

**TOWN OF SOUTH BETHANY
TOWN COUNCIL WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 22, 2016**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Mayor Voveris called the September 22, 2016, Town Council Workshop Meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

PRESENT: Councilmembers Tim Shaw, Carol Stevenson, Frank Weisgerber, and Mayor Pat Voveris; Town Manager Melvin Cusick; Chief Troy Crowson; Code Enforcement Constable Joe Hinks; and Administrative Assistant Pam Smith

PRESENT BY REMOTE ACCESS: Councilmember Wayne Schrader

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Councilmembers Don Boteler and Sue Callaway

Mayor Voveris announced that she was going to table Item 7, Discussion & possible vote to move forward on Ryan Architecture, LLC's estimate on preparation of architectural drawings for Police Department building expansion to incorporate Dr. Warren's Police Facility Renovations and Expansion Operational, Administrative and Support Services Needs Analysis and Recommendations Report until she had more time to understand the information and talk to the architect.

AT THE REQUEST OF THE TOWN MANAGER, A PRESENTATION BY ALAN KERCHER OF KERCHER ENGINEERING CONCERNING STREET MICRO-SURFACING TO BE CONSIDERED ON SOUTH BETHANY STREETS.

Alan Kercher presented a PowerPoint Presentation to Council and the public titled Managing Your Pavements Effectively (attached). Mr. Kercher took questions from the Council and the public.

- **Discussion and possible vote to engage Kercher Engineering for pavement management/micro-surfacing projects** – A motion was made by Councilmember Shaw, seconded by Councilmember Stevenson, to accept the 2016 Pavement Management Study Proposal from Kercher Engineering Inc., fund the project, and move forward with the project. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

ABSTAINED: Councilmember Schrader

The motion carried with a 4-0 vote.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- **Town Council Public Hearing Minutes – Ordinance 183-16, September 9, 2016** – A motion was made by Councilmember Stevenson, seconded by Councilmember Shaw, to accept the September 9, 2016, Town Council Public Hearing – Ordinance 183-16 Minutes. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, Schrader and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

- **Town Council Regular Meeting Minutes, September 9, 2016** – A motion was made by Councilmember Shaw, seconded by Councilmember Weisgerber, to accept the September 9, 2016, Town Council Regular Meeting Minutes. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, Schrader and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Brad Gough (121 Elizabeth Way) – Inquired who was responsible for damage to the road when a company such as Verizon has to dig up a road. The Town Manager said the company that dug up the road is responsible.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE TO DO A TITLE SEARCH ON PINE ROAD NEAR TOWN HALL

Councilmember Stevenson read the following recommendation from the Traffic Committee:

Description: Determine the ownership of a paper street located between Kent Ave. and Bridge Road -northern terminus and Evergreen Road - south terminus. Properties immediately adjoining this paper street included approximately: west side: Parcels 46.03, 46.01, south side: Parcel 46.02, and east side: Parcels 72, 73, Andy Road, 94, and 95.

Justification: South Bethany is conducting a Transportation Study to evaluate measures to reduce traffic volume and speed, and to provide safe pedestrian use on neighborhood streets. The study area includes a network of streets that make up a corridor between Kent Ave, and Ocean Highway DE 1. Use of Pine Road as a new link in the road network is one of several alternatives being considered by the Traffic Committee. In order to evaluate the merit/effectiveness of this alternative, ownership must be determined. A deed supposedly recorded in 1959 indicates it is part of Middlesex Beach. Subsequent recorded plans indicate a ROW dimension greater than shown on this deed. Historically Pine Road provided access to the Town of South Bethany. Sussex County Parcel maps indicate that the property line of Middlesex Beach does not include Pine Road. A title search and inquiry into the use of Pine Road is supported by DeIDOT.

Mayor Voveris said the cost would probably not be more than \$2,000.

A motion was made by Councilmember Weisgerber, seconded by Councilmember Stevenson, to approve doing a title search on Pine Road. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, Schrader and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

ORDINANCES

- **Second Reading and possible vote on Ordinance 182-16 to amend the Code of the Town of South Bethany Chapter 50, Bulkheads, to regulate the height of boat docks, to permit the installation of Modular Floating Docking Systems, and to change the number of days for an appeal to commence and to clarify violations. (Frank Weisgerber)**

Councilman Weisgerber reviewed Ordinance 182-16.

Councilmember Weisgerber noted that the restriction on the height of boat docks has been dropped for now because the committee could not find the correct wording to legally support the regulation.

§50-8.1 Due to Ordinance 180-16 which redesignated Subsections 145-38 F through L as Subsections G through M, the reference to § 145-38F will need to be changed to § 145-38G. There are a few references such as this which need to be changed for the third reading.

George Junkin said the Code Enforcement Constable requested additional wording in § 50-9. For the third reading the following words will be added in the first sentence after "repair": "or are not compliant". Also, in the second sentence delete the word "repair".

Regarding the changes in § 50-9.1 Appeals, Mayor Voveris will check with the Town Solicitor to see if a separate ordinance is required to make this change for each chapter in the Code needing this language or if the changes can all be incorporated into one ordinance. Mayor Voveris said she would rather the Code be consistent throughout. Councilman Shaw agreed. There were no objections. (Administrative Assistant Note: The Town Solicitor advised Mayor Voveris that all ordinances with similar language being changed/added should reflect the same.)

Mayor Voveris declared this the second reading of Ordinance 182-16.

- **Second Reading and possible vote on Ordinance 184-16 to amend the Code of the Town of South Bethany Chapter 145, Zoning, Article III, "Definitions", Article X, "Dimensional Requirements", and Article XI, "Setback Requirements" to increase the maximum height of houses by one foot from 32 feet to 33 feet and allow house elevations to be measured from both the Center line of the road and the Base Flood Elevation in the AE and AO Zones (Sue Callaway)**

George Junkin reviewed Ordinance 184-16.

Regarding the suggestion to eliminate the Center Line of the Road measurement and only have the measurement from the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), Mr. Junkin stated that sometimes the Center Line of the Road measurement is more beneficial to the property owner. Also, there are some lots that are not in the floodplain and those lots do not have a BFE.

Regarding the suggestion to put the word "elevation" in front of "the Center Line of the Road", Mr. Junkin said the current language is the way it has always been and the Charter and Code Committee agrees the current language is adequate.

For clarification the definition of Lowest Horizontal Structural Member has been changed. The definition came from the FEMA website. Mr. Junkin noted that the language in §§ 145-35J(4) and 145-38E(2)(c) have been changed to be consistent with the definition of Lowest Horizontal Structural Member.

Mayor Voveris declared this the second reading of Ordinance 184-16.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE TO SUPPORT S.C.A.T. MEMBER, THE TOWN OF GEORGETOWN, IN CONTRIBUTING \$250 TOWARDS THE BUILDING OF A WWI MEMORIAL

A motion was made by Councilmember Shaw, seconded by Councilmember Stevenson, to support S.C.A.T. member, the Town of Georgetown, and contribute \$250 towards the building of a WWI memorial. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, Schrader and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING 2015 COMMUNITY SURVEY COMMENTS – TOWN SERVICES: TOWN MAINTENANCE, STREET MAINTENANCE, TOWN STORM DRAINAGE, CODE ENFORCEMENT, PERMITTING PROCESS, RECYCLING WASTE REMOVAL, TRASH REMOVAL, AND YARD WASTE REMOVAL. BEACH SERVICES: BEACH PATROL, VENDORS, CLEANING, AND ACCESS. TOWN GOVERNMENT: STAFF RESPONSIVENESS AND STAFF KNOWLEDGE. FUTURE TOWN NEEDS: PLAN FOR IMPROVED BEACH ACCESS AND SIGNAGE IMPROVEMENT

The Town Manager reviewed the following:

TOWN SERVICES
NO. 3 - TOWN MAINTENANCE
NO. 4 – STREET MAINTENANCE

The average score of 4.38 puts the Town Maintenance in the “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Very Satisfied” category. There were 11 comments submitted, however, most of the comments did not relate to Town Maintenance but rather property maintenance or code enforcement issues. There were favorable comments regarding excellent maintenance with limited staff and praising snow removal.

Three items and the responses/recommendations are as follows:

- Plate on Canal St. at West 8th that seems loose.
 Answer: The plate referred to is the hinged door access to a lift pump which is owned and maintained by Sussex County. The Town has requested in the past that this be looked at.
- Sand on beach roads can be hazardous to bikes, sand on York, near Rt. 1 starting to cover the walkway.
 Answer: The Maintenance Dept. periodically “plows” sand off of Ocean Drive during the summer months. Sweeping cannot be performed during the summer months due to the number of vehicles. The sweeping can cause broken windshields and chipped paint from the stone that is in the sand from the ocean side driveways.
- We have noticed a lot of deterioration on street corners on Oceanside near Rt. 1.
 Answer: The area referenced is where the Town streets meet paving aprons on Rt. 1. This area is under DelDOT maintenance. When the Town sees any problems with these areas, it is reported to DelDOT.

It should be noted that a long range plan for street pavement maintenance/preservation was completed by the Town several years ago which indicated, by year, which streets may need some type of pavement preservation work. Also a Pavement Distress Evaluation was completed at no cost by the University of Delaware, Delaware Center for Transportation. If the long range plan is to be followed, about one third of the streets should have some type of pavement management performed in 2017. A proposed program and path forward will be presented to Town Council in the near future.

TOWN SERVICES
NO. 5 – TOWN STORM DRAINAGE

The average score of for Storm Drainage was 3.43 which has dropped slightly from 3.87 in 2011. There were 43 comments submitted in 2015 compared to 68 comments submitted in the 2011 survey. Many of the comments were about standing water during or shortly after a storm and during high tide events. Several issues were about drainage issues on private property.

- The Town has had an investigation and repair procedure in place now for the past 10 years. When a resident reports a drainage problem that is within or perceived to be in the Town right-of-way, the address is documented and then the area is monitored through several

storms and tide cycles to see if there is a problem and also to determine if it is within the Town's responsibility. We find that most areas are on private property and are the responsibility of the property owners. Many of the older homes in Town were built with little or no elevation of the lot. If water stands more than 48 hours and it is determined that it is the Town's responsibility to remedy, the property address(s) are listed and if funds are available within the drainage budget, a drain system is either modified if one exists or a new one is installed. It should be noted that many of the drainage problems have been remedied. For instance, in 2005 and for several years, the Town budgeted \$50,000.00 for street drainage. This was in response to demands and many complaints aired at Town Council meetings by residents to address drainage problems. As problems have been addressed, this figure has come down to \$10,000.00 placed in the drainage budget for the last several years. Also, there have been very few if any drainage complaints aired at Town Council Meetings.

- There were several comments concerning tidal flooding. One way check valves have been installed of several drainage pipes where they exit through the bulkhead on Bristol Drive. This has relieved some of the nuisance flooding but severe high tides will continue to flood streets during storm events.
- There was one comment concerning flooding at the corner of Plymouth and York Rd. This has been addressed and the issue seems to be resolved. The Town will continue to monitor.

The Town Manager noted that the Code Enforcement Constable has a very good poster that he is handing out to property owners of things they can do on their property to assist them with their own drainage.

The Town does periodic inspections on the storm drainage system and the Town keeps a log of when the drains are inspected for the Community Rating System (CRS) Program.

TOWN SERVICES
NO. – 6 CODE ENFORCEMENT
NO – 7 PERMITTING PROCESS

The average score of 3.81 places Code Enforcement in the "Somewhat Satisfied" category which is slightly down from the 2011 survey which was 4.04. The Permitting Process placed at 3.65. This question was not on the 2011 survey.

In the following, the red print is the Code Enforcement Constable's response to all of the comments received in this category.

Mayor Voveris expressed concern regarding comments 5 and 21 below in regard to trees, bushes on the Town right-of-way and on houses at end of streets because sight lines are impaired. Mayor Voveris said this is dangerous. Mayor Voveris believes this is a Code issue. During discussion it was noted that the Code Enforcement Constable and the Planning Commission Chair, Dick Oliver, have been discussing this issue. The Code Enforcement Constable has given Mr. Oliver some ideas that center around a "clear sight triangle" which currently is ten feet from the intersection. Mr. Oliver said the Planning Commission is going to work on language for the code and come forward with a recommendation to Council.

1. Code enforcement: Town should be more lenient/reasonable when considering variances—most SB homes need or will undergo some improvements as such, most homeowners are trying to better their properties in function & aesthetics – for example – allow small porches for home access that will not infringe on neighbors but will create architectural character and increase value & beauty – keeping strictly inside a 50x100 lot w/o considering style/depth/lines/ architectural significance creates uninteresting, low-rent appearance. We need differences to create value! **Council and BOA issue. Town Code.**

2. Allow each homeowner to have one shed placed up against side of house for storage (approximately 4x8) this will reduce the amount of extraneous beach items that properties leave out and are unsightly – again, reducing clutter and increasing appearance and value in Town. Be reasonable – if owners want to improve property let them. Idea: create a boat exchange program: can list boats for sale or trade or search for boats wanted. **Council and BOA issue. Town Code**
3. Town code – properties too close to the sand and existing unstable property. **DNREC controls.**
4. Code enforcement officer should be more available to meet residents for general questions. **I am and frequently have meetings with owners, prospective buyers and realtors.**
5. Code enforcement of trees/bushes on Town right of way and on houses at end of streets because sight lines are impaired. **Code is not able to affect all situations.**
6. My road (Rebecca) drains into my drive way under my house I wonder about codes & inspection of adjacent house. That contributes to my drainage problem. **How? Please specify.**
7. Permitting process – I hear it's cumbersome! **Misinformation**
8. We owned a house for 11 years and totally enjoyed the Town & beach. Rentals were increasing. Hurricane Sandy flooded our house & flood claim & Sussex County permitting were very painful. Our family lives in different locations now, so we are selling our SB house. We settle in October hopefully. But we will come back every year as renters! **OK**
9. I would also like to see a code restricting lights on properties in the same way. **Council**
10. Why is a permit required to replace an existing structure or HVAC system? **FEMA requires it.**
11. With emphasis on water quality, code enforcement should be more concerned about debris falling from trees that overhang the canals (even those that are high) also bushes that overhang and sometimes fall into the water and create a mess for others to clean up. **Not in Code.**
12. Code enforcement has always been too strict. Permitting process is too much. I don't think you need a permit for many things on the current list. We feel that "big brother" is always watching which does not feel good. There are too many regulations and rules. We have two other houses and they do not come close to the oversight that SB has over everything! People are mostly nice they will usually do the right thing. We need less regulation and oversight from the city. **FEMA rules.**
13. Code enforcement in the past has been spotty or non-existent. This is especially true on residential streets when new construction is underway. Contractors ignore time, site safety, site drainage, noise, etc. **How long ago? Issues addressed as they occur.**
14. Permitting Process – The process is fine-the fee to improve my property to FEMA specifications and increase the value of my home was ridiculous. I installed six flood vents on the ground floor. As a result was required to pay for entire floor square footage improvement. **The fee schedule has changed and even the old one did not calculate fee that way.**
15. Code enforcement-still many properties poorly maintained fences falling into canal, weeds, "ABANDONED PROPERTY." **Where? Please specify.**
16. Permitting process. Code enforcement constable needs to, if he doesn't already, communicate ordinance changes that are being considered, but not yet implemented, to applicants so that they can plan appropriately. Examples include higher elevation with freeboard, potential bulkhead height changes, as well as proposed new BFE's. **They are explained.**
17. Code enforcement – stricter control. **Really?**
18. Permitting – requiring permit for repairs. Discourages well-kept properties. **FEMA rules.**
19. Permits fees are not equal to work to be done. **Council sets the fees.**
20. Permitting – building restrictions are too strict, especially the arbitrary limit on bathrooms. **Eliminated.**
21. A change in the Town code is needed to address the issue of street corner vegetation on private property. The four foot height currently in place impedes the sedan and SUV driver's visual access to cross traffic causing a serious safety hazard. Currently one must extend the front of the sedan into the intersection to see if traffic is present on the cross street. A good example is exiting W. 9th St. onto Canal Dr. **Council issue.**

22. FEMA/ CODE COMPLIANCE. Want to replace compressors & we're told by contractor we need to have an elevation certificate done. We have flood insurance and our house is elevated 8'. Compressors are currently 2' above ground and can go higher. **Must be BFE or higher.**
23. Items 6 & 7 too many situations/codes and permits. Homeowners need latitude. **FEMA rules.**
24. Town Services, Code Enforcement - We were putting in a new sliding glass door and code enforcement came. They were going to shut us down if we didn't pay \$150.00 cash to him on the spot. For all we know that money went right into his pocket. That was so uncalled for. **I don't accept cash. \$150.00 would be a mercantile license. Unlicensed Contractor?**
25. Code enforcement – could do better follow up with code violations. **Doing my best.**
26. Town services, code enforcement – I've noticed flags (lanyards) in the space between the canal and homes, obstructing view of canals and little Assawoman Bay. I thought such items were prohibited by code. **Flagpole not a structure according to code.**
27. We are at the beach, windows fail & wood rots! The more the Town requires building permits for maintenance work, the higher the cost to fix and creates a barrier to keeping up home appearances. Maintenance should not require a permit, only new construction or additional square footage additions. New code changes are too much! **FEMA rules.**
28. Code enforcement. Neighbor has abandoned auto and weeds growing. House is abandoned as well. This is an unsightly house and yard reflects poorly on the whole community. Reduces home values. **Where?**
29. Ordinances to stop sign proliferation and junk (excessive) vehicle/boats) in driveways. This would help improve property values. This Ordinance is definite; shops need to be cleaned up (Dollar Store) outside and rejuvenated. They are looking rough. **Not in SB. Middlesex.**
30. Some driveways/walkways with standing water are unsightly and contribute to mosquito breeding. There are docks that are in need of repair, as well as sheds & outside showers. **?**
31. Some yards are cluttered with junk which detracts from the beauty of the coastal area. **No beauty code.**
32. Town Services #6 – Many setback violations-sheds etc. 11 – does not apply police & emergency service. **Grandfathered.**
33. Also, should residents be made aware of the fire hazard these overgrown trees create? An example of trees shedding pine needles excessively, W. 4th Street off Canal Drive # 300. **Not a current code. Council issue.**
34. I live at 121 Canal Drive and every year I complain about the utility cover on Canal, at the bottom of my driveway that has never been secured – every time a car drives over it, it “bangs/clangs” 24/7/365. No one in Town Hall has ever been able to help us rectify this – no one owns this! Problem! **Not my department.**
35. Town service. Should do a better job at enforcing trees hanging over into canals. **Only if a real violation.**
36. It is unacceptable that house setbacks apply to small backyard sheds. Most of the houses here have small lots, and the house takes up all of the setbacks. No other Town that I have lived in has such a crazy law. Many of the houses, including mine, have no garages, and have little spaces for storage. Building “up” as was suggested, could run upward of \$40,000 to \$50,000, not many can afford that. Although there are many sheds on lots now, they were supposedly “Grand-Fathered in”. Stop the micromanaging and allow people some reasonable storage options for their properties! **Council issue.**
37. Signage – the “for rent” & “for sale” signs are out of control and very ugly particularly on the Ocean Drive. There should be some standardization. **Council issue.**
38. I think Town should warn people to take care of their properties and driveways. House at corner of Periwinkle & Russell has high weeds on front side & bad appearance to be doing nothing about it. Other houses as well. **Weeds were cut.**
39. We have never had a problem with renters on our street until this year. Many weeks there were up to 8 cars for one house. Do we have any ordinance in place for how many cars can be at a rental property at any given week? We love SB and have watched it grow for the better over the last 25 years. Keep up the great work! **No. And OK.**

40. We would like an indoor shower on our first floor, but one builder says we can't. This is crazy since we have outdoor showers. **Below BFE?**
41. The Town currently does not adequately enforce the NO wake policy. Outside or mention in Zephyr – even phone calls have not resulted in enforcement. **Police issue.**
42. A few “NO wake” signs around the canals would be nice. Many folks violate this policy. An improved violation reporting ability would be great. Can't depend on DNREC for enforcement. **Not Code Enforcement. Police issue.**
43. Change the time allowed for new building construction of homes, to below for peaceful summer – months, i.e. everything under roof before-summer season. Inside work ok! **Council issue.**
44. Would like to see a "no wake" sign placed on the island facing Jefferson Creek at the Snap Gut. Or place one in the middle of the water. Residents and vacationers go through that area, on a regular basis, at a high level of speed. The “no wake” signs at the beginning of each street are not enough. Thank You. **I don't do this.**
45. Boats on power lifts are increasing, therefore, increasing obstructing views of canals and wetlands. **No restriction on views.**
46. SB needs to continue to balance the restrictions of DNREC and the property rights of the owners. Renovation & reconstruction has improved the environment more than the unintended consequences of onerous regulation & restriction. Therefore, if individuals can't afford to improve, then improvement does not occur. **? What is the issue?**
47. As new homeowners (who are planning to move to SB in the next few years full time) we are delighted! Joe Hinks is wonderful to work with! **YEA one vote.**

TOWN SERVICES
NO. 8 – RECYCLING WASTE REMOVAL

The average score of 4.14 for Recycling Waste Removal places in the “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Very Satisfied” category compared to 4.20 in the 2011 survey. There were 34 comments submitted. Of those, 9 comments suggested more frequent pickups during the summer season and 8 comments suggested a different day for pickup. Some complaints concerned missed pickups.

When the Town receives a call for missed pickups, the company is contacted with the address. The company has been responsive on these complaints and typically responds the next day.

If the Town Council wants to consider an additional recycling pickup during the summer season, it will require a contract addendum with Republic Waste Services. The Council will have to determine what day the additional pickup will occur and a cost will have to be negotiated with the contractor. Since waste services is a pass through cost to property owners, the additional cost will have to be determined and included in the tax bills that are scheduled to be sent out May 1st.

During discussion Mayor Voveris stated that an additional pickup would mean another truck on the street.

TOWN SERVICES
NO. 9 - TRASH REMOVAL

The average score of 4.41 for Trash Removal places it in the “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Very Satisfied” category. This compares to 4.51 in the 2011 survey. There were 13 comments submitted compared to 16 comments submitted in the 2011 survey. Of those, 3 comments suggested that pickups 3 times a week during the summer was not necessary. It should be noted that this was tried several years ago and did not work very well. Town Maintenance had to step in and empty overflowing trash cans between pickups. The Town Council decided to go back to the 3 pickups per week during the summer season. There were a few comments about missed pickups. When a complaint such as this is received, the Town contacts the contractor with the address and requests a pickup.

It should be noted that there was a comment stating the trash removal was excellent and that A.J. was an asset to the South Bethany community.

TOWN SERVICES
NO. 10 – YARD WASTE REMOVAL

Yard Waste Removal had an average score of 4.09 which places it in the “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Very Satisfied” category. There were 13 comments submitted as compared to 26 comments submitted in the 2011 survey. It should be noted that Yard Waste Removal was not included in the 2011 survey as it was not instituted until after the 2011 survey was sent out. One comment suggested yard waste should be picked up 4 times per year. Yard waste is picked up every other week throughout the year-26 pickups on the average. There were also a few comments that suggested more frequent pickups.

BEACH SERVICES
NO. 1 – BEACH PATROL

Beach Patrol had an average score of 4.58 which places it in the “Very Satisfied” category. There were 7 comments submitted. 3 comments referenced training. 1 comment wanted expanded Jr. Life Guard program to include teenagers. 1 comment complained a raft was allowed in the water. 1 comment submitted thought female bathing suits were too “skimpy”.

It should be noted that the current Jr. Lifeguard program allows up to 15 year olds in the program.

Since Beach Patrol Training was mentioned, below is the Job Posting for the South Bethany Beach Patrol which lists certifications and requirements. This is in addition to the daily training that is required for all Beach Patrol members.

South Bethany Beach Patrol

Job Posting:

Lifeguard / Ocean Rescue

Requirements:

We are seeking individuals to fill positions as ocean lifeguards for the upcoming summer season. Candidates must have current certifications in CPR, First Aid, AED, and pass the South Bethany Beach Patrol fitness test requirements listed below.

Every candidate must be able to perform the following tasks: Run in soft sand, swim in ocean water, enter and exit the ocean through the surf, move an unconscious person of 150 lbs., see for 400 meters, hear and locate whistle blast from 300 meters, speak and read the English language. Inability to perform these tasks will result in disqualification from the testing process. Ocean Rescue Training is provided by the South Bethany Beach Patrol. Prior to entering training, each candidate must pass a vigorous, physical test consisting of the following phases in succession:

Complete a 300 meter soft sand run in less than 65 seconds (400 meter run in 80 seconds offsite testing)

Complete a 400 meter ocean swim in less than 10 minutes (500 yards in less than 10 minutes offsite in a pool)

Complete a series of simulated rescues in the surf incorporating the rescue buoy

Complete a rescue using a cross-chest carry and Victim removal techniques

Complete a medley of 150 meter run, 100 meter swim, and a 150 meter run

Complete a transport of the lifeguard stand a distance of 20 meters

Complete a 25 yard underwater swim while holding breath

Complete a personal interview

BEACH SERVICES
NO. 2 – VENDORS

Beach vending had an average score of 3.82 which places it in the “Satisfied” to “Somewhat Satisfied” category. There were a total of 21 comments submitted. Of the 21 submitted, 7 stated they were not in favor of having vending on the beach. 1 comment submitted wanted more vendors on the beach. 5 comments wanted to allow a previous vendor back. The remaining comments submitted wanted more variety from the beach vendor and more frequency.

It should be noted that the Town holds a contract with Dewey Beach Service (David Lynam) which runs through the summer of 2017. This contract pays the Town \$18,000 per year. At the end of the summer of 2017, the Town will have collected a total of \$135,000.00 in revenue since the inception of beach vending in 2010.

BEACH SERVICES
NO. 3 – CLEANING

The average score of 4.25 places beach cleaning in the “Somewhat Satisfied” to “Very Satisfied” category. There were 3 comments submitted concerning beach cleaning. One comment stated they have never seen the beach cleaned while the other two comments suggested the Town purchase a Beach Rake.

The Town budgets \$3,000.00 a year for beach cleaning where a contractor with a beach rake is brought in to clean the beach if necessary. This has worked well and the funding is sufficient at this time. It should also be noted that this is typically performed early in the morning before the beach is too crowded to have the equipment on the beach. The Maintenance staff checks the beach daily and picks up any trash that may be present.

BEACH SERVICES
NO. 4 – ACCESS

The average score of 4.11 places beach access in the “Somewhat Satisfied” category. There were 72 comments submitted. Of those, 8 comments concerned needing a boat ramp or kayak launching ramp in South Bethany. 2 stated that public restrooms were needed. 2 stated sand wash off stations were needed. Almost all of the remaining comments stated that the dune and walkways were too steep. Several stated that more walkways like the one at S. 3rd street were needed. Three were a few comments that expenditures for such walkways should not be made since they could be destroyed during storm events. There were some comments in favor of mobi mats and that more were needed. There were some comments that stated they did not like mobi mats as they could be slippery and too hot.

It should be noted that the issue of more handicap wooden walkways has come up before. There are many issues that would need to be discussed by Council including costs, maintenance, and the possibility of losing the structures during storm events. Also DNREC and probably the Corps of Engineers would have to approve any structures crossing the dune. It is a Council decision on whether to pursue and fund any new structures to cross the dune system.

TOWN GOVERNMENT
NO. 4 – STAFF RESPONSIVENESS

The average score of 4.10 places Staff Responsiveness in the “Somewhat Satisfied” category. There were 3 comments submitted. One comments stated that the staff was “Extraordinarily efficient and effective! Always improving”. One comment stated that the Code Enforcement Constable was wonderful to work with. One comment stated that “employees are responsive and knowledgeable. Friendly and helpful”.

TOWN GOVERNMENT
NO. 5 – STAFF KNOWLEDGE

The average score of 4.11 places Staff Knowledge in the “Somewhat Satisfied” category. The only comments submitted are the comments mentioned in the above category.

FUTURE TOWN NEEDS
PLAN FOR IMPROVED BEACH ACCESS

This was discussed to some extent under the category Beach Services, No. 4 – Access. The comments in the 2015 survey indicate support for improved beach access. As mentioned previously, the installation of additional handicap walkways will have to be discussed with Council, DNREC, and most likely the Army Corps of Engineers. The dune system is owned and managed by DNREC and the current “template” was designed and built by the Corps of Engineers. Any proposed crossings will have to meet approval by both agencies. The Town would likely have to fund all of the expenditures which can be sizeable. The Town would also have to consider that any structures are vulnerable to damage or total destruction by storm events.

Handrails were placed on the N. 6th Street beach crossing several years ago. There were no comments received by the public, positive or negative, on the handrails. They were destroyed by the storms in the winter of 2015-2016.

In the FY 2018 Budget, additional mobi-matts could be considered. The Town currently owns and maintains 15 mobi matts. This would give the Town more flexibility in placing the matts after storm events.

The Town Manager noted that anytime a storm event comes up the Town is required to remove from the beach any items it has on the beach. In order to do so the Town has to hire a contractor to come in and help because there is so much stuff on the beach. The more items the Town puts on the beach the cost to remove those items increases. Also, at the end of the season the mobi matts have to be power washed and stored.

FUTURE TOWN NEEDS
SIGNAGE IMPROVEMENT

Not sure what was meant for this category. All of the street signs in the Town have been changed/improved over the past several years with the phased replacement suggested by the Community Enhancement Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Councilmember Weisgerber, seconded by Councilmember Shaw, to adjourn the September 22, 2016, Town Council Workshop Meeting at 4:00 p.m. The voting was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION: Mayor Voveris and Councilmembers Stevenson, Weisgerber, Schrader and Shaw

AGAINST THE MOTION: None

The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

phs:2016 09 22 Workshop Minutes Approved 10 14 16

Attachment: PowerPoint Presentation titled Managing Your Pavements Effectively