

**July 14th, 2004
Meetings Minutes
Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group**

NEXT Working Group Meeting
Wednesday, September 22, 2004
4:00PM Field Trip; 5:30 PM Meeting
Modern Maturity Center
Dupont Ballroom
1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Meeting Date: July 14, 2004
Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

Robert Bewick	Woodbrook Resident
Brian Belcher	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
James Brown	Mayor, Town of Wyoming
Lori Rigby (for Gerald Buckworth)	34th Representative District
Steve Cain	President, Crossgates/Mayfair Homeowner's Association
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Gloria Chappell	Lincoln Park Resident
Randi Pawlowski (for Claudio Consuerga)	Dover First Seventh-Day Adventist Church
Jane Kesselring Edwards	Kesselring Property (east of New Burton Road)
Colin Faulkner	Director, Kent County Department of Public Safety
James Galvin	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
Darren Harmon)	Kraft Foods
Constance Holland	Director, Office of State Planning Coordination
James Hutchison	Executive Director, Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce
Frank King	President, Wyoming Mills Homeowner's Association
Milton Melendez	Department of Agriculture
Rob McCleary	DeIDOT Representative
Robert Mooney	Mayor, Town of Camden
Sarah Keifer (for Michael Petit de Mange)	Director of Planning Services, Kent County
Ann Rider	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Eugene Ruane	Dover City Councilman - 2nd District
Robert Sadusky, Sr.	Dover City Councilman- 2nd District
Deb Scheller	Eden Hill Farm

Janice Sibbald	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Sammy Smith	Rodney Village Resident
Carl Solberg	Director, Kent County Parks and Recreation
Stephen Speed	Mayor, City of Dover
Ali Stark	Holly Drive Resident
Douglas Greig (for John Still)	17th Senatorial District
Donna Stone	32nd Representative District
Donald Sylvester	President, Rodney Village Homeowner's Association
Doris Kesselring Taylor	Kesselring Property (West of New Burton Road)
Nancy Wagner	31st Representative District
Craig Wearden	Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
John Whitby	Kent County Motor Sales Company
Juanita Wieczoreck	Executive Director, Dover/Kent County MPO
Others in Attendance (Public):	
Mary Homes	Crossgates Resident
James Houlett	New Burton Road Resident
Claude Marks	Wyoming Mills Resident
Mollie Pritchett	Dover First Seventh-Day Adventist Church
Paula Tawes	Wyoming Mills Resident
Jerry Winchell	Charles Polk Road Resident
Others in Attendance (Project Team):	
Jay Kelley	DeIDOT Project Manager
Gary Laing	DeIDOT
Andrew Bing	Kramer & Associates
Joe DiCarlo	DMJM+HARRIS
Chris Fronheiser	DMJM+HARRIS
Erich Hizer	DMJM+HARRIS
Gary Hullfish	DMJM+HARRIS
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM+HARRIS
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
Evio Panichi	DMJM+HARRIS Project Manager

Marge Quinn	DMJM+HARRIS
Leslie Roche	DMJM+HARRIS
Ed Thomas	Kramer & Associates
LeAnn Waletzko	DMJM+HARRIS

The purpose of the meeting was to provide information about natural and built environmental features in the study area, to review civil engineering features that will be collected in the study and to generate possible ideas for an extension of Saulsbury Road in breakout groups.

Introduction and Welcome

- Robert Kramer, of Kramer & Associates, the meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order at 5:50PM and asked for brief self-introductions of working group members, project team members and members of the public.
- Jay Kelley, the DelDOT Project Manger, then welcomed all working group members and public observers to the meeting. He stated that Carolann Wicks could not attend the meeting due to other commitments but sends her regards to the working group and is grateful for their participation in the study process. Jay then went on to review the agenda for the meeting.
- As a first item, a follow up of issues raised from the 1st Working Group Meeting was conducted. The first issue discussed was the study area limits. Jay said that the community concerns about cut-through traffic were heard in the Listening Tour and as a result of these community concerns, information on travel patterns was collected in license plate surveys by the project team. The license plate surveys affirmed the cut-through traffic problem. He added that the effort to study and evaluate alternatives for a West Dover Connector (extension of Saulsbury Road) is not anticipated to solve all of Dover's traffic problems. However, there is a problem with the cut-through traffic and this problem may be addressed if an alternative is advanced. Jay stated that the limits for the study area will be refined, if needed, when alternatives are identified.
- Jay went on to state that data requests can be made and he should be contacted. Additionally, slides, agendas and meeting summaries for working group meetings are posted on the project website and are available for downloading.
- Jay then explained that information regarding DelDOT's Capital Transportation Program (CTP) for Kent County is available in today's meeting material in front of each working group member in Tab 3. He explained that the CTP has many projects for Kent County and encompasses a period of 6 years from Fiscal Year 2005 to Fiscal Year 2010. The CTP has an allocation of \$165 million for Kent County transportation projects. He noted that Tab 3 contains both a list of projects as well as a map showing the general location of each project and that the West Dover Connector (Saulsbury Road extension) was included in the project listing and map. Bob Kramer asked whether the other projects in the CTP speak to the issues under consideration by the West Dover Connector (Saulsbury Road extension) study. Jay Kelley answered that the other projects in the list do not address the same problems but address different ones and that more specific information on each project in the CTP is available on DelDOT's website.
- Bob Kramer reviewed the agenda for the meeting and reminded working group members that the agenda items for review of working group guidelines and for the review of the draft goals and objectives were homework for working group members from the first working group meeting. Bob indicated that environmental conditions in the study area would be reviewed by Leslie Roche, of DMJM+HARRIS and that civil engineering features in the study area would be reviewed by Chris Fronheiser from DMJM+HARRIS. He explained that working group members will then convene in small break-out groups and be asked to draw ideas for possible extensions of Saulsbury Road. Bob called the working group's attention to the main question of the study, "Should Saulsbury Road be extended and if so,

where should it go?” He further emphasized that the results of this effort will not solve all of the area’s transportation problems but an opportunity is present now and if nothing is done, pending development will preclude any extension of Saulsbury Road beyond what is needed for access to the Eden Hill farm development.

Working Group Guidelines

- Bob Kramer provided an overview of the guidelines to establish the framework and control of working group business.
- The first major area covered dealt with how to treat each other in these meetings. Bob stressed the need to be courteous and respectful of each other. He continued by saying that it was his job to take care that all views get heard and considered by the working group. He also requested everyone to come forward to express their opinions, as silence will be interpreted to mean acceptance.
- Next Bob addressed the issue of how recommendations should be made in the meetings. He stated that the Working Group should operate by consensus, if possible and not by constant voting on issues. But when there is no consensus, especially if on a recommendation, the guidelines state that 75% of the members present, a super majority, will be needed for approval. He said that this is a commonly used practice for DelDOT’s community working groups. He also stated that designees can vote for a member except on the final full set of recommendations that the working group makes to DelDOT. He further explained that these meetings are always open to public but that the meetings are geared to members of the working group. DelDOT conducts public workshops that are geared to members of the public such as the one held in January and others are planned. Councilman Eugene Ruane asked Bob whether a quorum “of the members present” should be established. Bob Kramer explained that typically a majority of the members needs to be present to constitute a quorum. He further explained that for all but final recommendations, 75% of the members present at a meeting would qualify as super majority for an action item. For final recommendations only, 75% of the entire working group would qualify as super majority. For final recommendations, working group members should either be physically present or can vote through written absentee ballots.
- The last major section of guidelines consists of how the working group should communicate with those outside the working group. Bob explained that DelDOT makes every attempt to place all the material presented in the working group meetings on the project website within 48 hours. Ann Rider asked whether notices of the meetings are published in newspapers. Bob replied that they were not advertised but information about the time and location of each working group meeting is made be available in advance on the project website. Bob again noted that the working group meetings are structured for the working group process and are not a forum for general public input into the study process. The general public is provided opportunities for input at public workshops and by contacting DelDOT’s Project Manager and DelDOT’s Public Relations office, as listed on the project website.
- Bob explained that there may be time at a working group meeting where we say, we’ve gone far enough and now the study needs input from the general public and a workshop will be convened. He said that the project team also plans to have meetings with the affected communities.

Draft Project Goals and Objectives

- Bob Kramer stressed the importance of defining goals and objectives of the project as they will be important in developing and evaluating alternatives. He continued by saying that they feed into measures of effectiveness, the parameters that are used to evaluate how well an alternative meets the objectives. He urged the working group members to speak up if there is an issue that is not already covered by one of the objectives.
- Bob indicated that the first goal deals with the development and evaluation of alternatives to connect Saulsbury Road to New Burton Road and possibly to US 13. Douglas Greig asked whether the goal as stated currently, allows room for an alternative that does not necessarily connect to New Burton Road?

Eugene Ruane added that a Route 13 connection may be more intrusive in his opinion. Bob Kramer replied that based on what the project team heard from interviews conducted during the Listening Tour, there are some contrasting viewpoints about a US Route 13 connection. Rob McCleary indicated that the team showed problems with cut-through traffic and any connections made will determine what problems get solved. Donna Stone said she believes that the word “possibly” in the goal leaves the question of a connection to US Route 13 open ended and that it may be ultimately answered by the study. Bob replied saying that tradeoffs will have to be made as cut-through problems will still exist if a connection is not made to US Route 13, since so much traffic is trying to get to US Route 13. If the connection is terminated at New Burton Road, the cut-through traffic problem will continue. Janice Sibbald wanted to know why only connections east towards New Burton are being considered and why not west, over to Wyoming Mill Road? Bob answered that traffic patterns show that there is a need to get into Dover and onto US Route 13. Additionally, the history of project has spoken to making a connection to New Burton Road. Rob McCleary added that at this point the team is not ruling out any alternatives in terms of which roads to include a connection to.

- Janice Sibbald also asked whether a “no-build” is an alternative, meaning that any Saulsbury Road extension could end in the Eden Hill farm development? To this Bob Kramer replied that the no-build is always an alternative that must be considered and can even be the preferred alternative of the working group. However, the working group’s charge is not a discussion of the layout and design of the internal road system of Eden Hill Farm but instead is, “Should Saulsbury Road be extended and if so, where should it go?” Eugene Ruane asked whether the goal should be changed by leaving off the “connect Saulsbury Road with New Burton Road and possibly US 13” part. Bob Kramer indicated the group should take a vote as to whether or not to amend the goal. The vote resulted in 12 members opposing the amendment and 17 favoring it. Thus the vote was in favor of changing the language of Goal #1 to state: “Improve the transportation system on the west side of the City of Dover to better accommodate north-south travel movements by developing and evaluating alternatives to extend Saulsbury Road”. Bob Kramer explained that the focus of the project was at the end of Saulsbury Road and the project does not aim to solve all the north-south travel problems in West Dover area. Steve Cain expressed the view that any extension will bring traffic into neighborhoods.
- There were no comments on Goal #2
- Next a list of objectives was discussed by Bob. The objectives address issues pertaining to mobility, congestion and access, safety, land use planning, economic growth and development, environment, aesthetics and public outreach.
- Regarding the objectives for mobility/congestion/access, Janice Sibbald asked why there is only a reference to the west side of Dover – is there not a similar concern about the south side? Rob McLeary suggested that the objectives be modified to add the south side. Juanita Wieczoreck stated that the first objective under mobility/access/congestion should be changed from “providing improved travel options on the west side of the City of Dover” to “providing improved travel options between the south and west sides of the City of Dover.” Given consensus from the working group, Bob Kramer noted that all these changes will be made. Steve Cain asked whether the local streets should be listed in the last objective. Bob responded that it would not be a good idea as it could offend someone if one or more local street names were not listed. Carl Solberg wondered if “recreational” travel should be specifically mentioned in the access/mobility/congestion objectives but the group felt that the references to parks and neighborhoods was adequate enough and the references to “travel” in these objectives readily encompass recreational travel as well as non-recreational travel. Connie Holland stated that the working group should attempt to move ahead with the objectives, because adding overly specific language may put the group into a box and that it is more important to think of the larger picture at play here.
- The first draft objective under safety issues was to “maintain safety of all travelers.” Eugene Ruane suggested “improve” to be added, such that the objective becomes “maintain and improve safety of all travelers.” The group was not in favor of this change.
- One of the draft objectives under land use planning, economic growth and development is “maximize the compatibility of proposed transportation improvements with the comprehensive plans of Dover, Wyoming, Camden and Kent County.” Eugene Ruane asked whether this objective should allude to

consulting the transportation plans and policies of the MPO as well? Bob Kramer indicated this change would be made to the objective.

- Under the objectives for the environment, Eugene Ruane wondered if noise should be specifically mentioned. The response from the project team was that noise is included in the assessment of adverse impacts.
- There were no comments on the objectives that pertain to aesthetics
- There were no comments on the objectives that pertain to public outreach. However, Bob indicated that the last bullet referencing consistency with plans be modified to reflect previously agreed upon edits.
- Bob Kramer indicated that the project team will make these changes to the goals and objectives and bring them back to working group members at their next meeting.

Environmental Consultation and Environmental Features

- Leslie Roche from DMJM+HARRIS provided an overview of the effort already undertaken for environmental screening analysis and requested inputs from the Working Group members and public to help continue with this effort. She continued by explaining the goals of the environmental screening task, followed by information about the environmental study area and finally explained in detail the tasks involved in the environmental screening process including data collection, environmental inventory mapping and alternatives screening.
- Leslie presented the Environmental Study Area Map and explained that the geographic area was identified to encompass all potential environmental areas of concern and was somewhat larger than the traffic study area. She explained that this was done to take into consideration the headwaters of the Puncheon Run at the request of the Army Corps of Engineers who maintain jurisdiction over waterways in the study area.
- Leslie next explained the data collection effort. She said that environmental data such as waterways, wetlands, floodplains, rare, threatened and endangered species and soils were collected from a full range of federal, state and local agencies and the effort will continue. She also requested information and inputs from the working group members as well as the public about environmental features and issues.
- Maps representing the environmental data collected were briefly presented by Leslie. She explained that Puncheon Run and Isaac Branch were two waterways in the study area and that they drain into St. Jones River. She also explained that knowing the location and extent of wetlands and floodplains as seen in the map was important in accessing the permitability of an alternative.
- Leslie explained that there are two rare fishes that are known to occur in the St. Jones River and may also occur in Puncheon Run and/or Isaac Branch. Additionally, the red-headed woodpecker and black vultures have been sighted in Brecknock Park.
- Based on the soil data collected, Leslie explained that virtually all soils in the study area are designated either as Prime Farmland soils or soils of Statewide Importance, indicating soils ideal for food production.
- A Community Facilities Map was also presented showing locations of public schools, fire and police stations, Kent General Hospital and libraries.
- Leslie explained that as seen in the Planning Information Map based on Delaware's Strategies for Policy and Spending document, the majority of the study area is encompassed by either community or secondary strategy areas. She further explained that overall, the state strategies in the study area are geared toward meeting existing community needs and managing growth.
- Leslie explained that the Land Use Map showed that residential and developed areas are located primarily to the east of New Burton Road and rural areas are primarily located west of New Burton Road.
- Leslie next discussed demographic characteristics of the study area including minority populations and low income households. She explained that based on 2000 Census data the minority population in the study area is primarily African American. The share of minority population in the study area is greater than that of Kent County but less than that of the City of Dover. Also based on 2000 Census data, the

share of low income households in the study area is approximately equal to that of Kent County and the City of Dover. Based on the statistical information from the Census, Leslie stated that the study area is a diverse community and that the project team will be seeking meaningful involvement of all neighborhoods so that no group bears a disproportionate share of the negative consequences of any transportation improvement project. She asserted that the study effort will seek out and facilitate involvement throughout the community, provide opportunity for participation and consider the concerns of all participants.

- Next, maps showing information about agricultural easements and districts and water supply wells, well-head protection areas, and recharge areas were presented. Based on the maps, Leslie said that most of the study area has fair to excellent ability to absorb water and ultimately replenish the groundwater.
- A map showing historic and archeological sites was presented in order to draw awareness to such sites so that any alternatives developed could strive to avoid impacting such sites.
- Next Leslie presented a map showing sites of potential contamination concerns. She emphasized the fact that these sites are not necessarily sites where contamination exists. She explained that most of these sites are places where material that is hazardous or has the potential to be contaminated is used, stored, handled and disposed of as part of the normal course of business. She stated that when alternatives are developed, additional research will be performed to determine if any sites of concern have known contamination.
- Discussing air quality issues in the study area, Leslie stated that Kent County as a whole is classified by the USEPA as “nonattainment for ozone”. This means that the county does not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone. She explained that roadway projects can advance if they are examined in aggregate on a regional basis to ensure that the region will meet state air quality goals. This process is undertaken by the Dover/Kent Metropolitan Planning Organization, culminating in their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Leslie stated that the currently adopted TIP includes the West Dover Connector as a concept planning project.
- Leslie explained that the array of environmental data that was presented will be used in developing and shaping alternatives, identifying flaws, assessing permitability and refining alternatives to avoid or minimize environmental impacts. She then presented a map depicting key environmental and engineering constraints based on work to date that would be available in a very large scale for use in the breakout session.
- Leslie concluded her presentation by requesting working group members to provide their input on environmental issues that they know of in the study area.
- Discussion on the presentation followed. Ann Rider wanted to know whether private schools were included in the schools data shown. Chris Fronheizer replied that the project team is continuing its efforts in identifying school locations and the breakout session map has the location of the Capitol Baptist Christian School. Connie Holland stated that in regard to air quality, that during the land development process, we do have the opportunity to address issues associated with walkability. This process is the best way to address these types of concerns. Eugene Ruane commented on the issue of run-off and flooding by Puncheon Run as many homes currently get inundated and others are threatened with inundation. He asked whether the team is studying aggregate run-off from other improvements and what would be the strategy to address this? Leslie Roche replied that there is awareness that flooding is an issue in the area and currently information is being collected about it. She added that DNREC will not allow DelDOT or developers to make an existing flooding issue worse. Leslie explained that the project is in the planning phase and the issue of drainage would be addressed in the design phase. Jay Kelley stated that a 1986 study on flooding was pulled from DelDOT records and is available. He further stated that any project must address run-off from its own facility. Further, a transportation project can not add to an existing problem. On the development side, Jay indicated that site planners for developers must address run-off and flooding in the site planning process and the development can not add to a flooding problem. Jay Kelley indicated that in addition to the issue of the quantity of run-off, run-off quality is another issue that must also be addressed. Treatment options must be identified and addressed. Rob McLeary stated that ample data are available for analysis purposes when the design process is initiated.

Engineering Features

- Leslie Roche introduced Chris Fronheizer from DMJM+HARRIS to discuss the engineering features of the study area. Chris said that the initial step in this effort was documenting the characteristics of primary roadways in the area including number of lanes, presence of shoulders and/or sidewalks, etc. Also, larger existing structures such as bridges, underpasses and culverts in the study area were inventoried.
- Next Chris briefly discussed the issue of Norfolk- Southern Railroad (NSRR) in the study area. He said that this railroad was one of the most important physical features within the study area and an initial assessment through identification of physical and operational features such as location of spurs and sidings and active at-grade crossings has commenced. He stated that the NSRR will become a very active partner as alternatives are developed.
- Chris also explained that an inventory of utilities in the study area through visual field study was conducted. The utilities inventoried include overhead utilities such as transmission lines along NSRR/New Burton Road and North Street and underground utilities such as natural gas mains, water and sewer lines and fiber optics lines. He concluded his presentation by explaining that the utilities locations could pose challenges in determining the schedule and cost of the project and thus, ways to minimize impacts to such facilities would be considered.

Break-Out Groups: Existing Traffic Problems

- In preparation for the break-out groups, Bob Kramer reviewed with working group members the pertinent findings regarding the current traffic problems identified in the study area: significant cut-through traffic that is seeking ways to access US Route 13 and problematic performance of selected intersections in the study area. Working group members were urged to keep these problems in mind when brainstorming ideas for alternatives. Additionally, Bob reminded the group of the particular question at hand: “Should Saulsbury Road be extended and if so, where should it go?”

Ideas for Alternatives – Break-Out Groups

- Bob Kramer introduced the purpose of break-out groups: to brainstorm ideas for West Dover Connector alternatives. Bob indicated that first half of the break-out group session will be devoted to bringing out ideas from each group member individually and those ideas will be marked on a large study area base map using color markers. The second half of the break-out group session would be used to have a collective discussion within each group about the pros and cons related to each idea put forward on the base map. Additionally, Bob asked the group members to provide input regarding questions that need to be answered or information that needs to be gathered relative to the ideas put forth. Bob also conveyed that the last 5 minutes of the break-out group sessions will be used to summarize the discussion related to each suggested idea.
- Bob Kramer introduced Andrew Bing who announced the group members assigned to each of the six break-out groups, and the facilitator and recorder for each group.
- The following matrix shows the information discussed in each breakout group

Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
Group # 1 Members: Sarah Keffler (designee for Michael Petit de Mange) Rob McCleary Eugene Ruane Donald Sylvester Frank King Facilitator: Evio Panichi Recorder: Leslie Roche	Idea # 1: No extension (No Build)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address traffic problems 	-
	Idea # 2: Connect only to New Burton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowest cost Gets traffic onto New Burton Road; could address north west intersection problems Access to New Burton Road with a grade separated crossing Improves response time for emergency vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to residential developments (visual, noise impacts) Direct impact to school Does not address out-through problem 	-
	Idea # 3: Extension to Wyoming Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost Shortest connection Gets to US 13 via State Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential impacts Proximity to church May or may not have connection to New Burton Road 	-
	Idea # 4: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track; cross New Burton Road at Webbs Lane plus connection to Wyoming Mill Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connection to US 13 and Puncheon Run Connector Connection to Rt. 15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to school; waking school children safety Residential community impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many lanes on Webbs? How to grade separate pedestrian crossing at school?
	Idea # 5: Parallel to New Burton road on west side of tracks; tie into Wyoming Mill Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No neighborhood impacts Bypass North Street and Wyoming Mill intersection Existing SR15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extra traffic through Wyoming and Camden 	-
	Idea # 6: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track; cross Kesseling property to tie in with Charles Pok Road plus connection to Wyoming Mill Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Least community impacts (except Charles Pok Road) Connection to New Burton Road Connection to SR15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact to Charles Pok Road neighborhood 	-
Idea # 7: Cross New Burton Road at Garton Road; T-junction stop at Webbs Lane			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T-stop; not a free flowing movement at Webbs Ln. Long bridge over railroad and New Burton Road 	-

Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
Group # 2 Members: Gloria Chappell Milton Melendez Ali Stak Doris Kesseling Taylor Craig Wearden Facilitator: Marge Quinn Recorder: Joe DiCarlo	Idea # 1: Connection to Wyoming Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wyoming Avenue is a wide street Short and direct connection Does not cross Puncheon Run Minimizes flooding Eliminates congestion at North Street and West Street intersection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impacts to Wyoming Avenue residents 	-
	Idea # 2: West of New Burton Road and tracks; come out on Webbs Ln.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenic Takes through traffic away from neighborhoods and goes directly to US13 Provide direct access to SR1 via Puncheon Run Connector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs long bridge crossing Puncheon Run and railroad Chops up development area 	-
	Idea # 3: Widening of North Street east of Saubury Road intersection or provide a road parallel to North street within this section.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's clean; no existing development on one side Minimizes impacts to existing residential developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need an overpass at West Street May be an at-grade crossing Would impact planned community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is designated for parks, housing and industrial development?
	Idea # 4: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track; cross Kesseling property to tie in with Charles Pok Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less impact to residential development Does not bisect park Could work in a greenway option; would increase park area Keeps traffic away from school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts farms Crosses Puncheon Run Charles Pok Road is not wide Charles Pok is a part of existing subdivision; impacts some residential development 	-
	Idea # 5: Extend only up to New Burton Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travelers will use the grid of streets available between New Burton Road and US 13 as they are doing now 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic would need to sort through neighborhoods; does not address out-through traffic People need to get to US 13 Connection would be above access to Rt.1 (Puncheon Run Connector) 	-

Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
<p><u>Group # 3</u></p> <p>Members: Robert "Dick" Bewick James Brown Lori Rigby (designee for Gerald Budkworth) Steve Cain Robert Mooney</p> <p>Facilitator: Erich Hizer</p> <p>Recorder: Gary Laing</p>	Idea # 1: No extension (No Build)	-	-	-
	<p>Idea # 2: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track, connect with Wyoming Mill Road and cross railroad to tie into Webbs Lane</p> <p>Idea # 3: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track, connect with Wyoming Mill Road and cross railroad to tie into Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take advantage of open land - Keeps traffic out of build-up areas - Keeps connection north of Camden and Wyoming - Gives better access to New Burton Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community does not want increased traffic, especially trucks, on Webbs Lane 	-
Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
<p><u>Group # 4</u></p> <p>Members: Brian Belcher Connie Holland Deb Scheller Steve Speed Doug Greig (designee for John Still)</p> <p>Facilitator: Ed Thomas</p> <p>Recorder: Gary Hullfish</p>	<p>Idea # 1: Parallel to New Burton road on the west side of the track and over railroad/New Burton to tie in with Charles Polk Road</p> <p>Option 1: Through Kesselring Property</p> <p>Option 2: Via Garton Lane and then through Kesselring Property</p> <p>Must have a "free flowing connection from new road south to New Burton and from north on New Burton to new road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces congestion at Wyoming Mill and North Street intersections - Minimizes impacts to farmlands depending on the option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses more agricultural land depending on the option - Impacts to Charles Polk Road Residents - Impacts school bus lanes on Webbs Lane - Impacts Ace Hardware Store 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigate impacts to US 13 - Investigate impacts to Kesselring Farm - Investigate impacts to agricultural land and trees - Ease of movement
	<p>Idea # 2: Realignment of Wyoming Mill Road at Hazletville Road / North Street</p>	-	-	-

Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
<p><u>Group # 5</u></p> <p>Members: Zachary Carter Ann Rider Sammy Smith Donna Stone John Whitby</p> <p>Facilitator: Andrew Bing</p> <p>Recorder: Mayuresh Khare</p>	<p>Idea # 1: Under or overpass connection to New Burton Road. Continue on New Burton road and then provide connection to US13 through Kesselring property and Brecknock Park</p> <p>Idea # 2: Like Idea # 1 except connection to US 13 via Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing communities can access the connector - Option uses existing roadway (New Burton Road) - Provides connection to US13 - Minimizes impacts on existing developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New Burton Road is a local access road. Option adds more traffic. - Changes nature of local road traffic along New Burton Road - Impacts environmental features like wetlands and farmlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How the connector road would be connected to New Burton Road
	<p>Idea # 3: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track; cross Kesselring property to tie in with Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less intrusive alternative - Remaining pros same as Idea 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More impacts to wetlands and farmlands - Restrict the access for local communities - Brings more traffic to US 13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic impact information for study area roadways
	<p>Idea # 4: Accessing US 13 around Camden and Wyoming Towns</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimizes impacts on existing developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More impacts to wetlands and farmlands - Not useful to existing communities - Cut through traffic will still remain for northeast destinations 	-
	<p>Idea # 5: Wyoming Mill Road to US 13 connection through Kesselring properties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoids/minimizes congestion on Camden-Wyoming Avenue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would not eliminate cut through traffic between New Burton Road and US 13 north of Webbs Lane - Traffic problems will remain at the intersections along North Street - Impacts environmental features like wetlands and farmland - Impacts Charles Polk Road residents 	-

Group	Ideas Generated by Breakout Group	Pros/Advantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Cons/Disadvantages Discussed by Breakout Group	Info. Required Related to the Idea
<p><u>Group # 6</u></p> <p>Members: Randi Pawlowski (designee for Claudio Consuegra) Colin Faulkner Darren Harmon Robert Sadusky Janice Sibbald Carl Solberg</p> <p>Facilitator: Chris Fronheiser</p> <p>Recorder: LeAnn Waletzko</p>	<p>Idea # 1: Multiple connections to Wyoming Avenue, Wyoming Mill Road and Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoids cutting farm fields - Avoids more wetland and upland forest areas - Landowner currently selling property (where alignment crosses building site by Webbs Lane) - Safety – Hospital connection - Put through traffic on road; not local traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic on Wyoming – traffic signal backups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will Wyoming connection facilitate traffic movements?
	<p>Idea # 2: Multiple connections to Wyoming Mill Road and Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less local/residential impacts - Protects forests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Route 13 Camden traffic signal bottleneck - Does not improve access to hospitals - Reduces local traffic and adds through traffic in residential areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Origin-Destination Data - County Sewer Data - Upland Forest Data (2000 Legislation for impacts)
	<p>Idea # 3: Parallel to New Burton Road on west side of the track; cross Kesselring property to tie in with Charles Polk Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shorter than Idea 2 - Less travel time 	-	-

Break-Out Team Reports

- Ed Thomas, facilitator for the Group 4, reported the summary of the group discussion with the help of the study area map marked by his group. Ed reported that his group discussed several options connecting to Charles Polk Road. With all of the options, the group stressed the importance of connecting the new road with New Burton Road to allow easy north and south movements. He then briefly discussed pros and cons similar to the ones reported in the above table. Ed also reported that the group considered but rejected an option to extend Saulsburry Road parallel to New Burton Road on west side of track and connecting it to Wyoming Mill Road where Wyoming Mill Road becomes Railroad Avenue and discussed its impacts on Camden-Wyoming Avenue.

Apart from the connector options, Ed reported that the group discussed a possible straightening of the intersection of Wyoming Mill Road at Hazletville Road.

- At the end of Group 4 team report, Ed asked for inputs from his group members to bring up any missing points. There were no additional inputs from the group.
- Andrew Bing, facilitator for the Group 5, followed Ed Thomas with the summary of discussion in Group 5. Andrew indicated that his group discussed several options including connection to Charles Polk Road and connector going around Towns of Camden and Wyoming. He also reported that the group unanimously agreed to extend the connector to US 13 and agreed on an under or over-pass at New Burton Road rather than an at-grade intersection.
- With the help of the marked study area map, Andrew summarized pros and cons for options discussed by his group similar to that reported in the above table.
- Andrew reported that his group considered minimizing impacts to the existing developments, and the pros and cons of providing access from local communities to the connector.
- At the end of his summary, Andrew asked for inputs from his group members to bring up any missing points. Mayuresh Khare, recorder for the Group 5, brought to attention one additional idea, connection from Wyoming Mill Road to Charles Polk Road, that was discussed in the group and Andrew reported the summary for that idea. Ms. Ann Rider, one of the members in the Group 5, also shared concerns about possible impacts on the Capitol Baptist Church and Christian School parcel due to potential West Dover Connector connection with New Burton Road.
- Chris Fronheiser, facilitator for the Group 6, reported the summary of discussion in Group 6. Chris reported that his group considered safety, improved access and minimization of impacts on environmental features while coming up with options for the West Dover Connector.
- With the help of the study area map marked by his group, Chris summarized options discussed by his group including multiple connections to Wyoming Avenue, Charles Polk Road and Wyoming Mill Road. Chris briefly discussed the pros and cons related to each of the options similar to that reported in the foregoing table.
- At the end of the Group 6 team report, Chris asked for inputs from his group members to bring up any missing points. There were no additional inputs from the group.
- Erich Hizer, facilitator for the Group 3, then reported the summary of discussion in Group 3. Erich reported that his group discussed existing travel patterns within the study area.
- With the help of the study area map marked by his group, Erich discussed options considered by his group including no build option, connection to Charles Polk Road, and connection to Webbs Lane with an auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road. He summarized pros and cons for the options discussed by his group similar to that reported in the foregoing table.
- At the end of the Group 3 team report, Erich asked for inputs from his group members to bring up any missing points. There were no additional inputs from the group.
- Marge Quinn, facilitator for Group 2, reported the summary of discussion in Group 2. With the help of the study area map marked by her group members, Marge reported that her group considered 5 diverse options including connection to Wyoming Avenue, connection to Webbs Lane, widening of North Street, connection to Charles Polk Road and extending Saulsbury Street only up to New Burton Road. Marge also briefly summarized the pros and cons for each of these options similar to that reported in the foregoing table.

- At the end of the Group 2 team report, Marge asked for inputs from her group members to bring up any missing points. There were no additional inputs from the group.
- Evio Panichi, facilitator for Group 1, followed Marge Quinn to report the summary of discussion in Group 1. Evio reported that his group discussed 7 various alignments for the connector road along with potential bridge and ramp locations. Evio also indicated that his group considered the no-build option and discussed pros and cons of doing nothing.
- With the help of the study area map marked by his group members, Evio discussed several options including no-build, connection to New Burton Road only, connection to Wyoming Avenue, connection to Webbs Lane and Wyoming Mill Road, connection to Charles Polk Road via Garton Road as well as via the Kesselring property, and a connection to Wyoming Mill road only. Evio briefly summarized pros and cons for each of these options similar to that reported in the foregoing table.
- At the end of the Group 1 team report, Evio asked for inputs from his group members to bring up any missing points. There were no additional inputs from the group.
- Bob Kramer thanked the presenters and the working group members for their participation in the brainstorming exercise. Bob asked the group if they felt they had enough time to generate ideas and the consensus of the group was that it was sufficient. Bob indicated that before the next working group meeting, the project team will develop the ideas generated by the breakout groups into conceptual or possible alternatives for discussion at the next meeting. The working group will also have the benefit of the bus field tour at the start of the next working group meeting in terms of considering possibilities for alternatives. Bob urged members to be at the Modern Maturity Center no later than 3:45PM on Wednesday, September 22, as the bus will leave promptly at 4PM.
- Bob Mooney asked if the travel modeling and analysis that will be conducted on the alternatives will be able to identify improvements needed to US Route 13. Marge Quinn replied that yes, the alternatives analysis process will be able to identify improvements needed to US Route 13.

Next Steps

- Jay Kelley, DelDOT Project Manager, identified the steps that the project team would take after this meeting. He said that the team will use the ideas for alternatives based on the working group meeting tonight. The team would refine these into a range of possible alternatives. He also stated that the working group would meet at 4PM on Wednesday, September 22, 2004 for a field trip by bus of the study area, followed by discussions about possible alternatives. He added that a public workshop would be held later in the fall, as well.

Next Meeting

The next Working Group meeting will be held on **Wednesday, September 22, 2004. The Working Group will participate in a field tour that leaves the Modern Maturity Center at 4:00PM. Working Group members are urged to arrive at the Modern Maturity Center at 3:45PM. Following the field tour, the Working Group will meet from 5:30 PM to 8:30 PM at the Modern Maturity Center, in the DuPont Ballroom.** A light dinner will be provided at the meeting. The objectives of this meeting will be to discuss what was viewed during the field trip, discuss potential alternatives, and discuss next steps and a possible public workshop.