

Q & A

The following are questions posed during the Public Comments portion of City Council meetings. The responses were provided by Assistant City Administrator Loré Chambers.

JANUARY 14, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Why is multi-family recycling not being enforced by departments (i.e., do inspectors check to see if recycling is being offered)?

Answer: The Director of the Department of Public Works is looking into alternative means of enforcing the recycling ordinance. Up to this point, it was our understanding that the companies that provide waste hauling services have not been willing to provide recycling services.

Question: What is the status of electric inspections – is issue dead or will it come back for discussion?

Answer: The electrical inspection program is still under consideration. The City Council will be updated on this matter over the next several months.

FEBRUARY 11, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Who was the “other attorney” noted in the audit and what work was performed?

Answer: We were unable to determine what “other attorney” you are referring to in the audit. Please provide us with the page number, in the audit report, where we may locate this reference in order that we may provide you with a complete answer.

Question: Why do we continue to annex when studies show that residential development does not pay for itself?

Answer: The entire Delmarva Peninsula continues to grow. The Smart Growth policies of the State of Maryland require that growth be directed toward defined areas. In Wicomico County the cities and towns each have designated growth areas. Salisbury’s annexations have, without exception, taken place within the appropriate County designated areas.

Question: If the City continues to annex, will the WWTP have to be enlarged again?

Answer: The Wastewater Treatment Plant as well as the water delivery system are constraints to development. Future demand may require an increase in service capacity. If capacity is not available, additional development will not occur.

Question: Is there a plan that includes a stopping point:

Answer: As part of the update to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, a “Municipal Growth Element” will be required. This will be based in part upon the findings of the Water Resources Element and Development Capacity Analysis of the City. There will be quantifiable estimates of facilities constraints based upon long-term growth assumptions.

Question: Does the Office of Legislative Audits send letters to cities cited in their annual reports (i.e., Salisbury – cash deposits not fully collateralized or otherwise insured)?

Answer: The City of Salisbury does receive letters from the Legislative Auditors (and they have been provided to the City Council) with comments from the State. However, the letters do not mention the cash deposits not fully collateralized.

Question: Does Pam Oland’s department have enough help or not and why not go into surplus if help is needed?

Answer: The need for additional staff has been identified and requested. The City Council has devised a strategy to provide additional assistance to the Internal Services Department through the services of consultants. However, additional staff has not been approved at this time.

Question: Of the \$10+ million noted in the audit, how much was it off when it was reconciled?

Answer: The Finance Department staff was aware of the accounts that contained the \$10 million and knew what the balances were and what had been spent. Thus, it was just a matter of posting the amounts to the general ledger and/or creating reconciliation. There was no unknown portion to the account and the account was not “off” when it was reconciled.

FEBRUARY 25, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: How does the city expect to get from \$1.7 million or \$1.8 million to \$6 million in impact fees within the next 5 years without a huge increase in fee?

Answer: Cash flow from capacity fees is based on an assumption that capacity fees will be paid on water capacity 24,000 EDUs over a ten year period. The sewer capacity fee is based on 13,600 EDUs over a ten year period.

Further Clarification: The estimate for water and sewer capacity fees that would be collected over the five year period covered by the latest CIP was based on the approved development projects in the City that are estimated to be completed over this period and the EDUs that they represent. We have estimated approximately 245 EDUs being added to the water and sewer system over this period. At \$6,535 per EDU, we estimate to have \$1.6 million available each year in capacity fees. This estimate may prove to be conservative since the City has been averaging issuing 383 in residential EDUs alone over the past 10 years. In addition, as you are aware, we are proposing a policy that would allow the issuance of up to 400 EDUs per year.

Question: How did the dollar amount in contributions/donations increase from what was presented at a work session as compared to the new number of \$5 or \$6 million?

Answer: Contributions and donations increased primarily by adding capacity fees that would be used to pay for specific projects on a cash basis (as opposed to being bonded) to this funding category.

Question: Audit – are all the accounts now insured/collateralized?

Answer: The Director of Internal Services has contacted the City’s bank and requested that all accounts exceeding the insured threshold be collateralized. She is awaiting confirmation from the bank that this has been accomplished.

Question: Isabella Street Streetscape – How will the fire trucks be able to get through without zigging and zagging if the bridge was up and the Outten Brothers building was on fire?

Answer: The City of Salisbury has three fire stations, Station 2 on Naylor and Brown Streets, Station 1 on Beaglin Park Drive and Station 16 to be relocated to Cypress Street. In the event of a fire at the Outten Brothers building, located on Rt. 13, Station 1, which is 4 blocks away, will more likely be the first responder. If Station 16 personnel are required, they can take Isabella to Mill Street, to Rt. 50 to Rt. 13, if the streetscape layout poses a concern.

MARCH 10, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Why was \$200,000 needed for add-ons for the new ladder truck?

Answer: The \$200,000 that the volunteer corporation is funding is not for “add-ons”. These funds are for the purchase of new tools and equipment for the apparatus. The old tools and equipment are as old and dated as the truck itself. There is a serviceable life on the tools as well as the apparatus. Updated tools and equipment utilizing new technologies and advancements are the purpose of this expenditure of funds.

Question: What type of mileage and what type of calls do ladder trucks respond to?

Answer: The mileage on fire apparatus is typically low when compared to over the road vehicles. The use of the apparatus is calculated as hours of service, which measures the total run time of the unit to include time spent on the scene in operations. The mileage for this unit is 37,949. This type of unit responds to all structure fires and events that require the use of ladders.

Question: Does the City or the volunteers own the Station #16 building?

Answer: The City is currently conducting a title search of Station #16.

APRIL 14, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Was the Enterprise Zone application for 213 E. Main Street a last minute thing? Was this brought before the council just recently? Have you had time to review this Enterprise Zone designation request?

Answer: Applicants that request designation under this program are provided with the required documents to complete. Completed applications are presented to the City Council at the next available Council meeting. The final assessment, completed by the State Department of Assessment and Taxation, establishes the tax implication for the City of Salisbury.

Question: Where is the \$14+ million that the City approved for the TIF that was supposed to pay for development of the old mall? Where is that money going? Who has that \$14 million? Who is going to pay the \$14 million back if we don't have a development on that property? Who's supposed to pay for the TIF? All the tax revenue from the commercial and the residential buildings there was supposed to pay for the TIF over a 30-year period. When does that TIF come due? When do the payments stop? Have they already started? Where is the money coming from, where is the TIF money right now, who has that \$14 million and how is it going to be paid back if the development doesn't go through?

Answer: The bonds were issued as combined tax increment financing/special taxing district bonds. The purpose of the bond issuance is to provide funds to pay for specific public improvements for the (old mall) site that are in the nature of infrastructure improvements; bond proceeds will not be applied to fund private development activities.

The bonds were issued in April 2007 in the form of draw-down bonds and sold to Salisbury Mall Associates, LLC (SMA) as the initial bond holder. While the bonds are in draw-down mode, SMA will actually transfer to the bond trustee from SMA's own funds any "draws" on the bonds; the bond trustee will place such moneys in the project fund and then apply the moneys to project costs in accordance with requisitions approved by City officials. Other than the costs of issuance and an initial deposit to the administrative expense fund drawn down on the date the bonds were issued, no funds have been advanced against the bonds, to date. SMA, as the holder of the bonds advanced those funds at closing. Before additional draws may be made on the bonds (which will be advanced by SMA), the City's bond counsel will have to approve the contracts for the specific infrastructure improvements or specific project costs.

No interest is due on the bonds until July 1, 2012, or any earlier conversion date, and the first date that principal is due on the bonds is July 1, 2013. SMA has until July 1, 2012 to effect a successful conversion and remarketing of the bonds to private investors. If SMA is able to effect such a successful conversion, the funds received from private investors to purchase the bonds from SMA will be deposited with the bond trustee and applied to pay costs of the conversion and remarketing, to fund a debt service reserve fund, to pay capitalized interest on the bonds (if the public improvements have not been completed) and to fund project costs. SMA is responsible for paying any such costs in excess of those covered by the conversion and remarketing proceeds.

Please be advised that the developer paid for the demolition of the old mall building and site cleanup and no funds were utilized from the special obligation bonds for those activities. Also,

current legal considerations, between the developer and the builder, have no bearing on the special obligation bonds and the repayment thereof.

Money to pay debt service on the bonds will be generated through future incremental ad valorem real property tax revenues from the project, and, to the extent such revenues are insufficient, special taxes levied by the City on the project site. No funds are coming out of current tax revenue and this project is not a general burden on City taxpayers. The City has not pledged its full faith and credit or its general obligation taxing power to the payment of these bonds. The only impact to the City of Salisbury will be the reduction of incremental ad valorem real property tax revenue from the project that would normally flow to the City, until the bonds are paid in full. To the extent the owner of the property in the project site (which constitutes the tax increment development district and the geographically coincident special taxing district) fail to pay their normal ad valorem property taxes or any levied special taxes, the City has the power to foreclose on such properties, but the City is not liable for any deficiencies.

APRIL 28, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Is the new fire station leased (not bonded or purchased)?

Answer: The City of Salisbury utilized a mixed methodology to acquire financial resources in order to fund the new fire station. A portion of the funding, \$4,535,000 was acquired through two CDA bonds. The balance of the funding needed was acquired through a lease/purchase agreement with Sun Trust Leasing in the amount of \$5,320,000. Upon final payment under the lease/purchase agreement, the city will assume full ownership of the facility. This mixed method approach allowed the city to proceed with the construction of the new fire department building within the desired timelines.

MAY 12, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Who used up the infrastructure so that it was not available for Mr. Esham's development (school/residential housing)?

Answer: The City of Salisbury does not have a set policy to reserve sewer allocation. Access is on a first come, first served basis. The restriction for additional allocation of capacity that has been placed is temporary until we can complete the construction of the lift station.

Question: How much is the bonded debt? How much has been borrowed over the last 10 years and for what purpose?

Answer:

<u>Description of Bonds</u>	<u>Date Issued</u>	<u>Authorized Total Issue</u>	<u>Outstanding 6/30/07</u>
Public Improvement Bonds of 1994	2/1/94	\$ 6,975,000	\$ 3,425,000
Public Improvement Bonds of 1995	12/1/95	\$ 4,800,000	\$ 535,000
Public Improvement Bonds of 1999	5/18/99	\$ 4,860,000	\$ 2,665,424

Public Improvement Bonds of 2001	5/1/01	\$ 1,201,900	\$ 939,600
Maryland Water Quality Financing Admin. Revolving Loan Fund Revenue Bonds	3/1/90	\$ 76,146	\$ 17,382
Maryland Water Quality Financing Administration	3/1/90	\$ 2,848,109	\$ 977,234
Water Quality Bond of 2003	4/17/03	\$ 3,163,361	\$ 2,704,806
Infrastructure Bond of 2003	3/1/03	\$ 5,614,000	\$ 4,749,300
Public Improvement Bonds of 2004	4/22/04	\$ 5,318,000	\$ 4,597,900
Water Quality Bond of 2005	9/29/05	\$42,009,341	\$27,446,745
Public Improvement Bonds of 2007	4/12/07	\$ 4,950,000	\$ 4,950,000

Note: For further information, see pages 70 and 71 of the FY07 financials on the City's web site.

City of Salisbury – Bond Projects

1999 Bond Issue

General Fund

NE Collector Road
Isabella Street Box Culvert
Fire Engine

Water Fund

NE Collector Rd. – Water Main
Isabella Street – Water Main Upgrade
Wor-Wic Water Extension

Sewer Fund

NE Collector Rd. – Sewer Main
Isabella St. – Sewer Main Upgrade
Wor-Wic Sewer Extension

2001 Bond Issue

Parking Garage

CDA Bond 2003 Series A

Beaverdam Creek Stabilization
NE Collector Road
Wor-Wic Oversizing – Water
Wor-Wic Oversizing – Sewer

Renovation of Fire Station #1
New Fire Headquarters
Public Works Garage

CDA Bond 2004 Series A

New Fire Headquarters – construction
Isabella Shoreline

Fire Trucks

2007 GO Bond

General Fund

Renovation of Fire Station #2
Zoo Animal Health Engineering
Developer Reimbursements
Isabella Street

Water Fund

Developer Reimbursements
Isabella Street

Sewer Fund

Developer Reimbursements
Isabella Street

2008 GO Bond

General Fund

Waverly Drive Storm Sewer
Fire Station #2 Renovations
Fire Station #16 Truck Replacement
Engineering of repairs for Riverwalk
Beaverdam Bridge repairs
Mill Street Bridge repair

Water Fund

Elevated Water Tower - Engineering

MAY 27, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Has the Mayor decided to ask the court of appeals to review the Stu leer case?

Answer: No, the Mayor has not asked the court of appeals to review the Stu Leer case.

Question: Is the case involving the 430 Pennsylvania Avenue property over?

Answer: Due to the lack of legal representation for the City until July 1, 2008, we are unable to obtain an answer to this question.

JUNE 9, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: Benefits of All-America City?

Answer: The application process for the All-America City designation “represents a valuable opportunity to evaluate the way [our] community manages opportunities and challenges, which can make [our] community stronger. Communities that earn the All-America City title realize numerous benefits, including local, state, and national recognition; greater civic pride and greater civic collaborations; and economic stimulus.” (Information obtained from the ICMA Newsletter dated December 26, 2005, vol. 86, No. 26.)

This collaborative process engages residents, businesses, professional organizations and the city to work together, conduct fundraising activities, and participate in a major national event, if chosen as a finalist.

Question: Operational Review – why are we doing this?

Answer: The City Council requested the operational review to determine what is needed for the Finance Division of Internal Services. This was as a result of the management review letter comments from our previous auditors, including their recommendation that additional staff is needed for finance.

Question: Why was Assistant City Administrator getting such a large raise?

Answer: The Assistant City Administrator position classification qualified for and was recommended at the Grade 15 level. This position is currently compensated at the Grade 12 level. This senior management position’s, the 3rd position of authority in the City, duties include, assisting with the day-to-day management of city operations; assisting with the selection, supervision, and evaluation of all city department heads; serving as Acting City Administrator, in the absence of the City Administrator; along with a host of other duties, which are listed on the city’s website (under the Mayor’s office). This is the only senior level staff position that is compensated significantly below the qualified and recommended pay grade. The requested increase in the Mayor’s recommended budget would have corrected this situation. The City Council did not approve the compensation for the position pay upgrade in the FY 2009 budget.

Question: What is the benefit of the fireboat?

Answer: The Fire Department currently operates a 26’ pleasure craft as its primary marine operations vessel and provides fire protection services for a number of industrial and numerous residential occupancies along the Wicomico River and within the Port of Salisbury – the second largest operating port in the State of Maryland. This vessel has been outfitted with some firefighting and rescue equipment but is severely limited in its operational capabilities because it was never designed to serve as a firefighting rescue vessel – but a fishing pleasure craft. Our marine operations capabilities are substantially reduced compared to those of several decades ago because of poor planning and the lack of adequate funding required to maintain adequate first response equipment. However, the hazards have continued to increase over the years. We currently protect petroleum (gas, diesel, propane) storage facilities with over 17 million gallon capacities. Our desire is to replace this vessel with one similar to those recently placed in service in the Baltimore – Washington metro core areas (Annapolis, Baltimore, DC, etc.) and purchased with grant funds from either the state or federal governments. The vessels that we have looked at are 36 feet long and have pumping capabilities much greater (2400 gpm) than our current vessel (500 gpm). Should a major event occur along the waterfront the closest firefighting marine vessel is on the Western Shore and would take hours for it to arrive on scene. We are attempting to improve our capabilities to provide adequate service within the Salisbury Fire District.

Question: Marina – Why do we keep it?

Answer: The Marina property is potentially a valuable piece of land as the development and redevelopment continues along the waterfront. At this time, the cost to the city at approximately \$50,000 annually, is not a significant drain on our resources for the potential upside to this location. We are also researching how funds were acquired to purchase the marina, in case there are any restrictions on the city disposing of the property.

Question: Why replace Truck 16? Diesel engines should get 1,000,000 miles.

Answer: Truck 16 is a used 1980 Mack 100 foot ladder that was purchased in the late 1990s when the 1973 American LaFrance (ALF) ladder truck was permanently removed from service. The ALF truck was removed from service due to aerial failure and the City deemed it cost prohibitive to repair it. The City did not have the funds to replace it at that time and instead opted to purchase a used vehicle. Had the City not decided to purchase a replacement vehicle, the Fire Department would have had no aerial device in its firefighting fleet. Fire apparatus are not comparable to over the road apparatus in that they spend a large amount of time idling on the scene of events and even though the engine is running the odometer does not register vehicle miles. Annual maintenance and operating costs continue to increase annually for this vehicle and it does not meet current National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) safety specifications for aerial apparatus. This vehicle has also caused serious injury to an employee possibly ending his career. We have ordered a replacement vehicle that will meet the community’s needs and will meet all applicable current safety specifications.

Additionally, the vehicle has tools and equipment that have been used for years and have reached their service life. The vehicle also has a water pump and small water tank for use for firefighting

operations. The tank has eroded to the point that it is no longer usable and is cost prohibitive to repair.

Question: Where was \$9,000,000 spent on Fire Station #16?

Answer: The budgeted funds were spent on the design/build of the new fire station on Cypress Street. Funds were also utilized to purchase necessary office equipment and furnishings for the building.

Question: What happened to the Truck in NSCC? Why was it in such poor condition after only 50,000 miles?

Answer: The previous driver of the vehicle, which has 48,200 miles, was very hard on the vehicle, which is the reason it is in poor condition. The vehicle was involved in several accidents resulting in extensive body work and its current condition. The hood of the vehicle is beginning to rust under the paint and will soon be showing through. This vehicle, although low mileage, is eight years old.

Question: The City is in the process of replacing the leaking dam and has established the following timeline:

- Received MD Historic Trust approval – 4/28/08
- Received MDE Dam Safety approval – 8/18/08 (estimated)
- Install Interim Temporary Tidal Dam – 8/19/08 to 9/29/08 (estimated)
- Complete final punch-list items and close out – 9/30/08 to 10/31/08 (estimated)

The bank stabilization project is complete with the installation of the rip-rap and the bio-logs.

Question: New fire station – what is the City’s policy on having it available for rental activities?

Answer: The City does not rent its facilities. The Fire Department meeting rooms are available for public or community events upon request and dependent upon the availability of the facility space.

July 14, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question posed by Mr. James Trader (concerns with intermittent cable service)

Response provided by City Administrator John Pick

Question: Does the Franchise Agreement between the City and Comcast provide any mechanism for subscriber complaints to be resolved?

Answer: Following Mr. Trader's complaint at Monday's Council meeting concerning cable television service, I contact Tom Worley with Comcast, and asked him to look into this complaint. I also called Mr. Trader and let him know that I had contacted Mr. Worley and also gave him Mr. Worley's telephone number. I also advised Mr. Trader of two sections of our cable television franchise ordinance that may be relevant. The first is Section 5.22.250 which requires that the franchisee maintain provisions for receiving and responding to complaints. The second is Section 5.22.350 which provides for Performance Evaluation Sessions which can be called by either the Council or the Grantee.

June 9, 2008 City Council Meeting

Response to the questions posed by Mr. Stu Leer
Response provided by City Administrator John Pick

Question: Why are Mr. Taylor and Mrs. Wolfe still on the Historic District Commission considering the specific reference to Mr. Taylor's actions in my successful ruling in the 713 Smith Street appeal?

Answer: Although the judge made a specific reference in the case to comments made by Mr. Taylor, no specific violation of the current Rules and Regulations has occurred. Both members of the commission are in good standing. Both Mr. Taylor's and Ms. Wolfe's terms expire in October 2008.

Question: Why does the Salisbury Historic District Commission conduct meetings without first ensuring that all structures located within historic districts have been properly rated A thru D?

Answer: According to the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT), the A thru D rating scale is no longer recognized by the Secretary of the Interior or the National Park Service. MHT has suggested that the commission first determine if a structure is contributing or non-contributing. Since my return as Secretary of the commission in 2006 that has occurred with each application. The reference to the A thru D rating schedule has been removed from the City's web site.

Question: How do you move a specific area out of the boundary established for a Historic District?

Answer: According to section 17.52.030 Establishment of Boundaries, the City Council shall establish the boundaries of the historic district in accordance with section 17.228 of the *Salisbury Municipal Code*. It is my understanding that, before the boundaries could be realigned, a review by the Planning Commission would be required, followed by a recommendation to the Mayor and Salisbury City Council for approval. Any such change to the current boundaries would require this to be done in the form of an ordinance. Some preliminary approval from the State might be required.

Question: What can be done to allow property owners who were mistreated by the commission to allow them to be reheard before the 12 month waiting period?

Answer: As you aware no rejected application can be resubmitted to the Commission for a period of 12 months; however, an owner can seek relief if the structure has changed due to a casualty, or new evidence can be provided which supports the relief being sought. Furthermore, applicants can request a rehearing and the commission shall determine whether a rehearing should be granted. A request for a rehearing shall be submitted within 30 days of the date of the Notice of Decision. Upon review of the aforementioned section, I happened to note that a reference is made to the Planning Department. This is no longer accurate. The Department of Neighborhood Services and Code Compliance is now responsible for providing staff support to the Historic District Commission. A revised version of the Rules and Regulations for the Commission are ready and waiting the Commission's approval. These revisions will correct this error. There is certainly nothing that prevents an applicant, whose application has been denied, from submitting a revised application at any time.

July 28, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: Isabella Street traffic calmers – How did the brick sidewalks get in the job? Why were they done? How much did it cost? Did the City buy the flowers or did the individuals on Isabella? If the City purchased the flowers, how much did they cost? Is watering the flowers part of the City's responsibility and is it normal procedure?

Answer: The brick ribbons in the sidewalks were a part of the original design approved by the Process Action Team. The bricks were included in the chicanes to reinforce the curbing at vulnerable locations. The amount spent on all aspects of the brick was \$45,300 and was paid for by a grant obtained from the Department of Housing and Community Development's Community Legacy program. The flowers were purchased with funds from the City's grant match at a cost of \$2,741. The City is responsible for watering the plants to ensure that it's investment in the project is protected. The residents will collaborate with the City to assist in weeding the flowerbeds.

Question: Marina – Wouldn't the money (\$50,000 annually - \$500,000 over 10 years) be better spent on putting in drains on the two new water pipes running into the river from Waverly Drive and Isabella?

Answer: The decision whether the City continues to operate the Marina is a public policy question that is appropriately addressed by the Mayor and the City Council. The Marina was initially established to provide an amenity to the downtown area to boost tourism and economic development. It also provides a convenient location for local residents who need a place to store their boats. The Marina has never either made money or broken even, whether the City managed it or, as now, a private company manages it. Whether the public interest is served through the City owning this Marina, and whether it is worth the \$45,000 that the City has budgeted as a subsidy, is a matter for consideration by the mayor and the Council.

Question: New Fire Station – itemized account on where the money was spent.

Answer: Expenses for the construction of the new fire station are as follows:

Project Expenses Actual and Encumbered as of 6/2/08

Land	\$ 311,355
Engineering/Architectural	\$ 432,534
Construction:	\$8,096,865
Gillis Gilkerson (\$8,041,545)	
Legal, Insurance, Recording Fees (\$40,356)	
Miscellaneous (\$14,964)	
Design Services (Heritage Center)	\$ 89,272
Advertising	\$ 2,013
Improvements (off-site paving)	\$ 209,676
Equipment	\$ 403,214
Furniture & Fixtures	\$ 147,006
TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES 6/13/08	\$9,691,930
NON-ENCUMBERED CONTINGENCY	
FUNDS BALANCE 6/2/08	\$ 163,070

Question: Bottled water – Why are some employees in the Government Office Building drinking bottled water instead of City water from the tap?

Answer: Utilization of bottled water is a matter of personal preference. Employees provide their own bottled water and there is no expense incurred by the City.

Question: Tawes Crab Festival – Why was the City there – including the Zoo? What was the cost? Whose bottled water was it that was given out?

Answer: The City of Salisbury was present at the Tawes Crab and Clam Bake as part of a budgeted marketing strategy for the City. As the largest city on the Eastern Shore, home to the only regional zoo, attendance was a planned event to increase the City's visibility among the many visitors from the "Western Shore" and to highlight the City of Salisbury as a tourist destination. The Zoo is one of the featured and favorite attractions in the City. The bottled water that was given out was purchased by the City for the Maryland Municipal League convention that was held in Ocean City in June 2008. The remaining water was given out at the Tawes Crab and Clam Bake. The total cost to the City was \$1,848.40 for registration and supplies.

Question: How much was spent on the pamphlet that was sent out about the City's good water and why was it sent out?

Answer: The Consumer Confidence Report or CCR is an annual water quality report that a community water system is required to provide to its customers. The CCR helps people make informed choices about the water they drink. The report also informs people of what

contaminants, if any, are in their drinking water, and how these contaminants may affect their health. The CCR also gives the system a chance to tell customers what it takes to deliver safe drinking water. The total costs for printing and dissemination are as follows:

Printing	\$2,020
Mailing	<u>\$3,020</u>
	\$5,040

September 22, 2008 City Council Meeting

Re: Paving Contract

Statement: Wasn't mentioned how much more it would cost the City.

Response: The difference between the original bid (less work completed) and the re-bid is \$65,208.31.

Question: Does anyone know whether any of the work has been started on these streets?

Answer: Isabella Street, at a cost of \$31,398.88 and Parking Lot #10 at a cost of \$68,493.43, were completed by the original contractor, Chesapeake Paving.

Question: When was the contract first signed?

Answer: The Standard Form Agreement with Chesapeake Paving was dated April 17, 2008.

Question: How much has been completed so far?

Answer: Please refer to answer provided above depicting the cost for Isabella Street and Parking Lot #10.

OCTOBER 13, 2008 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Question: The Bricks property – is it true or false that it will cost \$1.8 million to remodel this building? What was it appraised for? Why would we consider spending almost \$2 million on that building?

Answer: The preliminary estimate of what it would cost to renovate the building is \$1,874,928. This donated property appraised for \$227,000. The City is currently considering options for renovating this property. The intent is to have a developer to seek grant funding for this project with the City's share to be the value of the property. As a result, no cash is anticipated to be required from the City. We would consider renovating this property to provide ten (10) affordable housing units to assist our citizens in having decent living conditions and to improve their quality of life at a reasonable cost.

Question: TIF (old mall) – what happened to the money? Do we get the money back or did they walk away with it?

Answer: In April 2007, draw-down bonds were sold to Salisbury Mall Associates, LLC who is the initial bond holder. To date, the only funds advanced on these bonds are the costs of issuance. Before additional draws may be made on the bonds, the City's bond counsel will have to approve the contracts for the specific infrastructure improvements or specific projects that are allowed under the bond agreement.

Question: Isabella Street project – who pays for the new retaining wall – property owner or the City?

Answer: The retaining wall, if constructed, will be in a granted easement as it is currently on private property. The City is applying for a grant under the Community Legacy program that will be utilized to construct the wall along with the other improvements in this area.

October 27, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: North Prong Strategic Revitalization Plan Report – Has there been a meeting set for the public and property owners and anybody else interested on the North Prong that was postponed to accept the Plan?

Answer: The North Prong Strategic Revitalization Plan is complete and the consultant has fulfilled all obligations under the contract. The property owners, stakeholders and the general public were given several opportunities to have input into the plan development, to include two Town Hall meetings held at the Fire Station Headquarters on April 22, 2008 and June 5, 2008. City Council President Louise Smith is considering whether to hold an additional meeting to allow for public comment. However, the plan has been finalized and submitted to the state.

Question: Fire House – What's going on with the old fire house? Is it being used? What's happening?

Answer: The old fire house is not currently being used. Due to the economic conditions, no actions have been taken to market the property. When economic conditions improve, a decision will be made as to how to move forward with this property.

Question: Retaining wall – suggested looking at Mill Street from Isabella Street to Chestnut Street on the east side where dirt washes into the street and when it rains goes into the storm sewer. What is the difference between that dirt washing in around this area and the Isabella Street area? Are we going to build the railroad retaining wall? How is that going to be handled? How are others in the City going to be handled?

Answer: The retaining wall on Isabella Street, between Park and Mill, is a continuation of an on-going streetscape project. It is the third phase of an approved project that has been developed over a number of years with the assistance of a Process Action team consisting of City staff and Newtown residents. The issue of the dirt washing down in this area impedes pedestrian traffic

and creates safety hazards for the residents. The City's attorney is currently reviewing the questions posed by Council in regards to the retaining wall.

November 10, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: Grant money – is the grant money still taxpayer money? Why do we always go for the grant money when it's offered? Can we do anything on our own?

Answer: The City of Salisbury does avail itself of grant opportunities to help to keep down costs to the city taxpayers. The funds received from the federal government and the State of Maryland, which are derived from taxes, are leveraged with local funding to enable us to complete projects that we would otherwise not be able to afford on our own, without negatively impacting our citizens.

City staff pursues grant funded projects that will improve the safety and quality of life for our citizens. Such grants include the emergency shelter grants that assist in providing operating funds for shelters to decrease the likelihood of people freezing on the streets due to homelessness. These grants also provide homeless prevention funding to keep citizens in their homes. The gratitude of our citizens that find themselves in adverse situations such as this, and the efforts of the providers of services, is a reminder of the need to provide for all our citizens with the least impact on our taxpayers. We very much appreciate the federal and state government redistributing some of the taxes that are paid back to our jurisdiction in the form of grants.

Question: Isabella Street project – What purposes does it serve? Is it beautification or satisfaction?

Answer: The Isabella Street project was borne out of concern from residents in the Newtown neighborhood over safety, due to the speed of vehicles traveling from the Westside to Rt. 13 north and vice versa. This project that was partially funded by the Department of Housing and Community Development's Community Legacy program has accomplished the desires of the residents by calming the traffic. Residents have also noted that the larger trucks are taking alternate routes, thereby further increasing the safety of the residents in the neighborhood.

The byproduct of the project has been one of beautification and satisfaction for the residents who assisted with planting and maintaining the landscaping, and also engaging the community to continue collaborating with the City.

Question: D P & L Lift Station – How long is this going to take and how much money will it be?

Answer: The project has been delayed with a completion of design estimated at no sooner than July 2009. The completion of construction is estimated no sooner than July 2010. The costs have risen by at least \$500,000.

Question: Donation of property (Linens of the Week property) – Where would we possibly get the money to do the suggestion for a youth program?

Answer: If the city were to accept the donation of this property and consider the possibility of a youth program, grant funds would be sought through the state. Potential grant sources would include the Community Parks and Playgrounds program. After school resource grants, Program Open Space, and any other grant opportunities that would accommodate this type of project.

Question: University Village amended Public Works Agreement – What are the terms of this and how much money did we give up when we struck the deal?

Answer: The amendment included the developer's responsibility to extend the sewer force main constructed under the original Public Works Agreement. Also included in the amended agreement is the developer's responsibility to contribute to the Bateman/Onley/Division Streets intersection improvement. We did not "give up money" in the amendment of the Public Works Agreement.

November 24, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: Property on north prong that incurred an oil spill in 1990 – Who owns the property?

Answer: Without further specificity, the property that I am aware of on the north prong that has been the subject of environmental concern is owned by SALCAP, LLC.

Question: Riverwalk on east prong – Have the repairs been finished? Did the contractors do shoddy work? Did the City not do its inspection? What is the status?

Answer: The current City Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) includes Riverwalk repairs as a FY10 project estimated at \$500,000. The project description states that "the Riverwalk . . . is 30 years old and in need of repairs. Large void spaces have opened up beneath the concrete slabs." The scope of the problem became apparent after Salisbury Public Works hired a contractor to fill the known void spaces in 2003, using a flowable fill product. That procedure was unsuccessful. The new approach is to hire a consultant who will be asked to recommend a solution based on multiple alternatives.

Question: What is the total debt of the City (be it in bonds or leases)? How much does the City actually owe for its debt?

Answer: The City, as of June 30, 2008 (unaudited), has \$66,512,014 in outstanding bond debt with an authorized funding level of \$70,523,939. The City also has \$5,810,265 in outstanding lease purchase.

Question: How many bank accounts does the City have?

Answer: The City has nineteen (19) cash and investment accounts.

Question: The Mayor told the public that no records had been destroyed. (A shredding company backed up to the old fire station 16 was mentioned.) If they weren't shredding documents, what were they shredding?

Answer: On July 22, 2008, a number of old paper records and miscellaneous files were disposed of by a commercial shredding company. Those documents included EMS run sheets (over 18 years old), station alarm attendance rosters (over 5 years old), and photocopies of paid invoices (dating back into the 90's). Fire personnel contacted a representative of the Maryland Institute for Emergency Medical Services Systems (MIEMSS) prior to the disposal of these records. The City Clerk, Brenda Colegrove, was also contacted to ensure that Fire Department personnel acted within the limits of the legal processes for disposal of such records. Please be advised that this action pre-dated the presentation of the records retention policy to the City Council which first occurred on November 3, 2008. The Mayor's comments occurred on November 24, 2008.

Question: Tax differential – What is the status of the independent study?

Answer: The Tax differential study request for proposal (RF) has been issued with a due date of January 8, 2009.

Question: The City is going to swap a piece of property (adjacent to his property on Lake Street) for an unknown amount. What are the merits of it? Why is the City spending taxpayer money on this? What does tax credit base mean? How much is the City going to allow for that property? What is really going on (contractor dug out 20' deep pits)? Does the Council know about this property swap? What is the City going to do with all the properties in its inventory?

Answer: The City of Salisbury is not currently engaged in any property swap on Lake Street and is not spending taxpayer money for such an endeavor. As for the activities occurring on this property, the City is not involved and cannot direct private land owners on the activities on their property, as long as it does not violate City ordinances, or adversely affect other citizens. The properties in the City's inventory will be assessed on a case by case basis with proposals provided to the City Council for approval.

Question: What is the status of old fire station 16?

Answer: The old fire station #16 has been decommissioned, winterized and surplused. The City is working on a Request for Proposal (RFP) for this property.

Question: The corner lot near Sam's Club – is that City property? If it is City property, will the City turn it into an Enterprise Zone so that a hotel gets a discount for doing business?

Answer: If the lot you are referring to is on the corner of Rt. 13 and Hampshire Road, it is located within the City limits. This property is not within the established Enterprise Zone.

Question: Property across from Councilwoman Shields' former home (believed owned by Mike Dunn's father and a partner) – whatever happened to it? Has it been sold?

Answer: The property in question is in the corporate name of R&D 622, Inc. and is still owned by Mr. Don Hughes and Robert Dunn. The project that was planned has been abandoned due to the City's inability to waive liens of two demolished houses and numerous grass and rubbish abatements.

December 8, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: Has the electrical system for the Paleo water plant been done?

Answer: The FY2008 budget included a project entitled "Electrical Upgrade Paleo Well House #1." This project is scheduled for final completion in early January 2009.

Question: Ordinance No. 2070 – what is specifically the item that brought this about?

Answer: The item that brought about the moratorium for special exceptions was the proposal put forth by CVS Pharmacy to build a new pharmacy at the site of Benedicts Florist. The proposal would infringe on Lorecrop Avenue which is a residential neighborhood.

December 22, 2008 City Council Meeting

Question: How much waste does the street sweepers accumulate off of City streets every year? What happens to it and do we pay the \$55/ton for disposal at the landfill?

Answer: The quantity of the street sweepings disposed of at the landfill cannot be exactly determined. The street sweeping debris is temporarily stored and loaded onto a dump truck later for disposal at the landfill. The debris is mixed with other debris accumulated by the City Yard so the quantity has never been separately tracked. The tipping fee is paid as required.

Question: What is the status of the standpipe? Was it found to be in good condition?

Answer: The evaluation of the standpipe has been completed and a copy of the report has been provided to the City Administrator, Mayor and Council members. The standpipe was determined to be structurally sound. The recommendations for repairs and painting are to be included in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

January 12, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Scuttlebutt on the street is that City workers (Police Department, Public Works or whatever) were instructed to take away the tents/sleeping bags, blankets and so forth that belonged to the homeless here in town. Did that happen? Why did it happen? Who gave the orders for it?

Answer: No orders were given to any City employees to take away items belonging to the homeless. The City of Salisbury is very proactive in assisting our homeless individuals by passing through four grants to assist with operating expenses for emergency shelters. The City

also provides funds for homeless prevention which is administered by Salisbury Urban Ministries. The City has been instrumental in acquiring these funds from the Department of Housing and Community Development's Emergency Shelter Grant Program for the past five years.

The City is responsible to ensure that debris and trash is cleaned up from areas around the City. This is a normal course of service provision. If Neighborhood Services and Code Compliance officers notice areas of the City that require rubbish removal, they will inform Public Works of the location. If there happen to be abandoned personal items in the cited area, the items will be removed, if not claimed. However, areas are not targeted to negatively impact homeless individuals. Resource information is provided to individuals seeking shelter and services.

Question: Regarding Lemmon Hill Standpipe – Is the engineering study finished? Is it worthwhile saving? What are the recommendations?

Answer: The evaluation of the standpipe has been completed and a copy of the report has been provided to the City Administrator, Mayor and Council members. The standpipe was determined to be structurally sound. The recommendations for repairs and painting are to be included in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

January 26, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Regarding purchase of Crown Victoria by Police Department and being transferred to Fire Department – Don't you think the Fire Department has had enough vehicles bought this year that they have to have another? The Police Department is in dire need of vehicles. Why not leave it with the Police Department and give the Fire Department a used police vehicle?

Answer: There are and have not been any plan to purchase a Crown Victoria for the Police Department and to transfer it to the Fire Department. Both departments have a vehicle replacement schedule in place that corresponds with the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

Question: Does the City have any ordinance against begging or soliciting?

Answer: The City does not have such an ordinance.

Question: What is the status of the repairs of the expansion joint to the Mill Street Bridge at the east prong of the river?

Answer: Currently, the expansion joint has been temporarily and partially repaired. Upon encountering dryer and warmer weather, a permanent repair will be implemented.

Question: What is the status of the standpipe?

Answer: The evaluation of the standpipe has been completed and a copy of the report has been provided to the City Administrator, Mayor and Council members. The standpipe was

determined to be structurally sound. The recommendations for repairs and painting are to be included in the City's Capital Improvement Plan.

February 9, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Regarding possible chemical smell at Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) – What happened and was Council aware if anything did happen?

Answer: The Department of Public Works received a few calls regarding an odor complaint. The WWTP staff investigated and determined that the odor was originating from the WWTP sludge holding tank. Plant staff made operational changes to the plant to eliminate the odor. We discussed the odor issue with the City Administrator and were informed that the Mayor's Office had not received any citizen complaints.

Question: Why isn't the City enforcing the multi-family recycling ordinance?

Answer: This subject is currently under legal review.

February 23, 2009 City Council Meeting – questions regarding property known as “The Bricks”

Question: Who will get the rents from the apartments?

Answer: Responses to the Request for Proposal (RF) for this project is not due until March 4, 2009. The potential rent usage model at this point is based on the model used for the Mitchell Landing property which is also owned by the City. Under that model, rents are used to pay for operating expenses, cost of the management company and to build a reserve for maintenance. Until we receive proposals, it is not possible to determine what the final negotiated management structure will be utilized.

Question: Who is the developer? Is this another situation where an LLC (with unknown partners) will benefit as they did in the transactions involving the property on Cypress Street?

Answer: As stated in the above answer, a developer has not yet been selected as the responses to the RFP are not due until March 4, 2009.

Question: Where is the developer's money going? Is it going to go into an escrow account for future upkeep and maintenance of the property with the City overseeing this account?

Answer: The structure of the revitalization funding will be determined once the bids are opened, reviewed and a developer selected. This process will be completed with the assistance of our legal advisor, if needed, to ensure the interests of the City are protected.

Question: If the property is refurbished for less than the grant from the state, does the money promised by the developer not have to be paid? Was the promise to put \$800,000 into the building only if it was needed?

Answer: The City did apply to the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development for funding consideration for this property. However, the grant process is extremely competitive and there are no guarantees that we will be funded. Also, as no developer has been selected to date, no promises have been made by anyone to put money into this project. The cost of revitalizing the units is expected to significantly exceed the amount of the grant request.

Question: Why is old fire station #16 chained off so no one can park there?

Answer: The parking lot at this location is not for public use. There is a lot diagonally across from the old fire station that provides free parking for two hours. There is also parking in the covered garage across from this location for public use.

Question: How many homes are on the Wicomico River in the City limits of Salisbury that cannot be accessed by a fire truck whether it's a business or residential?

Answer: We do not have specific data on the number of homes on the river that have access issues. It is noted that there may be several homes that, due to their location and size of driveways, may pose a limited access problem to the Fire Department.

Question: Why is this fireboat so important to the taxpayers of Salisbury?

Answer: The Port of Salisbury is the State of Maryland's second largest (by volume) operating port – Baltimore is its first. Most of the City's and the lower Eastern Shore's petroleum products are shipped to the area via marine barge shipments up the Wicomico River. They are stored within the Salisbury Fire Department (SFD) fire district and then shipped via truck through our fire district to their final destinations. Other products both agricultural and aggregate are also shipped to and from businesses along the river – in the SFD fire district.

This vessel is important to the City taxpayers because it will be a part of the Department's arsenal of firefighting equipment available to provide crucial firefighting services during emergencies. The closest similar vessel that could be available to respond is hours away. The proposed vessel will have increased pumping capabilities (2000 gpm) that will provide more effective and efficient fire flows for either land or water based events. It is also important in that increased effectiveness and efficiency ultimately should mean quicker event mitigation resulting in shorter operating times subsequently resulting in reduced operational costs.

Significant fires in the downtown area are prime examples of events that this vessel would prove to be extremely useful – not as a direct firefighting apparatus (water on the fire) but as a crucial water supply vessel with an unlimited source. During my career the SFD fireboat was used at the Benjamin's fire (1979) and I believe it was also used at the Riverside Medical Center (1993

or 1994). At each event the boat would have potentially been used to supply water to one or several land-based fire apparatus.

March 23, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Resolution No. 1763 – accepting Assistance to Firefighters Grant – requested a list of equipment and materials. How much will it cost the City of Salisbury and are we planning to buy a vehicle to pull this trailer?

Answer: The trailer to be purchased with the grant funds will not come with equipment or materials. The current equipment that is being utilized will be combined onto this vehicle. The cost to the City of Salisbury is approximately \$102,500 which includes match funding of \$17,500 and \$85,000 to purchase a tractor to pull the trailer.

Question: Difficulty for public input before decisions are made. Where does the public come in with this process? Is there any way to get a voice in before these decisions are made? Is there another system that can be set up to allow for us to get our two cents worth in?

Answer: Below are sections from the City Council Regulations and Rules of Order which provide an opportunity for public input.

7. PUBLIC INPUT

- A. Public comments should be directed to the agenda item under consideration. The Council President shall rule on the germaneness of the citizen comments.
- B. A citizen who has been recognized by the Council President to address the Council shall state his or her name, address, and organization affiliation, if they so choose.
- C. In order to afford all persons an opportunity to speak regarding an agenda item, the Council President may impose a reasonable limit upon comments made by members of the public, and/or may limit the number of times a member of the public may speak regarding an agenda item.
- F. A time may be established for public comments for citizens to address the Council on any item which is not on the agenda for that meeting. A time limit may be imposed and citizens are subject to the same rules of conduct as described above. If a prepared statement is available, a copy should be given to the City Clerk. Generally, members of the Council will not comment upon the comments made by a member of the public. If they are administrative issues, the Council President will refer them to the Mayor's Office for a response.

Questions posed by a citizen during the public comments portion will be logged, and tracked, by the City Clerk. The City Clerk will forward the questions to the City Administrator for a response. All City Council members and the City Clerk will be provided a copy of the response from the City Administrator.

- H. Anonymous/unsigned communications shall not be introduced to Council.
- I. Signed communications shall be accepted by the Council, but are not to be read in their entirety during the meeting. Signed communications shall be submitted to the City Clerk to be attached to the minutes as part of the record.

9. WORK SESSION MEETINGS

- D. Work sessions are considered public meetings under the terms of the open meetings law and the public can attend. Members of the public or an interested party may have the right to address the Council only on items under consideration in a work session. The Council President shall control the discussion of the Council and the public in accordance with the Rules of Order. Comment forms shall also be made available for any member of the public to submit written comments on any agenda item for consideration by the Council.

There is also a section in the Council's Regulations and Rules of Procedure allowing for a public hearing on Ordinances.

5. PROCEDURE FOR ORDINANCES

- B. First reading – motion/second, Council comments, and vote taken for first reading. No public comments will be received on first reading, however, a window of opportunity will be permitted for written comments to be received by noon on the Wednesday before preparation of the Council's Briefing Book for the second reading of the Ordinance and shall be included in the Briefing Book. Written comments may be submitted to the City Clerk by e-mail, mailed to the City Clerk's Office or hand delivered to the City Clerk's Office and shall be entered into the record.
- C. Public Hearing – A public hearing will be held on the next regularly scheduled Council meeting following the first reading to allow an opportunity for the public to express their opinions and/or concerns.
- D. Second reading – Motion/second, Council discussion and final vote. No public comments will be received.
- E. Ordinances of an emergency/urgent/time sensitive nature, budget and budget amendments, are exempt from the above policy.

For regular Council meetings, a sign-in sheet is available (on the small table as you enter Council Chambers) for anyone wishing to speak on an agenda item or during the public comments section. For work session meetings, comment forms are available (on the table as you enter the Conference Room) for any member of the public to complete and give to the Council.

The agendas, as well as the entire Briefing Book and Work Session Packet, are posted on the City's web site. For those citizens with Internet access, comments can be e-mailed to the Council using the ALLCityCouncilMembers@ci.salisbury.md.us address. For those citizens without Internet access, agendas and information on agenda items can be obtained from the City Clerk's Office by calling 410-548-3140. Comments on agenda items can be submitted in person to the City Clerk's Office or mailed to:

Brenda J. Colegrove, MMC
City Clerk
City of Salisbury
125 N. Division Street, Room 305
Salisbury, MD 21801-4940

April 27, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Why does the street light on Rt. 50 near the District Court Building (between the Baptist Church and District Court Building) stay on all the time?

Answer: Mr. Ray Birch of the City Public Works staff has determined the exact light in question. He has notified Delmarva Power previously of this issue and will notify them again.

Question: What is the situation with the Wastewater Treatment Plant? Is there any progress being made?

Answer: City Administration staff will be briefing the City Council in the next several weeks on this situation. We will provide further information at that time.

May 26, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: What is the actual cost to equip one police officer to put the officer on the street?

Answer: The approximate cost to equip one police officer is \$60,000.

July 27, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Is equipment included in the deal for the HazMat trailer or is the City buying equipment for it?

Answer: No additional equipment is required for the HazMat trailer. The current equipment will be transferred to this new unit.

Question: Is State Highway going to replace the trees that were cut down for the sidewalk project?

Answer: State Highway personnel have confirmed that the trees will be replaced. We are in the process of following up with them as to where the trees will be located and to ensure that the City will have input in the selection process.

August 10, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Wastewater Treatment Plant – Where do we stand with MDE? Are they going to penalize us if not meeting our deadline?

Answer: City staff has met with MDE to address the current NFDES permit exceedances and we have noted:

- The current exceedances are beyond the City's immediate control.
- We are working very diligently to come into full compliance.

MDE has not at this point moved to penalize the City and we believe that the better approach is to let the City use all of its resources to address the facility issues. In any event, the City intends to move as quickly as possible to come into full compliance.

September 14, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: When will South Boulevard be reopened to traffic?

Answer: The following efforts must be completed prior to reopening South Boulevard to traffic:

- repaving of the intersection
- Delmarva Power and Light providing service to the new traffic signal
- programming of the new traffic signal video detection system.

October 26, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Restricting parking at 4-way intersections (i.e., N. Blvd./Smith St.) – Is this underway?

Answer: The City of Salisbury does not routinely paint curbs at the 4-way intersections. However, if a particular intersection has been identified as a problem, we would be willing to paint that location. The intersection that you identified at N. Boulevard and Smith Streets will be addressed by our Public Works Department.

Question: Salisbury University's Master Plan – How many of these items have been discussed with the City and what are the impacts of these items on the City of Salisbury?

Answer: We will follow-up with Salisbury University and request that the City Council be briefed on their master plan.

November 9, 2009 City Council Meeting

Question: Crime – will you continue to support the rising crime rate or will you take action against crime starting right now?

Answer: Mayor James Ireton, Jr. has been working diligently with Salisbury Police, the State's Attorney's Office, the Wicomico County Sheriff's Department, Parole and Probation, the Department of Juvenile Services and the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention to address crime issues since he has been in office. The Mayor has acquired funds through the various City departments as well as continuing to seek funds to reduce the crime rate in the City of Salisbury. Initiatives include:

- COPPs Grant - funds received to hire four additional officers
- CSAFE-VPI – funds received to continue the multi-agency collaboration to reduce crime on the east and west sides of Salisbury and to track violent criminals and gang members city-wide
- Law Enforcement Grants – funds acquired to provide for police overtime and to purchase equipment to enhance police operations to reduce crime city-wide

Ensuring the safety and well-being of the citizens of Salisbury is a priority for the Mayor and his staff. The Mayor is also working with the Crime Task Force to identify issues, develop recommendations and implement recommendations that deal with underlying issues that may contribute to crime.

January 25, 2010 City Council Meeting

Question: Regarding request for fireboat information (required to fill out PIA request form) – What makes this information different from any other information requested?

Answer: According to guidance from the Governor’s Office of Grants, grant information is proprietary and confidential until grants are awarded. After the grant is awarded, information may be disseminated at the discretion of the municipality. A PIA form was deemed the appropriate manner in which to answer the request for this proprietary information.

Question: Couldn’t Mrs. Chambers have also answered the question?

Answer: The fireboat grant application was completed by Acting Chief Richard Hoppes and not Mrs. Chambers. As such, the information requested was acquired from the author of the application to ensure that complete and factual information was provided.

Question: What were the taxes owed on “The Bricks” property?

Answer: There were no taxes owed on “The Bricks” property at the time of transfer of title to the City of Salisbury.

March 8, 2010 City Council Meeting

Question: Are the grants that we apply for approved by the Council before they’re applied for? If not, why not?

Answer: Not in all cases. Due to grant deadlines, not all grants are scheduled to come before City Council prior to submission. Grants that do not require a match are not brought before Council unless awarded to request acceptance of the award.

Question: How does the Salisbury Fire Department expect to handle something (an incident) on the York River or the Rappahannock River or any place like that?

Answer: The SFD, like any other fire department across the country, will respond to calls for service wherever they may be if we can offer the assistance needed. This holds true whether it is a call for fire, rescue, EMS, or special operations. This is the very foundation and essence of the American Fire Service.

Question: Is there anybody in the Fire Department capable of taking this 36' boat if, at 11:00 at night, the Coast Guard calls questioning assistance on the York River? The winds blowing 40 knots, it's a driving rain, 6'-8' seas ... Is there any man in that department capable of running that boat down there? I'd like to know who.

Answer: The conditions referenced would indicate that there has been a gale warning issued by the USCG. The department conducts a risk/benefit analysis on all responses for service and this response would clearly need that analysis done. If the analysis reveals that the risk is greater than the potential benefit then the decision will be made to not make a response. The department currently has on staff several members that have the level of training required to safely operate this vessel. Before placing the vessel in service the department will undergo extensive in-service training for all operators and crew members.

Question: The rough seas will drown your personnel on board and it will take your boat down. Are they ready for this sort of thing? I don't think so.

Answer: See above response.

Question: How much does the County pay us for Fire Protection?

Answer: The City receives a stipend from the County for Special Operations of \$125,000 and the Volunteer Corporations receive a total of \$375,000.

Question: Is every man in the Fire Department going to have a TWIC card or just the crew? If just the crew, how many are on the crew?

Answer: No, the grant was applied for under ARRA PSGP Priorities of Enhancing Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA) and Enhancing Improvised Explosive Device (IED) and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) prevention, protection, response and recovery capabilities. TWIC is a separate funding priority and has no bearing on the priorities that the vessel was funded under.

Question: Do the firemen already have those TWIC cards?

Answer: No, this is not a requirement under this initiative as indicated above.

Question: Are you going to have to have enough crew to man this vessel 24/7?

Answer: Yes, the crew will be made up of on-duty personnel that are staffing the department already.

Question: The projected cost for this boat was \$800,000, but it actually cost \$903,500. Did the same person who made that projection also project the maintenance cost to be \$3,000 on this boat?

Answer: Yes, however the figure for the maintenance costs that you indicated are incorrect. The report to City Council was as follows: MetalCraft estimates annual R & M cost to be \$6,000 annually. Research from other FDs that currently operate a similar sized vessel indicates that the average costs for R & M = \$6-8k annually, and during the performance period of the grant (3 yrs.) ALL R & M costs will be at the expense of the vendor. Similarly the costs to purchase the vessel that you quoted were estimates only and were created to provide an amount for the grant. The actual cost to purchase the vessel has not been determined and will be defined under standard procurement rules once requested for proposals are completed.

Question: The firemen say their equipment is obsolete after five years. Is this boat also going to be obsolete after five years? If so, who's going to buy the next one?

Answer: There is nothing in the SFD fleet replacement schedule that has a five-year life expectancy. Management decides on apparatus obsolescence based on standard replacement schedules.

March 22, 2010 City Council Meeting

Question: How can you take a property that's valued at \$227,000, even if it's through grants because it's still taxpayer money, and invest \$1.8 million?

Answer: The City of Salisbury was donated the property known as "The Bricks" for the purpose of revitalization to develop affordable apartment units. As a municipality, the City can apply for grants specifically for these types of projects. It would be cost prohibitive for a private owner to take on this project because it would be difficult to generate the cash flow necessary to make it a profitable endeavor. However, as a municipality, as long as the project remains for the express purpose of affordable housing, we have options available to us that would not be available to for profit entities. Please be aware that the total cost of approximately \$1.8 million includes the value of the property of \$227,000.

Question: Is there some way the City can unload this property?

Answer: Yes, the City can surplus the property and sell it or donate it.

Camden Historic District

Question: When can the public see some action on reducing the boundaries in the Camden Historic District?

Answer: Mayor James Ireton, Jr., along with the Director of Salisbury Wicomico Planning and Zoning, toured the Camden Historic District to review the properties within the boundaries. The process of determining which properties provide significant contributions to the district is

underway. Mayor Ireton has redrawn the lines for the district and is soliciting input from the neighborhood on the proposed redrawn district and bed and breakfast legislation prior to sending information to the City Council.

Question: Is it feasible to utilize local historians to evaluate properties before they come to the Commission as to their historic significance?

Answer: Yes, it is feasible to have local historians evaluate properties. However, the Salisbury Historic District Commission members have the capability to rate properties regarding their historical significance prior to hearing an application. As a Certified Local Government, the City of Salisbury has taken great strides to ensure that qualified individuals serve on the Historic District Commission.

Merging City Police Department and Sheriff's Department

Question: Why is there such a disparity between the County and City budget costs for their police department operating costs?

Answer: The County's budget does not include any benefit costs. In contrast, the City of Salisbury's budget includes benefits such as health insurance, life insurance, blood bank, retirement, and workers compensation. Total costs for FY10 equal \$2,451,103.92.

Question: Can an independent study be made by some community leaders, at no cost to the City, to evaluate the feasibility of merging the County and City police departments?

Answer: A Consolidated Functions Committee looked at this issue in 1995 and determined it was not feasible at that time. A new study could be conducted to revisit this issue; however, the City Council is not in support of a merger.

Freedom of Information Act

Question: Is a Freedom of Information Act request needed to find out the property manager for a rental property?

Answer: No, this information is posted on the City's website.

April 12, 2010 City Council Meeting

Re: Public having to sign in at the Government Office Building

Question: Who are we afraid of? What's going on here? Are you afraid of the public? Why is there a police officer at the meetings?

Answer: According to the Building Superintendent, the intent has always been to ensure that the building is secured after normal business hours. This project has been implemented to meet the goals of building security. The building is available for evening meetings with the assistance of

the building Security Attendant. The sign-in registry was instituted several years prior, but was not implemented due to lack of staff. As there is an attendant on duty to assist individuals entering the building, the sign-in registry is being utilized to register individuals that enter the building after normal business hours, when there are no scheduled meetings. This will ensure that there is an accurate record of all persons entering and exiting the building after normal business hours.

A police officer has been on duty at the City Council meetings for a number of years to ensure safety for council members and our citizens. As you may be aware, there have been incidences around the Country of individuals becoming violent and even shooting council members. This is a safety measure that we believe is prudent for all concerned.

May 10, 2010 City Council Meeting

Question: What is the entire project for the Linens of the Week property?

Answer: The City of Salisbury has been asked by the owners of the former Linens of the Week property to accept the property as a donation. The owners have had a Phase II Environmental Assessment completed which outlines potential uses for the property. If accepted, the property, which consist of three parcels, will be cleared of any unsafe structures and potentially donated to Habitat for Humanity for construction of residential dwellings. One of the lots has been earmarked for the future construction of a community center. Until such time that the donation is accepted, plans for future demolition and development are on hold.

Q & A

May 24, 2010 City Council Meeting

Question: DNR allocated \$100,000 to help get the barges out of the river. Has anything been done yet along those lines?

Answer: The Department of Natural Resources will not allow work to be performed in the river during the fish spawning season which lasts from April to June. A pre-bid meeting has been conducted by the City's Procurement Division, as well as a site visit to the abandoned vessel location. We anticipate removal will begin within the next few months.

Questions: It is my understanding that we paid travel expenses for an applicant who lives out of state (Ohio) to come here twice to see about the Fire Chief's job. Is that true, and if so, why? When will we ever have a new Fire Chief? How about a new Police Chief? When will we have one of those?

Answers: The City of Salisbury has a practice of paying the expenses for Department Head level applicants for on-site interviews. The applicant in question did visit Salisbury for departmental interviews and to meet with the City Council. The Fire Chief's position has been re-advertised with a closing date of Friday, July 23, 2010. The position of Police chief is still under consideration by Mayor Ireton.

Question: Re: Award of contract to Rommel Engineering of \$260,410 on April 12, 2010 for city-wide traffic signal lamp conversion – Why was this not put out for public bid?

Answer: The City of Salisbury Traffic Signal Lamp Conversion project is funded through the Jane E. Lawton Conservation Loan, a Maryland Energy Administration Loan which, when finalized, contained Maryland fiscal year scheduling requirements that limited the City's ability to utilize the standard procurement process. Because of the scheduling issues, Salisbury Public Works (SPW) recommended using the Maryland State Highway Contract AX1405185 with Rommel Engineering & Construction. Rommel has done traffic signal and street light work within the City and State roads in Wicomico County. SPW believed that this expertise and experience qualified them to perform this work.

There was a reference made that this contract had expired and was only for video detection equipment. The City Purchasing Department contacted Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) to inquire about the contract status and they confirmed that this was a valid Maryland State contract. The Purchasing Department was informed that the contract has been extended for an additional two years and LED signal head line items were added to the base contract through a competitive process.

Question: What is the criteria that makes something a slum house and who decides this?

Answer: The Director of Neighborhood Services and Code Compliance is the housing official for the City of Salisbury. Criteria utilized to designate a property as a slum property has been established by this office as follows:

- Multi-agency life safety issues
- Could be one (1) department's issues with imminent danger
- Will not just be complaint driven. Actual visual evaluations will be performed before a property is designated.

Life safety issues that could contribute to the designation include:

- Structural deficiencies
- Health issues
- Endangerment to the public
- Criminal activity
- Fire code violations
- Property maintenance code violations – minimum livability standards

June 14, 2010 City Council Meeting

Questions: What is the total cost of the wastewater treatment plant going to be? Is \$130 million a reasonable number? Are we going to be in debt that far? How much are we going to bond that we have to pay back? For the original \$40 million that we spent, why wasn't the equipment replaced at that time? What happened to the \$40 million?

Answers: The total project cost cannot be determined at this time. Costs will be dependent on the process selected for completion of corrections to the plant. As such, cost reasonableness cannot be established. Total debt issued for the plant as of June 30, 2009 is \$47,260,302 which is the amount the City will have to repay. Expenditures as of June 30, 2009 total \$78,305,006. Equipment installation/replacement has occurred based on the engineering requirements for the upgrade.

Question: Purchase of trucks – Is there a better way than lease/purchase in order to save money on the interest?

Answer: The City endeavors to pay cash for vehicles where possible. However, at times funds are not available to pay the full purchase price, thereby limiting purchase options to leasing or debt issuance.