

COUNCIL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Council Committee of the Whole met on February 11, 2020 at 6:00 p.m., with Council President Hare presiding. Members of Council present were Mr. Anderson, Mr. Sudler, Mr. Neil, Mr. Slavin (departed at 7:44 p.m.), Mr. Cole (arrived at 6:06 p.m.), Mr. Polce, and Mr. Taylor. Mr. Lindell was absent. Mayor Christiansen was also present. Civilian members present for their Committee meetings were Mr. Caldwell and Col. Dix, Retired, (*Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement*), Mrs. Doyle (*Utility*), and Mr. Contant and Mr. Shevock (*Legislative, Finance, and Administration*).

PARKS, RECREATION, AND COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

The Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee met with Chairman Anderson presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Neil moved for adoption of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Taylor and unanimously carried.

Citizen Quality of Life and Community Enhancement Concerns

Ms. Diane Laird, Executive Director, Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP), highlighted areas of concern that were expressed in the last few weeks and noted that the DDP and its volunteers, who are members of the community, are already working on them. Ms. Laird stated that a lot of the concerns fell under the role of Community Policing Through Environmental Design (CPTED), so they are not addressing safety directly, but they are addressing a community that is designed to increase good behavior. She noted that CPTED is something that they can be trained in and she believes that it is a real area of opportunity to explore through the DDP.

Ms. Laird stated the DDP is already in conversations with someone doing some planter designs at the bus station on Loockerman Street and South Bradford and they hope to have it underway in the next couple of months. She noted that they have a lot of loitering there and thinks the appropriate design of planters and plants will help in that regard. Ms. Laird stated that another program that they have underway is the Downtown Dover Ambassador Program. They have nine ambassadors, volunteers, that commit time during events and they welcome community members and visitors to the community. She noted that it is a program that they would like to recruit more members of the community for. Ms. Laird stated that they can have bad behavior as kind of a deficit and they can have good to increase the revenue and so putting more people on the street and getting more businesses in vacant buildings are ways that they are going to help combat the behavior.

Ms. Laird stated lastly is just a general cleanup of the area, noting that the Boy Scouts and a Scout Master are coming this weekend to work on one of the kiosks in the parking lots. She noted that it is looking a little dilapidated.

Mr. Anderson noted other issues regarding lighting in the Minor Street Alley and a couple of other areas that have been brought up repeatedly. Mr. Anderson thanked Ms. Laird and the DDP for helping with the Town Hall meeting. He noted that they had over a hundred citizens participate and that it was very positive.

Mr. Sudler noted that a couple of days after the Town Hall meeting, he spoke with one of the downtown business owners who said that trash collection or dumpsters were needed downtown, especially near the

33 West area and within that radius or parameter. He stated that he heard that grease traps or grease waste mechanisms would be needed for some of the restaurants to dispose of grease, noting that some restaurants are possibly throwing the grease down the drain, which could mess up some of the pipe system for the City. Mr. Sudler stated that these were brought to his attention and maybe they can look at how to eradicate the trash collection issue.

Mr. Sudler stated that 33 West and Irish Mike's have a small trash container and it overflows. He stated he did not know if the City is supposed to pick the trash up in those trash containers that are not identified as City, but are stationary within the walkway downtown, which reflects some of the concerns of trash downtown. He stated that would like for that to be addressed.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Ms. Laird stated she was familiar with the issues with 33 West and insufficient trash collection. She noted that they use the dumpster in the alley and they are in ongoing conversation with the City and working through perhaps relocating the dumpster. Ms. Laird stated they have worked with them to change trash collection times to be a little later in the evening so that those that are working can get home in time to get their trash cans out, but she noted that they will continue to work with them. Ms. Laird stated she had not heard of the grease trap problem.

Mr. Sudler stated that the trash cans he is referring to near 33 West are pretty much stationary with brick veneer and they cannot be picked up to empty; however, he does not think are the City's.

Mr. Taylor noted that in front of Driftwood Spirits, people were saying that there was a trashcan but it is no longer there, so a lot of the trash is on the street. He stated they need to concentrate there and toward the tattoo shop in that area. Mr. Taylor stated they need another trashcan and also going North on Bradford Street and in the area of the Minor Street alley. He stated that they should be proactive and get some trash cans out in the community.

Mr. Slavin requested Mrs. Donna Mitchell, City Manager, to brief the Committee on how the City deals with commercial entities and trash removal in the City. Mrs. Mitchell stated that because trash is a service, they charge user fees for trash as a service. She noted that the dumpsters that are on Minor Street alley are paid for by the City to serve the downtown business owners. Mrs. Mitchell stated that one of those dumpsters is for recycling and one is for trash. The recycling one is being misused and trash is going in it instead of just recycling, so the contractor does not want to service that dumpster as recycling anymore because it has been contaminated with trash. Mrs. Mitchell stated that she has actually looked at the trash situation herself and noted that the fixed bins attached to poles are for the people on the street to put trash in as they are walking. She advised that those bins, along with litter on the street, are collected every day by one of the City's grounds laborers.

Mrs. Mitchell stated that Ms. Tina Bradbury, Operations and Program Manager with the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP), and Mrs. Sharon Duca, Director of Public Works, have been working on solutions for the business owners with regard to the trash situation. She noted that she has also talked with Ms. Kim Adams, Economic Development Committee, about helping configure the Minor Street lot to see if they cannot enclose those dumpsters and have the grounds laborer open the enclosure for the trash trucks in the morning as he goes through there. Mrs. Mitchell stated that they were looking for another option because when they sit open people are getting into the dumpsters.

Mr. Slavin stated that it is over and above what the City would do for a business that does not exist in the Downtown. Mrs. Mitchell agreed and noted that it is just for downtown and that other businesses pay for their own service through private contracting.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Mitchell stated that there have been complaints about lighting, particularly in the Minor Street Alley. She noted because of the complaints about the Minor Street alley when they did the LED grant project for the Unlock the Block neighborhood building block program, she paid separately from the grant for them to put LED lights in that parking lot. Ms. Laird stated it is very bright and that it was a big change.

Mr. Polce stated that he appreciates the DDP's willingness to explore CPTED as a strategy and he thought it would be a great initiative if the DDP would step up and spearhead it. He provided an overview of the CPTED program, noting that it is multi-pronged, as follows:

- Anchored in surveillance which would require greater police enforcement, probably through Community Policing, which would mean strengthening numbers in that division and allocating those numbers appropriately.
- Public health strategy from a true systems policy and environmental approach to look at how they can help individuals downtown and in the community navigate with their nonprofit community and ultimately receive treatment and services that they might need.
- City Council's role would be to outline and appropriate and connect the dots by getting not-for-profit community members to step up and play their role, as well as the faith based community and our local merchants, to be good stewards of downtown.

Ms. Laird added economic development as a fourth prong of getting businesses into the vacant buildings and getting the vacant buildings ready.

Mr. Taylor stated that he has heard repeatedly about people urinating all over the streets and requested the Committee to suggest some strategies to stop it, noting that it is a health hazard. He noted that he spoke to Mr. Hare about port-a-potties that are aesthetically pleasing and strategically positioned. Ms. Laird noted that the DDP is aware of the issues that come with getting porta-potties, but at the same time they need a strategy. Mr. Neil stated that lighting is one of the solutions that are going to help with crime. Col. Dix noted that the French have a good porta-potty system for males. Mr. Taylor mentioned the possibility of a police substation downtown.

Mayor Christiansen stated that he pledged money for the planters when Ms. Bradbury first came to him about them. He asked if the owners of Loockerman Square had offered to contribute toward the planters as they are part of the problem and could be responsible for paying for the planters. Responding, Ms. Laird stated it was her understanding that they are not at present but that they were making progress with them.

Mr. Sudler suggested having the downtown area pressure washed to address the urine odor. He stated that he did not know if the burden of the cost would be with the City, or a partnership with some of the businesses that it affects. Mr. Slavin stated that Mrs. Mitchell had sent an email out that day talking about the need to power wash and how that is one of the solutions that the Public Works crew that inspects downtown had identified.

Mr. Slavin noted that the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP) was originally formulated as a different corporation and some merging took place. He stated that the focus of the quasi-governmental entity that was created was to buy, improve and sell properties in the downtown, to take properties that were in need of repackaging for zoning or improvements to infrastructure or demolition and to get that work done so that properties did not sit idle and they flipped them back into the economy. Mr. Slavin asked if they are now out of that business as a partnership because it seems they are talking about things that really are at a much different level than what this quasi-governmental agency was created to do and created to receive an appropriation from the City to do.

Responding to Mr. Slavin, Ms. Laird stated that there has been a lot of transition over the last several years with the DDP. She noted that within the next fiscal year Council is going to see more activity within that realm of the DDP. Ms. Laird stated that they had more explicit conversations about that recently, noting that they are eyeing several buildings that they believe they will need to take ownership of if they are going to make progress in them. Ms. Laird advised that of the current properties that they have underway, there has been activity in terms of the RFP for the South Governor's Avenue parking garage area and Loockerman Way Plaza, noting that there are reasons things are not moving ahead there.

Mr. Slavin stated that part of the philosophy was to buy, improve and flip and get back onto rate-able property and be occupied and then in a bad economy, The Partnership kind of backed into buying, improving and leasing and became a landlord in the downtown. He stated that from his years on the board that they understood that in a lean economy they had to take that approach, but the economy is not lean anymore and things are really firing now in the private sector. Mr. Slavin stated he would ask Mr. Lindell to schedule a time during the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting for Ms. Laird to brief the Committee on all of the property holdings and what the strategy is going forward with those property holdings to get them back into private hands.

Mr. Slavin stated he has long felt that the City does a very adequate job of supporting what is going on downtown through infrastructure, through programmatic activities, through the appropriation that it gives to the partnership and the missing piece is private investment. He stated that they are just not seeing that private investment income and he does not know what that answer is but he is disappointed to hear that some of the private investments that they had lined up seem to have softened and moved.

Ms. Laird noted that she has heard and agrees with the quest for exploring a police substation at some level, whether it is fully staffed or manned occasionally with food patrols that just take breaks there. She stated there could be any level of a presence.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Semi-Annual Report (September 2019 - February 2020)

Mrs. Tracey Harvey, Planner/Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Administrator, reviewed the CDBG Semi-Annual Report, September 2019 – February 2020.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mrs. Harvey stated that when a first time home buyer applies, review of the applicant starts with the housing counselors. She noted that they mainly work with NCALL (National Council on Agricultural Life & Labor Research Fund, Inc.) and they do all the pre-screening and she also does a screening to determine eligibility.

Mr. Polce asked, as they prepare to receive the Consolidated Plan for 2020 – 2024, if they will be looking at any outcome data from the current participants that are listed and if the City receives annual outcome data or is it not a requirement of the grant. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated they do receive annual outcome data each year that they apply for the grant, even though it is a multi-year grant, they have to apply for allocation each program year.

Mr. Polce clarified if Connections and Central Delaware Habitat kind of failed to hit their benchmarks or their key performance indicators, why was the money released for the next fiscal year. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated it was a multi-year grant, and they try to work with the subrecipients to get them to spend the money and then because it was a multi-year grant, there was no other subrecipient to reallocate the funds to at that time.

Mr. Polce asked what happens if recipients did not spend down to a threshold, did not execute your key performance indicators that were outlined and in 2017, same thing occurred and 2018, same thing occurred. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated that the last year, fiscal year 2019, they were not awarded any grant funds because they failed to spend their grant funds the previous year, so they were not awarding any additional funds.

Mr. Polce stated that he would assume that if an organization has outlined any form of innovative programmatic exploration, and they did not meet their key performance indicators and they did not draw down the spending, then the program would have the ability to recoup and divert. He noted that they did not recoup it because they never allocated it, but redirect those funds to another potential organization. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated that information is going to be the next agenda item, she noted that she is proposing to reallocate those funds to another subrecipient.

Col. Dix stated he has no prior knowledge of these block grants, but had the idea that there were operating expenses that were being paid and that these were being given to organizations. He noted that he was at a neighborhood meeting about two weeks ago, and most of the people that were there kept reiterating the City does not have any money to give to the homeless, he noted here they are giving operating expenses money to these organizations.

Responding to Col. Dix, Mrs. Harvey stated it is heavily advertised, on the website, all the housing providers are aware of when the grant application process is going to happen every five years, it goes out to all the housing providers. She noted they do press releases and have public hearings and meetings. She noted that she is not sure why a lot of the housing providers are not aware.

Col. Dix asked if they do not give out that money to individuals, but give it to these housing providers, but can they give money in turn to the homeless. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated no, the way it works is that the funds are allocated to a nonprofit, an established 501(c)(3), and they provide the services to the homeless or whoever the grant recipient is. Responding to Col. Dix, Mrs. Harvey stated there is no money given directly to the homeless.

Mr. Polce stated an important clarification is that the City of Dover is just the administrator of a federal grant, that is, we are the pass-through vessel. He stated that it is not coming out of a general fund appropriation from the City of Dover, it is a pass-through grant from the federal government. We simply

administer the funds. He noted Mrs. Harvey is the gatekeeper, if you will, in charge of the stewardship of that fund.

Proposed Budget Amendments to the 2019 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan and Carry-Forward Undisbursed Obligations

Mrs. Tracey Harvey, Planner/Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Administrator, reviewed the Committee Action Form regarding the Proposed Budget Amendments to the 2019 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan and Carry-Forward Undisbursed Obligations.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed Budget Amendments totaling \$154,209.73 for Fiscal Year 2019.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mrs. Harvey stated the money that is going to be reallocated to the women's shelter would complete a large portion of their rehabilitation funds they need. She noted that they have other funding sources as well and they have already put out bids for a couple of projects, so this money will be spent right away. Mrs. Harvey stated she had an indication that the combination of funds that they are getting and this money will complete their rehabilitation.

Mayor Christiansen stated that they discovered over the last few years that there is a lack of shelters for women and families, and that he thought this is a great expenditure of the funds and the homeownership program, moving monies toward that will allow people to be partakers of the American Dream, and that is homeownership, where they can take a house and make it into a home.

Mr. Anderson stated that he supports this reallocation. He stated it is regrettable, however, that money was not spent for homeownership repair because there is a number of people who desperately need this program. Mr. Anderson noted that it is unfortunate that the connection is not being made between the people who need them, some of them are actually getting code violations and yet there is no connection being made to them and actually being able to fix their home. He hopes they can resolve that in the future.

Mayor Christiansen stated he does take umbrage with that, because he knows that some of our code inspectors have referred and continue to refer people to that home repair program or any redress or relief that the individual homeowners can find. He stated the thought Mrs. Harvey and the folks in Code Enforcement Department operate with a little bit of compassion to help people.

Mrs. Harvey stated that the funding that was terminated by Habitat was strictly restricted to restoring the Central Dover area and they had a lot of turnover within the last few years, and right now, their primary focus is on new homeownership, building new homes, so she does not think they have the staff capacity to really focus on rehab. She stated that there is still a need for rehab within the city of Dover. Mr. Anderson stated unfortunately, they have had problems with that connection somehow being made with two different vendors, Milford Housing before this and Habitat. He stated he hoped they can find somewhere in the future where they can accomplish that, because the need is desperate and it is vital to keeping our downtown in good condition, in habitable condition.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Harvey stated there is nothing that she is aware of funding that is available for victims of graffiti tags on their buildings for Downtown Dover.

Mr. Sudler asked if Mrs. Harvey has seen any grants out there that the City may want to inquire about that and may be able to ascertain, so that they can bring some financial relief. Responding, Mrs. Harvey stated she can try contacting NCALL, because they have a greater funding pool than she does, and see if they have something available because they do have a lot of neighborhood programs, so that might be one thing they could look at.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend approval of staff's recommendation of approval of the proposed Budget Amendments totaling \$154,209.73 for Fiscal Year 2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Slavin and unanimously carried.

Mr. Hare moved for adjournment of the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

UTILITY COMMITTEE

The Utility Committee met with Chairman Cole presiding.

Adoption of Agenda

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

Proposed Utility Rate Changes

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, City Manager, reviewed the presentation titled, "City of Dover Proposed Utility Rate Changes Sample Customer Analysis Effective July 1, 2020."

Responding to Mr. Neil, Mrs. Mitchell stated that it is a sliding scale and that the difference between an inside sewer rate and an outside sewer rate is inside City and outside City. She noted if you live outside the City and you have City water and sewer, you would get a higher rate. Mrs. Mitchell advised that groundwater is the City's inflow/infiltration rate they have to help cover the capital projects for the I&I for the sewer mains. She noted that everyone is going to be paying that regardless.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Mitchell stated the wastewater is not because of the County increasing. She noted that they have these rate increases going across all of them and that the County did a 10-year increase as well this last year, but they are projected to start evaluating the rates, so this is anticipation. Mrs. Mitchell stated if the County does not increase that rate, that rate will not change, but their last conversation was they are not waiting 10 years, they are going to reevaluate this and do them at least every three years. She noted that these rates will not be changed if the County does not change their rates, for the point of the presentation, they all changed.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Mrs. Mitchell stated that the part of the reasons for adjusting these rates and making them more in line with market rates is to provide efficient money for infrastructure to for the upkeep of our infrastructure. Mrs. Mitchell noted it is the operation of maintenance cost increases as well as to do more with the infrastructure. It is also to establish sufficient reserves if we have problems, which we do not have today.

Mr. Slavin stated we are beginning now to see what we have planned for the last five years, which is the balance of the way we fund the City, it is tipping toward usage and utilities rather than property tax rates. He noted that is a response to the large amount of tax-exempt property we carry in the City that uses services but pays no taxes and then when we went out to the nonprofit community and said, help us address this, we were just kind of stiff armed by them and were not able to get anywhere with that. This will include also a storm water utility at some point. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated at some point, right now she has not got that developed, but they will be working on that next.

Mr. Sudler stated that at Delaware State University (DSU) has a voice there, effort and initiative to help the City of Dover in any way they can as a nonprofit organization. Mrs. Mitchell agreed that DSU have.

Responding to Mayor Christiansen, Ms. Mitchell stated that she did not have what percentages of these increased fees will go toward contingencies for future repairs in emergencies, it is in the forecast model, but she can get it.

Presentation - Streetlight Inventory and Photometric Analysis (Citelum)

Mr. Michael Bartoszek, Regional Director, Mr. Sean Popp, Streetlight Manager, and Ms. Madeline Shaffer, Business Development, Citelum, reviewed a presentation titled, "Dover Lighting History, Street Inventory and Photometric Analysis."

Mr. Bartoszek provided three options: keep the lighting system the way it is; work on the lighting system through the Public Works Department, which is usually an incremental approach because usually Public Works Departments do not have the manpower to do that; or outsource to a third party who would do a citywide upgrade. Mr. Bartoszek stated generally whether Citelum or another performance contractor, you are going to have contractual guarantees for performance and cost as well as timing.

Mr. Bartoszek stated you are going to know exactly what you are going to get when you are going to have it and the key is reducing the kilowatt hours to obtain energy savings, so a lot of times there is a very, very significant reduction in number of kilowatt hours consumed by going from traditional high pressure sodium lighting to LED lighting. He noted that reduction in turn generally can be used to fund the cost of the new infrastructure amortized over a period of time, so a lot of times it is not even a budgetary issue in terms of funding the cap ex, it is something that can be funded through the savings generated through the upgrade.

Mr. Polce stated he appreciated Mr. Bartoszek's recommendations and though Citelum captured the vast importance of the project such as not only will it save money immediately, but in the future it will make them a bit better stewards from a financial modeling perspective of forecasting. It is going to absolutely increase safety standards across the City, especially in the downtown community. He noted it will absolutely reduce carbon footprint, but one thing he thought was missing from the recommendation is the technology component that could be incorporated. Mr. Polce stated that he thought it is a tremendous opportunity in the incorporation of technology and modeling good behavior by the City to incorporate, which in turn, hopefully, will incentivize job creation. He noted he truly sees the City of Dover as a 4G hub with smart cell technology, with that type of technology fixed on the top of these hard assets, which in turn will bring innovation and job creation into the future. Mr. Polce stated that is the general direction and if we do not do it now, then we are going to get outpaced by our competitors, which are other municipalities. As we look at Wilmington, as we look at Milford, as we look at Middletown, trust me, they are thinking about the same thing. He noted the City actually has the foundation to make some of this happen.

Mr. Polce asked Mr. Bartoszek to speak about the technology component to some of the work that could be done. Responding Mr. Bartoszek stated that the LED lighting industry and the related technologies like solar or many other industries have benefited from cost reduction over the last several years. He noted the network technology associated with LED lighting is one of those areas where as a few years ago it might be quite expensive and cities might consider whether or not it really made sense in their budget to incorporate it as part of their overall citywide upgrade, now that the costs have come down to the point where it is almost hard not to include it. Mr. Bartoszek noted that in essence you are creating a network lighting system, so you are creating nodes on each LED light, which will communicate to a central hub, communicate various data and make things easier for your Public Works Department to understand the condition of lights when lights are out or on, and various other things because you are also creating a citywide network, you are also opening the door to incorporating other technologies down the road. Mr. Bartoszek stated when you create the network, it is just like creating the WiFi network in your house, you can add environmental sensors or other technologies down the road, traffic analytics and things that might be beneficial to the City down the road. So when we see these procurements for lighting upgrades in cities across the U.S., they have really become combination LED lighting, smart city upgrades, and even 5G. Mr. Bartoszek noted the convergence between the three is really happening because of 5G technology needing to be closer to the ground and the co-location of 5G technology on the light poles.

Mr. Polce stated this is the template that all ultimately can pave those discussions and decisions can be made at that point. He noted that the presentation highlights a few things; one, the City staff has done a phenomenal job of maintaining the asset. It is not broken. But in this conversation, we must evolve with technology and moreover we have to evolve with the science, so although the asset is not broken, the technology switching to LEDs clearly show benefit.

Mr. Bartoszek stated LED lighting and increasing the City's lighting levels is obviously something that you can do which is fairly low cost. He noted that obviously is going to have an impact on reducing crime and increasing the well-being of your citizens.

Mr. Neil expressed concerns regarding if the lights that Citelum already identified as the colonial types of light can be converted to LED lighting. Responding, Mr. Bartoszek stated, regarding the lighting downtown and about pulling the shades down, he stated LED lighting is directional, you could put more lighting on the road or on the sidewalk and you do not necessarily going to impact citizens.

Mr. Bartoszek stated it is proper lighting design, not just simply taking lights out and putting new lights in is a key to getting it right, that is the lighting design aspect of the process, knowing where you want the light to go and where you do not want it to go to your other question. Mr. Popp stated that GE, Phillips, works well with acuity and that they all make a retrofit for the old style, and can do either a retrofit or a whole new fixture and it is going to be exactly what they see today except LED.

Mr. Polce moved to recommend directing City staff to work with Citelum to develop a strategic proposal to include scope and potential financial implications of the proposed project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson, and unanimously carried.

Discussion - Wireless Communications Facilities

Mrs. Dawn Melson-Williams, Principal Planner, reviewed a presentation titled, "Wireless Communications Facilities - Update on Provisions and Development of Ordinance," (**Attachment #1**).

Ms. Bonnie Mets, Director of State Government Affairs, Verizon, stated they are ready to come in and invest in the City in small cell infrastructure. She noted that 4G sets the stage, small cell is for 5G and the City will be well positioned more than some other municipalities in the State where they are not yet moving forward. She noted they are anxious to get to a final ordinance and also licensed agreements.

Responding to Mr. Polce, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated she was not sure she can answer when Council will have an ordinance before them. She stated they are hoping to have something by the end of the month, but was not sure how together it will be. There is a draft currently that is over 20 some pages long that still does not quite work well with the existing code and processes that they need to sort out. She noted that the Planning Office is just now really getting into really looking at the ordinance itself since they may be one of the key administrators of the ordinance.

Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that they do have existing procedures in the zoning ordinance that deal with the placement more on the tower world of this, of wireless facilities. There is a code interpretation memo that gives the process for dealing with them, whether they are in a residential or nonresidential area and depending on what they are on height. She noted that it is not like they cannot accept any kind of tower ones. It is the small cell technology that the City's code really does not address because it was not thought of, so, they are in that modern technology issue.

Mr. Polce stated it would be great to have something before Council before the end of March, because, at the end of the day, every day that ticks by, we lose out on an opportunity for not only implementation of 4G, but the implementation of 5G and the industry is wanting leaders. And if we, again, can demonstrate leadership in this role, we can then go to Verizon, to Sprint, to all the carriers and say, look, we are equipped and we want your business here and to be a leader. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated they are already reaching out to the city wanting to know how to come here.

Mr. Polce noted Fenwick did this two years ago, their ordinance has been in place two years ago. He noted that Dover can still be a leader, but there are local jurisdictions who have pieced it together strategically and thought about it. He stated it would be great if we were an early adopter and demonstrated good faith to the industries, so in turn, we can ask them for a favor down the road.

Mr. Anderson asked how would this affect private property owners who may get some of the technology on whether it is buildings, or posts. Responding, Mrs. Melson-William stated some of it depends on what type of approval process is necessary for the placement of the facility and what type of facility it is. The placement of a tower or a monopole is obviously very different than attaching something to the roof of a building. She noted right now, attachments probably to a roof of a building or as simple as a building permit process. Mrs. Melson-Williams stated the process for a tower is more likely in the world of a site plan that may be needing to appear in front of the planning commission for a full hearing process. She stated it will depend on the type of facility that they are looking to add to their property. The zoning ordinance regulates how you place structures, items on private property and whether limitations on height, location, setbacks from property lines, potentially, with this ordinance, any kind of appearance issues, whether it is color, stealth technology type aspects. She noted they certainly want to have the opportunity for private owners to explore placement of these items on their properties, but they need to have the ordinance in place.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Mets stated once these ordinances and processes are in place they are ready to go now. She noted they are looking at locations where they need to deploy from an RF standard,

where the facilities are needed. So, as soon as the ordinance gets into place, we are ready to file permits and start building.

Responding to Mr. Anderson, Ms. Mets stated the FCC and both the FDA have looked at the health effects and low level radiation and studied RF health effects over the last 11 years. The FCC came out in December with, based on all of the data that they looked at, that they did not make any changes. She noted they specifically looked at 5G technology as well as part of that. They did not make any changes to the current levels. The FDA just came out basically saying the same thing. That there were no quantifiable health effects. So, the experts and the weight of scientific evidence supports that.

Mr. Mike Mullen, right-of-way Manager, noted the threshold that they use are hundreds of times less than that threshold of the studies.

Responding to Ms. Doyle, Ms. Mets stated they do environmental studies where they are going into maybe a place where they are required by law to do that under the federal law. Ms. Mets noted that talking about small cells, generally they would be going in the right of way on an existing pole. That is what they would prefer to do, so, there really are not any environmental effects from really just changing out one of the poles.

Responding to Mrs. Doyle, Ms. Mets stated she was not aware of anything like the disappearance of birds in places that put these in place. Ms. Mets stated she can look into it and to get back to her.

Mayor Christiansen stated that this is something that the City really needs to pursue in earnest because, once again, this proposal and this concept, as many of the other things they have discussed tonight, is an economic tool toward our economic engine of the City. He noted they really need to take a long, hard look at it and expedite the process.

Mr. Neil moved for adjournment of the Utility Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Anderson and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE, FINANCE, AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

The Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee met with Council President Hare presiding, in the absence of Chairman Lindell.

Adoption of Agenda

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

Proposed Amendments to Personnel Policy (Employee Handbook) - Discrimination and Harassment Section

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, City Manager, reviewed the proposed amendments to Personnel Policy (Employee Handbook) - Discrimination and Harassment Section.

Staff recommended acceptance of the policy updates as recommended.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mrs. Mitchell stated they were basically following the guidelines that were given to them by the trainer, so in certain that the employee can go to the supervisor, they do not have to go directly to the Human Resources Director.

Mr. Sudler asked if there are guidelines whereas, once they do go to the supervisor, how the supervisor is to proceed, whether they are going to have an informal hearing, or does the supervisor just go directly to HR, or do they conduct an informal hearing, gather data, and then provide that along with the complaint. Responding, Mrs. Mitchell stated all that is done in the policy here. She noted the only change they are making is that change to say the employee can go to the supervisor. Everything else is detailed in the policy, the process.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Personnel Policy (Employee Handbook) - Discrimination and Harassment Sections (Attachment #2), seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

Amendments to Travel Policy

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, City Manager, reviewed the proposed amendments to the City of Dover Travel Policy.

Staff recommended approval of the Travel Policy as revised.

Responding to Mr. Hare, Mrs. Mitchell stated the cash advance goes directly into the checking account, weekly, they are not getting the whole and that when the employee comes back they still have to submit and justify where all the money went. Mrs. Mitchell noted that is the next change they have. She stated that any advance for meal incidental and allowances, not accounted for an expense report, will be considered over payment shall be returned, but they are also requiring receipts.

Mr. Sudler asked why the City does not just go to an ATM card or one of those Visa cards that you can just put a certain amount on and any and every transaction that they make you should be able to get a printout or read out. He noted that eliminates the receipts and they will have an itemized list of what or where they have eaten, or all transaction activities.

Responding Mrs. Mitchell stated they are looking into that with a new ERP system and looking to see if they can make that work. She noted they have talked to their purchaser as well, the problem is not everybody travels, it is just certain ones that travel. She noted they can give employees an ATM card or a P-Card or whatever to pay for their travel, from what she understands is the bank card has to have the employee's name on it. It cannot be generic that anybody could use, if they have got turnover, you got new employees, employees leaving that still have cards, you have got to get those cards back. You got to issue one for the new employee. She noted that it is all got to be logistically worked out and see how we can make it work, but that is being considered how we do that.

Mr. Sudler suggested a prepaid card, but was not sure if it gives a readout, but thought it would be worth wild and it could be more cost friendly.

Mr. Sudler moved to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the City of Dover Travel Policy (Attachment #3). The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Extension of Contract Services for Third Party Payroll Processing provided by Automatic Data Processing, Inc. (ADP)

Ms. Lori Peddicord, Director of Finance, reviewed the background information regarding the extension of contract services for Third Party Payroll Processing provided by Automatic Data Processing, Inc. (ADP).

Staff recommended authorizing the Controller/Treasurer to extend the ADP contract through December 31, 2020, unless the ERP implementation results in an earlier cancellation.

Responding to Mr. Neil, Ms. Peddicord stated it is a little bit more than has been budgeted and that it might be \$14,000. Ms. Peddicord noted that it is a bridge and was hoping they did not need a bridge.

Mr. Polce stated at some point it would be nice to have Tyler demonstrate why they are so far behind. He noted that the raw reality is it is impacting the fiscal budget and the timeline, staff capacity, human capital, but overall, so this is the first request that has come before Council because of lack of performance in the contract. Mr. Polce stated at some point it would be an interesting conversation if Tyler could come and provide a more general, holistic update on the implementation of the ERP that City staff has been working diligently on this merger.

Mrs. Peddicord stated she could probably bring something back to Council in the next few weeks to a month or so, because they have to revisit the timeline anyway.

Mr. Polce stated he would like someone from Tyler. Mr. Hare agreed and stated there needs to be some accountability on that part.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend approval of staff's recommendation.

Mr. Contant asked what performance metrics were built into the contract, and is there any money that can be brought back for failure to deliver on time. Responding, Ms. Peddicord stated she had conversations with Tyler and they have agreed to remove the charges for many of the sessions that they had in building the Executime System, which is the time and attendance system that they purchased from Tyler. She noted she has not gotten anything in a formal letter, but Tyler agreed to waive those fees or remove them from our, because of a letter that she sent to them requesting that Tyler review the account.

Responding to Mr. Contant, Ms. Peddicord stated she has a letter to Tyler and it was a phone conversation and Mrs. Donna Mitchell, City Manager, was there. Ms. Peddicord stated that she does not know that they have documented it since then, but the other pieces of it was we did purchase time clocks from Tyler and they also are going to refund that amount back to them.

Mr. Contant stated it is a great idea to have someone, some representative of Tyler come before the Committee or even the Council and explain where they are, why they are there, why the we are not getting what we paid for on time.

Responding to Mr. Contant, Ms. Peddicord stated that the systems is not customized.

Mr. Contant recommended that when Ms. Peddicord reaches out to Tyler, ask them to come back or come here and explain what is going on, that we get something in writing saying what they are going to give back

to us. He noted that Ms. Peddicord stated that they are working on it, but at the end of the day he would like to make sure that the City of Dover gets something back when they say it and that they are going to be held to that.

Mr. Neil moved to recommend authorizing the Controller/Treasurer to extend the ADP contract through December 31, 2020, unless the ERP implementation results in an earlier cancellation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Shevock and unanimously carried.

Proposed Ordinance #2020-04 - Amending Chapter 22 - Buildings and Building Regulations, Article I - In General, Section 22-1 - Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals

Mr. Dave Hugg, Director of Planning and Community Enhancement, reviewed the background information for proposed Ordinance #2020-04.

Staff recommended adoption of the Ordinance #2020-04.

Mr. Sudler stated his major concern is the keywords certified and the mere fact that the groups that they are illustrating or exhibiting as desirable, is slim picking. He noted there are not too many people to have an engineer or those types of qualifications that are just out in the community willing to serve. He noted not every contractor is knowledgeable in regards to plumbing, in regards to how to interpret the code. Mr. Sudler questioned where they are going to get these pool of people from and how are you going to ensure that they are certified.

Mr. Hugg stated the provisions basically would allow for a design professional, a builder, a superintendent of building construction or someone with experience in each of those fields. Mr. Hugg noted it is not as rigid as the word certified might indicate and does acknowledge that it will be a challenge to make sure that they can get people with those qualifications willing to serve. He stated that from our experience in working with folks in these various professions, they are out there, and a number of them that we have talked to are willing to be involved and to be appointed to the committee, but it will be a challenge.

Mr. Anderson expressed several concerns with this idea. He stated they need more time to discuss this because. He noted the direction is correct. Mr. Anderson stated number one, the people should always have a final appeal to their elected officials. In other words, now that once we establish a professional board to oversee, then they should have, we are talking about some of the people's most important items, their real property, where they invested their life savings in many times. That their businesses, their homes, that everything that is most precious to them, they should always have the right to appeal to City Council. He stated City Council should not delegate to subcommittees. He noted that when say delegate, he means delegate, they are completely cut out with no right of appeal.

Mr. Anderson stated that he did not like the European model which puts bureaucracy over democracy and he has several examples. He stated that there should be some citizen members, like from the real estate community that and maybe from the legal community, like the hearing code, on that committee so that you have a broader representation. Mr. Anderson stated then those others, there should be a pool, where you are pulling three from those other fields. He noted one, make it easier to get people to fill it the way it is designed, you have to have one from each of those professions, which is extraordinarily hard. Number two, he has a problem with it being recommended by the building inspector, that eliminates checks and balances.

That puts somebody who basically is beholden to the building inspectors, to be judging the building inspectors actions. And he stated at the very least looks like a conflict of interest.

Mr. Anderson stated he also has a problem with the idea of a two-thirds majority to overturn the building inspector, or modify a building inspector's position. He stated they do not do that anywhere in our formal government, should be a majority and two-thirds also does not work mathematically with a five member board. He noted essentially they would be making it a four-fifth majority by accident and he does not think that is appropriate. Mr. Anderson stated he also has issues with the dangerous buildings. He asked who hears that, is it the same committee, it did not seem to be clear. He also has an issue with changing from 30 days to 20. He noted there is hardly enough time for somebody who is out of town to get legal representation or to consultant an attorney in 20 days.

Mr. Anderson stated he also has a problem with the language of served. He stated he wants a definition of what it is to be served a notice, to make sure a person actually gets it, because that 20-day clock, when it comes to your property maybe being destroyed or it being subject to thousands of dollars of fines, should not be able to sit on somebody's desk for five days or whatever and then be mailed out and they get it, and they have 10 days now, and they are trying to get an attorney, get advice, and that just does not happen right. Mr. Anderson stated unfortunately, the International Building Code Committees and bureaucracy that wants to skew the stuff to their people. He stated it is contrary to the traditions of this City, which has been built in protecting the rights of private property. Mr. Anderson stated it is one of the reasons why he loves this City and loves being here. He noted that he has several amendment possibilities with the various different lines. Mr. Anderson stated that he would like to defer this for about a month and have opportunities to discuss different things and see what is feasible and what is not.

Mr. Sudler concurred with Mr. Anderson and stated because they are looking at the mailbox rule. When they receive, when they pick up. We just dealt with that scenario with Ms. Johnson, as an example of what could go wrong and how it could affect one's financial status.

Mr. Sudler noted that Mr. Anderson brought up a lot of valid points that he thinks they need to consider. Mr. Sudler noted when talking about people's property, he could see a huge blow back from the community if they do not get this one right, and how it is going to create a huge problem in the near future if the clarity is not there.

Responding to Mr. Polce, regarding the urgency, Mr. Hugg stated they have certainly heard in almost every one of the dangerous building hearings before Council, members say to us that we should not be in this loop. Mr. Hugg noted that by the time a project gets to this level, it has already had many steps of process through the building and code enforcement initiative. It just seemed to us, particularly as we are moving forward with trying to deal with the blighted properties in the City and the desire to get them handled on a regular basis, that having to depend on meetings of the Council and meetings of this board slows down the process.

Mr. Polce stated Mr. Anderson made some very valid points and noted one that is really important is just the math. Mr. Hugg stated he just realized that too, that it is actually wording straight out of the international building code.

Mr. Hugg stated he is perfectly fine with the notion that they take this back and do some additional work on it. He stated they need to move forward on getting the codes up to date. He Mr. Hugg stated the codes

are 2009 and or in the case of this particular revision, I think it dates back to somewhere around 2000, so it is a step they need to be taking. He noted that he would love to see Mr. Anderson's suggestions and see how we might address them. Mr. Polce suggested 30 days.

Mr. Hare noted that this is a good idea because they have these meetings. He stated they bring buildings in here that have been two, three years that need to be torn down and that maybe the staff instead of bringing it to Council, just send a letter out there that the people have the right to appeal to this committee, if that committee says they agree, then they have the right to appeal to Council.

Mr. Hare stated like with electric shutoff, it should be sent certified or hand delivered, or take it to the Sheriff's Department and have them serve them. He stated he thought someone said they were going to be looking into that. Responding Mr. Hugg stated they do post the building with a sticker.

Mr. Hare stated they can get some revisions to it and then move ahead and within 30 days bring something back.

Mr. Neil noted that one of the things the Construction Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals (CPMCBA) members have had is finding the people to be able to get there on time and now just said times five. He noted that if trying to get those people and do it within a timely fashion is not just another thing and it is worthy of delay to talk about it.

Mr. Hare noted that the CPMCBA is in the afternoon, maybe these meeting would be an evening meeting. He stated it might be easier for people to get there.

Responding to Mr. Contant, Mr. Hugg stated he did not have a hard number of the ratio of the appeals that are upheld versus denied. Mr. Hugg noted that most of the dangerous building requests, probably two thirds of them are upheld, the staff recommendation is approved. He noted that those that tend not to be upheld, are upheld typically with some additional consideration given to the property owner, so where the staff may recommend it be torn down, Council may very well say they will give the owner 60 days to see if they can bring the building up to code or not, and if not, then the staff recommendation goes forward. He noted on the vacant building ordinances, it is probably 50-50, that process is pretty much all over the board and it is probably one of the more inconsistent kind because the matter there is, it gets into hardship, it gets into how good the argument of the individual coming to the appeal board is, how persuasive they are. He noted there are a lot of other factors.

Mr. Contant stated he agrees with the intent but also agree with all of Mr. Anderson's recommendations and looks forward to seeing those actually written down in here.

Mr. Contant noted that it is a good idea to move towards a committee or board of appeal, however, when you add in the next level of, if they wish to appeal beyond that and they go to Council, which I think they should, really what they are doing is anybody who does not win is going to appeal. He stated but the reason he was asking for the numbers, is that is essentially going to save the time of one third to half of the appeals that you guys probably see.

Responding to Mr. Sudler, Mr. Hugg stated no, they are not the same individuals who have violated sitting on these committees. Mr. Hugg noted he does not know of anyone on the committee who is considered to be a conflict of interest.

Mr. Sudler stated his concern is if they have a department head that is the one that is saying, the person is in violation and we are moving forward with demo, he does not see how individual should sit on the committee.

Mr. Hugg stated that individual would not sit on the committee. The City Charter gives Mr. Hugg as the City's code official, ultimately that authority to declare your building to be a dangerous building, but it does not make him a voting member of the appeals board, either the current one or proposed one. He noted they are simply staffed to, they make a recommendation to the appeals board and provide the secretarial service if you will, but no.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend referring Proposed Ordinance #2020-04 - Amending Chapter 22 - Building and Building Regulations, Article I - In General, Section 22-1 - Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals, back to staff to work on the concerns expressed, and bring it back in March, seconded by Mr. Neil.

Mr. Hugg asked for Mr. Anderson to send his comments and notations.

Mr. Hare noted that this might be something to bring to the Council Workshop scheduled for March 13, 2020. Mr. Anderson stated that it does not work for him and that there are so many other things that are more visionary as opposed to nuts and bolts.

Mr. Hare clarified it would be in addition. He noted that they work it out and talk to it and fight over at the workshop, and then they can put the final numbers together and bring it to Committee and then go from there.

Mr. Anderson stated hopefully they will have that all worked out before then, so it will not be a big issue. He noted that he would not recommend this being a part of the workshop because it does not really fit in with the visionary agenda of dealing with the infrastructure and other things.

Mr. Anderson moved to recommend referring Proposed Ordinance #2020-04 - Amending Chapter 22 - Building and Building Regulations, Article I - In General, Section 22-1 - Construction and Property Maintenance Code Board of Appeals, back to staff to work on the concerns expressed, and bring it back in March. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Mr. Sudler moved for adjournment of the Legislative, Finance, and Administration Committee meeting, seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Mr. Sudler moved for adjournment of the Council Committee of the Whole meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neil and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

William F. Hare
Council President

WFH/TM/jt

S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Committee-Minutes\2020\02-11-2020 CCW Minutes.wpd

Attachments

- Attachment #1 - Presentation titled, “Wireless Communications Facilities - Update on Provisions and Development of Ordinance”
- Attachment #2 - Proposed Amendments to the Personnel Policy (Employee Handbook) - Discrimination and Harassment Section
- Attachment #3 - Proposed Amendments to the City of Dover Travel Policy



ATTACHMENT #1

Council Committee of the Whole Meeting of 02/11/2020

WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

UPDATE ON PROVISIONS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ORDINANCE

FEBRUARY 11, 2020 – COUNCIL OF COMMITTEE OF WHOLE: UTILITY COMMITTEE MEETING

PURPOSE

- To establish uniform standards for the siting, design, permitting, installation, maintenance and use of **Wireless Communication Facilities** in the City of Dover.
- Provisions need to address:
 - Regulate location, design, appearance
 - Manage development of WCF subject to Federal and State laws & regulations
 - Establish procedures (permitting, review of proposals, attachment agreements)
 - Encourage collocation
 - Promote health, safety, and welfare

ITEMS TO ADDRESS

- Decisions related to policy, public safety, land-use and right-of-way considerations
- Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and State of Delaware have established rules designed to facilitate Small WCF installation. This includes approval timeframes (Shot Clock) and placement in State right-of-way.
- Determination of types of application processes, review procedures, review timeframe, and fees.
- Development of Ordinance for adoption of regulations into *Dover Code of Ordinances (Zoning Ordinance)*.
- Type of WCF Applications: collocations, modifications, new facilities

TASKS TO DATE

- Topic under consideration by Staff of City Manager's Office, Electric Department, and Planning Office
- City hired Cohen Law; developed a draft Ordinance
- Early Drafts of Ordinance did not match Dover's needs or regulatory structure
- Continued work on development of an Ordinance
- Work on Agreements for pole attachments and licensing (on City owned poles and rights-of-way)
- Electric Department proposal to implement a Pilot Program working with vendors to gain real-time experience with WCF; program suspended
- Presentation of an Action Plan to CCOW-Utility Committee in October 2018
- Presentation to Historic District Commission in August 2019 on Small WCF with examples of designs

WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES



Small Wireless Communications Facility

The diagram consists of three horizontal bars of a medium blue color, stacked vertically. To the left of each bar is a white circle. A thin grey line connects the three circles, starting from the top circle, going down to the middle circle, and then down to the bottom circle. The background of the slide is dark blue with a blurred image of server racks on the right side.

Non-Tower WCF

Tower Based WCF

NEXT STEPS

- Development and refinement of Ordinance for Wireless Communication Facilities
 - Application and Review procedures based on Type of Activity, Location, and Type of Facility
 - Fee Schedule
- Development and refinement of agreements and licensing associated with attachment on City owned poles and access to City right-of-way
- Consideration of Development of a Small Wireless Communication Facility Design Manual



QUESTIONS ?

CITY OF DOVER PERSONNEL POLICY

ARTICLE VII. ETHICAL CONDUCT

SECTION 6. DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

State and/or Federal law prohibits discrimination on the basis of, among others, race, marital status, genetic information, color, age (40 or older), religion, sex (including pregnancy), sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability, or status as a victim of domestic violence, a sexual offense, or stalking. Harassment (including sexual harassment) often is considered a form of unlawful discrimination. It is the policy of the City of Dover to prohibit and not tolerate unlawful discrimination or unlawful harassment and to promote a workplace and work environment that is free of unlawful discrimination or unlawful harassment or conduct that might reasonably be perceived as constituting such, whether verbal, physical, or environmental.

Anti Sex Harassment Specifically (Definition):

For purposes of this policy, sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when: (1) submission to such conduct is made, either explicitly or implicitly, a term or condition of a person's employment; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting the person; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with a person's work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment.

Examples of sexual harassment include, *but are not limited to*: unwanted physical advances; requests for sexual favors in exchange for favorable treatment or continued employment; unwelcome flirtation, advances, or propositions; verbal abuse of a sexual nature; graphic, verbal commentary about a person's body, sexual prowess, or sexual deficiencies; leering, whistling, touching, or pinching; suggestive insulting, or obscene comments or gestures of a sexual nature; display in the work place of sexually-suggestive objects or pictures; transmitting or forwarding e-mails containing offensive, suggestive, or lewd attachments, statements, or jokes; and uploading, downloading, or viewing inappropriate pictures or material onto organizational information systems. The above list is illustrative of types of conduct that would violate this policy and, as such, by no means represents an exclusive list of conduct that could lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of employment.

Guidelines:

- All City of Dover employees must comply with this policy, which applies to conduct both within the work environment and elsewhere when an employee acts in an official capacity as a City of Dover representative.
- The City of Dover will not tolerate, condone, or allow unlawful discrimination or unlawful harassment, whether engaged in by fellow employees, supervisors, managers, outside clients, or other non-employees who conduct business with us.
- While the City of Dover encourages persons who believe they are being unlawfully harassed firmly and promptly to notify the offender that his or her behavior is unwelcome and must cease immediately, we also realize that the power and status disparities between the alleged harasser and

the person allegedly harassed may make such a confrontation unlikely. Especially when direct communication is either ineffective or impossible, City employees are expected to follow the procedures stated below.

- All employees must take appropriate measures to ensure that prohibited conduct does not occur. Members of management in particular must intercede to stop any violating behavior. City of Dover employees must report all such harassment, regardless of who the offender may be.
- In addition to discipline by the City of Dover as your employer, persons who engage in acts in violation of this policy may also be subject to civil and criminal penalties.
- The City of Dover will not retaliate in any way against any person who makes a good faith report of violation of this policy, nor will the City of Dover permit any supervisor, officer, or employee to do so. Retaliation is a serious violation of this policy and should be reported immediately.

Procedures:

- 1) A report of violation of this policy must be made promptly to the City of Dover Human Resources Director or any supervisor. If reported to a supervisor, the supervisor is to report the violation immediately to the Human Resources Director. While initial reports may be made verbally, a written statement of complaint also must be provided.
- 2) Such alleged violations will be investigated by the City of Dover Human Resources Department as appropriate under the circumstances. Throughout the investigation process, confidentiality will be maintained to the extent practical and appropriate under the circumstances, including to protect the privacy of persons involved. During an investigation, alleged offenders will generally be made aware of the report and, where deemed appropriate, will be given an opportunity to respond and propose witnesses. The Department of Human Resources will keep the complainant informed as to the status of the investigation. Upon completion of the investigation, the Human Resources Director shall recommend to the City of Dover Manager the appropriate action to be taken, unless the report alleges violation by the City Manager, in which case the recommendation shall be made to the City of Dover Council President.
- 3) In the event an employee alleges a violation of this policy by the Human Resources Director, then a report of a violation of this policy may instead be made to the City Manager; and any investigation will be handled through the City Manager.
- 4) Employment conditions of the complainant and any witnesses will be in no way adversely affected through use of this procedure. However, if an investigation clearly reveals that the complainant knowingly and intentionally made a false accusation of harassment, appropriate disciplinary action will be taken.
- 5) If the alleged violation of this policy cannot be substantiated, this finding will be communicated to the complainant in an appropriately sensitive manner. The complainant is always free to provide additional evidence for investigation.
- 6) Persons found to have engaged in misconduct constituting a violation of this policy, will be disciplined, up to and including termination of employment. Appropriate sanctions also may include written reprimand and referral to counseling.

CITY OF DOVER
TRAINING, CONFERENCE & TRAVEL POLICY

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines under which City of Dover employees, public officials, and appointees will be reimbursed for authorized travel expenses incurred in the conduct of business for the City of Dover, hereinafter referred to as "City." In addition to the guidelines, specific procedures with regard to incurring and reporting related expenses are provided.

2. Scope

This policy shall apply to employees of the City of Dover, elected officials, boards, commissions and others, who are engaged in authorized travel and who expend City funds for travel purposes. The Mayor and Members of City Council are not required to submit a Travel Request & Itinerary or Travel Expense Report Form but are required to follow the financial and budget requirements of this policy.

While this policy does not cover every possible situation, it establishes adequate guidelines for employees and officials to make appropriate and consistent judgments regarding the expenditure of City funds for reimbursable expenses. The City of Dover will provide flexibility to meet the special needs and requirements of their employees during travel.

It remains the responsibility of city management to control and approve travel-related expenditures. The City Manager and Controller/Treasurer may impose more stringent rules when deemed appropriate or necessary.

The City Manager and Controller/Treasurer will review every three years the implementation of this Policy and will provide policy interpretations and assistance to ensure effective and efficient implementation. Any exceptions will be subject to approval by the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer. The City Manager and Controller/Treasurer may also, on a case-by case basis, approve reimbursements exceeding the guideline amounts referenced in this policy. In any such instance, a detailed explanation and substantiation (a receipt) is required. Enforcement of this policy will be the responsibility of the Controller/Treasurer.

3. Responsibility

- a. Employee, Public Official, or Appointee
 - Traveler should be made aware of and comply with all provisions of this policy.
 - Obtain the necessary approvals in advance for overnight travel and out-of-state use of City vehicles. Provide a copy of the approval with the travel prepayment made by direct voucher.

- All expenses incurred in the course of City business are to be in accordance with the City's Administrative Policies and Rules of Ethics and must be paid solely from appropriated funds.
 - Comply with the ten (10) working-day rule.
- b. Department Director/City Manager/Council Designee
- Ensure compliance with this policy.
 - Review and approve each of their employee's/official's travel approval requests and reimbursable expenses.
 - Ensure sufficient funds are available for all anticipated expenses.
- c. Signatures on the Travel Expense Report (City of Dover Form 030 Exhibit B) certify that the expenses were incurred by the employee/official requesting reimbursement for official City business, are reimbursable in accordance with this policy, and have not been reimbursed except as indicated on this form.

Required signatures for expenses are:

- Employee
- Department Director or Council Designee

B. TRAINING AND CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FEES

1. Request for payment of registration fees shall be accompanied by the registration form.
2. City Council, Planning Commission and the Mayor are offered opportunities to attend courses designed for governmental officials. Any member of Council wanting to take advantage of these courses offered by the following organizations will submit to the City Clerk's office their request for registration.
 - Delaware League of Local Governments
 - National League of Cities
 - US Conference of Mayors
 - International City Managers Association
 - Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA)
 - American Public Power Association (APPA)
 - American Public Works Association (APWA)
 - American Planning Association
 - Organizations that provide Continuing Education credits for professional license renewals of applicable staff.

Any courses not offered by these organizations will be submitted to the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer for concurrence.

C. TRAVEL AUTHORIZATION

All out-of-state travel that extends beyond one day shall be approved by the City Manager. All requests shall be made on the "Travel Request and Itinerary Estimate Form" (City of Dover - Form 047 Exhibit A). A copy of the conference or meeting program must be attached to the form. The form must be submitted to the City Manager at least 30 days prior to travel unless an explanation is given and approved.

The Department Director or City Manager may impose specific requirements as to the time the form must be submitted prior to travel. Employees and Officials traveling on official City business should be aware that the approval is for travel only, and is not a blanket approval of the expenses incurred.

A travel packet including the Travel Request and Itinerary Estimate form, the meeting program/itinerary, and the purchase order(s) if over \$5,000, for advanced costs must be submitted to the Accounts Payable Department for audit prior to being keyed by department for reimbursement. Once the travel audit has been completed, Accounts Payable will scan and email the authorized packet to the department responsible for processing the travel costs. The department admin will then process the reimbursement request for payment. The Purchase Orders for the advanced costs should include the necessary supporting documentation. It does not require the submission of duplicate information.

Please note: Purchase Orders (if required based on Purchasing Policy) for registration costs must include the Registration form. Submission for hotel and airfare costs must include documentation of the individual costs. Cancellation and changes to travel should be done in a timely manner to avoid loss of City money. If travel cannot be refunded back to City, an explanation is required.

D. TRANSPORTATION: COMMON CARRIER

1. General

All trips requiring the use of common carrier (airline, rail or bus) must be pre-approved by the appropriate approval authority.

The mode of travel must be justified on the basis of the most economical use of time of the personnel involved, the cost of optional travel modes, and the requirements of the trip.

All common carrier reservations must be consistent with reasonable business travel planning, common carrier will be booked at the lowest available fare. If the lowest available fare is turned down by the traveler, the traveler's explanation for the denial is to be provided with the travel authorization request.

Travelers should be advised to make travel reservations as far in advance as possible to attain the lowest fares, including non-refundable tickets. Travelers may not specify particular airlines or other carriers to accumulate mileage on promotional plans such as frequent flyer programs.

In order to take advantage of special discount rates (supersaver fares, etc.), reimbursement to an employee may be made prior to a trip being taken under the following conditions:

- a. Documentation of the substantial savings that will accrue to the City (e.g., supersaver discounts).
- b. Employee's proof of payment on a statement from the airline, other than credit card receipts.

Most airlines will not give refunds or partial refunds for supersaver airfares.

It is encouraged to examine the advantage of fares requiring early trip departure or delayed return. However, it is important to consider the additional cost of meals and lodging for the required extra day(s) stay when comparing cost.

2. Air Travel

- a. Accommodations - When commercial airlines are used as a mode of travel, accommodations shall be coach/economy class unless some other class accommodations are more economical. Costs of baggage should be considered along with accommodations to achieve the lowest total cost for travel.
- b. Routing of Travel - All travel will be by the most economical and direct routes.

In the event that a person travels by an indirect route for personal convenience, the extra expense shall be the responsibility of the individual. Reimbursement for expenses shall be based only on the cost of the most economical and direct route.

- c. Conference Airfare Arrangements

When attending a conference, always check conference materials to see if special airline discounts are offered. When a special airline discount rate is offered and conferees are instructed to go directly to an airline to obtain the discount fare, the employee should compare the conference rates through the internet with all other airline rates available before scheduling airline reservations. The employee should always book the lowest fare possible. (See Section F.3. for Conference Lodging Arrangements).

**City will not pay for, nor reimburse priority boarding, preferred seating, or overweight baggage for personal preference. Detailed explanation and receipt is required. **

3. Rail Travel

- a. Accommodations – When it has been determined that rail travel is the most appropriate mode of transportation, the most economical class accommodations shall be utilized.

E. TRANSPORTATION: PASSENGER VEHICLES

1. City-Owned Vehicles

City-owned vehicles should be utilized for both in-state and out-of-state travel when such use is the most practical and economical mode of transportation, including the cost of tolls, fuel and parking.

2. Use of Privately-Owned Vehicles

- a. The use of privately owned vehicles for any City travel (both in state and out-of-state) should only be used when a City Vehicle is not available. The use of a privately owned vehicle for City travel shall require the prior approval of the City Manager and Department Director. Reimbursement of private vehicle expenses shall be at the Council approved rate as indicated on Exhibit B for actual and necessary miles traveled. Beginning and ending odometer readings are required for the reimbursement for mileage or a printout from MapQuest, Google Maps or other reputable internet mapping application showing the quickest or shortest route.
- b. In considering approval for use of personal vehicles, the approval authority shall take into consideration the cost of alternative modes of travel and the cost of meals and lodging for the additional travel/transit days. Mileage reimbursements shall not exceed the cost of airfare plus travel to/from the airport.
- c. When two or more employees travel in a privately owned vehicle, only one mileage reimbursement will be allowed at times when one vehicle is sufficient to carry all passengers.

3. Rental Cars

- a. General

The use of a rental car when traveling out of state must be justified as an economical need and not as a matter of personal convenience. Prior approval by the Department Director and City Manager is required before arranging for car rental. All rentals should be at the most economical rate per day including government rates or special rate agreements. When traveling in groups, sharing of cars, when practical, must be done to minimize costs. The city will not pay for the use of a rental car to accommodate family members or non-business associates traveling with the employee, public official, or appointee.

b. Vehicle Size

Whenever possible, compact cars shall be rented or reserved. However, if a larger size vehicle is more economical or more than two city travelers are traveling together the larger vehicle may be appropriate. Any representative of the City requesting an upgrade of the size of a rented vehicle shall provide a written explanation of their reasons to the City Manager. **A receipt is always required.**

c. Insurance

- (1) The optional insurance coverage offered by the car rental agency must be declined when the traveler charges the rental car. The traveler will automatically receive primary coverage under the City blanket insurance policy for travel. When insurance is declined, the policy covers collision damage, theft, fire and vandalism. Reimbursements for additional or optional insurance coverage will not be allowed.
- (2) Other. Travelers not covered under the blanket insurance policy may be covered by their personal automobile insurance policy or other personal credit cards. Travelers should check their automobile policy and credit card policy for business travel coverage and accept or decline additional coverage accordingly. Reimbursement for additional or optional insurance coverage will not be allowed.

d. Refueling Before Return

To avoid a refueling surcharge, all rental cars shall be refueled before returning the vehicle to the rental company. Any surcharges billed to the employee, public official, appointee, or City shall be explained in the reimbursement request.

e. Reservations

Approved car rental reservations shall be made in advance whenever possible. The employee should compare car rental rates and always look to reserve the lowest rental.

F. PER DIEM EXPENSES

The City uses per diem expenses as set by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) for official travel within the United States. M&IE Rates can be found at: <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>.

G. LODGING

1. General

City travelers are expected to seek accommodations that are comfortable, convenient, meet business and personal needs and offer good value. Employees are expected to compare local lodging rates in the area prior to reserving lodging.

2. Accommodation

- a. Lodging accommodations for reasonably priced single occupancy rooms are reimbursable when the traveler is away from home overnight due to official travel.
- b. Accommodations shared with family members or others not on official City business are reimbursable at the single occupancy rate only.
- c. Accommodations shared with other City travelers should be billed and reimbursed to one traveler. When required, reimbursements to more than one traveler shall be based on a pro rata share as reported on each reimbursement request.

3. Conference Lodging Arrangements

When hotel rooms are blocked for a conference, seminar, etc., and a special discounted conference hotel rate provided, the employee/official should compare conference rates with the rates for other local hotels within a three (3) block radius of the conference. The employee is urged to reserve hotel accommodations that offer the best value to the City. This includes conference rate, government rate or lower rate, for the employee/official. If a lower rate is not available, the conferees should make their lodging arrangements directly utilizing the conference instructions. Conference lodging will be considered to accommodate persons with special circumstances.

4. Occupancy/Sales Tax

The City is exempt from the tax on occupancy of hotel, motel and tourist home rooms within Delaware only. When in-state overnight accommodations are necessary, the employee should be provided with a copy of the Occupancy Tax Exemption Certificate (see Exhibit C) to be presented to the lodging facility. Tax on occupancy of hotels in other states must be paid. Out of state hotels shall be asked about their sales tax exemption policies and the traveler shall provide documentation to avoid applicable sales taxes whenever possible.

H. MEAL ALLOWANCES

1. General

The City will pay for or reimburse an employee/official for the necessary and reasonable cost of meals and incidental expenses incurred during out of state travel requiring overnight lodging.

Additional meal costs incurred over and above those provided as part of a conference, lodging, or airfare fee are not reimbursable, unless justified as a special circumstance and approved by the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer (e.g. special meeting or diet restrictions). Exceptions are to be pre-approved by the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer.

There will not be any reimbursement for meals when the meals are provided as part of the conference/training or by the host organization and when meals are provided as part of the hotel service and/or airfare.

If an employee is traveling partial days on any calendar day, the City will prorate the applicable advanced M&IE rate based upon time and location of meal. "Breakfast per diem is paid for travel extending after midnight until 10 am. Lunch per diem will be paid for travel the extends after 10 am and until 3 pm. Dinner reimbursement is paid for travel extending after 3 pm of the final day of travel. Travel begins when you leave your home, office or the last location before you proceed to the travel destination or transportation center (e.g. airport, train station). This applies to both day of departure and day of return.

When meals are provided at the conference or by the host, the meal allowance will be reduced by 25% for each meal provided. Continental Breakfast provided by the hotel or at the conference is counted as a meal, unless justified as a special circumstance and approved by the City Manager and Controller/Treasurer (e.g. special meeting or diet restrictions).

2. Day Trips, In-state Travel and Before or After Hours

The meal allowance for day trips out of the City will be reimbursed at actual cost, as long as it does not exceed 25% of the normal per diem per the M&IE Allowance. The meal allowance for working before or after hours as a general rule are not encouraged, but may be approved by the City Manager and/or Controller/Treasurer on a case-by-case basis. At no time can the amount exceed the allowances established. A receipt is required.

I. CASH ADVANCES AND ADVANCE PAYMENT

General/Blanket travel advance checks may not be issued to employees, public officials, or appointees. Employees, public officials, and appointees will be reimbursed for specific travel related expenses after the trip or event has been completed.

Department Directors should use their City credit card for business travel. Directors may use their departmental travel credit card when arranging employee travel. Under urgent situations, and with prior approval, employees and officials can also use a personal credit card and request reimbursement when they return.

The City will pay specific travel and lodging costs in advance, as long as the request deadlines are met. Employees, public officials, and appointees shall use a City purchase order (if necessary) when requesting travel cost advances.

Please note: The same procedure for Travel Authorization, as identified in Part C (above) will be required, with the exception that the travel packet must be submitted to the Accounts Payable Department a minimum of 20 days prior to travel.

The City will pay in advance the following costs:

- a) **Conference/Training registration fees.** Such payment will be made payable directly to the organization. A copy of the registration form describing the specific event must be attached to the travel packet.
- b) **Airfare.** Airfare is normally reserved on-line through the internet and paid with a City credit card after travel approval has been received. (See City Credit Card Policy)
- c) **Lodging.** Upon receipt of the approved Travel Request and Itinerary Estimate Form, the department may submit a purchase order (if necessary) for lodging. The check will be made payable to the hotel and will be given to the person for whom the lodging arrangements are made. The department must provide supporting documentation including the daily lodging rates and applicable taxes along with the travel packet. Lodging reservations can be held with the use of a City credit card. (See City Credit Card Policy)
- d) **Meal allowance.** An advance for the M&IE Allowance, which includes meals, tax and tips expenses, will be permitted for meals not provided by the conference, lodging or airfare as indicated in Section H (1) above. Only per diem rates as set by the Federal Government for official travel will be provided for M&IE Allowance. No purchase order is required for employee travel advance if the amount is less than \$5,000.00. M&IE Rates can be found at: <http://www.gsa.gov/perdiem>

J. TRAVEL EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT

1. General

Travel Expense Report (City of Dover Form 30) is due to Accounts Payable for final audit within ten (10) working days after travel or an expense is incurred (Ten working-day rule). Travel Expense Reports will be scanned and emailed to the remitting department for entry. Paper copies will remain in Finance.

- a. Timely reimbursement can be assured only if an accurate, properly substantiated Travel Expense Report is received to Accounts Payable ten (10) working days after completion of the trip.
- b. Failure to submit timely Travel Expense Reports after the completion of a trip will result in administrative action, such as notification to the Department Director and denial of future travel requests.

Travel Expense Reports for local travel and related expenses are to be submitted monthly. **Explanation is required if over 30 days and approved by Controller/Treasurer and/or City Manager. Failure to file for reimbursement for travel/conference/training related expenses within the 30-day window may result in denial of the reimbursement request.**

Note: This section pertains to only those travel expenses paid by the traveler; not to travel expenses directly billed to/paid by the City.

2. Receipt Requirements and Other Reimbursement Criteria

- a. Tickets booked on common carriers (airline, rail or bus) require original copy of the paid invoice or email confirmation containing total travel costs for arrangements booked on-line.
- b. Hotel/motel bills shall be the original copy of hotel/motel billing marked paid.
- c. Ground transportation, including airport shuttle, taxi or public transit requires a receipt.
- d. Car rental reimbursements require paid invoice from the rental company.
- e. All meals will require itemized receipts and are not reimbursable above the maximum daily/partial day per meal allowance. **Tax and tips are included in the M&IE Allowance and will not be reimbursed separately.** When more than one City employee, public official, or appointee's meals are being reimbursed, each employee must submit a separate Travel Expense Reimbursement for their allowance. Any advance M&IE and allowances not accounted for in the expense report will be considered overpayment and shall be returned to the City. Reimbursement will be for the actual aggregate eligible expenses for the day of travel or the maximum per diem per day, whichever is the lesser amount.
- f. Hotel/motel related expenses should be documented identifying the date and the cost for each category with the following requirements:
 - (1) Out-of-pocket costs for incidental items such as tips, baggage handling and maid service are not individually reimbursable by the City of Dover. Costs included under this category are included in the M&IE per diem rate. Only per diem rates as prescribed by the Federal Government for official travel will be provided for M&IE allowance.
 - (2) City-business related telephone calls are reimbursable as incurred and require a receipt from the telephone service provider or included on the hotel/motel billing invoice.

- g. Lodging at campgrounds using traveler's camper or recreational vehicle is reimbursable at the actual cost, not to exceed the equivalent cost of hotel/motel lodging. Receipt is required.

- h. Other Reimbursement Categories

Reimbursement for the following categories should be submitted on a schedule identifying the date, the cost and the category. All supporting receipts must be attached:

- 1) The City will reimburse employees for hotel and airport self-parking. The City encourages all employees to seek 'economy and budget parking'.
 - 2) The City will not reimburse employees for Valet parking, unless prior approval has been granted by the City Manager and Controller.
 - 3) The City will reimburse employees the cost of tolls for interstates, turnpike, bridges and/or ferries. All travel expenses require a receipt.
 - 4) The City will reimburse employees for necessary airport baggage fee. A receipt is required.
- i. Gasoline and/or Other Supplies require a receipt.

Need for emergency repairs incidental to using a City-owned vehicle shall require a Vendor receipt.
 - j. Department Director pre-approval is required to receive reimbursement for Internet Access Costs for city business. These costs must be substantiated with receipts.
 - k. While traveling overnight out-of-state, the City will reimburse employees for the cost of up to two (2) personal telephone calls not to exceed \$8 per trip. A receipt is required for reimbursement.
 - l. Reimbursements for travel expenses incurred without required receipts, as outlined, is strictly prohibited. A "no receipt - no reimbursement" policy applies

*** Any advance M&IE and allowances not accounted for in the expense report will be considered overpayment and shall be returned to the City.**

3. Non- Reimbursable Expenses

The City shall not reimburse expenses for the following:

- a. Alcoholic beverages.
- b. In-room movies or pay television.
- c. Theater tickets or nightclub entertainment.
- d. Laundry.
- e. Babysitting.

- f. Related expenses of spouse, children and other persons accompanying the authorized employee or official.
- g. Pleasure, historic or other tour related expenses. Expenses for business related tours would be reimbursed.
- h. Donations and gifts made while at training, conference, or meeting.
- i. Loss or damage of personal items.
- j. Meals for other conference attendees.
- k. Purchase of personal items.
- l. Any parking or moving violation fines.
- m. Any personal or pleasure travel while on City business.

K. CHARTER AND CODE OF CONDUCT

All City of Dover policies are subject to the City of Dover Charter Part 1, Subpart A, Article II, Section 12 “Compensation and expenses - Mayor and Council and other elected or appointed officials”, whereas, “Members of the council, mayor and other elected or appointed officials shall receive reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred when on official business as prescribed by city ordinance or policy” and; Part II Code of Ordinances Chapter 2, Article 1, Division 4 “Code of Conduct”, which is “applicable to all elected and appointed officials and to all employees of the City of Dover.”

L. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE - DEFINITION OF PUBLIC OFFICIAL

Generally, if there is any provision in a public law which authorizes the employment of the individual, and the individual is hired or elected under this authority, the individual is considered an employee of the State or political subdivision to which the provision applies.

The following factors indicate that an office is a “public office.”

The office was created by the constitution or through legislation, or by a municipality or other body with authority conferred by the legislature.

The office was delegated a portion of the powers of the government body.

The powers conferred and the duties to be discharged are defined either directly or indirectly law or through legislative authority.

The duties are being performed independently and without control of a superior power other than the law.

The office has some permanency and continuity, and the officer takes an official oath.

Examples of public officers are: the president and vice president, a governor or mayor, the secretary of state, a member of a legislative body, such as a state legislature, county commission, city council, school board, a judge, a justice of the peace, and members of advisory boards and committees.

M. REVIEW & REVISION

The City of Dover Travel Policy will be reviewed every three years by the City Manager, Controller/Treasurer and City Clerk to provide recommended changes to City Council for approval.

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A - COD Travel Request and Itinerary Estimate Form (Form 47)

Exhibit B - COD Travel Expense Report Form (Form 30)

Exhibit C - COD Exemption Certificate Form 99A

REVISION RECORD

Revised: November 24, 2003

Revised: February 9, 2004

Revised: July 24, 2006

Revised: March 23, 2009

Revised: January 23, 2012

Revised: February 23, 2015

Revised: February 26, 2018

EXHIBIT A

CITY OF DOVER									
TRAVEL REQUEST AND ITINERARY ESTIMATE									
EMPLOYEE TRAVELING					REQUEST DATE				
BUSINESS PURPOSE									
DEPARTMENT					TRAVEL DESTINATION AND DATES				
ESTIMATE ITEMIZED EXPENSES AND TRAVEL ADVANCES									
NOTE: ITINERARY AND PROOF FOR ALL TRAVEL ADVANCE REQUESTS BELOW ARE REQUIRED PRIOR TO TRAVEL.									
* APPROVAL FOR SPECIAL REQUESTS ARE REQUIRED FROM FINANCE-CONTROLLER/TREASURER OR CITY MANAGER PRIOR TO TRIP *									
									ESTIMATED COST:
REGISTRATION FEE:		MEALS PROVIDED BY CONFERENCE MUST BE DEDUCTED FROM M & IE RATE							
MODE OF TRAVEL AND COSTS:									
AIRLINE		ONE WAY		ROUND TRIP				0.00	
AIRPORT PARKING		PER DAY		TOTAL DAYS				0.00	
TRAIN		ONE WAY		ROUND TRIP				0.00	
BUS		ONE WAY		ROUND TRIP				0.00	
* RENTAL CAR		ONE WAY		ROUND TRIP				0.00	
* PERSONAL CAR		TOTAL MILEAGE	0.40	PER MILE				0.00	
* TOLLS		ONE WAY		ROUND TRIP				0.00	
CITY VEHICLE		" IS ADVISE TO BE USED INSTEAD OF PERSONAL CAR"							
LODGING EXPENSES: BREAKFAST PROVIDED BY HOTEL MUST BE DEDUCTED FROM M & IE RATE									
HOTEL		PER NIGHT		TAXES		NUM OF NIGHTS		0.00	
* SHUTTLE		PER TRIP		TAXES		TOTAL TRIP		0.00	
* TAXI		PER TRIP		TAXES		TOTAL TRIP		0.00	
* PARKING		PER DAY		TAXES		TOTAL DAYS		0.00	
MEALS:	M & IE RATE: \$64.00 (MEALS & INCIDENTAL EXPENSES) SUBTRACT 25 % FOR EACH MEAL PROVIDED. SUBTRACT 75% FOR PARTIAL DAY OF TRAVEL.								
DATES:	SUN	MON	TUE	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT		
TOTAL	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
									\$0.00
									TOTAL EXPENSE
EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE					DATE				
DEPARTMENT HEAD APPROVAL					DATE				
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE APPROVAL					DATE				
CITY MANAGER OR COUNCIL DESIGNEE APPROVAL					DATE				

Form 047

EXHIBIT B

CITY OF DOVER
TRAVEL EXPENSE REPORT FORM

NAME OF EMPLOYEE	DEPARTMENT	TRIP TAKEN TO (CITY)
------------------	------------	----------------------

PURPOSE OF TRIP

Please attach receipts for hotels, tolls, transportation, etc., and show all costs on this form.

Please use a separate form for each week.

Please note incidental expenses (tips) are included in M & IE Rate.

EXPENSES	DATE	MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT	SUN	TOTAL
REGISTRATION FEES									\$ -
TRANSPORTATION - AIR/TRAIN/BUS									\$ -
PERSONAL AUTO									\$ -
Miles @ .40 cents a mile									
AUTO RENTAL									\$ -
PARKING FEES / TOLLS / GAS									\$ -
TAXI / SHUTTLE / PUBLIC TRANSIT									\$ -
HOTEL / MOTEL									\$ -
TELEPHONE									\$ -
BAGGAGE / MISC. EXPENSES									\$ -
MEALS (M & IE RATE)									\$ -
MEAL ALLOWANCE OVERAGE									\$ -
TOTALS		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

EMPLOYEE INCURRING EXPENSE	DATE	TOTAL EXPENSES INCURRED	\$ -
		LESS AMOUNT PAID BY CITY:	\$ -
DEPARTMENT HEAD SIGNATURE (For Certification)	DATE	REGISTRATION	
FINANCE DEPARTMENT - AUDIT	DATE	HOTEL	
FINANCE - FINAL ACTION	DATE	AIRFARE	
ACCOUNT NUMBER		MEALS	
		MISC:	
		REIMBURSEMENT AMOUNT DUE EMPLOYEE	
		AMOUNT DUE CITY	

EXHIBIT C

CITY OF DOVER
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCEEXEMPTION CERTIFICATE
TAX ON OCCUPANCY OF HOTEL AND MOTEL AND TOURIST HOME ROOMS

In accordance with Internal Revenue Code Section 5253(I), no tax shall be imposed under section 4251 upon any payment received for services or facilities furnished to the government of any State, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia.

This Part to be Completed by the Operator

Name of Hotel, Motel, or Tourist Home			Fed. EI or SS number
Address	City	State	Zip Code

This Part to be Completed by the Occupant

This is to certify that I, the undersigned, am a representative of the City of Dover, Delaware; that the charges for the occupancy at the above establishment on the dates set forth below has been or will be paid for by the City of Dover, a government unit; and that such charges are incurred in the performance of my official duties as a representative or employee of the governmental unit.

Name (Please type or print)		Signature	
City of Dover	51-6000092		
Governmental Unit	Tax I.D. #	Title	
P.O. Box 475	Dover	DE	19903-0475
Address	City	State	Zip Code
Date(s) of Occupancy _____			

If additional information is needed, please contact the City of Dover Finance Director at (302) 736-7018.

NOTE: A separate Exemption Certificate is required for each occupancy and for each representative or employee.

THIS EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE IS TO BE RETAINED BY THE OPERATORS OF HOTELS, MOTELS, AND TOURIST HOMES AS EVIDENCE OF EXEMPT OCCUPANCY.