

**September 22, 2004
Meetings Minutes
Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group**

NEXT Working Group Meeting
 Wednesday, October 20, 2004
 5:30 PM Meeting
 Modern Maturity Center
 Dupont Ballroom
 1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Meeting Date: September 22, 2004
Time: 4:00 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

James Brown	Mayor, Town of Wyoming
Gerald Buckworth	34 th Representative District
Sandra Kinkus (for Steve Cain)	President, Crossgates/Mayfair Homeowner's Association
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Jane Edwards	Kesselring Property (East of New Burton Road)
Colin Faulkner	Director, Kent County Department of Public Safety
James Galvin	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
James Hutchison	Executive Director, Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce
Frank King	President, Wyoming Mills Homeowner's Association
Rob McCleary	DeIDOT Representative
Milton Melendez	Department of Agriculture
Robert Mooney	Mayor, Town of Camden
Jack Papen	Farmer, Major Property Owner
Randi Pawlowski	Dover First Seventh-Day Adventist Church
Michael Petit de Mange	Director of Planning Services, Kent County
Ann Rider	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Eugene Ruane	Dover City Councilman - 2 nd District
Robert Sadusky, Sr.	Dover City Councilman- 2 nd District
Deb Scheller	Eden Hill Farm
Janice Sibbald	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Carl Solberg	Director, Kent County Parks and Recreation
Stephen Speed	Mayor, City of Dover
Doris Kesselring Taylor	Kesselring Property (West of New Burton Road)

Nancy Wagner	31 st Representative District
Jeff Davis (for Craig Wearden)	Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
Juanita Wieczoreck	Executive Director, Dover/Kent County MPO
Others in Attendance (Public):	
Alvin Barnes	Rodney Village Civic Association
Mary E. Betts	Resident
Bill Edwards	Resident
Mollie Pritchett	Dover First Seventh-Day Adventist Church
Delores Rossetti	Rodney Village Civic Association Secretary
Karen Papen Walker	Papen Farms
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
Ed Janda	DMJM+HARRIS
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM+HARRIS
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
Preethi Narayanan	DMJM+HARRIS
Evio Panichi	DMJM+HARRIS Project Manger
Marge Quinn	DMJM+HARRIS
Leslie Roche	DMJM+HARRIS
Ed Thomas	Kramer & Associates

The purpose of the project field tour was to provide an overview of the study area by explaining various social, engineering and environmental features as well as constraints. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information about various connector concepts developed by the project team based on the Working Group ideas, help the group become conversant with the pros and cons matrix and to obtain feedback from the Working Group about the connector concepts.

Project Field Tour

- Bob Kramer of Kramer & Associates, the meeting facilitator, and Jay Kelley, the DeIDOT Project Manager, welcomed Working Group members at 4:05PM.
- Evio Panichi, the DMJM+HARRIS Project Manager, used display boards to provide a brief overview of various Working Group ideas for the West Dover Connector and essential civil engineering features to orient the Working Group before leaving for the project field tour.
- Working Group members were then taken on a bus tour of the study area. Chris Fronheiser of DMJM+HARRIS and Robert Kramer of Kramer & Associates explained various study area features and answered Working Group questions. The group stopped at five locations (at four locations remained on the bus while at one location disembarked from the bus) and reviewed feasibility of various options for the West Dover Connector alignment.
- Working Group members returned to Modern Maturity Center at 5:40PM.

Call to Order

- Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 6:00PM and asked for brief self-introductions of Working Group members.
- Bob explained the purpose of the meeting – to review connector concepts, to confirm that no ideas have been missed, to identify additional ideas, and to try to narrow down to a list of concepts that the Working Group would like to further analyze. Bob mentioned that No-Build concept will also be analyzed.

Opening Remarks/Update on Resource Agency Meeting

- Jay Kelley, the DeIDOT Project Manager, welcomed all Working Group members and public observers to the meeting. He oriented the Working Group members to the meeting material organized under several tabs in the project binder.
- Jay then presented a brief overview of resource agency meeting and field tour conducted on August 31, 2004. He reported that several resource agencies attended the meeting including Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Delaware State Historic Preservation Office (DE SHPO), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC).
- He indicated that the resource agency meeting and field tour were helpful to familiarize agency representatives with various natural and built environment features within the study area, traffic and engineering issues, and connector ideas generated by the Working Group as well as to obtain feedback from the agencies.

Update on City of Dover Zoning Ordinance Amendment

- Bob Kramer introduced James Galvin, Director of Dover Planning and Inspections.
- Jim explained that the City of Dover's zoning ordinance amendment is based on concepts of traditional neighborhood design and effective mixed use development principles.
- Jim also indicated that the ordinance is not designed for any specific land parcel but it is general and has city-wide application.

- Bob asked Jim if the ordinance is still in the public comment period. Jim replied that it is still in the public comment period and indicated that it is scheduled for a review on Tuesday, September 28, 2004 at 6:00PM in front of the City Parks and Recreation Committee.
- Bob then asked about the general purpose of the ordinance to which Jim replied that the ordinance will establish the visual and aesthetic feel of the community. Different developers intending to develop land parcels will have choices but the ordinance will provide guidelines to ensure that the visual and aesthetic character of the community will be preserved.
- Bob then summarized Jim's presentation indicating that it is an ordinance for city-wide application.

Revised Goals and Objectives

- Bob Kramer presented the revised goals and objectives.
- Bob displayed slides showing original language used in the project goals and objectives and revisions made based on comments received from the Working Group during the second Working Group meeting (July 14, 2004), as well as comments received from the resource agencies during the resource agency meeting (August 31, 2004).
- Bob specifically mentioned the resource agencies comment that the phrase "north-south travel movements" in the project goals should be replaced by "local travel movements" since population and employment projections estimate significant east-west travel movements in relation to the study area. Bob defined "local" travel as trips with at least one end in the general Dover area vicinity.
- Bob then asked the Working Group if they agree with the revisions and there was a general consensus in the Working Group to accept all the revisions.

Key Observations from the Field Tour

- Bob Kramer summarized key observations from the field tour. He mentioned that the field tour emphasized the fact that there is no simple solution to the traffic issues.
- He added that any connector alternative will have some kind of impact on someone, which makes it difficult and the Working Group needs to be sensitive about this fact.
- Bob also specified that the field tour may have helped the Working Group realize that "doing nothing" is not going to help the community as there are and will be even more community-wide impacts.
- Bob listed some of the key concerns heard during the field tour which included concerns about impacts on Webbs Lane, impacts on school kids walking to schools, impacts on Charles Polk Road homes and impacts on environmental features. He indicated that the project team will work with W. Reily Brown school authorities regarding the pedestrian count.
- Bob then urged the Working Group members to share with the project team any other questions and data needs they might have which will help the group to assess various connector concepts.

Preliminary Concepts

- Chris Fronheiser of DMJM+HARRIS indicated that there were a total of 25 ideas for the West Dover Connector from the 6 break-out groups during the previous Working Group meeting.

- Chris summarized how many of the 25 ideas suggested extension of Saulsbury Road, how many ideas suggested a connector extending up to US 13, and how many ideas suggested a connection to US 13 by tying the connector road with a specific existing roadway.
- He displayed summary tables showing similar ideas grouped together. The summary tables were categorized as ideas for the extension of Saulsbury Road, ideas for the extension of Saulsbury Road with multiple connections, and ideas that does not involve extending Saulsbury Road.
- Chris then mentioned that the project team developed 10 preliminary connector concepts based on the Working Group ideas. He directed the Working Group members to concept maps in Tab 3 of their binders.
- He explained how these maps were laid out. He clarified that the symbols and lines which display these concepts on the maps are used for defining generalized locations for connector alignments. They do not exactly represent the locations or widths of the rights-of-way required for a connector roadway.
- Chris drew attention to the insets showing how connections with New Burton Road could be made wherever applicable. The insets indicated what portions of connector road would be on structure, where elevations would likely change, and how traffic movements would occur.
- After Chris explained the first map showing No-Build concept, Bob indicated that a cul-de-sac would be provided at developer's expense to provide access to the proposed Eden Hill Farm development under this concept.
- When Chris explained various options of extending Saulsbury Road only to New Burton Road using the Concept 2 map, Rob McCleary pointed out that elevating New Burton Road under Option 2A was the project team's idea. It was not suggested by the Working Group. The Working Group suggested an at-grade intersection, but based on engineering constraints and Norfolk-Southern Railroad's policy regarding at-grade rail crossings, the project team suggested an elevated intersection of the connector road and New Burton Road.
- Regarding the concepts with a connection to US 13 via Charles Polk Road, Juanita Wieczoreck asked about the length of ramp required to potentially provide a free-flow connection between an eastbound connector and US 13 northbound. Chris responded that such a ramp may have to be approximately 600 feet long to return to grade after crossing over US 13. Juanita then asked about performance of the US13/Charles Polk Road intersection. Mayuresh Khare of DMJM+HARRIS replied that the intersection currently operates at a B or C level of service. It would have failing movements in 2015 and the intersection would fail in 2030.
- After Chris explained all the preliminary concepts, he indicated that the Working Group will have an opportunity to look at the maps closely during the break-out group session that evening as well as to ask questions. He then introduced Marge Quinn of DMJM+HARRIS.
- Marge indicated that to help start a discussion of impacts, the project team put together a pros and cons matrix associated with each of the 10 preliminary concepts. Marge directed the Working Group to take a look at the 15-page pros and cons matrix included in Tab 4 of their binders.
- Marge stated that reviewing this matrix is one of the homework assignments for the group members. She presented two slides which displayed how the pros and cons matrix was put together based on study objectives.
- Marge finally pointed out that the pros and cons associated with each concept are not quantifiable at this stage as detailed technical analysis is yet to be performed.
- Bob Kramer summarized the information that Marge presented by stating that the pros and cons matrix is a first step towards assessing different concepts. He stated that Working Group members should review the pros and cons listed for each concept and give feedback to the project team if something is missing or if their opinion differs from the project team's representation.

Breakout Teams – Work Session – Preliminary Concepts

- Bob Kramer introduced the purpose and tasks of break-out group session: review the concepts generated by the project team in detail, confirm whether the Working Group’s ideas were reflected in the concepts, suggest if there are other ideas, convey likes and dislikes about each concept to the project team, and point out what questions need to be answered and/or what information is needed to evaluate the concepts.
- Andrew Bing of Kramer & Associates 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 based on the recorder’s notes.

Concept Index

- Concept 1 – No Build
- Concept 2 – Stop at New Burton Road via
 - A. Straight line
 - B. Wyoming Avenue vicinity
 - C. Blue Beach vicinity
 - D. Kesselring Farm vicinity
- Concept 3 – Tie in to Wyoming Avenue to US13
- Concept 4 – Tie in to Webbs Lane to US13; auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road
- Concept 5 – Tie in to Charles Polk Road to US13; auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road
 - Option A: Via Garton Road through Kesselring Farm
 - Option B: Bisecting Kesselring Farm
 - Option C: Along southern boundary of Kesselring Farm near the parkland
- Concept 6 – Bypass west of Camden and Wyoming to connect to US13
- Concept 7 – Connect to New Burton Road north of Wyoming Avenue; widen New Burton Road; connect to Charles Polk Road
 - Option A: Via Garton Road through Kesselring Farm
 - Option B: Bisecting Kesselring Farm
 - Option C: Along southern boundary of Kesselring Farm near the parkland
- Concept 8 – Connect Wyoming Mill Road to Webbs Lane to US13
- Concept 9 – Connect Wyoming Mill Road to Charles Polk Road to US13
- Concept 10 – Other ideas* - Widen North Street to Governors Avenue

* Realignment of Wyoming Mill Road at North Street is not a connector concept but rather a stand-alone localized intersection improvement. It would not have any impacts on local travel patterns.

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
Group # 1	1	-	- Does not address problems	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
Craig Weardon)	2	- 2B & 2C may work	- 2A & 2D doesn't solve problem	- Is 2A viable?	2B & 2C - Yes 2A & 2D - No
Jane Edwards				- Information on impacts to homes	
Milton Melendez	3	- Away from school	- Elevating Wyoming Avenue		Yes
Doris Kesselring Taylor	4	-	- Auxiliary connector	-	No
Facilitator: Marge Quinn				- Impacts to school - Bad traffic on Webbs Lane intersections with US13 and Alt. US13	
Recorder: Ed Janda	5	-	- Elevated structure	-	No
	6	-	-	-	No
	7	- Option 7C preferred over 7A & 7B	- 7A & 7B split property	-	7C – Yes 7A & 7B - No
	8	-	- Doesn't solve problem	-	No
	9	-	- Doesn't solve problem	-	No
	10	-	- Impacts to properties	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
<u>Group # 2</u>	1	- Eliminates the concerns about potential impacts of a West Dover Connector build concept	- Traffic condition will worsen in the future, especially with Eden Hill Farm development	- Costs for traffic improvements	Yes
Members: Frank King					
Rob McCleary			- Avoids adverse impacts to natural and built environment conditions that could happen with build concepts	- Will have to make other improvements to address traffic conditions	
Mike Petit de Mange	2	- Will not attract traffic to the area the way adding roadway capacity would	- 2B & 2C are disruptive in terms of land acquisition and visual impact east of New Burton Road	-	No
Facilitator: Evio Panichi			- 2D has the least impact on the built environment of the #2 concepts		
Recorder: Leslie Roche	3	-	- Doesn't address cut through traffic - Impacts to homes on Wyoming Avenue where road is elevated	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct access to Puncheon Run - Desirable for truck travel because there is little stop-and-go in this concept - Auxiliary connection makes sense because it's a straight shot across the study area to Wyoming Mill Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Directing traffic along Webbs Lane is an impact to school children walking to school - Congestion at Webbs Lane and US13 intersection will be exacerbated - Auxiliary connector would encourage traffic on Wyoming Mill Road requiring improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much north-south traffic is headed south on US13 versus north on US13 at the Webbs Lane intersection 	Yes
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option 5C preserves Kesselring land for future development. Allows for development of complementary pedestrian corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Options 5A and 5B bisect Kesselring land, possibly limiting future development - Concept through Brecknock Park is not feasible. Too many natural and built environment impacts 		Yes
	6	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not address cut through traffic conditions - This is a different project 		No
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Widening New Burton Road allows possibility of addressing other mode issues, including pedestrians - Avoids elevated structures; possibility of depressing New Burton Road near Wyoming Avenue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts Eden Hill Farm property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How is drainage handled in a depressed section? - How much right-of-way is needed? - Can southern connector locations have railroad underpass for connection to New Burton Road? 	7C – Yes 7A, 7B - No
	8	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doesn't solve cut through traffic issues (project goal) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More traffic information is needed to assess the utility of this concept 	No
	9	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doesn't solve cut through traffic issues (project goal) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More traffic information is needed to assess the utility of this concept 	No
	10	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Realignment of North Street /Wyoming Mill Road intersection is a separate project already in works 	No
Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
Group # 3 Members: James Brown Gerald Buckworth George Dickerson (for Robert Mooney) Juanita Wieczoreck Facilitator: Erich Hizer Recorder: Joe DiCarlo	1	-	- Something has to be done	-	No
	2	-	- 2D will run traffic into Wyoming - Needs to connect to US13 somewhere to avoid traffic inundation in Wyoming	- Could we go under New Burton Road for 2D?	Yes
	3	-	- Connection to US13 is too far north - Too residential	-	Yes
	4	- Other than school issue, connector to US13 is ideal - Spur is away from church property - Like the through movement to Webbs Lane - Group's favorite	- Cuts across environmental area	-	Yes
	5	- 5C least bad - Spur is good - One member liked 5B as well	- Bad connection to US 13 - Disturbs high quality houses at Charles Polk Road - Should cross New Burton Road farther north - Cuts off community from park - Could impact future development	-	Yes
	6	-	- Heads to prime farmland - Doesn't address issues	-	No
	7	- Uses less farmland - 7A preferred - Connector to US13 is good	- Wouldn't stop traffic from going to Wyoming	-	Yes
	8	-	- Won't help heavy truck traffic	-	No
	9	-	- Cuts into church property - Lacks connection to Saulsbury Road	-	No
	10	-	- Doesn't help anything - Too many historic properties	-	No
Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
Group # 4	1	-	- Does not solve any current / future problems	-	No
Members: Jim Galvin Jack Papen Deb Scheller	2	- Could be used with another concept - Relieves problem at North Street	- Does not solve problem / moves problem to south - Does not relieve truck traffic - Large costs for flyover to New Burton Road but no connection to US13	-	No
Facilitator: Steve Speed Ed Thomas	3	-	- Wyoming Avenue can not handle traffic - Wyoming Avenue splits two developments	-	No
Recorder: Gary Hullfish	4	- Auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road is good - Auxiliary connector should be built in future if not with this project	- Passes through agricultural land preservation - Increased traffic on Wyoming Mill Road could increase traffic in Towns of Camden and Wyoming - Residential street and school can not accommodate additional traffic	- Wyoming Mill Road will need to be improved regardless of selected option	No, except for auxiliary connector
	5	- 5C better. Avoids impacts to Webbs Lane - 5A ok if passes over Webbs Lane - 5C Railroad close to road grade would minimize structure size - 5C would provide potential scenic overview of park - Like connection to US13 w/flyover - Easiest connection to US13 at Charles Polk Road - Auxiliary connector should be built in future if not with this project	- 5A cuts Kesselring Farm in half - All options have impacts to farmland	- Should add connection from New Burton Road to connector road to improve access to US13 - Any alignment through Rodney Village should go on South side - Connection to US13 should have good connection to SR1 - Wyoming Mill Road will need to be improved regardless of selected option	Yes
	6	-	- Do not like this concept - Major impacts to Camden and Wyoming	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
	7	- Improves North Street but moves problem south	- Does not address future traffic on New Burton Road - Many impacts to developments / homes along New Burton Road - Does not eliminate cut through traffic	-	No
	8	- Connector to Wyoming Mill Road is good	- Do not like Webbs Lane connection	-	No
	9	- Solve traffic issues in south	- Doesn't solve traffic issues in the northern portion of the study area - Impacts to church	-	No
	10	- Widen North Street - Realign Wyoming Mill at North Street; separate project	- North Street can not handle traffic - Will correct local problem	-	No

General Questions from Group 4 for all Alternatives:

1. What is DelDOT's Right-of-Way acquisition process?
2. How do affected property owners get compensated and do they get paid relocation costs?
3. Are the Charles Polk Road properties within floodplain?
4. How does DelDOT determines design speed?

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
<u>Group # 5</u>					
Members:	1	-	- Does not address problems - Not an option to consider	-	No
Zachary Carter Sandra Kinkus (for Steve Cain)	2	- 2D gets some traffic off the New Burton Road	- Does not address cut through traffic - Performance of New Burton Road would be impacted	-	No
Ann Rider Nancy Wagner	3	- Reduced traffic on other local roads - Away from school - Worth considering	- Dumps all traffic on Wyoming Avenue - Side street performance on Wyoming Avenue will be affected	-	Yes
Facilitator: Andrew Bing	4	-	- Impacts on school and school children walking to school	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis	
Recorder: Mayuresh Khare	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5C less impacts to Kesselring property - Less impacts to developments - Auxiliary connection required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts to Charles Polk Road homes - Impacts to Brecknock Park - Impacts to environmental features 	-	Yes	
	6	-	- Does not solve problem	-	No	
	7	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cut through traffic not addressed - New Burton Road will be overloaded 	-	No	
	8	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts on school and school children walking to school - Doesn't solve problem 	-	No	
	9	-	-	- Doesn't solve problem	-	No
	10	-	-	- Doesn't solve problem	-	No

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
Group # 6 Members: Randi Pawlowski Robert Sandusky Janice Sibbald Carl Solberg Facilitator: Chris Fronheiser Recorder: Preethi Narayanan	1	-	- Does not address the issue of cut-through traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the improvements that could help the system without extending Saulsbury Road? 	No
	2	-	- Does not address the issue of cut-through traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would concept 2B take up a large portion of the church property? - Could an underpass be provided at all connection points on New Burton Road? - Is the average elevation lower in south as compared to north New Burton road? - Plan for a pedestrian loop trail through Brecknock Park 	Yes
	3	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not address the issue of cut-through traffic - would be a fatal flaw to divert anyone going west to access 1 North, as they would first have to travel on the already congested 1 South and then make a turn to go North. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have improvements to Governors Ave. and 13 been considered? - Currently congestion is experienced around the funeral home at the intersection of State St. & Wyoming Ave. 	Yes

Group	Concept	Likes	Dislikes	Questions/ Additional Information	Advance to Further Analysis
	4	- This would be the best connector intuitively - Direct route	- safety issues for school children - Access roads along Webbs Lane would be blocked and become unsafe - Concept would require the acquisition of all the homes to the south of Webbs Lane		Yes
	5	-	- The concept of cutting through Brecknock Park.	- Will the capacity on US13 be sufficient to accommodate additional traffic from Charles Polk Road? - Is there sufficient right-of-way available on US13 to provide additional capacity?	Yes
	6	-	- Does not address any of the problems in the area	-	No
	7	-	-	- Is it quieter to have underpasses built? - How much area would be required for an underpass at New Burton Road connection?	Yes
	8	-	Does not solve the problem of cut-through traffic and thus can be eliminated	-	No
	9	-	Does not solve the problem of cut-through traffic and thus can be eliminated	-	No
	10	-	Does not solve the problem of cut-through traffic and thus can be eliminated	-	No

Brief Breakout Team Reports

- Each of the six facilitators reported a brief summary of the discussion in his/her group to the entire Working Group. Each group's summary reflected key likes and dislikes about each concept and general consensus in the group about whether to advance each concept to further analysis or not.
- At the end of summary, each facilitator asked his/her group members whether the summary reflected their discussion properly. For Group 2, group member Eugene Ruane pointed out a question that did not get reported in the team report about whether southern connector locations can have a railroad underpass for connection to New Burton Road. The group facilitator Evio Panichi reiterated the question to the entire Working Group.
- There was a general consensus in all the groups that team reports properly reflected their discussions during the breakout session.
- Based on the breakout team reports the following table shows a summary about which concepts were supported by the breakout groups.

Concept <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Group										
Marge	X	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	X	X	x
Evio	✓	X	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	x
Ed	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X	X	X	x
Andrew	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X	X	X	x
Chris	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	x
Erich	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	X	x
Some or Full Support (✓)	1	3	4	3	5	0	4	0	0	0
No Support (x)	5	3	2	3	1	6	2	6	6	6

Next Steps

- Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group to work on the homework assignments. Homework assignments included review of the pros and cons matrix and filling out likes and dislikes forms. Bob pointed out that a pre-labeled and prepaid envelope was provided to each Working Group member and each member should mail the completed forms back to the project team before October 1, 2004.
- Eugene Ruane asked Bob whether the likes and dislikes form envelopes are tagged to each Working Group member purposely. Bob replied that this has been done only to make sure that the responses from all Working Group members have been collected. Marge Quinn added that the project team will not differentiate which member provided what input. The purpose is to collect all the likes and dislikes associated with each concept from the Working Group.
- Bob indicated that the team will use this feedback to refine the conceptual ideas and pros/cons.
- Bob mentioned that there will be more discussion on these concepts during the next Working Group meeting on October 20th, 2004. He indicated that all concepts cannot be carried forward to detailed study as computerized traffic modeling requires substantial work and resources. The Working Group is expected to recommend concepts that the group desires to be advanced to further study.
- Bob then indicated that there will likely be a public workshop in November during which all the concepts will be presented to general public.

- Eugene Ruane indicated he was confused that whereas Bob indicated some concepts will not be selected by the Working Group for further study he also stated that all the concepts will be presented to general public. Bob clarified that all the concepts will be shared with general public to display all the possibilities considered by the Working Group and it will be indicated to the general public which of the concepts have been recommended by the Working Group.

Next Meeting

The next Working Group meeting will be held on **Wednesday, October 20, 2004 at 5:30PM**. It will be held in the **DuPont Ballroom at Modern Maturity Center at 5:30PM**. A light dinner will be provided at the meeting. The objectives of this meeting will be to review homework assignment results, provide answers to Working Group questions raised during the breakout group session and further discuss the conceptual alternatives.