

Committee of the Whole Summary Report Regarding Resolution 3-21

During the last year, Dover City Council has observed with continually growing concern at what its members believe is an increasing neglect of the supervisory and administrative duties under the control and duty of Mayor Richard Homrighausen. In response to these concerns, in March of 2021 City Council, via passage of Emergency Resolution 3-21, unanimously authorized the Committee of the Whole to investigate personnel issues within the City of Dover administration. After conducting many hours of oral interviews, receiving 13 written affidavits, and hundreds of pages of documents, the Committee of the Whole now releases the summary of its conclusions. It is important to note that all interviews were conducted in a voluntary manner with City employees, and all documents gathered were ultimately through public records requests. Additionally, the Mayor was requested to appear before the Committee of the Whole to answer questions related to the committee's concerns but declined the opportunity to take those questions. While this investigation began with regards to very recent concerns regarding the proper functioning of City administration under the authority of the mayor, subsequent additional City personnel related issues have been voluntarily disclosed by City employees to this body, that information is also included in this report. This Committee does not take lightly any of the statements, conclusions or concerns raised in this report. This information is grouped into concern area categories for simplicity purposes. Some of the report locations for supporting documentation regarding these determinations is included with each statement. We encourage the public to review the report in its entirety beyond just the summary of this information, and to draw their own determinations.

Concern Area One: Neglect of the Responsibilities Under the Control of the Mayor

- The mayor was unavailable during much of the COVID-19 emergency. In the near total absence of leadership, dedicated—but unelected—City employees were forced to take up duties related to city policy making during the crisis. At most, the Mayor merely signed/approved the directives without significant engagement or comment. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 18-23; Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-15).
- Even prior to the beginning of the pandemic, the Mayor was coming into city hall with less and less frequency. (See, Eva Newsome's Affidavit at paragraph mark 16; Gerry Mroczkowski's Affidavit at paragraph mark 7; Nicole Stoldt's Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-7; Dave Douglas's Affidavit at paragraph mark 10).
- The committee of the whole has received testimony that he now rarely, or infrequently, comes to his city office. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 18; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 7; Stoldt Affidavit at paragraph marks 6-7).
- The Committee received testimony that he has infrequently responded to efforts to reach him when he is not in the office when City employees attempt to contact him by email or phone. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 18; Angie Gump's Affidavit paragraph marks 4-8; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 13).
- Nicole Stoldt, the City's Auditor, was unable to find the Mayor to sign documentation for federal CARES act funds, nearly missing the deadline. Missing this deadline could have cost the City of Dover a substantial amount of federal funds. (See, Stoldt Affidavit at paragraph mark 36).

- Ms. Stoldt was also unable to find the Mayor to secure his signature for an application for a private grant for the city. Again, nearly causing the City to miss the private grant application opportunity. (See, Stoldt Affidavit at paragraph mark 40).
- The Mayor has provided almost no input on the city's budget, an over \$60 million budget. The one item he asked to be removed via email, he had already approved in person previously. (See, Stoldt Recorded Interview).
- The Mayor routinely missed recent labor negotiations with the City's Police union, other labor management meetings, records commission meetings, and city health insurance renewal meetings. (See, Stoldt Affidavit at paragraph mark 11-22).
- The Mayor failed to provide proposed salary scales of non-bargaining personnel. Ultimately, staff at the auditor's office had to put together an ordinance based on his intermittent email communications. When the ordinance was presented to Council, the Mayor failed to show up to explain "his" recommendations to Council. When Council ultimately voted against the ordinance, the Mayor failed to provide a revised proposal as requested. Council, rather than the Mayor, then had to prepare and pass a revised ordinance addressing non-bargaining employees' raises. The Mayor's absence from this process delayed approval of an ordinance until after the deadline to set 2021 salary scales. (See, Kelly Elliott's Affidavit at paragraph mark 24-29; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 17-18).
- The Mayor has not been present at a council meeting since January, apart from brief reports via zoom or phone. He has failed to bring assignments to council in a timely manner and failed to enact basic legislation in a timely manner. (See, Leggett Affidavit at paragraph mark 23-30; Gunnoe Statement to Council 4/5/2021 Council Committee of the Whole).
- The Mayor has delayed or failed to review and approve certain City expenditures. In some instances where the purchases were time-sensitive, City employees have been forced to bypass the Mayor's review completely. (See, Gump Affidavit at paragraph mark 5-12; Gunnoe Statement to Council 4/5/2021 Council Committee of the Whole).
- The Mayor has failed to make necessary hires or promotions. City's HR Director asked the Mayor to provide a replacement over a year ago. The Mayor has failed to hire his replacement and it is unclear if he has taken any steps to address this urgent position in City personnel. (See, Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 14-15; Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 25; and Investigation Findings, at Tabs C.29 and C.30 emails regarding Kenneth Young).
- The Mayor also failed to timely take action to address the retirement of the City's Assistant Cemetery Superintendent. He has failed to take timely action on the Human Resources Director's discipline recommendation for another City Superintendent. (See, Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 14-15).
- The Mayor failed to provide timely responses to properly submitted public records requests. (See Investigation Findings, at Tabs C.7, C.8, C.9 emails regarding: Public Records Request).
- The Mayor refused to meet his statutory obligation to appear before Council when requested in writing to do so under Ohio Revised Code. (See Minutes of April 26, 2021 Council Committee of the Whole Meeting).

- When the Mayor failed to sign passed City Council legislation in a timely manner, he appeared to take efforts to cover up these failures by backdating his signature on legislation. (See, Leggett affidavit at paragraph mark 24-27).
- The Mayor also misused a City credit card for private purchases at Kohl's. Though the misuse appears to have been an innocent mistake, because the Mayor was non-responsive to emails, it took several weeks to reimburse the City and correct the error. (See, Stoldt affidavit at paragraph mark 31-33).

Concern Area Two: Regarding Delegation of Authority to Non-City Personnel

- There are significant concerns among many city employees, including members of this body, that the mayor may have improperly delegated managing and responding to emails to non-city employees. This improper delegation compromises the City's ability to maintain confidentiality or protect sensitive information, including information pertaining to City finances or personnel issues. (See, Investigation Findings, at Tabs C.5 and 6 emails regarding: Technology Issues; Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 30-31; Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 19-22; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 20-21; Matthew Arnett's Affidavit at paragraph mark 24).
- The City IT Director received a request for a city-owned laptop that came not from the Mayor, but from his son, Nick Homrighausen, who is an unelected private citizen of Dover and not a City employee. (See, Arnett Affidavit at paragraph mark 24).
- The Mayor's wife and son, not the Mayor, contacted City employees to address technology issues. (See investigation Findings, at Tabs C.5 and C.6 emails regarding: Technology Issues).
- The IT Director has submitted that there is the possibility that emails have been accessed from a residential IP address when the Mayor was known to be in a medical facility. (See, Arnett Affidavit at paragraph mark 26).
- In addition, in phone and email communications, the Mayor's son, Nick Homrighausen, has instructed City employees on City affairs, including responding to public records requests from other City officials. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 29-30; Investigation Findings, at Tabs C.1, C.2, and C.3 emails from N. Homrighausen on behalf of the Mayor).
- As noted previously, the Mayor had virtually no input in the City's budget. The only input came in the form of a single email asking the Auditor to remove a budget line item that the Mayor had previously approved and voiced no objection too. Further raising suspicion that someone other than the Mayor was using the Mayor's email account to influence City policy. (Stoldt Recorded Interview).
- More recently, the Mayor has brought his wife with him to the office, and she has been present during in-person communications with City employees. She is also assisting the Mayor in his in-office activities. An unelected private citizen who is not a City employee should not be in anyway involved in the decision-making processes regarding City affairs. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 32; Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 19, 22; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 12).

- The Mayor has also officially identified his wife as his “designee” to City employees and empowered her to access a public building and public records without supervision. (See, Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 22; Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 41).

Concern Area Three: Impeding the City Council’s Legislative Investigation Pursuant to Resolution 3-21.

- The Mayor purportedly issued an “Administrative Instruction” telling City employees not to respond to requests from Dover City Council, impeding not only the 3-21 Investigation but also routine City business. (See Investigation Findings, Tab C.6 Administrative Instruction Letter from the Mayor).
- The Mayor has failed to comply with the City’s public records policy. The policy requires: “Copies of public records must be made available within a reasonable period of time...‘[R]easonable’ take[s] into account the volume of records requested, the proximity of the location of where the records are stored; and the necessity for any legal review and redaction of the records requested. It is the goal of the City of Dover that all requests for public records should be acknowledged in writing or, if possible, satisfied within 5 business days following the office’s receipt of the request, or as quickly as reasonably possible.” (See Investigation Findings, Tab A 2(b); Investigation Findings, Tabs C.7 and C.8 emails regarding: Public Records Requests).
- The Mayor instructed City employees that received a subpoena from City Council not to comply with that subpoena. (See Investigation Findings, Tab C.6 Administrative Instruction Letter; Douglas Affidavit paragraph mark 47; Mroczkowski Affidavit paragraph mark # 32; Arnett Affidavit paragraph Mark 32).
- He also intervened in and provided denials to public records requests from City Council members. (See Investigation Findings, Tabs C.7, C.8, and C.9).

Concern Area Four: Failure to Enforce Dover’s Drug Free Workplace Policy

- During the course of this investigation, city employees have voluntarily provided additional information indicating the Mayor implicitly condoned a serious violation of the City’s Drug-Free Workplace Policy. It appears to this committee that he may have permitted the violation to take place because the underlying incident involved his son, Peter Homrighausen, who is also a City Employee. (See, Scott Jerles’ Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Michael Burtcher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35).
 - The City’s Policy mandates employee drug and alcohol testing when there is:
 - An “accident” which is defined as “an unplanned, unexpected, or unintended event that occurs[] on city property; during the conduct of the City’s business or during working hours; or which involves City supplied motor vehicles [...] or is within the scope of employment and which results in [...] [p]roperty damage in apparent excess of \$750.” (See Investigation Findings, Tab A.2(a) Drug Free Safety Program Policy).
 - A “reasonable suspicion” that a City employee may be using or under the influence of drugs and alcohol. Specifically, the policy provides:
 - “Reasonable suspicion testing will occur when City supervisors have reason to suspect that an employee may be in violation of this Policy. The suspicion must

be documented in writing within 24 hours of the event or prior to the release of the test findings. The employee shall timely be provided with a copy of any such documentation. Reasonable suspicion testing may be based upon, among other things: [...]Information provided either by reliable and credible sources or independently corroborated regarding an employee's substance use.” (See Investigation Findings, Tab A.2(a) Drug Free Safety Program Policy).

- Approximately two years Peter Homrighausen backed a City truck into a pole in the General Services garage. Allegedly the damage was less than \$750.00, though there does not appear to be any independent assessment of the damage. Peter Homrighausen and his supervisors discussed a potential drug test. At that time, Peter Homrighausen stated that he did not believe he could pass a drug test. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- Instead of instructing that Peter Homrighausen take a drug test, his supervisor has reported he contacted the Mayor. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- Peter Homrighausen was never drug tested following the incident and did not otherwise face any disciplinary action related to the incident. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- Peter Homrighausen has a Commercial Driver’s License paid for by the City and, at the time, his job routinely involved operating City-owned vehicles. (See Investigation Findings, Tabs C.25 and C.26).
- The Mayor failed to act when having information concerning a potential Drug Free Workplace violation. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- This is a direct violation of the City’s Drug Free Workplace Policy section II.B.4 by Failing to Act when information is provided by a reliable source. Peter Homrighausen’s admission should have triggered a reasonable suspicion under Dover’s policy. Drug testing should have been immediately mandated. That admission with an accident should have mandated it further. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- Instead of following the drug free workplace policy, the Mayor appears to have condoned a known violation of the policy. This failure subjected fellow employees and the public to an employee with a Class A CDL who drives trucks for the City to the dangers inherent in said drug free workplace violation. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark

Concern Area Five: Potential Nepotism Law Violations

- During this investigation city employees also voluntarily provided additional information regarding the process of hiring and handling employment related issues regarding the Mayor’s son, Peter Homrighausen.

R.C. 2921.42(A)(1) provides: “No public official shall knowingly do any of the following:

Authorize, or employ the authority or influence of the public official's office to secure authorization of any public contract in which the public official, a member of the public official's family, or any of the public official's business associates has an interest.” (See Investigation Findings, Tab A.3(i)).

The Mayor is a “public official” under the statute, which is any elected or appointed officer, or employee, of the state or any political subdivision of the state. R.C. 2921.01(A). “A member of the public official’s family” includes children, whether dependent or not. (See Adv. Op. No. 80-001; dv. Op. No. 2008-03).

R.C. 2921.42(A)(1) prohibits the public official’s using the “authority and influence” of his position to either (a) secure employment for a family member, or (b) participate in any decision that affects the continuation, implementation, or terms and conditions of a family member’s employment.” (See Adv. Op. No. 92-012). (See Investigation Findings, Tab A.4(c)).

Further R.C. 102.03(D) prohibits any official from participating, formally or informally, in any matter that directly affects a family member’s employment.

The Mayor is the ultimate authority for hiring decisions for all City departments. (See Investigation Findings, Douglas Affidavit paragraph mark 27). The Mayor made the decision to hire his son. (Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 29). Using his hiring authority to make the decision to hire his son is in direct contravention of R.C. 2921.42(A)(1). (See Investigation Findings, Tab A.4(i)).

Further, he participated directly in decisions that affected the continuation or terms and conditions of his son’s employment in the following ways:

- The Mayor ruled on a grievance brought by his son and two other employees. (See Investigation Findings, Tab. C.27 Step III Grievance Response).
- The Mayor implicitly condoned the improper decision not to drug test Peter Homrighausen following a minor accident and stated admission by Peter Homrighausen that he would not be able to pass a drug test if given one. (See, Jerles Affidavit at paragraph mark 10-12; Mroczkowski Affidavit at paragraph mark 34-35; Burtscher’s Affidavit at paragraph mark 6-11).
- The Mayor appears to have at times contacted his son’s direct supervisors regarding issues related to his son’s employment. (See, Douglas Affidavit at paragraph mark 35).

Concern Area Six: Potentially Receiving Improper Compensation

As a result of voluntary disclosures from City of Dover employees, we learned that the Mayor has personally received and retained compensation for weddings that he performed as Mayor, often on City property. Though the compensation goes to the Mayor personally, he uses his executive assistant and City resources for the administrative tasks associated with the weddings.

This conduct implicates a City Code Section and state statutes. R.C. 2921.43(A) provides:

No public servant shall knowingly solicit or accept, and no person shall knowingly promise or give to a public servant, either of the following:

(1) Any compensation, other than as allowed by divisions (G), (H), and (I) of section 102.03 of the Revised Code or other provisions of law, to perform the public servant's official duties, to perform any other act or service in the public servant's public capacity, for the general performance of the duties of the public servant's public office or public employment, or as a supplement to the public servant's public compensation;

(2) Additional or greater fees or costs than are allowed by law to perform the public servant's official duties.

(See Investigation Findings, Tab. A.3(j)).

City Code Section 501.21 mirrors the state statute providing:

(a) No public servant shall knowingly solicit or accept and no person shall knowingly promise or give to a public servant either of the following:

(1) Any compensation, other than is allowed by Ohio R.C. 102.03(G), (H), and (I) or other provisions of law, to perform the public servant's official duties, to perform any other act or service in the public servant's public capacity, for the general performance of the duties of the public servant's public office or public employment, or as a supplement to the public servant's public compensation[.]

(See Investigation Findings, Tab A.1(a)).

Further, R.C. 705.25 provides:

All fees and perquisites appertaining to any municipal office or officer shall be paid into the treasury of the municipal corporation, and shall be credited to the general fund. No officer or employee of the municipal corporation shall receive otherwise than as the representative of the municipal corporation and for the purpose of paying it into such treasury any fee, present, gift, or emolument, or share therein, for official services, other than his regular salary or compensation. Any officer violating this section shall thereby forfeit his office. No member of the legislative authority or other officer or employee thereof shall receive compensation for services rendered in any other department of the municipal corporation, nor shall they or any other officer, clerk, or employee of the municipal corporation act as agent or attorney for any person, company, or corporation, in relation to any matter to be affected by action of the legislative or any other department, or by the action of any officer of the municipal corporation. The violation of this section is cause for removal.

(See Investigation Findings, Tab A.3(g)).

Sworn testimony and documentary evidence received in response to a public records request directed to Eva Newsome, Executive Assistant to the Mayor reveals:

- The Mayor officiated more than 60 weddings in 2014; more than 55 weddings in 2015; more than 45 weddings in 2016; more than 35 weddings in 2017; more than 30 weddings in 2018; more than 15 weddings in 2019; four weddings in 2020; and one wedding in 2021. (See Investigation Findings, Tab C.11 Wedding Dates Spreadsheet).
- The Mayor charges between \$35 and \$175 to officiate a wedding. (See Investigation Findings, Tab. C.10 Wedding Fees Spreadsheet).

- The Mayor uses the City’s resources to coordinate and schedule his appearance at weddings. (See Investigation Findings, Tab C.31 Wedding Emails; Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 6).
- The Mayor uses the City’s seal on the sample wedding vows that he provides to couples. (See Investigation Findings, Tab. C.15 Sample Wedding Vows).
- The Mayor keeps the fees charged for his appearance at weddings. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 4).

From this testimony and record evidence it seems that the Mayor is performing the weddings as an official duty, or at the very least, in a public capacity as Mayor. This likely violates R.C. 2921.43(A) and its mirror City Code section 501.21.

Further, per R.C. 705.25, to the extent those fees are collected they should be turned over to the general fund. We further know from Auditor Stoldt that no identifiable fees have been deposited in the general fund.

Concern Area Seven: Failure to Disclose Compensation to Ethics Commission

Based off the voluntary information provided by city employees regarding the mayor’s performance of weddings, a representative of City Council filed a public records request to obtain recent filings of his required Ohio Ethics Commission disclosure statements.

The Mayor’s compensation for performing weddings does not appear to be disclosed on his recent ethics commission filings. This failure amounts to a potential statutory violation of Section 102.02.

Revised Code Section 102.02 (A) requires all elected officials in city office to file a financial disclosure with the appropriate ethics commission. R.C. 102.02(A)(1). The statute requires that officials filing an ethics disclosure statement identify “every source of income [...] received during the preceding calendar year, in the person’s own name [...], and a brief description of the nature of the services for which the income is received.” R.C. 102(A)(2)(b)(i). (Investigation Findings, Tabs C.22, C.23, and C.24 Financial Disclosure Statements; Tab A.3(c) Financial Disclosure Requirements).

The statute also provides: “No person shall knowingly file a false statement that is required to be filed under this section.” R.C. 102.02(D). Violation of that section is a first degree misdemeanor. R.C. 102.99. (See Tab A.3(c) Financial Disclosure Requirements).

In response to a public records request to the Ohio Ethics Commission, the Committee of the Whole received the Mayor’s financial disclosures filed for 2017, 2018, and 2019. None of those disclosure statements identified compensation received for performing weddings as a source of income. (See Investigation Findings, Tabs C.22, C.23, and C.24).

We know from written testimony from Ms. Newsome that the Mayor received that compensation “in his own name” as described in the statute. Thus, we believe that failure to identify that source of income could be a potential violation of R.C. 102.02(D). (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph mark 4).

Concern Area Eight: Solicitation Calls by City Employees for Mayoral Campaign Fundraising Event

In the course of the investigation, City employees have voluntarily disclosed to the committee that they were asked to make sponsorship solicitation calls for the Mayor's campaign. This Committee believes that request, especially if made during city business hours is inappropriate even if ultimately the calls were made during non-business hours. The relevant state statute is R.C. 124.57(A), which provides, in relevant part:

No officer or employee in the classified service of the state, the several counties, cities, and city school districts of the state, or the civil service townships of the state shall directly or indirectly, orally or by letter, solicit or receive, or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political party or for any candidate for public office; nor shall any person solicit directly or indirectly, orally or by letter, or be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any such assessment, contribution, or payment from any officer or employee in the classified service of the state, the several counties, cities, or city school districts of the state, or the civil service townships of the state; nor shall any officer or employee in the classified service of the state, the several counties, cities, and city school districts of the state, or the civil service townships of the state be an officer in any political organization or take part in politics other than to vote as the officer or employee pleases and to express freely political opinion.

(See Investigation Findings, Tab. A.3(f) Prohibition Against Partisan Political Activity).

We learned through voluntary disclosures that:

- Eva Newsome, the Mayor's administrative assistant, made phone calls on behalf of the Mayor's reelection campaign. She made calls every year that she has been in that role, with the exception of 2020. The fundraiser was not held that year because of the COVID19 pandemic. Dave Douglas, the City's Service Director advised her to make the calls from her personal cell phone and outside of her normal working hours. (See, Newsome Affidavit at paragraph 7-10).
- Douglas was also asked to make calls, as was his administrative assistant, Tiffany Sica. (See, Douglas Affidavit at paragraph 38-40).
- Nick Homrighausen asked Gerry Mrockowski, the City's HR/Service Director to make calls in 2018. (See, Mrockowski Affidavit at paragraph 36).
- Dave Douglas and Eva Newsome provided their call lists in response to public records requests. The call lists included local businesses but did not appear to include any City employees. (See Investigation Findings, Tabs C.17, C.18, C.19, C.20, and 21 Mayor Golf Outing Solicitation List).

Conclusion the Committee of the Whole's Summary Report

In February and March of 2021, Dover City Council undertook final passage of Emergency Resolution 3-21 with the understanding that there were significant issues and concerns within the City of Dover administration to which this body had an obligation to research. It was the feeling of the members of City Council that we owed to the residents of the City of Dover to conduct a complete and through review of issues of which we had substantial concern. Each of these categories on its own should be a point of concern for every citizen of Dover. Taken together however, it becomes clearly apparent to the members of this body that City administration under Mayor Richard Homrighausen is not functioning currently in a proper manner. Given the gravity of some of the information voluntarily disclosed by City employees to this committee during this investigation, the members of Dover City Council would request additional outside review of that information by appropriate state and local agencies, especially as it relates to potential violations of the Ohio Revised Code or the Codified Ordinances of the City of Dover. While it is the intention of the members of this body to examine in the future the need for possible additional legislation, which may resolve a few of the problems outlined, ultimately enforcement of legislation and policies falls within the authority of City Administration. It is the firm belief of the members of this committee that proper enforcement of relevant statues, ordinances, and city policies has not occurred. Therefore, with the best interests of the citizens we serve in mind, and with this new information in hand, the members of this body again renew our call for the resignation of Mayor Richard Homrighausen. Based upon the extensive research done during this legislative investigation, the members of Dover City Council feel confident in our determinations. However, we invite the public to review all of the supporting documentation obtained in this report in its entirety, and to ultimately draw their own conclusions. Finally, this Committee of the Whole would like to close by expressing our thanks to the employees of the City of Dover, who have endured what we know are stressful situations as a result of our legislative investigation. The citizens of the City of Dover owe a debt of gratitude for the cooperative, and even courageous, way they have assisted in bringing forward the information obtained in the course of this report.

Shane Gunnoe, President of City Council

Don Mauer, Councilmen At Large

Justin Perkowski, Councilmen At Large

John Correll, Councilmen At Large

Greg Bair, Ward 1 Councilmen

Kevin Korns, Ward 2 Councilmen

Sandy Moss, Ward 3 Councilwoman

Bob Mueller, Ward 4 Councilmen