



SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

AGENDAS & MINUTES

SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL - GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE, OCTOBER 25, 2011

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Sussex County Council was held on Tuesday, October 25, 2011, at 10:00 a.m., in the Council Chambers, Sussex County Administrative Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware, with the following present:

Michael H. Vincent	President
Samuel R. Wilson, Jr.	Vice President
George B. Cole	Councilman
Joan R. Deaver	Councilwoman
David Baker	County Administrator
Todd F. Lawson	County Administrator Appointee
Susan M. Webb	Finance Director
Everett Moore	County Attorney

The Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance were led by Mr. Vincent.

Call to
Order

Mr. Vincent called the meeting to order.

Request
to Amend
Agenda

Mr. Baker announced that the Agenda was previously amended to reflect that the scheduled Public Hearing regarding Councilmanic Election Districts would be held at 10:30 A.M.; initially, the time of the Public Hearing was listed on the Agenda as 10:30 P.M. Mr. Baker reported that the Public Hearing was advertised correctly and listed on the County's website correctly.

Mr. Moore stated that, although there was a typographical error on the Agenda, the required advertisements were correct, the notice on the website was correct, and the item was listed on the Agenda providing notice that the matter would be discussed on this date. Mr. Moore stated that the Agenda was corrected on the posted Agenda and on the County's website as soon as the error was discovered. Mr. Moore suggested that the Council may wish to leave the record open for a few days in the event there was any question about the time.

M 577 11
Amend
and

A Motion was made by Mrs. Deaver, seconded by Mr. Wilson, to amend the Agenda by deleting "Fine Bar Screen for South Coastal Regional Wastewater Facility" under Michael Izzo, County Engineer; by deleting

Approve Agenda **“Executive Session - Job Applicants’ Qualifications, Personnel, Pending/Potential Litigation, and Land Acquisition pursuant to 29 Del.C. §10004(b)”;** and by deleting **“Possible Action on Executive Session Items”;** and to approve the Agenda, as amended.

Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.

M 577 11 (continued) **Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea; Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea; Mr. Vincent, Yea**

Minutes **The minutes of October 18, 2011 were approved by consent.**

**Corre-
spondence** **Mr. Moore read the following correspondence:**

REHOBOTH HISTORICAL SOCIETY MUSEUM, REHOBOTH BEACH, DELAWARE.

RE: Letter asking the Council to renew its support of the Rehoboth Beach Historical Society.

SUSSEX COUNTY FOSTER PARENT ASSOCIATION, GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE.

RE: Letter in appreciation of grant.

2012 Proposed Holiday Schedule **Mr. Baker reviewed the proposed 2012 Holiday Schedule:**

<u>Holiday</u>	<u>State Observance</u>	<u>County Observance</u>
New Year's Day	January 2 (Monday)	January 2 (Monday)
Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday	January 16 (Monday)	January 16 (Monday)
Presidents Day	-----	February 20 (Monday)
Good Friday	April 6 (Friday)	April 6 (Friday)
Memorial Day	May 28 (Monday)	May 28 (Monday)
Independence Day	July 4 (Wednesday)	July 4 (Wednesday)
Labor Day	September 3 (Monday)	September 3 (Monday)
Columbus Day	-----	October 8 (Monday)
Election Day	November 6 (Tuesday)	November 6 (Tuesday)
Return Day	November 8 (Thursday) (after 12:00 Noon)	November 8 (Thursday)
Veterans Day	November 12 (Monday)	November 12 (Monday)
Thanksgiving Day	November 22 (Thursday)	November 22 (Thursday)
Day After Thanksgiving	November 23 (Friday)	November 23 (Friday)
Christmas	----- December 25 (Tuesday)	December 24 (Monday) December 25 (Tuesday)

Mr. Baker noted that (1) the State of Delaware grants 2 floating holidays (in place of Columbus Day and Presidents Day) to eligible employees per calendar year, (2) the State has a 1/2 day off on Return Day, and (3) the Governor historically grants Christmas Eve as a day off.

Mr. Vincent asked for the Council's comments on providing two floating holidays in lieu of County-wide holidays on Columbus Day and Presidents Day. Mr. Vincent asked the Council to consider the proposal for further consideration on November 1st.

2012
Proposed
Holiday
Schedule
(continued)

Mr. Baker presented the County Council (No Meeting) Schedule:

March 6	NACo Conference
March 13	Winter Holiday
April 10	Easter Holiday
May 29	Memorial Day Holiday
July 3	Summer Holiday
July 10	Summer Holiday
August 28	Summer Holiday
September 4	Summer Holiday
November 20	Thanksgiving Holiday
December 25	Christmas Holiday

Mr. Vincent asked that the Councilmembers to review the proposed schedule for further consideration on November 1st.

The Council discussed cancelling meetings when there are not enough items to warrant holding the meeting.

It was decided that, when scheduling zoning hearings in the future, when only one application is to be scheduled, the Public Hearing would be held during the morning session.

Mrs. Deaver stated that she does not support not holding a meeting due to a light agenda as there may be constituents who wish to speak to the Council.

Sea
Watch
Inter-
national
Economic
Develop-
ment
Incentives

Mr. Baker reported on a proposal from Sea Watch International located in Milford. Sea Watch currently employs approximately 325 employees including 80 employees who were added last March; their primary business is to process clams. Sea Watch is the largest clam producer in the world and they obtain their clams from the Mid-Atlantic Region. They operate two other processing facilities – one in New Bedford, Massachusetts and one in Easton, Maryland.

Mr. Baker reported that Sea Watch is considering an expansion of their Milford facility and they are considering expanding in Milford or at a Virginia location. The City of Milford and Delaware Economic Development offices have also been contacted and are offering some incentives to Sea Watch to expand their Milford facility. Mr. Baker stated

**Sea
Watch
Inter-
national
Economic
Develop-
ment
Incentives
(continued)**

that, with the expansion, they would further diversify which would help them in the future; they would add soup products such as tomato soup, chicken noodle soup and vegetable soup to their product line. It is hoped that they would use Sussex County products which would benefit Sussex County agriculture. Expansion of the Milford facility would bring an estimated 50-60 new jobs at an average of \$10 per hour and some administrative staff at a higher salary. Sea Watch is planning on investing \$600,000 to expand their buildings and \$1.9 million for equipment (if they stay in Milford). Sea Watch wants to make a decision on the location by November 1st.

Richard Carmean of the City of Milford was in attendance and he explained the offer that the City has made to Sea Watch which includes the following: a property tax exemption on new construction, an impact fee exemption, an electric rate rebate, and a water and sewer rebate. The total value of the incentives is \$133,043.00.

Mr. Baker reviewed possible incentives that the County could offer subject to a maximum of \$800 per new job (based on 50 jobs), including: property tax (County and school) abatement on new construction, waive building permit fee, funding from the Economic Development Fund, or a reduction in an Industrial Revenue Bond or Economic Development loan.

Mr. Baker asked if the Councilmembers are interested in offering incentives to Sea Watch. Mr. Baker stated that, with the Council's approval, County staff would present options to Sea Watch after which Mr. Baker and Mr. Lawson would report back to the Council with final numbers, assuming Sea Watch decides to expand in Milford.

Mr. Baker noted that the Delaware Economic Development Office has also indicated that they will be offering something to Sea Watch.

It was the consensus of the Council to offer economic development incentives to Sea Watch International.

**Public
Hearing/
Council-
manic
Election
Districts**

A Public Hearing was held on the Proposed Ordinance entitled "AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL ORDINANCE NO. 1548 RELATING TO COUNCILMANIC ELECTION DISTRICTS AND ADOPTING COUNCILMANIC ELECTION DISTRICTS".

Mr. Moore presented a Redistricting Report (by power point presentation) including draft maps for Sussex County Council's five districts.

Mr. Moore advised that, by law, the County must adjust its Council districts, a process known as redistricting, following each decennial census to equally distribute the population among the five County Council districts. Based on the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 population results for Delaware, Sussex County's population increased near 26 percent between 2000 and 2010, from 156,638 residents to 197,145 residents. Redistricting is required every 10

Public
Hearing/
Council-
manic
Election
Districts
(continued)

years following each census to equally redistribute population among Council districts. Given 2010 census figures, each Council district must be within plus or minus 5 percent of an ideal population of 39,429 residents, containing no fewer than 37,458 residents and no more than 41,401 residents. Two of the five current Council districts are outside the bounds of the acceptable deviation, based on 2010 census figures. District 1 is below the deviation, thus creating the need to expand its geographical boundaries. District 3 is above the deviation, thus creating the need to contract its geographical boundaries. Neither district is adjoining, requiring a minimum of three districts to be altered to put all five districts within the acceptable deviation.

Mr. Moore presented details on each district:

District 1 – because of population changes, District 1 had to expand to capture more residents; only options to shift boundaries were to the north and east – shifting to the south would have placed two Council members within the same district, in conflict with a stated goal; most significant change is the movement of Bridgeville from District 2 to District 1; District is wholly contained in western Sussex, and includes Laurel, Seaford and Bridgeville.

District 2 – District 2 had to move east – a shift of District 1 boundaries to capture the Bridgeville area caused a loss of population for District 2 – to be within the acceptable deviation, District 3 had to lose population – District 2 could capture residents to compensate for losses to District 1; District shifted to east of US 113, and encompasses portions of southern Milford area; district was already east of US 113 in Georgetown area; the first of four districts with more than 50 percent of its population east of US 113 – 56 percent of population, based on 2010 census, lives east of US 113.

District 3 – Because of a population increase, District 3 had to contract; changes proposed are in keeping with stated goal of making as few changes as possible; with geographic limitations to the east, changes were achievable in northern part of the district, namely in Milford area; the first of two district with 100 percent of its population east of US 113; the second of four districts with more than 50 percent of its population east of US 113.

District 4 – District 4 was already within the mandated deviation and thus required no changes; the second of two districts with 100 percent of its population east of US 113; the third of four districts with more than 50 percent of its population east of US 113.

District 5 – District 5 was already within the mandated deviation and thus required no changes (other than slight adjustments warranted by new House and Senate overlay lines); the fourth of four districts with more than 50 percent of its population east of US 113 – 54 percent of population, based on 2010 census, lives east of US 113.

Mr. Moore explained the goals of the redistricting process: impartial process managed by legal, consulting staff; change Council districts as little as

possible; do not undo what voters have chosen; avoid placing current Council members within the same district; keep together ‘communities of interest’; look at both current and historical trends and data; ensure increases in population match increases in representation (in this case, areas east of U.S. Route 113).

Public
Hearing/
Council-
manic
Election
Districts
(continued)

Mr. Moore presented highlights of the proposal: because of population changes, two of five districts were outside of deviation; proposed maps avoid any two current Council members from being contained within the same district; for the first time in history, four of five Council districts have a majority of their constituents east of US 113; three Council members would continue to represent areas along the Atlantic coastline (Districts 3, 4 and 5) and one Council member (District 3) would represent areas along the Delaware Bay coastline; and no municipalities have been divided.

Richard Carter, who worked on this proposal with Mr. Moore, was in attendance and responded to a question raised by Councilwoman Deaver. He stated that there were no changes in Districts 1 and 5 and there were no changes in the line in the Laurel area.

Public comments were heard.

Jo Klinge of Rehoboth spoke on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Sussex County. She read the League’s statement into the record:

“The League of Women Voters commends the County for providing the opportunity for public input in the 2011 redistricting process - for the first time in history. This is a significant step in the right direction.

Our disappointment comes in the missed opportunity to reflect communities of interest in this process that occurs only once every 10 years. There are an infinite number of ways to draw lines in any redistricting process. What is critical is to identify, in advance, the criteria - or “goals” – to be used in judging the most appropriate maps. The League undertook a major study of redistricting principles and practices beginning in late 2010. Following background research, the first step in that process was to develop criteria that supplemented the legal requirements. It took five drafts before we were satisfied that our criteria were appropriate. The most important of those criteria was that of recognizing “communities of interest”.

Communities of interest comprise groups of people living in an area that have similar interests. Similar interests are especially important to prevent fracturing groups across districts in a manner that dilutes their voting strength. Communities of interest can be based on race or ethnicity, age, or on other factors such as rural/farm related or manufactured home communities. They may be based on social and economic interests such as media markets, culture, or jobs.

The concept of communities of interest is widely used throughout democratic nations and is highly regarded by judges in any litigation over redistricting plans.

Public
Hearing/
Council-
manic
Election
Districts
(continued)

The League then made presentations on the redistricting process in three public forums and 9 additional civic groups and sought suggestions for perceived communities of interest at each forum. We then developed 12 variations of maps and recommended one that protected all the communities of interest identified in our meetings with members of the public. It also left each incumbent Council member in a separate district.

The concept of communities of interest appeared to be considered as possible input, though not by name, by Mr. Moore in his presentation of the proposed process at the June 28 Council meeting. However, the recommended map and report presented to Council on August 9 seemed to equate this concept with municipalities. We were pleased that the proposed map does protect municipal boundaries. However, municipal boundaries are not the same as communities of interest. The proposed map was based on different criteria, with different results than the League's recommended map. The key criteria used in developing the map proposed by Mr. Moore included:

- “Change council districts as little as possible”,
- “Do not ‘undo’ what voters have chosen”, and
- “Avoid placing current Council members within the same district.”

The proposed map does protect the Long Neck community and the Georgetown area and does not split any municipalities. But, by changing districts as little as possible, the map ignored such significant communities of interest as the Cape Region and the “Quiet Resorts.” Instead, it retained District 5 that spreads from the beach communities – South Bethany south to Fenwick Island and west to the Maryland line. It split the Cape Region so that the Lewes area remains in one district while the rest of the Cape Region – Rehoboth and Dewey Beach down to Bethany Beach remain in a separate district – further separating Bethany Beach from South Bethany.

We believe Council should have compared the map developed by the League of Women Voters with that presented by Mr. Moore and choose the one that best reflects communities of interest. The League map does change current Council Districts more than Mr. Moore's map that was drawn to protect incumbents in 2001, most of whom are no longer on Council. But our map did place each incumbent Council member in a separate district.

As a separate issue, it is unclear how the goals/criteria of the proposed map were developed and adopted. These goals were the most critical aspect of the entire process. They determined the outcome. They deserved to be discussed fully in a public Council meeting. We believe they were never discussed in public. If more than two Council members had any input into

these goals, the Delaware Freedom of Information Act would require that they be discussed in public.”

There were no additional public comments.

Mr. Vincent announced that the Public Hearing was closed and the public comment period will be open until Noon on Friday, October 28th, at which time all comments are to be “in hand”.

Public
Hearing/
Council-
manic
Election
Districts
(continued)

It was announced that public comments can be submitted by email, regular mail, or by fax:

- 1- by email to Redistricting@sussexcountyde.gov
- 2- by regular mail to Clerk of Council, P. O. Box 589, Georgetown, DE 19947
- 3- by fax to 302-855-7749

Mrs. Deaver stated that it is shame that the Ellendale district, a community of interest, had to be divided since it will cause confusion.

Economic
Develop-
ment
Incentives

Mr. Baker presented possible options for economic development incentives; this proposal could be used as a guideline for the future. The County’s goal would be to provide some supplemental incentives for businesses on a case-by-case basis, based on new employment. The intent would be to base this incentive primarily on new revenues generated by the business. This would be subject to review by a committee and subsequent County Council approval, again on a case-by-case basis. An applicant would provide at least ten new full-time positions with benefits. A claw back recovery provision and discontinuance of incentives would occur if the company falls below job number expectations. The proposal would be subject to availability of County funds. Incentives could be based on the additional property tax generated by the new business for the County and partially for schools. Also, it could be based on reductions in building permits, Building Code, zoning, and possible other fees that the County generally charges. As a last resort, the proposal includes use of funds from the Economic Development Fund.

Mr. Baker stated that the goal of the economic incentive options is to provide supplemental economic incentives for businesses based on new employment in the County. Mr. Baker reviewed the proposed incentive options:

1. Provide a County incentive primarily based on new revenues generated by the business.
2. Maximum amount of \$800 per new full-time, with benefit, positions.
3. Possible conditions:

**Economic
Develop-
ment
Incentives
(continued)**

- a. **Subject to committee review and County Council approval on a case-by-case basis**
 - b. **Company must provide at least ten new full-time positions with benefits to qualify**
 - c. **Contingent on review of company financial plan, history, and benefit to Sussex County; does not apply to non-profit organizations**
 - d. **Incentives would be discontinued if company falls below job number expectations or fails to meet required objectives**
 - e. **Claw back recovery provision if they do not meet job numbers during first three years**
 - f. **Complete project within one year of building permit issuance**
 - g. **Subject to availability of County funds**
- 4. Incentives could include the following, subject to a maximum of \$800 per new job.**
- a. **County portion of property tax on new construction or renovations for a maximum of ten years.**
 - b. **School district match of County property tax abatement, subject to approval of the school district**
 - c. **Building permit fee reduction**
 - d. **Building Code fee reduction**
 - e. **Zoning fees reduction**
 - f. **Sewer connection fees – possible reduction to treatment portion of connection fee**
 - g. **Industrial Revenue Bond fees reduction**
 - h. **County economic development loan low interest rate – 1 %**
 - i. **Economic Development Fund**

Mr. Baker stated that the goal of this proposal would be to supplement other programs, especially by the State of Delaware, which is expected to provide greater incentives due to the income tax base for the State.

Mr. Vincent asked the Councilmembers to review the proposal and to submit comments to Mr. Baker or Mr. Lawson. The matter will be placed back on the Agenda in one to two weeks.

**Proposed
Selection of
Underwriter
Services**

Mrs. Webb reported that, on October 17th, the County received 13 proposals from investment banking firms to provide underwriting services to the County. Public Advisory Consultants reviewed and evaluated each of the proposals to determine which of the firms would provide the lowest cost of financing to the County. Mrs. Webb stated that they are recommending to the County to select Wells Fargo Securities as the senior manager for the

for Anticipated Bond Refunding	<p>upcoming refunding bonds. Wells Fargo proposed the lowest fees and a competitive interest rate indication. Wells Fargo is a large national firm who can sell bonds to both large investors and local retail customers. Mrs. Webb stated that they are also recommending hiring M&T Securities and RBC Capital Markets as co-managers as these two firms would complement Wells Fargo and bring additional retail capability to the transaction in their ability to reach Delaware and, in particular, Sussex County residents.</p> <p>Lester Guthorn, Managing Director of Public Advisory Consultants, stated that the RFP process was open and competitive and that Wells Fargo's proposal was substantially lower than the other bidders. Mr. Guthorn stated that local participation will be given preference over another bond sale; Sussex County residents who wish to acquire bonds will be given first priority and State of Delaware residents who wish to acquire bonds will be given second priority.</p>
Proposed Selection of Underwriter Services (continued)	
M 578 11 Hire Firm (Under- writer Services) for Anticipated Bond Refunding	<p>A Motion was made by Mrs. Deaver, seconded by Mr. Cole, that the Sussex County Council hire Wells Fargo Securities as the Senior Manager for the upcoming bond refunding and also hire M&T Securities and RBC Capital Markets as co-managers.</p> <p>Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.</p> <p>Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea; Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea; Mr. Vincent, Yea</p>
Wastewater Agreement	<p>Hal Godwin, Deputy County Administrator, presented a Wastewater Agreement for the Council's consideration.</p>
M 579 11 Approve Wastewater Agreement/ The Reserves at North Bethany	<p>A Motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mrs. Deaver, based upon the recommendation of the Sussex County Engineering Department, for Sussex County Project No. 81-04, Agreement No. 712, that the Sussex County Council execute a Construction Administration and Construction Inspection Agreement between Sussex County Council and The Reserves at North Bethany, LLC, for wastewater facilities to be constructed in The Reserves at North Bethany, LLC, located in the North Bethany Expansion of the Bethany Beach Sanitary Sewer District.</p> <p>Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.</p> <p>Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea; Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea; Mr. Vincent, Yea</p>
Mapping and Addressing	<p>Mr. Cole raised questions regarding addressing and asked that representatives of the Mapping and Addressing Department provide an update and answer questions during a future Council meeting.</p> <p>Robert Schoonover, Division Manager, Technical Services, Emergency</p>

**Lease
Renewal/
Paramedic
Station**

Medical Services, presented a request to renew a Lease Agreement between the Mid Sussex Rescue Squad, Inc. and Sussex County for Paramedic Station 106. The lease has been in effect since 2003; the current rental amount is \$1,400 per month including utilities. There are no proposed changes to the Lease Agreement. Mr. Schoonover noted that this will be the last lease renewal as Mid-Sussex has asked the County to find a new location.

**M 580 11
Approve
Lease
Renewal/
Paramedic
Station**

A Motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mr. Wilson, that the Sussex County Council approves a Lease Agreement (that contains no changes) to Paramedic Station 106 between Sussex County Council and Mid-Sussex Rescue Squad, Inc. for a period of one year, from November 1, 2011 through October 31, 2012, as per the terms and conditions of the Lease and Memorandum of Agreement.

**M 580 11
(continued)**

Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.

**Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea**

**Request to
Prepare
and Post
Notices/
Concord
Road
Expansion
of the
Blades
SSD**

John Ashman, Director of Utility Planning, presented a request to prepare and post notices for the expansion of the Blades Sanitary Sewer District to include thirty-seven (37) parcels more or less; the expansion will consist of +/- 55.5 acres. The parcels are located primarily along County Road 20 (Concord Road) and are contiguous to the existing district. The primary reason for this request is that the Town of Blades has identified the area along Concord Road for consideration of annexation into the town. They are proposing to annex the area into the town and to provide water service to this area. They have requested that the County consider a concurrent project that would provide sewer service as well. The parcel will be responsible for system connection charges of \$3,162.00 per EDU based on rates from July 1, 2011 until June 30, 2012.

**M 581 11
Authorize
Posting of
Notices/
Concord
Road
Expansion
of the
Blades SSD**

A Motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mr. Wilson, that the Sussex County Engineering Department is authorized to prepare and post notices for the extension of the Blades Sanitary Sewer District boundary to include parcels along Concord Road, as presented.

Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.

**Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea**

**Grant
Requests**

Mrs. Webb presented grant requests for the Council's consideration.

Deferred

Action was deferred on the request from Feral Friends of Millsboro.

Harvey Bullock was in attendance to present the request from Sussex

- Presen-
tation** **Technical High School Music Department.**
- M 582 11**
Community
Grant **A Motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mrs. Deaver, to give \$4,500.00 (\$1,000.00 from Councilwoman Deaver's, Councilman Phillips', Councilman Vincent's, and Councilman Wilson's Community Grant Accounts and \$500.00 from Councilman Cole's Community Grant Account) to Ravens Music Boosters, Inc. for trip expenses.**
Motion Adopted: 3 Yeas, 1 Nay, 1 Absent.
- M 582 11**
(continued) **Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;**
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Nay;
Mr. Vincent, Yea
- M 583 11**
Community
Grant **A Motion was made by Mrs. Deaver, seconded by Mr. Cole, to give \$1,500.00 from Mrs. Deaver's Community Grant Account to Milton CatSnippers for their spay/neuter program.**
Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.
Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea
- M 584 11**
Community
Grant **A Motion was made by Mrs. Deaver, seconded by Mr. Cole, to give \$250.00 (\$50.00 from each Community Grant Account) to CHEER for the 2011 Deck the Halls wreath sponsorship.**
Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.
Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea
- M 585 11**
Community
Grant **A Motion was made by Mr. Cole, seconded by Mrs. Deaver, to give \$500.00 from Mr. Phillips' Community Grant Account to the Fenwick Island Lions Club for the Selbyville Halloween Parade.**
Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.
Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;
Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea
- M 586 11**
Adjourn **A Motion was made by Mrs. Deaver, seconded by Mr. Cole, to adjourn at 11:35 a.m.**
Motion Adopted: 4 Yeas, 1 Absent.
Vote by Roll Call: Mrs. Deaver, Yea; Mr. Cole, Yea;

**Mr. Phillips, Absent; Mr. Wilson, Yea;
Mr. Vincent, Yea**

Respectfully submitted,

**Robin A. Griffith
Clerk of the Council**