements for acknowledgment of heirs, including providing nominal bequests, whereas TOD deeds allow a direct transfer designation without such requirements.

Ms. Thornton stated that TOD deeds require two witnesses and notarization to help ensure the individual is of sound mind and acting without duress. She emphasized that, once recorded, changes to property designation can be identified through the Property Fraud Alert program, allowing individuals to be notified of changes and potentially address disputes directly with the property owner.

Responding to Mr. Coder, Ms. Thornton stated that the law in question has been adopted in approximately 30 other states, in some cases for up to 20 years. She referenced Chicago, where she stated she studied the practice extensively, noting that approximately 30,000 transfer-on-death (TOD) deeds have been processed over the past decade. She further stated that studies, including those conducted by DePaul University and others, have found that TOD deeds can help create generational wealth, which she cited as one of the reasons she supported implementing the law in Delaware.

Ms. Thornton stated that in cases where a property is sold, the TOD deed becomes incompatible because the grantor no longer has an ownership interest in the property and therefore cannot transfer it. She noted that some title companies recommend revocation of a TOD deed during the settlement process to ensure a clear title, although this practice is not uniform. She stated that in Delaware, some title companies are currently requiring revocation as part of closing due to the relative newness of the law.

She further explained that the legal effect is the same as with wills in that a disposition cannot apply to property no longer owned by the testator or grantor. She stated that any attempt to transfer property through a will or TOD deed is ineffective if the individual no longer owns the property at the time of death.

Ms. Thornton also noted that inheriting property includes assuming associated obligations, including mortgages, homeowners' association fees, insurance, and utilities. She stated that property transfer does not eliminate existing debt or financial responsibilities tied to the property.

During the Regular Council Meeting, Ms. Thornton explained that Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds provided an option for individuals who wanted to simplify how their property would pass to their heirs while they were still alive. She stated that if an individual added someone other than a spouse to a deed during their lifetime, they could expose the property to the heir's creditors, and the heirs might also lose certain first-time homebuyer benefits later. She noted that when one (1) owner was over 65 and the other was under 65, it could also affect tax rates. She further explained that if someone was added to a deed and later became the sole owner after the original owner's death, they could face capital gains taxes based on the property's value at the time they were added compared to its value at the time of death. She added that the TOD deeds helped avoid those issues. She also explained the problems that occurred when people died without wills. She said the government would determine ownership of the property, which was known as escheat, and that properties often became difficult to track, leading to neglect and "tangled titles." She added that when individuals were not listed on a deed, they could not

qualify for loans, subsidies, or sell the property, which could lead to neighborhood decline. She emphasized that TOD deeds were designed to address both issues. She explained that the property owner, or grantor, could complete the form in her office or by mail, providing information about the property and naming beneficiaries. The document would then be notarized with two witnesses and recorded in her office, with a fee of $88. She noted that TOD deeds could help avoid probate and transfer taxes. If changes were needed, the individual could return to her office and file a new document for another $88, and they could cancel or update the deed at any time for the same fee.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Ms. Thornton stated that she could not guarantee the 10 years but mentioned that she had an individual do a TOD deed, and they had passed away a week later. She noted that for individuals who do not have wills, the TOD deeds were something that should be considered.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Thornton stated that the TOD deed could not be done through the Register of Wills' office since the document was a deed and not a will. She explained that just as someone could sell their house to anyone they wanted to, they could leave their house to anyone they wanted to, but it would not take effect until that individual died. She noted that, as far as coordinating with the Register of Wills office, in most counties across the country, there was no Register of Wills office, and the Recorder of Deeds would have the document from start to finish. She stated that when someone dies, the heir would bring in the death certificate to the Recorder of Deeds office, or in Delaware, it would go to the Register of Wills, and at that point, an affidavit would be created documenting that the individual was the heir. She added that it would not necessarily go to the Register of Wills because there would be no probate. She further added that the TOD deed does not have the flexibility of a will and that the property would not be available to the heir until that individual died. She suggested consulting with an attorney if you have questions concerning the TOD deed because she could only explain how to fill out the document.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Thornton stated that the $88 fee was based on the recording fees that they have in their office, which were set by the Levy Court Commissioners. She noted that the Levy Court Commissioners' job was to set tax fees, etc. She further noted that with a four (4) page document, and an annotation fee in her office was $88. She added that she had asked the Levy Court Commissioners if she could have an extra page for free because there were individuals that have more than one (1) individual they would like to leave their property to and not all names would fit on the fourth page, or there may be a longer legal description that would not fit on the fourth page, so she has included a fifth page for free. She stated that in Sussex and Newcastle County, they may have different fees; even though they all have the same forms, they all may have different fees because the county government sets the fees for each county.

Mr. Anderson moved for the acceptance of the Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt.

Mr. Anderson moved for suspension of the rules by unanimous consent to allow constituent questions on Item #7, Presentation on the Transfer on Death (TOD) Deeds. The motion was seconded by Dr. Sudler and unanimously carried.

Responding to Mr. Arellano, Ms. Thornton clarified that there could be litigation on a TOD deed. She stated that with a will, there was a law that determined who would get things; with a TOD deed, there was no law that determined who would get things. She explained that litigation was not a danger to the TOD deed because the document had the two (2) witnesses, a notary, and it was a public document for so many years before the individual died. She noted that everything could be litigated.

Mr. Anderson moved for the acceptance of the Transfer on Death (TOD) deeds report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried.

Evaluation of Proposals – City Hall Roof Replacement (Andrew McNatt, Facilities Manager)

Mr. Andrew McNatt, Facilities Manager, reviewed the background and analysis regarding the City Hall roof replacement.

Staff recommended awarding the City Hall Roof Replacement to Quality Exteriors, Inc. as per the proposal submitted in response to RFP #26-0018FM.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. McNatt stated that the money was allocated from Fiscal Year 2026.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend approval of the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried by a roll call vote (Boggerty, Sudler, Garfinkel absent).

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

Transportation Infrastructure Investment Fund (TIIF) Grant Application (Jason Lyon, Water/Wastewater Director)

Mr. Jason Lyon, Water/Wastewater Director, reviewed the background and analysis behind the Transportation Infrastructure Investment Fund (TIIF) grant application.

Staff recommended approval of the grant application in accordance with the City of Dover Department of Finance procedure.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the grant application for the TIIF. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mr. Lyon stated that the intent of the budget that was presented to the body included money to pay for the improvements at Garrison Oak Technical Park using Economic Development funds. The goal is that the money will be awarded through the TIIF so that they will not have to use the Economic Development funds as a funding source.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the grant application for the TIIF. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

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

Sole Source Request – *ZeroEyes* Gun Detection Solution (Thomas Johnson, Chief of Police)

Mr. Thomas Johnson, Chief of Police, and Ryan Kelly, Advantech, reviewed the background and analysis behind the sole source request for the *ZeroEyes* gun detection solution.

Staff recommended approving the request to sole-source Advantech/ZeroEyes vendors.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Chief Johnson stated that he has been tracking the ZeroEyes technology for approximately five years. He noted that when he first became aware of the system at a conference, it was primarily marketed for campus protection applications, such as healthcare or educational campuses, with the primary objective of identifying visible firearms in public spaces.

He explained that the intended use of the technology aligns with existing surveillance coverage of common areas within campuses and the city, and that it would only be applied to existing camera networks already used for recording video for criminal investigations, post-incident review, and other public safety purposes.

Chief Johnson stated that the system is intended to serve as an augmentation to current practices and uses narrowly focused artificial intelligence and analytics. He emphasized that it is not facial recognition technology and is not designed for identifying individuals. He described the system as being limited to detecting visible firearms, including pistols, revolvers, rifles, and shotguns, based on known firearm imagery.

He further explained that any alert generated by the system would be independently verified by a separate monitoring station staffed by vendor-employed specialists prior to notification being sent to law enforcement. He stated that this verification process is intended to reduce false alerts, such as those involving law enforcement officers carrying firearms in the course of duty.

Chief Johnson concluded that, once verified, notifications would direct staff to review specific camera feeds in real time, noting that the technology is designed to supplement, rather than replace, human monitoring capabilities, which are limited by staffing constraints.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Chief Johnson stated that the system will initially send a photograph as part of an alert process. He explained that the review process is learned over time and improves with experience, as analysts become familiar with routine scenarios such as armed security personnel conducting cash drops at locations like Wawa.

He noted that the individuals reviewing the alerts are law enforcement personnel and retired military analysts who make determinations on whether an alert should be cancelled or forwarded to the police department. He emphasized that these reviewers assess context, such as armed guards performing routine duties, in order to avoid unnecessary escalation while still ensuring appropriate notifications are made when a legitimate threat is identified.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Mr. Kelly stated that the process includes human intervention, whereby the analytic system first identifies a potential firearm, which is then verified by a human reviewer in dispatch. He explained that the "human-in-the-loop" verification step ensures that alerts are reviewed and confirmed before being forwarded to the Dover Police Department. He noted that this means alerts are already subject to a verification process prior to law enforcement notification.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Chief Johnson stated that, in response to an earlier observation from Council President Neil, he wanted to distinguish the technology being proposed from ShotSpotter, which is a sound detection system that identifies gunshots. He noted that the department has followed ShotSpotter for some time and receives frequent inquiries about it; however, he stated that it is very expensive and, in his view, offers limited additional value given the existing level of citizen reporting and dispatch response when gunfire occurs in the city. He noted that in most cases, though not all, when a firearm is discharged, police receive multiple calls quickly and response times are generally strong.

Chief Johnson further contrasted sound detection technology with ZeroEyes, emphasizing both cost and operational differences. He stated that ZeroEyes is significantly more economical and aligns with the department's "left of bang" philosophy. He explained that "left of bang" refers to intervening before a weapons discharge occurs, rather than responding afterward.

He stated that while post-incident response involves investigating and addressing events after a shooting, the goal is to move earlier in the sequence of events to prevent harm. He explained that identifying a brandished firearm prior to discharge could provide officers additional time to respond and intervene.

Chief Johnson stated that such situations may include lawful firearm possession, which officers are trained to assess and handle appropriately, as well as unlawful

possession cases requiring intervention. He emphasized that early identification could provide a critical window to prevent a potential shooting.

He concluded that this technology represents a significant advancement in using available tools to proactively address gun violence and improve the department's ability to intervene before weapons are discharged, rather than solely responding after the fact.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mr. Kelly stated that the technology is an analytic system that is expected to continue improving over time. He noted that there are over 250 cameras throughout the downtown area and that the intent is to leverage this existing infrastructure through analytics in order to be more proactive, rather than relying solely on human monitoring.

He stated that it is not feasible for staff to manually monitor all camera feeds without significant additional personnel, estimating that it would require a substantial increase in staffing to do so. He emphasized that the purpose of bringing the technology forward is to support law enforcement personnel by enhancing existing capabilities.

Mr. Kelly concluded that the city would continue to evaluate technology and analytics to assist the men and women behind the badge and to support public safety in the community.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Chief Johnson directed him to page three of the action form, noting that the project had been approved by the Criminal Justice Council for two consecutive years at slightly more than $60,000 per year for the base cost of the detection system. He stated that the platform fee and associated upfront costs required by Advantech to interface with existing technology totaled slightly over $13,000, which was identified as the additional funding needed to implement the system. He further noted that the funding source is listed to the right of the corresponding amount on the form.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Chief Johnson stated that the approval covers a two-year period. He explained that, prior to the meeting, he requested that the Criminal Justice Council consider approving funding for the second year during their budget deliberations. He stated that the Council subsequently approved the second-year funding.

He noted that this approval was significant for two reasons: first, to reassure city council that the system is funded for two years; and second, to allow sufficient time to evaluate the effectiveness and efficacy of the technology. He stated that this evaluation period would help determine whether he would recommend continuing the system and, if alternative funding cannot be identified, whether costs would need to be absorbed by the city in the future.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Chief Johnson compared the system to a traditional alarm company process. He explained that when an alarm is triggered, for example, for an ADT customer, the signal is first sent to the alarm company, which contacts the customer according to established protocols and, if necessary, forwards the alert to the appropriate 911 center.

He stated that the proposed system follows a similar path. Once the technology identifies a potential weapon, the alert is sent to a monitoring station in Conshohocken, where trained professionals staff the system 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He explained that these personnel verify the alert and once confirmed, electronically transmit the image and location information to the 911 center, where it is received through electronic means for further response.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Mr. Kelly stated that the system includes geotracking capabilities that provide location information within dispatch. He explained that designated staff members will also receive alerts directly on their cell phones through an application. He stated that alerts will identify the individual, the location, and any movement across multiple camera feeds in real time. He noted that this information will be simultaneously transmitted to both dispatch and mobile devices, allowing for immediate awareness and response as the situation develops.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Chief Johnson stated that the technology detects the image and shape of a firearm regardless of how it is constructed, including polymer, metal, or 3D-printed weapons. He emphasized that the system does not identify or focus on individuals, noting that it is not concerned with who a person is or what they are doing. He explained that the system simply detects when a firearm appears to be present in an uncontrolled or public setting, such as in a person’s hand or on a vehicle, and generates an alert so that authorities can determine whether it presents a public safety concern.

Chief Johnson further stated that the alert is reviewed by a monitoring center staffed with trained personnel who are familiar with distinguishing lawful firearm possessions from potentially unlawful or threatening situations. He noted that if there is any uncertainty or concern, the alert is forwarded to the police department, which then follows standard response protocols. He compared the system to a 911 call reporting a person with a gun, noting that in traditional calls there may be only a verbal description and no visual confirmation. He stated that this technology provides an additional layer of information that is both faster and more detailed than a verbal report, enabling quicker situational awareness and response.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the sole source Advantech/ZeroEyes vendor.

Responding to Ms. Arndt, Chief Johnson stated that his prior remarks were intended to clarify that individuals such as uniformed security guards, police officers, sheriffs, and other persons acting in an official capacity would be included within that context. He stated that the reference was meant to address those individuals specifically. He further stated that the system does not consider additional personal factors related to individuals and that alerts are treated similarly to a 911 call reporting a person with a firearm. He explained that in such situations, dispatch and officers initially have limited information and must respond based on available details. Chief Johnson emphasized that whether information originates from a 911 call or from a ZeroEyes alert, the response is governed by standard dispatch procedures, officer training, and departmental policy. He stated that the source of the information does not change how incidents are handled operationally.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kelly stated that to dismantle the system there would be zero cost. The physical server would be returned back to ZeroEyes who have the analytics on it and there would be no additional cost to remove that.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Marney stated that the funding was pulled from the police budget auto line and applied to the construction line, and the funds are available through the existing budget.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Ms. Marney stated that funds are being reallocated from the Auto line object code 5022 to the Construction line object code 54031. She explained that the funds were already available in the Capital Budget (Fund 101), which is the city's capital budget fund. She further noted that object code 5402 is an internal general ledger classification and that the funding is being moved into the Construction line because the project is classified as a capital construction project.

Responding to Mr. Faust, Chief Johnson stated that the technology does not distinguish between individuals carrying a firearm; rather, it alerts when a firearm is visible. He explained that the department will process any resulting alert in the same manner as other notifications. He further stated that, for security purposes, he could not disclose specific methods used to identify law enforcement partners, noting that the department uses both active and passive deconfliction processes. He acknowledged concerns regarding potential "blue on blue" incidents but stated that the additional alerting system is not expected to increase that risk. Chief Johnson emphasized that existing rules of engagement and deconfliction procedures remain in place to ensure coordinated operations when law enforcement agencies are operating in the same area.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the sole source Advantech/ZeroEyes vendor. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and carried by a roll call vote of seven (7) yes (Hall,

Anderson, Pillsbury, Arndt, Rocha, Neil, Shevock, one (1) no (Lewis), and three (3) absent (Boggerty, Sudler, Garfinkel).

During the Regular Council Meeting, Mr. Lewis stated that the item was on the agenda for the Committee of the Whole meeting on June 9, 2026, and for the public to be aware, it was proposed by Police Chief Johnson that we bring in a new piece of equipment into the city called ZeroEyes Gun Detection. He noted that it was a device that was integrated into the city's camera system, and it would detect guns. He explained that after doing some research and consulting with colleagues in law enforcement, he was provided with and found information that he would like to put into the record.

Mr. Lewis stated that a report from the U. S. Department of Homeland Security last year suggested some answers and raised questions about the effectiveness of ZeroEyes, such as an AI program that could detect a visible gun and alert First Responders within seconds, but it does not guarantee threat prevention. He further stated that the program could be better as a post-incident investigator tool, as it would reduce the need for investigators to comb through hours of footage from multiple cameras or different businesses. He noted that there was an item regarding false alarms and public incidents. He highlighted a publicized issue in a Florida middle school incident that occurred in December 2025, where ZeroEyes AI mistakenly took a student's clarinet for a rifle and triggered a lockdown. He noted that the police later confirmed that it was a costume, and the school banned the student for pretending to have a weapon. He pointed out that critics have argued that false positives could cause panic, disrupt learning, and waste law enforcement resources. He mentioned that the system could not detect concealed or holstered weapons and required the firearm to be visible and identifiable in camera footage. He stated that it would limit effectiveness in real-world scenarios where weapons could be hidden and that in the State of Delaware, individuals have the right to carry concealed weapons. He also stated that there have been unproven safety benefits. He explained that the ACLU questioned whether those technologies could enhance public safety, given that past systems like ShotSpotter have failed to do so. ACLU's stance on the matter was that ZeroEyes technology expanded surveillance without democratic accountability, carried the risk of misuse, and may not deliver on its safety promises.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that he could not speak to the reviews and articles he had not had a chance to review. He further stated that he would like him to consider their assessment of ZeroEyes from the standpoint of how they view getting a 911 call, whether or not it was a supplemental technology to their already existing camera system, which the city has already invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in over the years. If not millions, that allowed them to get out in front of gun violence when a firearm was brandished. He believed one (1) of the misnomers was that if ZeroEyes created an alert for a brandished firearm, they just took it at face value, assuming it was true, and acted aggressively to respond to that location and the individual indicated by the technology. If that individual saw someone on the street with a gun in their hand and ZeroEyes saw it on the camera, both of those detections would lead to their communication center, and in both cases would prompt their telecommunications to look at their own cameras to verify what the report was saying, and then they would begin their investigation. He noted that they would begin their response protocols from that point. He added that the actual activation goes to a monitoring center, and it would be verified by a human before the report

would be sent to them, so with the technology detecting the item, the human verification, and the quick transmission to the appropriate 911 call center, they would look at that as more of a 911 call than if the technology told them it was true. He stated that they would then respond using their policy manual and protocols to respond to the situation. He further stated that they would address the situation based on the fatality of the circumstances, not just because AI-supported technology directed them to any particular place or any particular location. He noted that they would follow through and do what was indicated or walk away when they discovered that the activation was not associated with a status offense.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that they would be hard-pressed to find someone who would not believe that the firearm offenses and gun violence were not a problem in Dover in recent years. He further stated that if he was going to invest time and resources to check a brandished firearm, the technology was not supposed to activate a holstered firearm. If it did, the monitoring center would screen it; if it were a holstered firearm, they would send it to them. He explained that the ZeroEyes technology allowed officers to detect a firearm when it was brandished before it was used, enabling them to intervene in certain situations and potentially prevent harm. He noted that several camera views in the city have routinely captured gun violence, and they have been able to find it on post-incident review, but at that point, the damage was done. He emphasized that with the ZeroEyes technology being available to see the firearm when it was brandished and before being utilized, that allowed them to intervene when appropriate in certain circumstances to be in that location before the trigger was pulled and possibly harm an individual.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson clarified that they do not possess the ShotSpotter.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that the ShotSpotter was cost-prohibitive for them.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that there were an infinite number of possibilities and an infinite number of elapsed timeframes from the brandishment of a gun to the utilization of a weapon. He acknowledged that technology could not prevent every incident, particularly when a firearm was concealed until the moment it was used. However, he explained that the technology could provide early detection when a firearm was brandished before being fired, allowing officers the opportunity to intervene in some situations. He noted that the technology had been utilized regularly in campus settings, certain condensed neighborhood settings, hospitals, and educational locations, and it was starting to prove its utility. He further noted that he has not been made aware of any events where harm had occurred to an innocent party based on a police response to a zero-wise activation.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that he was not familiar with the Capital School District or Caesar Rodney School District reviewing or considering the ZeroEyes technology. He mentioned that it was only going to be on public-facing city cameras from the educational side of things. He explained that Delaware State University had chosen to share publicly that they have already invested in ZeroEyes and that they were the 911 call center for that potential activation. Chief Baynard, Superintendent Overton, and he were staying in communication as they piloted the technology and saw where it would go. He noted that, as discussed during the Council

Committee of the Whole meeting two weeks earlier, the city would evaluate the effectiveness of the ZeroEyes technology as the grant funding neared its end. He stated that the city had received two (2) years of grant funding totaling $120,000, which would provide an opportunity to determine whether the technology was beneficial for the City of Dover. He further stated that at the end of the grant funding period, if the city had little or no results from the technology, they would need to evaluate whether the technology would be worth continuing into a third year. He noted that if the city decided not to continue, the technology could be discontinued, and the city could return to its previous practices.

Mr. Neil stated that during the Open Forum, a public speaker came up and spoke about individuals shooting at his house, and damage had occurred. He questioned whether they could pick up those individuals as a result of that shooting and get them off the street; then council would have addressed one (1) of his questions regarding what actions could be taken. He noted that the zero-source funding listed under the receiving grants may have been the answer the public speaker was seeking, as securing grant funding was what council was looking for. He expressed hope that council would continue moving forward with the item and release it, as it had been included on the consent agenda.

Mr. Anderson moved to approve Item #10, Sole Source Request – ZeroEyes Gun Detection Solution, as recommended by the committee. He stated that the item was very important for public safety and that the public had demanded it for years. He noted that if the city was going to invest in hundreds of cameras, then they needed to embrace technology to help 24/7 because constituents' lives were at stake. He added that was how one (1) of the items was going to help them reclaim the city and make the city safer for the constituents. He emphasized that if council was serious about public safety, he stated, then they needed to see how the technology worked; since it cost practically nothing, it could save someone everything.

Mr. Lewis stated that he wanted to respond to Mr. Neil's comments concerning drive-by shootings; he needed to remember that the technology was not 100% and, as Mr. Lewis had indicated, it took a second for a bullet to eject from the chamber of a firearm, particularly with those drive-by shootings or any kind of shooting. He expressed concern that the device was not 100% effective and that the device would not stop a weapon from being brandished. He stated that the cameras would not pick up a concealed weapon.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson stated that the technology would not detect a concealed firearm. He further stated that they were trying to invade a space where a brandished firearm was not immediately used but appeared to be a threat to the immediate vicinity, whether that was a street corner, a neighborhood, Barrister Place, or cameras on display. He emphasized that every opportunity to get ahead of the actual utilization of the gun was important. Based on incident reviews from the past several years and the analysis of multiple scenarios, he noted that there have been a number of events where sufficient time was available for police to respond before a weapon was discharged. He stated that the biggest win would be preventing harm to an individual, particularly to innocent bystanders.

Mr. Lewis made a motion to suspend the rules to allow public comment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rocha and carried unanimously.

Lachelle Paul, 501 Silverside Road, expressed concerns regarding AI detection and potential illegal searches. She questioned how AI detection would be applied while ensuring compliance with legal search requirements and asked how law enforcement would be able to legally conduct searches when relying on AI detection technology. She also questioned whether the city would be legally prepared to address possible lawsuits and the associated costs from those lawsuits.

Responding to Ms. Paul, Chief Johnson stated that the technology should be viewed as a proactive measure because it allowed law enforcement to become aware of potential gun violence in a specific location before it was detected by human observation. He stated that while the technology reacted to the act of a firearm being displayed, it provided a proactive opportunity for law enforcement to respond quickly. He noted that even if an individual witnessed the same event, the camera notification could reach the 911 center faster than a citizen could call, provide their location, and describe what they observed. He further explained that the technology would be used in conjunction with other proactive public safety initiatives, including reallocating resources and utilizing available grant funding for violent crime over time. Regarding potential litigation, he acknowledged that anyone could file a lawsuit but stated that the technology would serve as an aid. He explained that when the technology detected what it believed to be a firearm, the monitoring company would notify the 911 call center. However, personnel would not rely solely on the alert. Communication center staff and the on-duty supervisor would review the information, access existing city-owned camera footage, and separately verify what the technology identified. He noted that if the information was confirmed, officers would proceed using the same procedures that would apply if the incident had been observed through traditional means. He emphasized that officers would still be required to establish independent probable cause and verify the facts before taking enforcement action.

Responding to Ms. Paul, Mr. Griffith explained that the two (2) concepts from criminal law that would apply whether or not the person who was the subject had a reasonable expectation of privacy in a public place were that courts would have held that they did not have a reasonable expectation of privacy when they were walking down the street or in a school situation. He noted that an individual could be permitted to be videotaped in that situation. He stated that the second part was the Fourth Amendment, in which the videotaping would not be considered a seizure or a search.

Responding to Ms. Paul, Mr. Griffith stated that based on the technology, if a weapon was detected and considered in plain view, and the individual subsequently concealed the weapon, officers have the ability to conduct a search of that individual.

Bonnie Pennington, 200 North Kirkwood Street, expressed concerns about having more officers on patrol in the city instead of having cameras placed in the city.

Responding to Ms. Pennington, Chief Johnson stated that they were not adding cameras, but integrating software into the existing camera network to have more utility out of the cameras that they already own, maintain, and pay for. He further stated that the technology represented a giant stride towards the efficient deployment and application of their resources, to help assist officers to be in the right place at the right time to prevent gun violence. He noted that his job was to

balance the acquisition and utilization of technology with traditional human resources to try and get the biggest return on investment. He emphasized that he believed that was what they were trying to accomplish.

Responding to Ms. Pennington, Chief Johnson stated that they upgraded their camera system from the technology they had from about 11 years ago. Over the last 24 to 36 months, he noted that they have been updating the cameras to have more high-definition digital video and better capacity that sets up for ZeroEyes to be useful in discerning a working firearm or the potential of a working firearm from other objects that any individual might have on them or in their hand. He mentioned that they were taking a good step, getting a better value out of their past investments, considering that their share of the 24-month project was around 10% of the total cost, and the other 90% was being covered by a specifically targeted grant program as it was presented to him.

Ms. Pennington questioned whether the grant funding should be used for other purposes. She concurred with Mr. Lewis and expressed concerns about using taxpayer dollars for the technology when they were not sure how the device was going to work.

Vonderlear Smack, 1001 White Oak Road, expressed concerns about the technology ZeroEyes.

Responding to Ms. Smack, Chief Johnson explained that ZeroEyes had a monitoring center and compared it to an alarm company. When the technology detected what it believed to be a firearm, the alert was reviewed by monitoring personnel, including former law enforcement and military members, who used their expertise to determine whether the object appeared to be a firearm. If confirmed, they sent a still image notification to the 911 call center identifying the camera location for review. He stated that the Dover Police Department's communication center and responding officers would then independently verify the information and make the determination regarding whether a firearm was present and what action should be taken.

Responding to Ms. Smack, Chief Johnson stated that the police department was always the biggest customer of litigation. He noted that it was the nature of what they do when trying to intercede in dangerous conduct or criminal conduct and that they try to do it in a constitutionally conscious way. He added that they were always going to be proportional to what they would be seeing on the cameras. He stated that the only difference would be how the Dover Police Department became aware of the situation. Instead of receiving a 911 call or having a staff member manually access a camera, observing activity, and determining that a patrol officer should respond, the technology would serve as an additional tool to alert personnel to a possible incident.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, expressed concerns about equipment breakdown costs, who pays for repairs, and what ZeroEyes can monitor, such as armed robbery or assault.

Responding to Mr. Faust, Chief Johnson stated that ZeroEyes monitoring was solely for guns. He noted that he was not aware of the technology that could interpret human behavior and detect all crimes, such as armed robbery and assault. He added that there was a lot of technology in circulation for the police departments to consider. He explained that the only thing they could do was look at their crime dynamics, community problems, and scan the marketplace for

technologies that could assist them in doing their job. He noted that nothing was going to suffer going forward in the budget. He mentioned in the beginning of the budget year, when he first brought the item to council last August, he did not have a grant, and the amount of money was not available in his budget unless council wanted to entertain the idea of a shifted budget priority. He explained that certain variables revealed themselves in expenses that they had anticipated that they did not incur, and in their capital budget program, once they got completed, the vehicle upfits cost them less than originally anticipated, so they had an opportunity to relocate funds to cover it so that they would not get to the grant funding, so they could deploy the technology. He stated that there were no absolutes and that the overarching concern about AI was databases, facial recognition, privacy related issues. The only thing the technology would do was try to find guns, and then present those images to working professionals to figure out what to do next.

Responding to Mr. Faust, Chief Johnson stated that ZeroEyes was not a construction project and that it was a CPU that got put in the communications center that was attached to their network. He emphasized that if they choose not to do the project anymore, they could pull the plug and disconnect the wire.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson stated that the technology was being met. He noted that he did not have any specific information regarding disproportionate deployment. He further noted that they were adding the technology to cameras that were already in service in the locations that the crime data told them had a high propensity for gun violence. He added that the technology was only interested in finding the outline of a working firearm and nothing else.

Responding to Mr. Faust, Chief Johnson stated that he would have to reach out to the Criminal Justice Council because he was not prepared to go that deep into the grant rules for that specific burn grant. He noted that the only thing he could say was that grants do not like to pay for buildings, cars, or any kind of transportation. He mentioned that the grant was for technology. He stated that he believed that the fixed position system that they have in place currently could help achieve better detection results.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Chief Johnson stated that he received a phone call from the Criminal Justice Council. He explained that the Criminal Justice Council has a committee and that both Wilmington and Dover were contacted with grant details. He noted that they matched an offer with what their need was, and a CAF was generated, and a conversation happened.

Responding to Chief Johnson, Dr. Sudler stated that he should partner with some of the departments that also handled grants, and then they could all find alternatives that could possibly address one (1) or two (2) needs that the city needed. He further stated that they could broaden and utilize that funding so it could be beneficial not only to the police department but also to IT and other departments. He noted that there needed to be more collaboration and partnership between the Dover Police Department and other departments in the city. He believed that the City Manager should be involved with reviewing grants since the Dover Police Department was not a department on its own; it was part of the city budget. He also noted that the money should be utilized more towards patrolmen on a beat and/or a mini mobile police state, which the constituents have been asking for. He added that it would align with the new priority-based

budgeting approach for the city.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Neil stated that there was a long discussion on the item ZeroEyes at the Council Committee of the Whole. He noted that they should have been discussing that at that meeting, and new ideas were coming up. He added that there was a motion on the floor and they needed a second.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the sole-source Advantech/ZeroEyes vendor. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury.

Mr. Lewis stated that the item had been previously discussed at the Council Committee of the Whole, and that they all should have had the opportunity to follow up with questions that may not have been asked during that session because that was an important subject matter and it dealt with taxpayer funds.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson clarified that ZeroEyes was a software addition to the dispatch/camera system in the 911 call center. He stated that there was no more than one (1) device and that the overlay software would interface with their camera system software. He explained that they were using heat map data to help them distinguish which cameras were going to be assigned. There were several more camera feeds in the city than they had money available to fund. He noted that to keep the project within budget, they had to prioritize which camera views were going to be monitored. He added that there was a fee per X amount of cameras and did as many cameras as they could within the grant dollars that were available. He mentioned that the cameras were chosen based on historical data on crime, but he did not have exact proportions and percentages as far as coverage goes. He would need to do research to get those numbers.

Responding to Mr. Lewis, Chief Johnson clarified that the device was not a physical add-on to specific cameras. He noted that the device was a software add-on to the server in the 911 call center, which was the destination point for all the cameras, which was their home base.

Responding to Chief Johnson, Mr. Lewis concurred with Dr. Sudler and Ms. Smack. He stated that the data and statistics were very important when they were trying to sell something. He noted that he would appreciate it in the future if he were able to provide data and statistics when making a presentation.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation for the approval of the sole-source Advantech/ZeroEyes vendor. The motion was seconded by Dr. Pillsbury and carried with Sudler and Lewis voting no.

Allocation of Higher Education and Public Safety Fees (Grant in Aid Funds) for FY2026 (Patricia Marney, Controller/Treasurer)

Ms. Patricia Marney, Controller/Treasurer, reviewed the background and analysis of the allocation of the Higher Education and Public Safety fees for FY2026.

Staff recommended applying the remaining funds to police revenues to offset expenditures related to state-mandated expenses.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of the staff recommendation to apply the remaining funds to the police revenues to offset expenditures related to state-mandated expenses. The motion was seconded by Ms. Arndt and unanimously carried by a roll call vote (Boggerty, Sudler, and Garfinkel absent).

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

Closing of the Economic Development Grant Application Period (Councilman Anderson

Mr. Anderson reviewed the background to the closing of the Economic Development Grant application period.

Staff recommended approval of closing the Economic Development Grant Application period.

Mr. Rocha moved to recommend acceptance of Mr. Anderson's recommendation to close the Economic Development Grant application period. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hall and unanimously carried.

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

Mr. Anderson moved for adjournment of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Mr. Neil moved for adjournment of the Council Committee of the Whole meeting, hearing no objection the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

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

SPECIAL ELECTION OF OFFICERS – ROBBINS HOSE COMPANY – FIRE LINE OFFICERS (TERM TO EXPIRE DECEMBER 08, 2026)

By consent agenda, Mr. Anderson moved for approval of the following special election of officers – Robbins Hose Company – Fire Line Officers, seconded by Dr. Sudler and carried by a unanimous roll call vote.

Fourth Assistant Chief – Drew Kuntzi
First Fire Line Captain – Richard Flood

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

The First Reading of the Proposed Ordinance #2026-06 was accomplished during the Council Meeting of June 08, 2026. The ordinance is available at the entrance of the Council Chamber and on the City's website at www.cityofdover.**gov** under "Government."

Dr. Pillsbury moved that the Final Reading of the proposed ordinances be acknowledged by title only, seconded by Mr. Anderson, and unanimously carried.

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

By motion of Ms. Arndt, seconded by Mr. Lewis, Council, by a unanimous roll call vote, adopted Ordinance #2026-06, as follows:

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

That Chapter 106 – Traffic and Vehicles. Article III. – Stopping, Standing, and Parking, Division 1. – Generally, Section 106-123. – Vehicle parking time limited where carrying capacity is in excess of one ton, and trailer and recreation vehicle parking be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 106-123. Vehicle parking time, vehicle load capacity, trailer, and recreational vehicle parking.

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person to park any vehicle with a vehicle load capacity of more than one ton, any trailer, which includes, but is not limited to, boat, utility, construction or one that is used to carry goods regardless of weight capacity and is designed to be towed or pulled by another vehicle, or any vehicle or trailer on the city streets for a period longer than two consecutive hours.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to park any commercial vehicle with a vehicle load capacity of more than one ton, any trailer, which includes, but is not limited to utility, construction or one that is used to carry goods regardless of weight capacity and is designed to be towed or pulled by another vehicle, or any vehicle or trailer combination thereof, in any residential zone in the city except for temporary parking for immediate deliveries, pickups, and/or service calls to residences or for construction work on residential properties. A commercial vehicle shall be one which that is used or maintained

for the transportation of people, property, or goods, for hire, compensation, or profit, except taxicabs and rideshare.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to park a trailered board under 25 feet on the streets of Dover for a period longer than 12 consecutive hours. For any trailered boat with a length of 25 feet or greater, refer to subsection (a).

(d) It shall be unlawful for any recreational vehicle to park on any residential street for a period longer than 12 consecutive hours without a permit. A resident owner of a recreational vehicle may request a parking permit from the city to park on a residential street in the vicinity of their residence for a period not to exceed 72 hours. The permit would be made available at no cost to the resident. The parking permit shall be displayed in the front window of the vehicle, visible from the street. A resident may only request such a permit three times in any 12-month period.

(e) Non-residents are exempt from subsection (d) for a period of up to seven days as long as their recreational vehicle does not create a safety hazard or interfere with traffic in the residential area where they are parked.

(f) All parking shall comply with the regulations in Appendix A, Article VI, Section A.

ADOPTED: June 22, 2026

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

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

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Duca clarified that for Fiscal Year 2027, the current fee applied to all commercial properties, both exempt and non-exempt.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Duca clarified that for Fiscal Year 2027, the current fee for residents was zero (0).

By motion of Dr. Sudler, seconded by Ms. Arndt, Council, by a unanimous roll call vote, adopted Ordinance #2026-12, as follows:

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

That Chapter 2 – Administration, Article V. – Finance be amended by inserting Sec. 2-428. – Public Safety fund as follows:

Sec. 2-428. – Public safety fund.

(a) The City Manager is hereby authorized to impose a fee and to bill residents and others for police and fire services. Such fees will be assessed monthly and included as a general billing item, included on monthly residential and commercial utility bills. The public safety fee shall apply to all utility customers within the City of Dover boundaries.

(b) Establishment of specialized fund.

(1) All revenues received in accordance with this section shall be deposited in the public safety fund. These funds shall be used to pay for regular and necessary administrative and capital costs for police and fire services, including allowances for externalities and uncertainties, and debt service.

(2) The proceeds of the public safety fund shall be managed by the City of Dover Department of Finance, which shall regularly report the status of the fund, arrange for audit, and oversee disbursements as provided for by any contractual provisions and the city's financial management policies.

(c) Fees and the fee schedule will periodically be reviewed and adjusted to reflect changing costs. Council shall set the fee by ordinance to be adopted annually with the adoption of the Fiscal Year Budget ordinance. The fees are to be added, updated, and reflected in the rates and tariff annual document, and such amount shall be kept in a separate, interest-earning account and shall be used only for the costs associated with police and fire administrative and capital costs and debt service. The fee is subject to the city's collection policies and procedures, but is not lienable against customers' property nor subject to the Clean Hands Ordinance. The City Manager may authorize commercial allocation procedures and utilize the same procedures as other outstanding fees.

(d) Exemption. Associated fees shall not be applied to properties covered by the Public Safety Higher Education Fund.

(e) Severability. If any provision of this article shall be determined to be invalid in whole or in part, all other provisions shall continue to be separately and fully effective.

(f) Effective date. The public safety fee shall be effective on July 1, 2026.

Secs. 2-429-2-500. – Reserved.

ADOPTED: June 22, 2026

FINAL READING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE #2026-11 – FISCAL YEAR 2026/2027 CITY OF DOVER BUDGET ORDINANCE

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

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca stated that when the information became available, she reviewed the information prepared by Police Chief Johnson regarding the memorandum on the Dover Police Academy. She further stated that she reviewed information that was provided by him regarding the revenues and expenses, as well as different communications asking various questions to try to get clarity regarding the situation. She pointed out that he was correct that the revenues totaled $95,630, and of that total, the cost included a $25,000 grant for each academy to defray overtime expenses specifically. She mentioned that the expenses totaled $430,727.98, and out of those expenses, personnel-related expenses, including salaries, benefits, and overtime, represented $422,601.82, or 98% of the overall expenses. She noted that when costing a service or program, it was standard practice to include personnel expenses. She explained that the revenues that were received covered all ancillary expenses in addition to $87,000, or 21% of the personnel expenses. Regarding the personnel expenses, it was indicated that there were three (3) officers dedicated to the Dover Police Academy, of which historically there have been two (2) per year as of late. She noted that the memorandum from Chief Johnson also identified other

officers who assisted with the academy during the year. She stated that when reviewing the Dover Police Academy, it was a personnel-intensive operation, just like their other municipal operations for the City of Dover. She pointed out that while the revenues identified for Fiscal Year 2025 covered all the ancillary expenses and most of the overtime expenses associated with the academy, they did not cover the salaries and benefits of the officers dedicated to the academy. She noted that if the academy were to be paused, those officers would be assigned to other operations. In addition, she mentioned that the revenue sources would not be there either, which would balance out with the overtime expenses.

Dr. Sudler stated that the officers could be reassigned to patrol duties. He noted that Chief Johnson had previously stated that additional patrol officers were needed and stated that reassigning the officers would help address that need. He moved to temporarily suspend the Dover Police Academy until sufficient revenue or a surplus to sustain a non-essential expenditure was available so that more officers could be assigned to patrol duties. He noted that it would show good faith to the constituents that the city was being diligent in public safety matters by having more patrolmen out in the community and building stronger relationships between police officers and the public.

Dr. Sudler moved to suspend the Dover Municipal Police Academy as non-essential and place officers out in the community on patrol. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis.

Responding to Mr. Rocha, Ms. Duca stated that, reviewing the numbers they had for Fiscal Year 2025, and with the assumption that if they suspended the academy, the revenue associated with the academy would no longer be coming in and that the overtime and expenses associated with that would cease, there would be no net change.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Duca clarified that the figures specifically reported $95,000 in revenue and $430,000 in expenses covered Fiscal Year 2025.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Ms. Duca stated that the driver track expense covered both existing police officers and the Dover Police Academy recruits and was included as a single line item in the Police Department’s operating budget. She noted that she would provide him with the specific cost for the line item.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Chief Johnson clarified that there was a new partnership with Dover Air Force Base for driver training. He stated that they did not, in the past, incur a charge to use the facility in town that had previously allowed them to do the cone course. He explained that once a charge was initiated, they did not have a lot of choice for that session and the session after that, but they did go out and find a new partner with Dover Air Force Base security forces and the leadership of the Air Force Base. He noted that they have adequate space on base for their cone course, and that Dover Air Force Base is providing it at no cost.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Chief Johnson stated that the driving course costs should be cost-neutral, other than the wear and tear on the vehicles. He noted that they received news that there was a police and public safety driving course facility in Newcastle County that they had been offered courtesy access to if they ever needed to use it. He added that they now have a primary

and a backup location for driver training that would not cost them anything.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Chief Johnson stated that before the Dover Police Academy was reactivated, only three (3) police academies were available. He explained that enrollment depended on each academy's schedule and capacity, and when space was limited, available training slots were rationed among the agencies, which could delay the training of new officers. He noted that the academy costs were monitored each time they were conducted. He further explained that when there were too many recruits in a cohort, additional staff were required for areas such as the firing range and other safety functions, which increased costs and affected the budget. He stated that they have established a good cap on class size to keep personnel costs stable and avoid the need for additional staff. He further stated that, depending on demand, he may have had to limit enrollment and decline requests from other agencies to enroll recruits in the academy.

Responding to Mr. Boggerty, Chief Johnson clarified that the decision has already been made to increase the tuition costs in order to continue supporting the police departments statewide. He stated that whether it be through grant requests or an increase in the tuition rate, their attempt was to try and stay ahead of costs and maintain a small surplus. He noted that Session Seven (7) experienced a significant shortfall when he presented in the March report to council, but the department recovered during Sessions Eight (8) and Nine (9) through adjustments. He stated that through adjustments from what was stated by Ms. Duca, the academy would be cost-neutral.

Mr. Neil provided for the record his comments in writing, "The Value of the Police Academy Worth Keeping." (**Exhibit #1**).

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Ms. Duca stated that, based on her understanding, the bulk of the candidates for the training academy come from other locations. She noted that they were looking at a certain number per academy that was sponsored by the city, but then there was a certain number of those that stayed on to retain. She mentioned the ballparked percentage of officers who have come to the Dover Police Department and have been hired by the Dover Police Academy was at 25%.

Dr. Sudler stated that when the Dover Police Academy was held, a portion of the recruits were from other municipalities, which resulted in fewer officers being candidates for the Dover Police Department. He further stated that it was not feasible that the constituents were paying the cost and officers were being trained for other municipalities, and in return, the city may receive four (4) or five (5) candidates out of 18 candidates. He noted that suspending the academy would be cost-neutral and would allow more officers to be reassigned to patrol duties. He believed that it would improve the building and strengthen the community and police relations. He added that by strengthening the community and police relations, the community would feel more comfortable reporting crimes and being proactive instead of reactive. He stated that he was not opposed to the police academy but believed fiscal responsibility was necessary when it came to taxpayer dollars. He explained that the academy had originally been supported as a temporary measure because of COVID-19, and he felt that now the academy had an adverse impact on the city when it came to the community and police relations, such as having additional patrol officers on the streets. He noted that the city should utilize all its resources, whether it was monetary

resources or manpower, to address the challenges that the City of Dover has been confronted with.

Mr. Anderson stated that he supported a downtown police unit and ensuring adequate time and resources for that. He stated that the issue being discussed was a policy decision rather than a budgetary one (1). He noted that changing the current plan could create a staffing shortage if academy schedules were disrupted, as recruits might accept other offers if their training was delayed. He stated that the city still needed to hire additional officers and that the current plan was intended to fill upcoming retirements and vacancies. He cautioned that altering the schedule could result in unintended consequences, including the loss of recruits, and stated that it would be preferable to follow the existing plan.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he respected Dr. Sudler's concerns regarding the Dover Police Academy but emphasized the importance of recruitment and retention of officers to ensure future public safety. He stated that the academy allowed recruits to "go home" after training, which he believed helped officers balance training with family life while still completing required instruction. He contrasted this with a residential "live-in" police academy. He stated that training did not generate revenue but was necessary to produce well-trained officers who could meet community expectations and support a community-oriented police department. He encouraged continued support for the academy to ensure officers could be trained and assigned to address public safety needs. He further stated that several officers who were eligible for retirement were currently involved in training new police officers in the academy because they believe they could pass along the legacy of law enforcement in the City of Dover. He expressed concern that reducing or eliminating the academy could impact recruitment and staffing levels.

Mr. Lewis respectfully disagreed with Mayor Christiansen's concerns regarding a residential "live-in" police academy. Drawing on his experience attending a residential "live-in" academy as a police officer in Washington, D.C., he stated that he found the experience beneficial because it encouraged to increased focus and camaraderie. While acknowledging that both residential and "go home" training models have merit, he stated that, based on his personal experience, he could speak positively about the residential academy.

Dr. Sudler asked if it was permissible for the community to be allowed to speak on the Fiscal Year 2026/2027 City of Dover Budget Ordinance, since there were individuals who had questions.

Responding to Dr. Sudler, Mr. Neil stated that he could ask for a suspension of the rules.

Dr. Sudler made a motion to suspend the rules to allow public comment on the City of Dover Budget. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Anderson stated that they already had a public hearing, so his vote was no.

Ms. Arndt stated that they already had a public hearing and a workshop, so her vote was no.

Dr. Sudler made a motion to suspend the rules to allow public comment on the City of

Dover Budget. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis and carried by a roll call vote of six (6) yes (Hall, Boggerty, Pillsbury, Rocha, Sudler, Lewis) and three (3) no (Anderson, Arndt, Neil).

Lachelle Paul, 501 Silverside Road, expressed concerns about the proposed budget and questioned how funds in the Economic Development Fund had been allocated. She stated that the public did not know what the money was distributed for in the Economic Development Fund. She stated that the city had not provided a detailed breakdown of Police Academy expenditures and expressed concern that council was approving the budget without complete financial information. She emphasized that the city needed an audit to determine its financial position and to take accountability for the budget.

Cleveland Wilson, 234 North Kirkwood Street, expressed concerns with public safety and the proposed budget. He emphasized that council needed to prioritize putting funds into public safety, which would allow more patrols to be around in the city.

William Faust, Jr., 136 Orchard Avenue, expressed concerns about the proposed budget. He questioned why the city was giving the Downtown Dover Partnership $150,000 when they had already received $22 million from the Governor. He also questioned the mayor and council's discretionary funds, since constituents were giving up items, such as vacations, or were not able to pay a bill; then the Mayor and Council should give up the discretionary funds because it was considered a luxury, and not many constituents have those luxuries. He suggested that council review what Mr. Lewis and Dr. Sudler had presented as a new format to address the budget situation. He stated that if council answered the constituents' questions, then they would see fewer letters in the newspaper and fewer constituents being hostile and upset.

Bonnie Pennington, 200 North Kirkwood Street, expressed concerns about more police patrols on the streets. She stated that the city wanted tax money to pay for the police officers but questioned why she had to beg for a police officer to come to her street when he paid his taxes. She expressed frustration that nothing was getting done in the city.

Ms. Hall stated that there would be no net gain or loss with the academy, so her vote was no.

Dr. Sudler stated that the city needed more patrolmen, so his vote was yes.

Mr. Lewis stated that he concurred with some of the items that Dr. Sudler had stated, such as patrolmen in the streets, so his vote was yes.

Dr. Sudler moved to suspend the Dover Municipal Police Academy as non-essential and place officers out in the community on patrol. The motion was seconded by Mr. Lewis and failed by a roll call vote of two (2) yes (Sudler, Lewis) and seven (7) no (Hall, Boggerty, Anderson, Pillsbury, Arndt, Rocha, Neil).

Dr. Sudler stated that based on the majority of the Fourth District constituents, with whom he has conversed, they understand the importance of presenting a balanced budget. He further stated that the constituents have also recognized that the Dover Police Academy had generated a severe

operational cost deficit, contributing to the volume of overtime expenses and the lack of patrol officers on duty in areas that were confronted with gun violence and youth gang activity. Several constituents reiterated that the proposed budget would create a financial hardship for households living on fixed incomes. He noted that he could not support the proposed budget because the passing of the budget would place most constituents in an impossible financial position. He further noted that most Fourth District constituents have urged him not to support the Proposed Ordinance #2026-11 – Fiscal Year 2026/2027 City of Dover Budget Ordinance.

Mr. Lewis stated, for the record, that he had outlined his concerns regarding the proposed budget and explained how he intended to vote on it in an op-ed published in the *Delaware State News* and the *News Journal*. He further stated that he would not support the proposed budget because many of his constituents had expressed that they were experiencing financial hardship. He noted that his district consisted of senior citizens and that they would be hurting financially because they would have to choose between buying medicine, food, or paying a bill. He stated that he had talked with several of his constituents, and the majority of them were not in favor of the increase. He noted for the record that $0.04 was not four (4) pennies and that it was based on the square footage of the property. He explained that $0.01, as far as an increase in a resident's electric bill was based on kilowatts, not one (1) penny. He stated that he wanted residents to be aware because he believed several had been misled.

Ms. Arndt moved for adoption of Ordinance #2026-11 – Fiscal Year 2026/2027 City of Dover Budget Ordinance, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury.

Ms. Hall stated that she had spoken with several constituents in the Second District and across the City of Dover about the proposed budget. She noted that she understood how hard it was trying to make ends meet, and the challenges for herself being a single mother with two (2) children and being the breadwinner on a fixed income. She stated that the budget discussions focused on funding services that were needed. She indicated that she saw the wisdom in approving the budget because it would provide those necessary services, and for that reason, she would be voting in favor of the budget.

Mr. Boggerty stated he understood the challenges with having an increase in anything. He noted that they were all experiencing increases in every aspect of life. He explained to the constituents that he understood that council would continue to work and plan better, and hopefully have things turn around, but he had to vote in favor because the city has costs to cover. Failure to cover those costs meant that things would cost more if they were not maintained. He noted that council would do its best to be more proactive and would be reviewing the budgets on a more regular basis.

Mr. Anderson stated that the budget was public safety-oriented and expressed gratitude to the budget team for a balanced budget. He believed that the proposed budget carried necessary expenses, and not unnecessary ones. He stated that he understood the cost issues that constituents have and that was why he had offered amendments, which he was thankful that council had adopted. He noted that it cut the tax increase proposal almost in half, which eliminated the public safety fee on residents. He emphasized that council had not only heard the residents but stated that council was with them and that council was working towards the future for the City of

Dover. He mentioned that council has an interest in building a strong economy so that the city is not in a chronic situation where the general fund is sick based upon inflation and other costs.

Dr. Pillsbury stated that she supported the proposed budget and the comments that have been made.
Mr. Rocha stated that he concurred with Mr. Anderson's comments. He noted that they have made cuts where they needed to make cuts and that they could not move forward into the next Fiscal Year without those cuts. He applauded Dr. Sudler and Mr. Lewis for bringing some ideas that could be addressed next month, and that council needed to move forward with the budget, so his vote was yes.

Dr. Sudler stated that his vote was more based on the budget and the constituents. He applauded the budget team and the City Manager for an excellent job with the proposed budget. He noted that his vote was not a reflection of their work, but a reflection of his constituents crying out about the financial hardship, and that his vote was no.

Mr. Neil stated that crafting a budget came with risks, especially in an election year with undeclared candidates making declarations because complex problems invoked simplistic answers that called for new, undefined revenue sources that did not come from taxes. He noted that, as the political season approached, residents should carefully evaluate proposed solutions and be cautious of claims that seemed too good to be true. He stated that he voted yes for the proposed budget.

By motion of Ms. Arndt, seconded by Dr. Pillsbury, Council, by a roll call vote of seven (7) yes (Hall, Boggerty, Anderson, Pillsbury, Arndt, Rocha, Neil) and two (2) no (Sudler, Lewis), adopted Ordinance #2026-11 (Exhibit 2).

CITY MANAGER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Duca announced that, on Saturday, June 27th, during the African American Festival, the City of Dover would have an informational table where residents could ask questions about the proposed rate and fee changes. City staff would be available to provide information and answer questions.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Christiansen announced the 36th Annual African American Festival on Saturday, June 27th, and stated that it would be a great event for everyone to attend and participate in. He also announced that fireworks would be held at Bally's Casino on July 3rd. He stated that the City of Dover's 250th Anniversary of American Independence Celebration would be held on July 4th as an all-day event and encouraged the public to visit the Bay-to-Bay website and the City of Dover website for additional information. He further announced that the Balloon Shows USA Hot Air Balloon Festival would be held in August at the Woodlands at Dover Motorsports, and encouraged the public to visit the event's website for more information.

COUNCIL MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council members had no announcements.

The meeting adjourned at 9:31 p.m.

ANDRIA L. BENNETT, CMC
CITY CLERK

All ordinances, resolutions, motions, and orders adopted by the City Council during their Regular Meeting of June 22, 2026, are hereby approved.

ROBIN R. CHRISTIANSEN
MAYOR

/AB

Exhibits
Exhibit #1 – Mr. Neil's comments in writing, "The Value of the Police Academy Worth Keeping."
Exhibit #2 – Ordinance #2026-11 – Fiscal Year 2026/2027 City of Dover Budget Ordinance

The Value of the Police Academy Worth Keeping

by President of the Dover City Council Fred Neil

The Dover Police Academy is neither a luxury nor a necessity; it is an asset—an important and valuable one.

It was re-activated out of necessity and has transformed into a strategic advantage for the police department.

The alternative is the Delaware State Police Academy, or one of the municipal academies in New Castle County, which are excellent training programs. However, the primary focus of the State Academy is state policing rather than municipal policing. The other Academies are a considerable distance away creating logistical challenges and commuter expenses. In addition, Dover pays a tuition fee for every candidate it sends to outside Academies, an amount that is comparable to what Dover charges other jurisdictions to attend its own academy. Inflation continues to drive both all tuition rates higher. Dover will be raising its tuition rate leading into the next session in order to keep pace with costs.

A second, and perhaps even more important, advantage of the Dover Police Academy is that it guarantees a training slot for every candidate selected by the City. Historically, that is not always the case with the other Academies. If space is limited no slot is available, Dover has to wait longer to replace normal attrition and risks losing a qualified candidate to another agency. The Dover Academy also provides the flexibility to determine when new classes will begin, allowing the City to better meet its staffing needs by eliminating the uncertain period between the hiring process and the beginning of basic training.

There is no question that the Dover City Council—and therefore the public—should know the cost of operating the Academy. Most of those costs are intertwined. For example, the primary instructors are regular members of the police force, already on the payroll, who perform other duties when they are not teaching at the Academy. The cost for uniforms, equipment and supplies would be the same no matter which academy a recruit would attend. In addition, most operating expenses are offset through tuition and grants awarded to the Academy.

The cost per student is largely determined by the number of candidates enrolled from Dover and other jurisdictions. When Dover has only three candidates in a class, the per-student cost is higher than when there are four or five candidates. Unless the cost of operating the Academy is dramatically higher than the tuition revenue it generates, its intrinsic value makes it an asset worthy of preserving.

Preliminary retention figures of Dover Academy graduates show a significant improvement from the retention rates recorded prior to the reactivation of the program. Improved retention of personnel actually lowers the overall cost of the hiring process and is a better return on the investment we are already making.

Closing the Dover Police Academy will not lower property taxes to any extent, but it would eliminate a valuable resource that provides training flexibility, staffing stability, and municipal focus.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11
2026-2027 BUDGET ORDINANCES

Exhibit #2
Regular Council Meeting 06/22/2026

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DOVER, IN COUNCIL MET:
The amount hereinafter named aggregating Sixty-Two Million Nine Hundred Eight Thousand Three Hundred dollars ($62,908,300) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

GENERAL FUND
CASH RECEIPT SUMMARY FOR 2026-2027

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 10,139,500**	**$ 5,246,200**
RECEIPTS		
FINES AND POLICE REVENUE	767,900	745,600
LIBRARY REVENUES	151,200	157,700
KENT COUNTY BOOK REIMBURSEMENT	180,000	165,000
BUSINESS LICENSES	1,540,000	1,540,000
PERMITS AND OTHER FEES	1,722,000	1,740,000
MISCELLANEOUS RECEIPTS	-	75,000
POLICE EXTRA DUTY	514,000	550,000
HIGHER EDUCATION PUBLIC SAFETY FUND	-	1,600,000
PROPERTY TAXES	17,200,000	18,186,300
RECREATION REVENUE	145,000	142,000
FRANCHISE FEE	500,000	450,000
RENT REVENUE - GARRISON FARM	100,000	100,000
COURT OF CHANCERY FEES	4,500,000	4,500,000
INVESTMENT INCOME	200,000	100,000
RECEIPTS SUBTOTAL	**27,520,100**	**30,051,600**
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS		
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS GENERAL GOV	1,788,200	1,981,100
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS PUBLIC WORKS	983,100	790,300
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS CENT SRVCS	1,793,700	1,331,600
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS FIN ADMIN	3,373,700	3,398,500
INTERFUND SERVICE RECEIPTS SUBTOTAL	**7,938,700**	**7,501,500**
GRANTS:		
POLICE EXTRA DUTY	708,000	190,000
POLICE GRANTS FUND	165,000	-
POLICE PENSION GRANT	850,000	860,000
GREEN ENERGY GRANT	98,500	98,500
MISC STATE GRANT REVENUE	-	10,000
GRANTS SUBTOTAL	**1,821,500**	**1,158,500**
TRANSFERS FROM:		
TRANSFER TAX	2,400,000	2,300,000
LODGING TAX	500,000	450,000
AMBULANCE SERVICE	600,000	661,500
PUBLIC SAFETY FEE	-	589,000
MUNICIPAL STREET AID	750,000	750,000
CIVIL TRAFFIC PENALTIES	1,318,400	200,000
WATER/WASTEWATER	2,000,000	2,000,000
ELECTRIC	10,000,000	11,000,000
SANITATION	-	1,000,000
TRANSFERS FROM SUBTOTAL	**17,568,400**	**18,950,500**
TOTAL REVENUES	**54,848,700**	**57,662,100**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCE & REVENUE	**$ 64,988,200**	**$ 62,908,300**

2026-2027 BUDGET ORDINANCES

GENERAL FUND - EXPENDITURES AND BUDGET BALANCE FOR 2026-2027

DEPARTMENT EXPENSES	**2025/26 REVISED**	**2026/27 BUDGET**
CITY CLERK	$ 492,900	$ 542,200
COUNCIL	276,600	276,100
PLANNING	1,088,600	765,300
CITY MANAGER	1,605,300	1,630,100
HUMAN RESOURCES	529,900	423,700
MAYOR	316,700	320,200
FIRE	1,133,800	1,154,900
LIFE SAFETY	1,664,100	1,736,000
CODE ENFORCEMENT	962,000	858,300
INSPECTIONS	768,800	727,900
POLICE	24,762,300	26,939,400
POLICE EXTRA DUTY	910,700	910,700
PUBLIC WORKS - ADMINISTRATION	743,500	760,100
STREETS	981,600	940,900
GROUNDS MAINTENANCE	2,047,300	2,185,900
STORMWATER	1,085,100	1,077,600
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT	807,900	670,900
PUBLIC WORKS - ENGINEERING	303,500	268,700
LIBRARY	2,378,800	2,455,000
RECREATION	1,653,300	1,560,200
PROCUREMENT & INVENTORY	1,013,900	1,045,400
FLEET MAINTENANCE	1,139,800	1,144,000
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	1,045,700	1,075,200
FINANCE	1,029,800	1,046,400
CUSTOMER SERVICE	1,515,900	1,575,700
DEPARTMENT SUBTOTALS	**50,257,800**	**52,090,800**
OTHER EXPENSES		
DEBT SERVICE	625,200	630,000
CONTRIBUTION TO DDP	150,000	150,000
INSURANCE	1,200,000	1,200,000
OTHER EMPLOYMENT EXPENSES	200,000	-
BANK & CREDIT CARD FEES	57,800	55,000
STREET LIGHTS	830,000	750,000
OTHER EXPENSE SUBTOTAL	**3,063,000**	**2,785,000**
TRANSFERS		
TRANSFER TO CAPITAL FUND - PROJECTS	5,511,200	1,799,100
APPROP. POLICE PENSION - STATE GRANT	850,000	860,000
TRANSFER TO FRANCHISE FEE RESERVE	10,000	10,000
TRANSFER TO ELECTRIC FUND (ERP)	25,000	25,000
TRANSFER TO INVENTORY RESERVE	25,000	25,000
TRANSFERS SUBTOTAL	**6,421,200**	**2,719,100**
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**59,742,000**	**57,594,900**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	**5,246,200**	**5,313,400**
TOTALS	**$ 64,988,200**	**$ 62,908,300**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

GOVERNMENTAL CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Fifteen Million Three Hundred and Sixty-Five Thousand Three Hundred dollars ($15,365,300) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - PROJECTS	**$ 4,164,800**	**$ 1,529,700**
REVENUES		
MISCELLANEOUS RECIEPTS	20,000	-
LINE OF CREDIT (HEAVY DUTY VEHICLES)	324,500	-
STATE GRANTS - Other	7,447,000	10,160,500
TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND	5,720,400	1,799,100
TRANSFER FROM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	-	1,426,000
TRANSFER FROM LODGING TAX	450,000	450,000
SUBTOTAL PROJECT RECEIPTS	**13,961,900**	**13,835,600**
TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES	**13,961,900**	**13,835,600**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCE AND REVENUES	**$ 18,126,700**	**$ 15,365,300**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

EXPENDITURES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CITY CLERK	$ -	$ 100,000
FIRE	569,500	909,400
GROUNDS	81,900	-
LIBRARY	94,100	-
RECREATION	1,748,900	-
CODE ENFORCEMENT	135,000	-
POLICE	1,624,800	670,700
STREETS	3,603,000	1,426,000
STORMWATER	6,151,500	10,279,500
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	579,600	-
FACILITIES MANAGEMENT	480,100	-
PROCUREMENT & INVENTORY	1,293,400	-
FLEET MAINTENANCE	49,100	-
DEPARTMENT SUBTOTAL	**16,410,900**	**13,385,600**
BUDGET BALANCE	1,715,800	1,979,700
TOTAL BUDGET BALANCE & EXPENDITURES	**$ 18,126,700**	**$ 15,365,300**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

GENERAL FUND CONTINGENCY
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Eight Hundred Sixty-Five Thousand Five Hundred dollars ($865,500) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 810,800**	**$ 830,500**
INTEREST EARNED	19,700	35,000
TOTALS	**$ 830,500**	**$ 865,500**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CARRY FORWARD TO NEXT YEAR	$ 830,500	$ 865,500
TOTALS	**$ 830,500**	**$ 865,500**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

GOVERNMENTAL CAPITAL ASSET RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating One Million Seven Hundred Eighty-One Thousand dollars ($1,781,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 1,404,700**	**$ 1,666,000**
INTEREST EARNINGS	261,300	115,000
TOTALS	**$ 1,666,000**	**$ 1,781,000**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CARRY FORWARD TO NEXT YEAR	$ 1,666,000	$ 1,781,000
TOTALS	**$ 1,666,000**	**$ 1,781,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

PARKLAND/RECREATION RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating One Hundred Thousand dollars ($100,000) much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 100,000**	**$ 100,000**
INTEREST EARNINGS	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 100,000**	**$ 100,000**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	100,000	100,000
TOTALS	**$ 100,000**	**$ 100,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

SANITATION
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Six Million Three Hundred Eighty-Three Thousand Nine Hundred dollars ($6,383,900) much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 331,800**	**$ 859,100**
RECEIPTS		
SANITATION SERVICES	5,168,400	5,524,800
TOTALS	**$ 5,500,200**	**$ 6,383,900**

OPERATING EXPENSES

DEPARTMENT EXPENSES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
SANITATION OPERATIONS	$ 3,288,500	$ 3,202,200
INTERFUND SERVICE FEES	617,600	610,200
TRANSFER TO CAPITAL FUND - PROJECTS	735,000	477,000
TRANSFER TO CONTINGENCY RESERVES	-	75,000
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	-	1,000,000
TRANSFER TO CAPITAL ASSET RESERVE	-	75,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	**4,641,100**	**5,439,400**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	859,100	944,500
TOTALS	**$ 5,500,200**	**$ 6,383,900**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

SANITATION CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Four Hundred and Seventy-Seven Thousand dollars ($477,000) much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 739,000**	**$ -**
TRANSFER FROM OPERATING FUND	735,000	477,000
TOTALS	**$ 1,474,000**	**$ 477,000**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

DEPARTMENT EXPENSES	**2025/26 REVISED**	**2026/27 BUDGET**
SANITATION CAPITAL PROJECTS	$ 1,474,000	$ 477,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	**1,474,000**	**477,000**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 1,474,000**	**$ 477,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WATER FUND
REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Ten Million Nine Hundred Seventy-Six Thousand Nine Hundred dollars ($10,976,900) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WATER	$ 2,225,400	$ 2,624,700
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**2,225,400**	**2,624,700**
BASE REVENUE		
WATER SERVICES	7,568,500	7,478,000
WATER TANK SPACE LEASING	464,000	484,000
WATER IMPACT FEES	250,000	330,000
INTEREST - WATER	150,000	15,000
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICE FEE	85,900	45,200
TOTAL REVENUES	**8,518,400**	**8,352,200**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES AND REVENUES	**$ 10,743,800**	**$ 10,976,900**

2026-2027 BUDGET ORDINANCES

WATER FUND - EXPENSES AND BUDGET BALANCE FOR 2026-2027

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
DIRECT EXPENSES		
ENGINEERING & INSPECTION	$ 428,100	$ 437,200
WATER DEPARTMENT	971,000	1,013,100
WATER TREATMENT PLANT	3,081,500	2,981,000
DIRECT EXPENDITURE SUBTOTAL	**4,480,600**	**4,431,300**
OTHER EXPENSES		
DEBT SERVICE - WATER	543,000	604,100
INTERFUND SERVICE FEES	750,900	1,209,100
BANK & CREDIT CARD FEES	25,000	25,000
OTHER EXPENSES SUBTOTAL	**1,318,900**	**1,838,200**
TRANSFER TO:		
GENERAL FUND FROM WATER	1,000,000	1,000,000
WATER IMP AND EXT	1,289,600	940,700
WATER IMPACT FEE RESERVE	-	110,000
ELECTRIC FUND (ERP)	25,000	25,000
TRANSFER TO INVENTORY WRITE-OFFS	5,000	5,000
TRANSFER TO SUBTOTAL	**2,319,600**	**2,080,700**
TOTAL EXPENSES	**8,119,100**	**8,350,200**
BUDGET BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**2,624,700**	**2,626,700**
TOTAL CURRENT YEAR BALANCES AND EXPENSES	**$ 10,743,800**	**$ 10,976,900**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WATER IMPROVEMENT & EXTENSION FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating One Million Eighty-Four Thousand Two Hundred dollars ($1,084,200) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year begining July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WATER	$ 4,436,900	$ 143,500
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**4,436,900**	**143,500**
REVENUES		
STATE LOAN FUND - WATER	2,217,500	-
STATE GRANT - WATER	8,072,500	-
TRANS FR OPERATING FUND - WATER	1,289,600	940,700
TRANSFER FR WATER IMPACT FEE	357,600	-
INTEREST INCOME	50,000	-
TOTAL REVENUES	**11,987,200**	**940,700**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES & REVENUES	**$ 16,424,100**	**$ 1,084,200**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

EXPENSES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
ENGINEERING	$ -	$ -
WATER	9,720,400	340,700
WATER TREATMENT PLANT	6,560,200	600,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	**16,280,600**	**940,700**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**143,500**	**143,500**
TOTAL BUDGET BALANCES & EXPENSES	**$ 16,424,100**	**$ 1,084,200**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WASTEWATER FUND
REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Fifteen Million Seven Hundred Eighty Thousand One Hundred dollars ($15,780,100) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 3,114,100	$ 2,648,900
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**3,114,100**	**2,648,900**
BASE REVENUE		
WASTEWATER SERVICES	5,131,300	5,028,600
WASTEWATER TREATMENT SERVICES	4,775,400	5,300,000
GROUNDWATER INFLOW ADJUSTMENT	2,369,800	2,322,400
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEES	235,000	310,200
INTEREST - WASTEWATER	200,000	150,000
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICE FEE	200	20,000
TOTAL REVENUES	**12,711,700**	**13,131,200**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES AND REVENUES	**$ 15,825,800**	**$ 15,780,100**

2026-2027 BUDGET ORDINANCES

WASTEWATER FUND - EXPENSES AND BUDGET BALANCE FOR 2026-2027

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
DIRECT EXPENSES		
ENGINEERING & INSPECTION	$ 531,400	$ 559,000
WASTEWATER DEPARTMENT	1,524,400	1,594,200
DIRECT EXPENDITURE SUBTOTAL	**2,055,800**	**2,153,200**
OTHER EXPENSES		
DEBT SERVICE - WASTEWATER	644,000	582,500
KENT COUNTY TREATMENT CHARGE	5,811,000	6,580,000
INTERFUND SERVICE FEES	935,200	936,800
BANK & CREDIT CARD FEES	6,000	8,500
OTHER EXPENSES SUBTOTAL	**7,396,200**	**8,107,800**
TRANSFER TO:		
GENERAL FUND FROM WASTEWATER	1,000,000	1,000,000
WASTEWATER IMP AND EXT	2,694,900	1,437,600
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE RESERVE	-	150,000
ELETRIC FUND (ERP)	25,000	25,000
TRANSFER TO INVENTORY WRITE-OFFS	5,000	-
TRANSFER TO SUBTOTAL	**3,724,900**	**2,612,600**
TOTAL EXPENSES	**13,176,900**	**12,873,600**
BUDGET BALANCES		
BUDGET BALANCE WASTEWATER	2,648,900	2,906,500
BUDGET BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**2,648,900**	**2,906,500**
TOTAL CURRENT YEAR BALANCES AND EXPENSES	**$ 15,825,800**	**$ 15,780,100**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WASTEWATER IMPROVEMENT & EXTENSION FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Million Seven Hundred Forty-Eight Thousand Eight Hundred dollars ($2,748,800) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year begining July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WASTEWATER	**$ 2,989,900**	**$ 1,222,800**
REVENUES		
STATE GRANT	95,300	-
TRANS FR OPERATING FUND - WW	2,694,900	1,437,600
TRANSFER FR WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE	235,400	28,400
INTEREST INCOME	50,000	60,000
TOTAL REVENUES	**3,075,600**	**1,526,000**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES & REVENUES	**$ 6,065,500**	**$ 2,748,800**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

EXPENSES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
WASTEWATER	$ 4,842,700	$ 1,526,000
TOTAL EXPENSES	**4,842,700**	**1,526,000**
BUDGET BALANCE - WASTEWATER	1,222,800	1,222,800
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**1,222,800**	**1,222,800**
TOTAL BUDGET BALANCES & EXPENSES	**$ 6,065,500**	**$ 2,748,800**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WATER CAPITAL ASSET RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Six Hundred Eighty Thousand One Hundred dollars ($680,100) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WATER	$ 636,200	$ 650,100
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**636,200**	**650,100**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WATER	13,900	30,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**13,900**	**30,000**
TOTALS	**$ 650,100**	**$ 680,100**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WATER	$ 650,100	$ 680,100
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**650,100**	**680,100**
TOTALS	**$ 650,100**	**$ 680,100**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WASTEWATER CAPITAL ASSET RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Six Hundred Seventy-Eight Thousand Six Hundred dollars ($678,600) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 634,800	$ 648,600
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**634,800**	**648,600**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WASTEWATER	13,800	30,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**13,800**	**30,000**
TOTALS	**$ 648,600**	**$ 678,600**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 648,600	$ 678,600
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**648,600**	**678,600**
TOTALS	**$ 648,600**	**$ 678,600**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WATER IMPACT FEE RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Million Four Hundred Nine Thousand Five Hundred dollars ($2,409,500) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WATER	$ 2,132,700	$ 2,304,500
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**2,132,700**	**2,304,500**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WATER	171,800	105,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**171,800**	**105,000**
TOTALS	**$ 2,304,500**	**$ 2,409,500**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO I & E FUND FROM WATER IMPACT FEES	-	340,700
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WATER	$ 2,304,500	$ 2,068,800
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**2,304,500**	**2,409,500**
TOTALS	**$ 2,304,500**	**$ 2,409,500**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Six Million Eight Hundred Forty-Seven Thousand Eight Hundred dollars ($6,847,800) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 6,264,600	$ 6,547,800
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**6,264,600**	**6,547,800**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WASTEWATER	283,200	300,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**283,200**	**300,000**
TOTALS	**$ 6,547,800**	**$ 6,847,800**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO I & E FUND FROM WASTEWATER IMPACT FEES	$ -	$ 28,400
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 6,547,800	$ 6,819,400
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**6,547,800**	**6,847,800**
TOTALS	**$ 6,547,800**	**$ 6,847,800**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WATER CONTINGENCY RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Three Hundred Twenty-Two Thousand Four Hundred dollars ($322,400) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WATER	$ 298,400	$ 310,400
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**298,400**	**310,400**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WATER	12,000	12,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**12,000**	**12,000**
TOTALS	**$ 310,400**	**$ 322,400**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WATER	$ 310,400	$ 322,400
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**310,400**	**322,400**
TOTAL EXPENSES AND CURRENT YEAR BALANCES	**$ 310,400**	**$ 322,400**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WASTEWATER CONTINGENCY RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Three Hundred Fifty-Eight Thousand One Hundred dollars ($358,100) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 andending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 331,100	$ 343,100
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCES	**331,100**	**343,100**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS - WASTEWATER	12,000	15,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**12,000**	**15,000**
TOTALS	**$ 343,100**	**$ 358,100**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE - WASTEWATER	$ 343,100	$ 358,100
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE SUBTOTALS	**343,100**	**358,100**
TOTAL EXPENSES AND CURRENT YEAR BALANCES	**$ 343,100**	**$ 358,100**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC REVENUE FUND
REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating One Hundred Sixty-Two Million One Hundred Eighty-Eight Thousand Seven Hundred dollars ($162,188,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026:

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 66,151,300**	**$ 50,119,000**
DISTRIBUTION OF EARNINGS - PCA CREDIT	-	-
BEGINNING BALANCE - ADJUSTED	**66,151,300**	**50,119,000**
BASE REVENUE		
DIRECT SALES TO CUSTOMER	101,796,900	107,128,600
UTILITY TAX	1,348,500	1,356,100
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	700,000	800,000
RENT REVENUE	135,000	75,000
GREEN ENERGY	135,000	135,000
INTEREST EARNINGS	3,000,000	2,500,000
TRANSFER FROM OTHER FUNDS (ERP)	75,000	75,000
TOTAL REVENUES	**107,190,400**	**112,069,700**
TOTAL BEGINNING BALANCE & REVENUES	**$ 173,341,700**	**$ 162,188,700**

2026-2027 BUDGET ORDINANCES

ELECTRIC REVENUE FUND EXPENSES AND BUDGET BALANCE FOR 2026-2027

EXPENSES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
POWER SUPPLY	$ 26,631,500	$ 22,777,200
SOLAR ENERGY	3,361,200	3,097,100
SOLAR RENEWAL ENERGY CREDITS	375,100	348,200
POWER SUPPLY MANAGEMENT	729,900	759,000
REC'S (Renewable Energy Credits)	6,465,100	4,706,100
RGGI (Regional Greenhouse Gas Init.)	87,500	96,700
PJM CHARGES - ENERGY	11,925,700	16,015,700
PJM CHARGES - TRANSMISSION & FEES	17,001,700	17,045,100
CAPACITY CHARGES	22,191,100	21,303,100
SUB-TOTAL POWER SUPPLY	**88,768,800**	**86,148,200**
PLANT OPERATIONS	2,239,600	2,398,600
GENERATIONS FUELS	878,500	220,000
PJM SPOT MARKET ENERGY	(108,300)	(816,300)
PJM CREDITS	(188,000)	(225,200)
CAPACITY CREDITS	(9,336,100)	(10,589,400)
GENERATION SUBTOTAL	**(6,514,300)**	**(9,012,300)**
POWER SUPPLY & GENERATION SUBTOTAL	**82,254,500**	**77,135,900**
DIRECT EXPENDITURES		
TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION	5,743,600	5,761,100
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING	2,052,000	2,333,000
ADMINISTRATION	1,751,900	1,544,100
METER READING	569,400	494,200
SYSTEMS OPERATIONS	1,159,400	1,203,500
DIRECT EXPENDITURE SUBTOTALS	**11,276,300**	**11,335,900**
OTHER EXPENSES:		
UTILITY TAX	1,348,500	1,356,100
ALLOW FOR UNCOLLECTIBLES	100,000	250,000
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES - RFP'S	50,000	50,000
LEGAL EXPENSES	50,000	50,000
INTERFUND SERVICE FEES	5,123,800	4,733,900
INTEREST ON DEPOSITS	20,000	21,000
BANK & CREDIT CARD FEES	700,000	750,000
DEBT SERVICE	1,376,300	1,374,800
STORM EXPENSE	150,000	100,000
OTHER EXPENSES SUBTOTAL	**8,918,600**	**8,685,800**
TRANSFER TO:		
IMPROVEMENT & EXTENSION	10,538,300	2,438,500
GENERAL FUND	10,000,000	11,000,000
OTHER RESERVES	135,000	135,000
TRANSFER TO INVENTORY WRITE-OFFS	100,000	100,000
TRANSFER TO SUBTOTAL	**20,773,300**	**13,673,500**
TOTAL EXPENSES	**123,222,700**	**110,831,100**
BUDGET BALANCE - WORKING CAPITAL	**50,119,000**	**51,357,600**
TOTALS	**$ 173,341,700**	**$ 162,188,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Fifteen Million Six Hundred Twenty-Seven Thousand Seven Hundred dollars ($15,627,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 15,580,600**	**$ 10,989,200**
REVENUES		
GRANT/BOND/LOAN	10,538,300	2,438,500
GENERAL SERVICE BILLING	200,000	1,700,000
INTEREST EARNINGS	500,000	500,000
TOTAL REVENUES	**11,238,300**	**4,638,500**
TOTALS	**$ 26,818,900**	**$ 15,627,700**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

EXPENSES	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
ELECTRIC ADMINISTRATION	$ 87,000	$ 190,000
ELECTRIC GENERATION	807,800	670,000
TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	3,649,000	2,438,000
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING	9,431,600	1,246,000
METER READING	50,800	94,500
ERP SYSTEM	1,803,500	-
TOTAL EXPENSES	**15,829,700**	**4,638,500**
BUDGET BALANCE	**10,989,200**	**10,989,200**
TOTAL BUDGET BALANCE & EXPENSES	**$ 26,818,900**	**$ 15,627,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY CONTINGENCY RESERVE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating One Million One Hundred eighteen Thousand Four Hundred dollars ($1,118,400) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 1,013,400**	**$ 1,063,400**
RECEIPTS		
INTEREST EARNINGS	50,000	55,000
TOTAL RECEIPTS	**50,000**	**55,000**
TOTALS	**$ 1,063,400**	**$ 1,118,400**

EXPENSE SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	$ 1,063,400	$ 1,118,400
TOTALS	**$ 1,063,400**	**$ 1,118,400**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY DEPRECIATION RESERVE
SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Twenty-One Million Seven Hundred Thirty-Seven Thousand Seven dollars ($21,737,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 19,887,700**	**$ 20,787,700**
INTEREST EARNINGS	900,000	950,000
TOTALS	**$ 20,787,700**	**$ 21,737,700**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO ELECTRIC I & E	$ -	$ -
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	20,787,700	21,737,700
TOTALS	**$ 20,787,700**	**$ 21,737,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY FUTURE CAPACITY RESERVE
SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating sixteen Million Two Hundred Seventy Thousand Seven Hundred dollars ($16,970,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 15,570,700**	**$ 16,270,700**
INTEREST EARNINGS	700,000	700,000
TOTALS	**$ 16,270,700**	**$ 16,970,700**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO ELECTRIC I & E	-	$ -
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	$ 16,270,700	$ 16,970,700
TOTALS	**$ 16,270,700**	**$ 16,970,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY INSURANCE STABLIZATION RESERVE
SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Nine Hundred Eighty-Six Thousand Six Hundred dollars ($986,600) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 883,600**	**$ 933,600**
INTEREST EARNINGS	50,000	53,000
TOTALS	**$ 933,600**	**$ 986,600**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	$ 933,600	$ 986,600
TOTALS	**$ 933,600**	**$ 986,600**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRIC UTILITY RATE STABLIZATION RESERVE
SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Ten Million Four Hundred and Seventy-Two Thousand Two Hundred dollars($10,472,200) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 9,804,600**	**$ 10,142,200**
INTEREST EARNINGS	337,600	330,000
TOTALS	**$ 10,164,600**	**$ 10,472,200**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	10,142,200	10,472,200
TOTALS	**$ 10,164,600**	**$ 10,472,200**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

MUNICIPAL STREET AID FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand One Hundred dollars ($750,100) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 100**	**$ 100**
STATE GRANT	750,000	750,000
TOTALS	**$ 750,100**	**$ 750,100**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	$ 750,000	$ 750,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	100	100
TOTALS	**$ 750,100**	**$ 750,100**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ELECTRONIC RED LIGHT SAFETY PROGRAM
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Hundred Thousand One Hundred dollars ($200,100) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 100**	**$ 100**
POLICE FINES	1,318,300	200,000
TOTALS	**$ 1,318,400**	**$ 200,100**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	$ 1,318,300	$ 200,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	100	100
TOTALS	**$ 1,318,400**	**$ 200,100**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

WORKERS COMPENSATION FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Nine Million Three Hundred Eighty-Five Thousand Seven Hundred dollars ($9,385,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 6,691,500**	**$ 7,583,500**
INTEREST INCOME	200,000	235,000
PREMIUM FROM CITY	1,352,000	1,567,200
TOTALS	**$ 8,243,500**	**$ 9,385,700**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PROGRAM EXPENSES/SUPPLIES - CLAIMS	$ 300,000	$ 250,000
INSURANCE	291,300	300,000
STATE OF DEL - SELF INSURANCE TAX	30,000	30,000
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	38,700	37,200
TOTAL EXPENSES	**660,000**	**617,200**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	7,583,500	8,768,500
TOTALS	**$ 8,243,500**	**$ 9,385,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Four Hundred Ninety-Six Thousand Six Hundred dollars ($496,600) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ -**	**$ -**
GRANTS REVENUE	556,100	496,600
TOTALS	**$ 556,100**	**$ 496,600**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PROGRAM EXP. GRANT RELATED	$ 556,100	$ 496,600
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 556,100**	**$ 496,600**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

LIBRARY GRANT FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Four Hundred Eighteen Thousand Seven Hundred dollars ($418,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ 215,786**	**$ -**
STATE GRANT	414,112	415,100
FEDERAL GRANT	8,348	3,600
OTHER GRANTS	1,000	-
TOTALS	**$ 639,246**	**$ 418,700**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
STATE GRANTS		
FURNITURE/FIXTURES	$ 93,864	$ 30,800
OFFICE SUPPLIES	33,258	30,000
PRINTING AND DUPLICATING	18,308	10,000
PROGRAM EXPENSES/SUPPLIES	37,425	37,000
BOOKS	170,416	145,000
COMPUTER SOFTWARE	9,026	6,000
COMPUTER HARDWARE	55,109	30,000
AUDIO VISUAL SUPPLIES	106,526	85,000
POSTAGE	168	100
ADVERTISING	14,486	10,000
TRAINING/CONF/FOOD/TRAV	12,840	5,000
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	67,200	17,200
OFF EQP/REPAIRS & MAINT	3,385	2,000
OTHER EQUIP - LEASE	7,888	6,000
SUBTOTAL EXPENSES STATE GRANTS	**638,246**	**417,700**
GRAND TOTAL EXPENSES	**638,246**	**417,700**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	1,000	1,000
TOTALS	**$ 639,246**	**$ 418,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

CDBG GRANT FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Three Hundred Thousand dollars ($300,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	303,430	-
CDBG GRANTS RECEIVED	321,933	300,000
TOTALS	**$ 625,363**	**$ 300,000**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
EXPENDITURES		
PRIOR YEAR NSP PROGRAM	$ -	$ -
PRIOR YEAR CLOSING COST/DOWN PAYMENT PROGRAM	-	-
PRIOR YEAR DOVER INTERFAITH MINISTRY	-	-
PRIOR YEAR MHDC EMERGENCY HOME REPAIR	42,540	-
PRIOR YEAR MHDC HOMEOWNER REHAB.	-	-
PRIOR YEAR MHDC HOMEOWNER REHAB.	-	-
PRIOR YEAR MILFORD HOUSING H/O REHAB	8,839	-
PRIOR YEAR HOUSE OF HOPE	-	-
PRIOR YEAR ADMIN EXPENSE	-	-
SALARIES	-	-
CURRENT YEAR NSP PROGRAM	6,000	-
CURRENT YEAR CLOSING COST/DOWN PAYMENT PROGRAM	203,056	80,000
CURRENT YEAR DOVER INTERFAITH MINISTRY	927	-
CURRENT YEAR HABITAT FOR HUMANITY	25,000	25,000
CURRENT YEAR MHDC EMERGENCY REPAIRS	25,000	40,000
CURRENT YEAR HOUSE OF HOPE RENOVATIONS	15,000	-
CURRENT YEAR HOUSE OF HOPE OPERATIONS	45,444	40,000
CURRENT YEAR MILFORD HOUSING H/O REHAB	90,000	55,000
CURRENT YEAR PEOPLES COMMUNITY CENTER REHAB	40,000	-
CURRENT YEAR PEOPLES COMMUNITY CENTER OPERATIONS	22,700	-
CURRENT YEAR ADMIN EXPENSE	100,858	60,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**625,363**	**300,000**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 625,363**	**$ 300,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

210 - ARPA FUNDING
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Three Hundred Forty-Eight Thousand Five Hundred dollars ($348,500) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ 348,500**	**$ 348,500**
INTEREST INCOME	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 348,500**	**$ 348,500**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	**348,500**	**348,500**
TOTALS	**$ 348,500**	**$ 348,500**

The above budget represents the combination of all State & Federal Grants.

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

207 - POLICE GRANTS FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Hundred Fifty-Two Thousand dollars ($252,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ 944,415**	**$ -**
STATE AND FEDERAL GRANTS RECEIVED	191,000	252,000
TOTALS	**$ 1,135,415**	**$ 252,000**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
EXPENDITURES		
PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES		
PROGRAM SALARIES	$ 117,339	$ 177,000
MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES		
PROGRAM EXPENSE	429,410	-
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	437,666	-
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES		
TRAINING	-	25,000
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**984,415**	**202,000**
OTHER FINANCING USES		
OPERATING TRANSFERS-OUT	151,000	50,000
TOTAL FINANCING USES	**151,000**	**50,000**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 1,135,415**	**$ 252,000**

The above budget represents the combination of all State & Federal Grants.

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

LODGING TAX FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Nine Hundred Thousand dollars ($900,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ -**	**$ -**
LODGING TAXES	900,000	900,000
TOTALS	**$ 900,000**	**$ 900,000**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO CAPITAL PROJECT FUND	$ 450,000	$ 450,000
TRANSFER TO GOVT CAPITAL FUND	450,000	450,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 900,000**	**$ 900,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

209 - POLICE GRANTS FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Hundred Fifty Thousand dollars ($250,000) or so much thereof dollars ($250,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ 137,334**	**$ -**
STATE AND FEDERAL GRANTS RECEIVED	279,704	250,000
TOTALS	**$ 417,038**	**$ 250,000**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES		
POLICE EQUIPT & PROG SUPP	$ 299,464	$ 200,000
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES		
TRAINING	10,000	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**309,464**	**200,000**
OTHER FINANCING USES		
OPERATING TRANSFERS-OUT	107,574	50,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 417,038**	**$ 250,000**

The above budget represents the combination of all State & Federal Grants.

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

SUBSTANCE ABUSE GRANTS FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Eighty-One Thousand Nine Hundred dollars ($81,900) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

OPERATING REVENUES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PRIOR YEAR BALANCE	**$ 95,100**	**$ 36,900**
STATE GRANTS RECEIVED	-	-
RECREATION REVENUE	45,000	45,000
TOTALS	**$ 140,100**	**$ 81,900**

OPERATING EXPENSES

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
EXPENDITURES		
TEMPORARY HELP/BENEFITS	$ 58,200	$ 60,400
PROGRAM EXPENSES/SUPPLIES	45,000	21,400
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**103,200**	**81,800**
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	36,900	100
TOTALS	**$ 140,100**	**$ 81,900**

The above budget represents the combination of all State & Federal Grants.

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

REALTY TRANSFER TAX FUND
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Two Million Three Hundred Thousand dollars ($2,300,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ -**	**$ -**
REALTY TRANSFER TAXES	2,400,000	2,300,000
TOTALS	**$ 2,400,000**	**$ 2,300,000**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	$ 2,400,000	$ 2,300,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 2,400,000**	**$ 2,300,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Three Million Ninety-Eight Thousnd Seven Hundred dollars ($3,098,700) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ 712,400**	**$ 3,098,700**
TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND	2,469,600	-
TOTALS	**$ 3,182,000**	**$ 3,098,700**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
PROGRAM EXPENSE	$ 83,300	$ 1,426,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	3,098,700	1,672,700
TOTALS	**$ 3,182,000**	**$ 3,098,700**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

AMULANCE SERVICE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Six Hundred Sixty-One Thousand Five Hundred dollars ($661,500) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ -**	**$ -**
AMBULANCE FEE	600,000	661,500
TOTALS	**$ 600,000**	**$ 661,500**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	**$ 600,000**	$ 661,500
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ 600,000**	**$ 661,500**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.

CITY OF DOVER ORDINANCE # 2026-11

PUBLIC SAFETY FEE
CASH RECEIPTS/REVENUES AND BUDGET FOR 2026-2027

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

The amount hereinafter named aggregating Five Hundred eighty-Nine Thousand dollars ($589,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary are hereby appropriated from current revenues and other funds for the use by several departments of the Municipal Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027:

CASH RECEIPTS

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
BEGINNING BALANCE	**$ -**	**$ -**
AMBULANCE FEE	-	589,000
TOTALS	**$ -**	**$ 589,000**

BUDGET SUMMARY

	2025/26 REVISED	2026/27 BUDGET
TRANSFER TO GENERAL FUND	**$ -**	$ 589,000
CURRENT YEAR BALANCE	-	-
TOTALS	**$ -**	**$ 589,000**

The City Manager is hereby authorized, without further approval of the City Council, to make interdepartmental transfers of up to five percent of the amount hereinafter appropriated to any department with the exception of any transfers prohibited by City Procedure #F306.