SAFETY ADVISORY AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Safety Advisory and Transportation Committee Meeting was held on October 26, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. with Chairman Hosfelt presiding. Members present were Mr. Hutchison, Mr. Sudler (arrived at 4:12 p.m.), Mr. Keller, and Mr. Shelton. Members of Council present were Mr. Anderson (arrived at 4:27 p.m.) and Mr. Cole.

AGENDA ADDITIONS/DELETIONS

Mr. Hutchison moved for approval of the agenda, seconded by Mr. Keller and unanimously carried.

Discussion - Prohibited Speed Reduction Devices

Chairman Hosfelt explained that this item was the result of a discussion that took place at a neighborhood meeting at the Greentree Shopping Center involving the owner of the property as well as business owners. Crime issues and speed reduction devices were discussed. Mr. Hosfelt indicated the desire to hear from the public regarding the problems that they were incurring.

Mr. John Anstine, JBA Properties, 1460 Russell Road, Paoli, Pennsylvania, advised members that JBA is the property manager for the Greentree Shopping Center. He indicated that there is a service road in back of the shopping center that extends from Redner's Warehouse Markets to PNC bank between Independence Boulevard and Kenton Road that has become a major cut-through road. Mr. Anstine explained that the space is very tight in that area and tenants must cross over the road to access their dumpsters. He noted that there is a lot of traffic on the road and people drive very quickly. Mr. Anstine expressed his opinion that speed bumps would help to slow people down or deter them from going through there in the first place.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Anstine stated that, as property manager, he favored speed bumps and noted that although traffic is supposed to be one-way traffic heading west from Independence Boulevard, people disregard the "Do Not Enter" sign and travel in both directions.

Mr. Hutchison stated that there had been previous discussion about changing the dumpsters around to reduce drivers' ability to get through the service road easily and questioned if that had been done. Responding, Mr. Anstine stated the need for 18-wheeled trucks to get through since trucks back in to the loading dock at Redner's and then head out to the west. He noted that some trucks do an illegal U-turn and then go back out.

In response to Mr. Hutchison regarding which businesses have large tractor trailers coming in, Mr. Anstine indicated that Giacomo's Pizza Delight and the UPS store receive deliveries from these large vehicles.

Mr. Hutchison stated that speed bumps had been discussed for many years; however, they do not work well with fire and paramedic apparatuses. He indicated that he very strongly supported measures other than speed bumps.

Mr. Anstine stated that his township in Pennsylvania uses speed bumps on municipal roads, noting that they do slow the traffic in neighborhoods. He indicated that they were open to other ideas to slow people down as well.

Mr. Keller stated that his only objection was that emergency vehicles would run into a problem. He questioned how visible the one-way sign was and whether enforcing it or putting another sign up would help. Responding, Mr. Anstine stated that there was only one (1) sign, and it was clearly visible and met specifications, estimating that it was approximately 18 inches wide by two (2) feet tall. He noted that the ground is also stenciled; however, he expressed his opinion that people do what they want to do. Mr. Anstine explained that the service road previously allowed two-way traffic until Redner's opened and he felt that people have this ingrained in their minds.

Responding to Mr. Keller regarding the traffic in front of the stores, Mr. Anstine stated that pedestrian crossing signs were put out, which helped; however, sometimes people speed through and there is only so much that can be done. He noted that people sometimes run over these signs and do not even know that they have done so.

Mr. Shelton stated that he goes by the area all the time; however, he had not seen the signs. He asked if there was a sign that says "For Deliveries Only." Responding, Mr. Anstine stated that they used to have a "Do Not Enter, Authorized Vehicles Only" sign that was up for years. A truck ran over it and he had it removed and it was never replaced.

Mr. Ed Trumble, Owner, Integrity.PC.Computers, 59 Greentree Shopping Center, advised members that he had concerns not only with the back of the store but also the front. He indicated that he is usually there six (6) or seven (7) days per week, over 12 hours per day, and had been at that location for over one (1) year. He expressed his opinion that it is very dangerous to park in the front lot or to try to cross in the back to take trash out. Mr. Trumble stated that there are three (3) or four (4) one-way arrows and a "Do Not Enter" sign. There is no speed limit sign out back, but he questioned if this would matter since it is private property and the police would not issue a ticket anyway. Mr. Trumble stated that there is a 15-mph speed limit sign in front of his store; however, he indicated that speeders are not ticketed.

Mr. Trumble advised members that there were speed bumps in Rodney Village, less than five (5) miles away, and in Milford and Christiana and that these speed bumps work. He noted that the police, fire services, and paramedics can function in those municipalities and questioned why they could not do so in Dover. He felt that an ounce of prevention was worth a pound of cure and questioned what would be done when someone gets hurt. Mr. Trumble indicated that he has senior citizen customers that come from as far at Milford to use his services, and he sometimes has to help them carry their equipment in and out and the drivers don't seem to care. He stated that there had been several instances of crime in the shopping center lately and felt that speed bumps would make it less easy for those involved to get in and out, noting that they might not even come if there are speed bumps. Mr. Trumble felt that this was something that needed to be looked at and addressed since the problem was getting worse.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Trumble stated that the problem increases in the fall when football teams practice on a nearby field, although more football participants had been parking on the main road rather than in the back lately. He suggested that more yellow striping, like that around fire hydrants, could be added so that motorists do not park so close to the drive. Mr. Trumble noted that

he currently has to go beyond the parked vehicles to look left and right to see what is coming before he can cross to dump his trash. He advised members that people are using the service road as a thoroughfare to go from one (1) road to the next, noting that he had observed three (3) or four (4) cars in a 10 to 15 minute period passing through to avoid an intersection or going through the front of the shopping center.

Ms. Susan Whitney, Something Unique, 61 Greentree Drive, stated that customers come from as far as Salisbury, Maryland, and Wilmington to her establishment and have problems crossing the street without somebody hitting them. The stylists who work there also complain about almost being hit by cars. Ms. Whitney felt that this was definitely a problem that was getting worse. In addition, she stated that she recently saw a man beating a woman in front of the store and had to call the police.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt as to whether her problems were only related to traffic in the front of her store, Ms. Whitney stated that when big tractor trailers come to the back area, she cannot get into her parking space. When backing out to leave, she notices that the football families sometimes leave a lot of trash and park in such a way that it is hard for her to back out. Ms. Whitney confirmed that the service road is used as a thoroughfare to go from one (1) side to the other by those who do not work or live there. She noted that people come and dump their trash in the store's trash cans as well.

Responding to Mr. Keller regarding whether the nature of the problem in the front was disregard for the people crossing or speed, Ms. Whitney stated that it was a combination. She noted that one (1) lady hollered out, "I don't stop for pedestrians." Ms. Whitney indicated that there were elderly clients, 80 or 90 years old, that try to cross. She stated that kids also ride their skateboards and bikes on the sidewalks, which could become an issue if an elderly client is hit.

Referring to the photo of a device that was similar in nature to a portable speed bump, Mr. Hosfelt advised members that this type of speed bump would allow heavy apparatus to cross. He stated that this example was provided by Council President Slavin and forwarded to the City of Dover Police Chief and Fire Chief.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison as to whether these devices were being used in Delaware, Mr. Hosfelt stated that he was unsure and that this would be a better question for Councilman Slavin. Mr. Hutchison stated that he liked the idea.

In response to Mr. Keller, Mr. Hosfelt indicated that he was unsure about the installation of these bumps or if they were just laid down.

Mr. Cole advised members that these devices had been looked at with respect to State Street and the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) had indicated that these types of devices were being used in upstate Delaware.

Fire Chief Mark Hall expressed his belief that South Governors Avenue had these speed cushions and indicated that the Fire Department was not, at this time, opposed to them. He stated that speed bumps are permanent and that national response time is reduced seven (7) to 11 minutes with the

installation of speed bumps, and noted that two (2) firefighters in Dover had been injured by them. Chief Hall indicated that they liked the idea of speed cushions since the wheel base of an apparatus can get through. He stated that he had done some research and it looked like the cushions are bolted to the ground with an eyebolt and, although he was not completely sure, he felt that the City would be able to remove them for snow removal. Chief Hall noted that different types of devices are offered by different companies, stating that the cushions are a speed calming device, whereas a speed bump is more of a speed reduction device. He reiterated that Capitol Park on South Governors Boulevard had them and advised members that the Fire Department had been there for fires in the past and had one (1) issue involving a loose eyebolt that got caught in the wheel well and ended up in someone's yard.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt regarding the devices on South Governors Boulevard, Chief Hall stated that they were similar to those pictured but smaller and for use in developments. He was unsure if they were yellow striped, but indicated that they are accessible to the fire apparatus and wheels can be put between them when traveling through them. Chief Hall indicated that the firefighters' injuries referenced previously were both leg injuries but was unsure of the location of the speed bumps involved. He stated that Kentwood Mobile Home Park has permanent speed bumps and there is a great reduction in the Fire Department's rate of response once they enter that development. The fire apparatus must come almost to a full stop, and it takes some time to get it back up to speed. Chief Hall stated his belief that the national average response time mentioned previously was based on speed bumps on more open, residential streets as opposed to developments, noting that the current discussion was about private property. He reiterated that he did not have an issue with speed calming devices.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt, Chief Hall clarified that the areas he had mentioned were outside the City of Dover limits and its police jurisdiction, but within the Dover Fire Department's jurisdiction.

Captain David Spicer, Dover Police Department, stated that he had spoken to Police Chief Paul Bernat, who indicated that he was against speed bumps and speed cushions. Captain Spicer stated that they would reduce response time, maybe by seconds, which in their line of work could mean the difference between life and death. He indicated that Chief Bernat had mentioned to him that the City of Harrington was using similar devices and it was his belief that they had worked there; however, it was his understanding that a snow plow had damaged one (1). Captain Spicer noted that if they are fastened to the ground with eyebolts that work their way loose, there could be potential injuries to pedestrians, motorists, and vehicles. Captain Spicer stated that, at this time, they were against this approach.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Captain Spicer confirmed that the Police Department was against these devices on both private property and public roadways.

Mr. Sudler inquired if there were any other mechanisms that residents may be able to utilize to decrease the speeds that the Police Department would favor. Responding, Captain Spicer stated that approximately one (1) month ago, he attended a meeting where different ideas were discussed for Independence Boulevard, Bicentennial Village, and North State Street. The pros and cons of speed

cushions, traffic redesign to divert traffic around objects or slow it down, and traffic islands were discussed. Captain Spicer felt that Chief Bernat would be in favor of a traffic circle similar to that on Mifflin Road, which seemed to slow a lot of traffic in that area.

Captain Spicer noted, in regard to signage at the Greentree Shopping Center, that the Police Department is limited in the number of traffic laws that they can enforce on private property, and that inattentive driving, driving under the influence (DUI), and reckless driving on private property could be enforced.

Mr. Hosfelt stated that he would like the Committee to continue this discussion after a couple of months, which would allow him time to do further research, especially in regard to speed cushions. He stated that this subject would not be put aside and was worth investigation. He expressed his thanks to Captain Spicer, Chief Hall, the business owners who participated, and the property manager from Greentree Shopping Center. Although the discussion had concentrated on speed bumps, Mr. Hosfelt expressed his understanding that some who were present had other concerns regarding crime and stated that he was sure Captain Spicer would make himself available to them regarding any concerns.

Request for Waiver - Appendix B - Zoning, Article 5 - Supplementary Regulations, Section 17 - Emergency Access Requirements - Waiver of Emergency Rear Access Requirement for Blue Hen Apartments Phase 2 (Application S-15-12)

Mrs. Dawn Melson-Williams, Principal Planner, reviewed a request from Blue Hen Apartments, LLC, located behind the Blue Hen Corporate Center, for a waiver of the requirement for a 16-foot alley or a 18-foot secondary fire lane and a 18-foot subgrade emergency access lane as emergency access to the rear building areas for two (2) and three (3) story apartment buildings. Mrs. Melson-Williams explained that a site plan had been filed to expand this community of apartment complexes to include 12 additional apartment buildings, two (2) at the intersection of Blue Hen Boulevard and Haslet Street and the remaining buildings in a straight line, running parallel to the Blue Hen Corporate Center building.

Mrs. Melson-Williams reviewed a site plan depicting the proposed layout, noting that all of the buildings had a 24-foot fire lane crossing in front of the main entrances to the buildings. In some cases, given the position of the building, the building would either back up to another street or there would be a secondary driveway in close proximity. Mrs. Melson-Williams advised members that the Planning Commission, in reviewing the application, looked at the overall layout as well as the comments provided by the City Fire Marshal's Office. She noted that, due to their size, the buildings were required to be sprinklered.

Mrs. Melson-Williams noted that there is a fire lane coverage percentage requirement for the front of the building. Fire lanes must be marked on the ground surface, and the buildings are required to have a fire alarm system and a Knox box safe; therefore, they have a high level of fire protection required by other regulations beyond the requirements of the zoning ordinance. She reiterated that the applicant was seeking relief from the secondary rear fire access requirement for either an alley or another fire lane and advised members that the waiver request had been presented to the Planning Commission and members recommended approval.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison, Mrs. Melson-Williams confirmed that the waiver was supported by the Fire Marshal's Office, noting that they were fairly comfortable that the other fire prevention regulations specific to the building construction, including a sprinkler and fire alarm as well as the primary fire lane across the front, would be adequate for response to that type of building.

In response to Mr. Hutchison as to whether a legal opinion had been obtained from the City Solicitor's Office approving the waiver and in regard to any liabilities, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the zoning ordinance established that this was a waiver that could be asked for. She explained that the review process is that the Planning Commission makes a determination which goes through the Committee, with final action by City Council. Mrs. Melson-Williams indicated that she was unsure if the liability question had ever been posed in this regard.

Noting that waivers had been granted previously, Councilman Anderson questioned what the history had been and if there had been any problems. Responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she was not aware of any problems. She stated that the most recent waiver approved was probably in the Leander Lakes apartment complex, which was now under construction on the west side of Dover High Drive. Mrs. Melson-Williams indicated that the Leander Lakes building project was very similar, sought the same waiver, and was successful. The Leander Lakes project was a three (3) story apartment building with a sprinkler, fire alarm and a front primary fire lane but no ability to provide the rear access via an alley or secondary fire lane due to the layout of the complex. She stated her belief that the existing Blue Hen Apartments project, which was a little older in its construction, also received this waiver previously.

Mr. Anderson inquired if this regulation was outdated due to the current technology in designs, or if this was a unique situation. Responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that staff had come across this situation in multiple instances and had seen a lot of requests for waivers of the rear emergency access provision for apartments, which also applied to townhouse developments. Staff had identified this as one (1) of the sections of the zoning ordinance that needed review. Mrs. Melson-Williams indicated that technology had improved and there were other fire protection requirements and regulations that would greatly supersede and probably be more beneficial than additional pavement to the rear of these units.

Mrs. Donna Mitchell, Controller/Treasurer, expressed her hope that the safety of the public is looked at when approving these waivers, noting that the requirements were included in the code for public safety. She stated that she was speaking as a member of the public and that this was not a professional comment.

Responding to Mr. Sudler's request for elaboration on her comment, Mrs. Mitchell stated that the purpose of the requirement was for safety equipment to get in and out, rather than public access and egress, or to allow two (2) entrances or exits in case there was something that caused an unsafe environment. She also expressed concern that if some of the streets were narrowed, fire apparatus could not get around and maneuver as well, and this was why she felt the provisions were in place.

In response to Mr. Sudler as to whether Mrs. Mitchell was saying that if the waiver were granted some apparatus would not be able to have access, Mrs. Mitchell stated that she was not sure but, as a citizen, she felt that there was a need to make sure that these issues could be handled when making these decisions.

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that the waiver ability is in the zoning ordinance, so that if it is determined it would not compromise public safety to waive the alley requirement, members had the ability to do this. In addition, she noted that the section of the zoning ordinance that requires rear access behind apartments predates a lot of the current fire protection regulations and was much more relevant at a time when buildings were not required to be sprinklered. Mrs. Townshend stated that there were a number of cases where waivers had been granted, including townhouse developments such as Senator's Lake, off Silver Lake Boulevard, which subsequently sprinklered the townhouses voluntarily. She indicated that this was not an uncommon waiver.

Fire Chief Mark Hall stated that he had discussed this with the Fire Marshal, and he advised members that without a rear access, the Fire Department could not access the rear of the building, unless they physically walk a 24-foot or 35-foot ground ladder to that side of the building. With respect to the 16-foot to 18-foot alley, Chief Hall stated that it takes anywhere from 20 to 24 feet to set up a ladder truck. In his opinion, eliminating the rear access would be a life safety issue, noting that if someone's apartment was on fire and they were on their balcony or hanging out their window, this would thwart the Department's response to them. Chief Hall indicated that, although the Fire Department would get to them as fast as they could on foot, it would be a lot better with a ladder truck, especially when someone is panicking. In regard to sprinklers for fire protection, he noted that recently there was a fire at Luther Towers and another at Legislative Hall where sprinklers did not activate. He indicated that the sprinklers in place do not always work and he asked members to take that into consideration.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding how far it would be necessary to walk and carry a ladder to the rear area, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that new fire prevention regulations require that plans provide perimeter access around the buildings. She estimated that, in most cases, 40 to 50 feet would get firefighters around the short end of the building to the rear. Mrs. Melson-Williams explained that in some situations, there is either another street or another circulation path that covers another side of the building or the rear of the building, depending on the specific building.

In response to Mr. Hutchison regarding the cost of an emergency rear access, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that she was unsure of the cost. She stated that, in the case of this project, it would be a paved, hard surface and she was unsure that there was space to physically construct it, which would mean a total redesign of the project, depending on which building was being looked at. Mrs. Melson-Williams reiterated that some of the buildings had two (2) means of coverage, including a 24-foot fire lane across the front of all of the buildings, which is the main entry into these buildings and where the Fire Department connection is located.

Mr. Anderson questioned how far the front of one (1) building is to the rear of another and if there was complementary access. Responding, Mrs. Melson-Williams advised members that there were two (2) different situations in this apartment complex. She stated that in one (1) area, the buildings are in a line, the spacing distance between individual buildings was specified in the code, and a second roadway goes between two (2) of the buildings. In the other area of the apartment development, the two (2) proposed buildings were flanked in the rear by either a street or another existing drive aisle. Mrs. Melson-Williams indicated that there would be some measure to get to the full back and full front of the building. There was capability to get to the full front on the long strip of buildings, but there would not necessarily be access to the rear on the main line of apartment buildings as proposed.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt as to what is at the rear of the development, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that there is a green, open space area at this location and a pedestrian path a little further away. She expressed her belief that there was a graded swale between the path and the building within that 40-foot area.

Responding to Mr. Hosfelt, Chief Hall stated that access was not something that the brush truck could handle but, if needed, the Fire Department could get the ladder truck behind the area. He noted that the ladder truck would jump the curb and tear up some of the property, but they would do this in order to get to someone needing assistance.

Responding to Mr. Sudler regarding what kind of damage this would do to the apparatus, Chief Hall estimated possible damage from $10,000 to $50,000.

In response to Mr. Sudler regarding the width of the roads in the plans, Mrs. Melson-Williams stated that the drive aisle in the upper left corner, where parking is located in front of the buildings, was a 24-foot-wide, two-way path of travel. These would be the primary fire lanes, which were required to be 24 feet, and there were additional paved areas with parking spaces which could be utilized if there were no cars parked there. She noted that one (1) of the buildings backed up to Blue Hen Boulevard, which was a public street and closer to 30 feet in width.

Fire Chief Hall stated that the diagram appeared very similar to Bay Tree Apartments, where the front apartment building did not have front access and the rear apartment building did not have rear access. He indicated that the Fire Department would have to take pre-planning measures and would figure it out. He noted that the Fire Marshal had provided him information regarding a turn-around at this location, which was a big help.

Responding to Mr. Hutchison as to whether there were after-hours staff or security people at the location, Mrs. Melson-Williams indicated that the Blue Hen Apartment complex had on-site property management, but she was unsure of their work hours or overnight staffing. She indicated that an on-site property office and leasing facility currently manages Phase 1 and would also manage Phase 2.

Mr. Hutchison stated, for the record, that he had the opportunity to personally go out and look at the Blue Hen Apartments, both at day and night, and felt that the operation was very impressive and absolutely first class. Based upon what he had seen personally, he stated that he supported the request.

Mr. Hutchison moved to recommend approval of the request for a waiver of the emergency rear access requirement for Blue Hen Apartments Phase 2, seconded by Mr. Keller.

Mr. Keller indicated that his seconding of the motion was based on Mr. Hutchison's statement.

The motion to recommend approval of the request for a waiver of the emergency rear access requirement for Blue Hen Apartments Phase 2 was carried by a vote of three (3) yes (Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Hutchison, and Mr. Keller) and two (2) no (Mr. Shelton and Mr. Sudler).

Briefing on Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Projects - Capital Gateway Study Presentation (Rich Vetter)

Mr. Rich Vetter, Executive Director, Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) reviewed a presentation, entitled "Capital Gateway Study." He advised members that the MPO had been involved in a planning study, along with the City's Planning Department, for the past month with regard to the area including Division Street from Salisbury Road to State Street and Forest Street from its split from Division Street down to the Duncan Center. The purpose of the study was to develop a land use and transportation master plan for this area. Mr. Vetter explained that the most important part of the study would be to provide a gateway to downtown from the west, which was lacking. He indicated that there was currently no identity or theme in terms of land use and transportation for this area and the goal was beautification, enhancements in streetscapes, and a land use vision. Mr. Vetter explained that the existing land use in this area was mixed and included vacant parcels and areas that were not aesthetically pleasing, and it was desired to develop the gateway theme to present to future developers and property owners in the area. He indicated that landscaping and beautification could be considered, potentially extending what currently exists on Loockerman Street westward.

Mr. Vetter stated that community input was being sought, noting that so far, based on local information, they had heard that bicyclists and pedestrians were an important aspect of the plan, and there could be maintenance and parking improvements as well. He informed members that a charrette process would be used to solicit community involvement, explaining that a charrette is a condensed, hands-on, multi-day planning process which is something of a magic marker session for the community. In a three (3) or four (4) day period, the goal would be to progress from a blank piece of paper to something that could be presented as a community vision. Mr. Vetter stated that public participation was planned for Monday, November 16th; Tuesday, November 17th; and Thursday, November 19th, probably from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m., at the Inner City Cultural League at 54 South Kirkwood Street. He informed members that, during the past couple of weeks, there had been meetings with stakeholders such as Councilman Anderson, the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT), the Delaware Transit Corporation, the Downtown Dover Partnership (DDP), residents, and business owners to get input in preparation for the charrette.

Mr. Vetter indicated that flyers would also be going out in the next couple of weeks and it was hoped that there would be a lot of media coverage.

Mr. Anderson encouraged members to provide input, noting that the questions asked would be valuable and the opportunity to provide constituent input was important.

In response to Mr. Hosfelt, Mr. Vetter stated that business owners and residents in the area would be notified. He stated his belief that Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, would direct mail to every business and property owner.

Briefing on Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) Projects

Mrs. Ann Marie Townshend, Director of Planning and Community Development, stated that she had received an update on transportation projects from the Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) and there was not much to report since the previous update provided during the Committee's meeting of July 27, 2015. She stated that it was a pleasant surprise that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program at DelDOT was getting some unexpected funding, which would help with some of the projects on the City's priority list, including planning for the Senator Bikeway, which would help with the construction of sidewalks within the walk zone of the new Dover High School. Mrs. Townshend noted that U.S. 13 sidewalk construction would also be addressed through this funding.

In regard to matters for future discussion, Mr. Anderson advised members that concerns were heard at a recent neighborhood watch meeting about shots being fired and confusion about how to identify where they are coming from. He stated his understanding that there was a State program called Shotspotter that involved grants and wondered if it had any use or viability. Mr. Anderson stated that the program seemed to have pluses and minuses to it.

Mr. Hosfelt stated his belief that the City of Wilmington had looked into the Shotspotter program at one point.

Mr. Hutchison moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Keller and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

James E. Hosfelt, Jr.
Chairman

JEH/TM/js/dd
S:\AGENDAS-MINUTES-PACKETS-PRESENTATIONS-ATT&EXH\Committee-Minutes\2015\10-26-2015 SA&T.wpd