

Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group

Meeting Date: May 25, 2005
Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

**NEXT Working Group Meeting
(IF NEEDED)**

Wednesday, August 17, 2005
5:30 PM Meeting
Modern Maturity Center
DuPont Ballroom
1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

James Brown	Resident, Town of Wyoming
Gerald Buckworth	34 th Representative District
Steve Cain	President, Crossgates/Mayfair Homeowner's Association
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Gloria Chappell	Lincoln Park Resident
Jane Edwards	Kesselring Property (East of New Burton Road)
James Galvin	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
Patricia Gauani	President, Rodney Village Civic Association
Steve Kitchen (for Darren Harmon)	Kraft Foods
Ken Hogan	Dover City Councilman – 1 st District
James Hutchison	Commerce Bank
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
Hans Reigle	Mayor, Town of Wyoming
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
Donna Stone	32 nd Representative District
Donald Sylvester	Resident, Rodney Village
Doris Kesselring Taylor	Kesselring Property (West of New Burton Road)
Nancy Wagner	31 st Representative District
Jeff Davis (for Craig Wearden)	Asst. Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
Juanita Wiczoreck	Executive Director, Dover/Kent County MPO

Others in Attendance (Public):

Joe Abbate	John Clark Road Resident
Ben Andersen	Willis Road Resident
Jean Bauer	Vining Road, Camden Resident

Donald Bauschbach
Gladys Bishop
Mary Beth Cannon
Sheila and Charles Cooper
Jill Cravens
Christina Deatley
Cindy Drew
Wynell Ebaugh
Bill Edwards
Carleton Fifer
Phyllis Garhartt
Aeneas Gauani
Shirley Gauani
T. K. Gellis
Angelo Giudici, Jr.
Richard and Jackie Goriup
Irene Harding
Leon Hart
Adrienne Hirt
Mary Horres (designee for Ann Rider)
Nellie Houston
Beatrice Kemp
Frank and Alice Kesselring
Sandra Kinkus (designee for Janice Sibbald)
Tom Kinkus
Rhae Kenschak
Perna and Olga Ledoenka
Jackie Lee
Billy Lewis
Claude Marks
Anthony Matone
Elizabeth Matone
Davona McCurley
Edwin Meredith, Jr.
Lee Morgan
John and Carol Mosemann
Fred and Gene Mott
Adele Nagle
Jack Olenik
Cheryl Precourt
Ruby Proudford
J.A. Sharp
William Spence
Susan Staucil
Kristina Stephens
Charles Thompson
Drew Volturo
Karen Papen Watts
Phyllis Wernfare
Theresa Winchell

Oakrest Drive Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Alder Road Residents
Wyoming Avenue Resident
Kesselring Avenue Resident
Wyoming Avenue Resident
Richard Bassett Road Resident
Kennett Square, PA Resident
Allabands Mill Road Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
South Bradford Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Mockingbird Avenue Residents

South Taylor Drive Resident

Blue Beach Drive Resident
David Hall Road Resident
South Governors Avenue Resident
Chapel Drive, Camden Residents
Fiddlers Green Resident
Fiddlers Green Resident
Wyoming Avenue Resident
Wyoming Avenue Residents
Charles Polk Road Resident
John Clark Road Resident
Wyoming Mills Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Kesslering Avenue Resident
Wyoming Avenue Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Richard Bassett Road Residents
Holly Drive Residents
Fiddlers Green Resident
Wyoming Avenue Resident
Kesselring Avenue Resident
Mockingbird Avenue Resident
Alder Road Resident
Shadow Court Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Dover Resident
Woodsedge Road Resident
Delaware State News
Hazletville Road Resident
South Governors Avenue Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident

Lettie Yadacus
Linda Zacovic
Van and Barb Zandhuis

Charels Polk Road Resident
Pennsylvania Avenue Resident
Wyoming Avenue Residents

Others in Attendance (Project Team):

Andrew Bing	Kramer & Associates
Chris Fronheiser	DMJM Harris
Mike Girman	DMJM Harris
Ed Janda	DMJM Harris
Jay Kelley	DeIDOT
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM Harris
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
Gary Laing	DeIDOT
Marge Quinn	DMJM Harris
Leslie Roche	DMJM Harris
Ed Thomas	Kramer & Associates

The purpose of the meeting was to update Working Group members about the results of screening Concepts 7D and 14 in terms of traffic and the natural and built environments, and to obtain input from the Working Group on which concepts and/or preliminary alternatives may not merit further consideration.

Introductions and Updates

Bob Kramer began the meeting by welcoming the Working Group members and the public to the meeting. Bob reviewed the agenda for the meeting. Bob Kramer explained that tonight's meeting would include a breakout session that would enable Working Group members to discuss the concepts and Preliminary Alternatives they feel do not merit further study and why. He explained that four breakout groups would be created with the Working Group members and a fifth breakout group would be provided for the public.

Jay Kelley thanked the Working Group and public for coming to the meeting. Jay stated that there is a new binder for the Working Group members. He explained the contents of the binder including the tabs that were mailed to Working Group members ahead of time. He explained that because a great deal of material would be discussed at tonight's meeting, material was made available ahead of the meeting for the Group's review and consideration.

Jim Galvin asked whether the material the Working Group receives could be provided on a CD. Jay Kelley responded that, yes, electronic information will be made available. Bob Kramer stated for the benefit of the public that the information from tonight's meeting will be on the project website.

Bob Kramer reviewed the Working Group Guidelines. Bob explained the need to review the guidelines in light of the tough issues that are being discussed at the current and on-going meetings. He highlighted the key guidelines:

- o How We Treat Each Other. Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group members of the importance of showing respect for other Working Group members and their views throughout the process.

- How We Make Recommendations. Only members of the Working Group can make recommendations. The word “consensus” means Working Group members can live with a decision. A supermajority (75%) of the members present is required to approve a Working Group action.
- How We Communicate With Others Outside the Working Group. It is very important that the members of the Working Group uphold the commitment to accurately reflect the work and positions of the Working Group. Working Group members need to reach out to their respective communities to quell rumors and incorrect or misleading information.

Bob Kramer mentioned a petition that challenged the position of a member of the Working Group. Bob reminded the Group that each member was appointed to the Working Group at the pleasure of the Secretary of Transportation. Each appointment decision is the prerogative of the Secretary and the Department of Transportation.

Bob Mooney acknowledged that DeIDOT made a presentation on the West Dover Connector study to a combined meeting of the Towns of Camden and Wyoming on May 2, 2005. Bob Mooney complimented DeIDOT and thanked them. Hans Reigle seconded the compliment. Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group of DeIDOT's desire to be invited to any community desiring such a presentation.

As a follow-up to the April 6, 2005 Working Group meeting, Mike Girman presented additional information regarding the potential for impact to the City of Dover substation. Mike stated that a partial impact to the grounds of the substation could occur in Preliminary Alternatives 7 and 12 if widening is required on the east side of New Burton Road. However, if such an impact were to occur, substation operations would not be affected and relocation of the substation would not be required. Eugene Ruane asked whether Mike Girman's statement about substation impacts reflects discussions with the electric company and City. Mike Girman responded that those discussions would occur in design of the alternatives during the detailed study phase.

Mike Girman explained that the impact of Preliminary Alternatives 12A or 12B on preserved Agricultural District land would be 1.82 acres. This total includes impacts due to relocating the railroad. Mike Girman explained that the data matrix has been updated to show this information (Tab 7).

Mike Girman clarified the impact data for Preliminary Alternatives 5C and 7C Spurs by saying that although impacts to the natural environment in the vicinity of Isaac Branch would be equivalent for each alternative, overall natural environment impacts of the 5C Spur at Puncheon Run would be much greater than those of the 7C Spur. The 5C Spur would involve constructing a new crossing of Puncheon Run whereas the 7C Spur would use New Burton Road with some widening.

Mike Girman explained why the symbols for Preliminary Alternative 4 impacts on floodplains and preserved Agricultural District lands are the same as those for Preliminary Alternatives 5A through 5C. Mike explained that the impacts of each alternative fall within the same ranges established for the symbols. The symbols do not represent rank order.

Mike Girman explained the additional information on Preliminary Alternative 11 contained in Tab 8. He explained that intersection analysis was performed for all 25 intersections in the study area. Intersection levels of service (LOS) were determined for years 2015 with DeIDOT committed improvements. Potential improvements were then identified and applied to intersections where

possible and the LOS analysis was recalculated. Then a similar exercise was conducted using 2030 traffic volumes and the full range of possible TSM improvements were identified. Bob Kramer pointed out that when DeIDOT makes an investment they look at a design year, which in this case is 2030. Bob Kramer explained that the LOS scale is from A to F with A being the best operation and F being the worst operation.

Bob Kramer indicated to the Working Group that DeIDOT had received correspondence from Steve Cain (Tab 3) and Jane Edwards (Tab 4) of the Working Group. Bob Kramer indicated that DeIDOT's responses to each are included in Tabs 3 and 4, respectively. Bob noted that Jane suggested an additional idea. The project team developed a Concept 14 for presentation tonight. However, due to a misunderstanding on the part of the team, Concept 14 does not fully convey Jane's idea. Concept 14 as developed by the team assumed there would be no connector extending Saulsbury Road or a grade separated crossing of the railroad. The team will develop a concept that does accurately reflect Jane's idea.

Regarding stakeholder meetings, Bob Kramer noted that DeIDOT made a presentation on May 2, 2005 at a joint meeting of the Towns of Camden and Wyoming. He mentioned that the team has had question and answer sessions at Rodney Village, but no presentation to date. Bob Kramer stated that the team has been seeking to make a full presentation to Rodney Village. He offered that if any member of the public would like a presentation to their community, please contact Jay Kelley at DeIDOT.

Bob Kramer noted that tonight's notebook materials include a DeIDOT press release regarding the continuation of field work to map wetlands in the study area. He reminded the Working Group and the public that field work is to be expected and that the team had indicated early on in this study that field work would occur. During the detailed study phase, more field work will occur. Bob Kramer asked that anyone with questions about the field work should call Jay Kelley.

Bob Kramer noted that the Working Group is not the only source of recommendations to the Department; the public is another source.

Deb Scheller remarked that she was disturbed by Working Group member Patty Gauani leading demonstrations outside the Working Group meeting and leaving the meeting to give an interview to the media. Deb's concern was echoed by Ken Hogan. Ken stated that in the interest of the Group, the issues Patty is talking to the media about should be shared with the Working Group.

Leslie Roche summarized a meeting with the environmental resource agencies on April 14, 2005. She stated that the team met with federal and state environmental resource agencies that are charged to protect certain resources. She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to provide the agencies with information about the study and obtain their input. Leslie explained that the information presented to the agencies was the same that the Working Group has seen: study background, an overview of the concepts and preliminary alternatives, and a summary of the screening process and matrices. In turn, the resource agencies provided the following input:

- Preliminary alternatives with the least impact on Puncheon Run are favored in terms of minimizing environmental impact. Leslie stated that although the agencies were focused on Puncheon Run, this same opinion applies to Isaac Branch.
- The Working Group should be informed of all the environmental factors that will be evaluated during the detailed study phase. Leslie presented a slide showing 20 broad topics

to be evaluated during the detailed study phase and explained that the screening work performed to date had looked at five of those topics.

- The use of lands of Brecknock Park for the 5C and 7C Spur alternatives is viewed as a fatal flaw due to protections afforded to public parklands in general by Section 4(f), and specifically by Kent County as a result of the terms under which the land was donated to the County. Leslie noted that federal law presumes that there is a feasible and prudent alternative to impacting public parklands and natural resources. In this study, there are feasible and prudent alternatives to the 5C and 7C Spur alternatives.

Jeff Davis asked whether just the spur is fatally flawed. Leslie responded that, yes, only the small section of Preliminary Alternatives 5C and 7C that crosses Isaac Branch and enters Brecknock Park is considered fatally flawed by the agencies.

Mike Girman explained Preliminary Alternative 7D by stating that it is similar to 7B but would use Webbs Lane. A map of Preliminary Alternative 7D is included in Tab 5 of tonight's notebook materials. The data and scoring matrices have been updated to include 7D.

Mike Girman explained Concept 14 as interpreted by the team. Concept 14 would improve capacity along Webbs Lane, Wyoming Avenue and New Burton Road.

Steve Cain asked for a reminder of the distance required for a flyover at the railroad to return to existing grade. Chris Fronheiser indicated that with a 40 mph speed limit, a distance of about 800 feet would be required to return to existing grade in a straight line. Jane Edwards asked if Preliminary Alternative 7D is a flyover. Mike Girman responded yes.

Jeff Davis asked for verification of what alternatives make up Concept 14B. Mayuresh Khare responded that Concept 14B is a combination of Preliminary Alternatives 3 and 7D. Mayuresh stated his belief that the results of modeling Concept 14B would be slightly better than the results for 7D included in Tab 5. Jeff stated that we're starting to talk about combining alternatives and pieces of alternatives. He asked whether that is appropriate at this point? Jeff suggested combining Preliminary Alternatives 3 and 5C. Bob Kramer responded that two railroad crossings would add significant and possibly prohibitive costs. Jeff asked about combining Preliminary Alternatives 3 and 7C. Bob Kramer responded that it's something we can look at.

Steve Cain stated that the two-dimensional maps don't show the elevation changes of a roadway proposal. He thinks Concept 14 is similar to Preliminary Alternative 2. Mayuresh Khare responded that the two are dissimilar because improvements on New Burton Road and Webbs Lane would not happen in Alternative 2.

Steve Cain asked when the next public workshop would occur. Mike Girman responded that the next workshop would occur in the fall. Steve Cain asked that elevational information and impact data for structures be presented to the public as well as the impact data. Steve Cain asked that the matrices be put on the website. Bob responded that, yes, the scoring sheets and data matrices would be put on the website.

Gene Ruane asked what the overall height of the flyover would be. Mike Girman responded that the height depends on the type of structure, but the structure depth would be about 10 feet on top of the required 24 feet of clearance. The total structure height would be about 34 feet.

Gene Ruane asked for verification of the distance required for the road to return to existing grade from the highest point of the flyover. Chris Fronheiser responded that at a 50 mph speed, the distance needed would be 800 to 1000 feet. At a 40 mph speed, the distance required would be 600 to 800 feet.

Gene Ruane asked how access would work at the Wyoming Avenue/New Burton Road intersection portion of Preliminary Alternative 7D. Mayuresh Khare responded that full access would be provided. Gene Ruane stated his opinion that Eden Hill Farm traffic would be attracted to Preliminary Alternative 7D and Wyoming Avenue. Mayuresh stated that the modeling results show that no significant additional traffic impact would occur on Wyoming Avenue although cumulative cut-through traffic would increase on all the streets under 7D. The southern connection via Webbs Lane would be used. Bob Kramer stated that cut through traffic would persist at some level on Wyoming Avenue with Preliminary Alternative 7D.

Jim Galvin asked for clarification as to how traffic in Preliminary Alternative 7D would not be attracted to Wyoming Avenue. Mayuresh Khare stated that cut through traffic on Wyoming Avenue will persist in the future under 7D. Bob Kramer stated 7D would not reduce cut through traffic. Growth in cut through traffic will be proportional on all roads. Mike Girman reminded the Working Group that the projected traffic volumes are for year 2030, not the day the road opens.

Jim Galvin asked how the impacts of a bridge will be assessed, particularly long-term economical effects on neighborhoods. Bob Kramer responded that the detailed study phase will include the development of means to analyze and evaluate those kinds of impacts. Jim Galvin asked whether the study will include an examination of other areas that have had impacts from similar projects. Bob Kramer responded that the team would welcome suggested locations from Jim Galvin and the Working Group. Mike Girman stated that the Environmental Assessment process will include land use and socioeconomic analysis.

Bob Mooney suggested that the meeting move on so that the project team can provide the information the Group needs to make decisions during the breakout sessions.

Marge Quinn explained the screening processes for Preliminary Alternative 7D and Concept 14. She stated that the modeling results for 7D show high benefits in terms of traffic circulation around Schutte Park and Eden Hill Farm, traffic volume reductions in those movements, and reduction in trip lengths.

Marge Quinn stated that in terms of performance improvements at the North Street intersections, 7D would have high benefits by reducing turning movements at North Street, changing a significant number of turning movements to through movements at the Saulsbury Road/North Street intersections, and improving intersection performance and safety.

Marge Quinn stated that the modeling results showed moderate reduction in traffic volume on Camden-Wyoming Avenue. In terms of cut through traffic, Preliminary Alternative 7D would bring more traffic to New Burton Road which could then cut through using existing east-west roads.

In terms of improved access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad, Marge Quinn stated that a high benefit would be provided by 7D as a grade-separated crossing of the railroad would be provided. Overall, the traffic analysis determined that Preliminary Alternative 7D meets the project purpose and need.

Marge Quinn summarized the modeling findings for Concept 14 as interpreted by the team. In terms of traffic circulation, Concept 14 would draw more traffic to Saulsbury Road and North Street, resulting in an increase in circulatory trips. Concept 14 would result in a deterioration of performance at the intersections of North Street with Saulsbury Road and West Street as Concept 14 would encourage more traffic to use those intersections. Along Camden-Wyoming Avenue, traffic reduction would be moderate. No reduction in through traffic would be provided by Concept 14 on east-west roads as Concept 14 would bring more traffic to New Burton Road which could then cut through on east-west streets. Finally, Concept 14 would not address the need for improved access and mobility across the railroad as no grade-separated crossing would be provided. Overall, Concept 14 would not improve study area traffic conditions and does not meet the project purpose and need.

Bob Kramer explained for the benefit of the public that meeting purpose and need is not the final solution. Meeting the purpose and need is a first step that looks only at transportation criteria. Subsequent steps will look at other factors.

Chris Fronheiser explained the results of the environmental screening of Preliminary Alternative 7D. He stated that based on the environmental screening data in hand, 7D would have no wetlands impacts, minimal floodplain impacts like 7A through 7C and no impacts to preserved Agricultural District lands. Preliminary Alternative 7D would result in a similar number of displacements as 2B, and a modest amount of right-of-way would be required.

Bob Kramer asked whether New Burton Road would be widened in Preliminary Alternative 7D. Chris Fronheiser responded yes. The minimal floodplain impacts would result from widening New Burton Road across Puncheon Run.

Jane Edwards asked which side of New Burton Road would be widened. Chris Fronheiser responded that an 80 foot wide bandwidth was used, and the widening would be to the east. The western right-of-way line abuts the railroad property line, thereby prohibiting widening to the west in 7D.

Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that Preliminary Alternative 12 would provide widening on the west side of New Burton Road because the railroad would be relocated.

Steve Cain asked for a review of the displacements and partial impacts of Preliminary Alternative 7D. Chris Fronheiser stated that "displacement" means a full purchase of the property requiring relocation of the owner; a "partial impact" is purchase of a portion of the property allowing the owner to remain. Bob stated that DeIDOT is obligated to pay fair market value for property acquisitions. Chris Fronheiser responded by referring the Working Group to the data matrix in Tab 7 of tonight's notebook materials. In 7D, displacements would occur on the east side of New Burton Road near Wyoming Avenue while partial impacts would occur along the east side of New Burton Road and along Webbs Lane.

Steve Cain asked what an 80 foot bandwidth means. Chris Fronheiser explained that 80 feet is the maximum right-of-way width that DeIDOT may require (a worst case). Typical travel lanes are 12 feet wide. The number of lanes will depend on other amenities like medians, turning lanes, sidewalks, and etc. Webbs Lane is now a 60 foot wide corridor which means that widening to 80 feet would require new right-of-way. Bob Kramer explained that until detailed analysis is undertaken, the number of travel lanes and other amenities needed and whether properties can be avoided is not known.

Steve Cain stated that the residential displacements look similar for many alternatives. Chris Fronheiser agreed.

Gene Ruane asked whether park connectivity was a factor in evaluating 7D. Chris Fronheiser responded that the matrix shows that 7D would provide fair park connectivity. Gene asked what parks would be connected. Mike Girman responded that the parks include Schutte, Eden Hill and Brecknock. He stated that it is possible to build park connectivity features into any alternative. 7D has an overpass which could be used to facilitate park connectivity. Chris Fronheiser explained that 7D was scored based on its ability to get over the railroad and the provision for other routes that can be improved to provide multimodal connections. The connectivity rating for 7D is somewhat lower because the connectivity to Brecknock Park is not as easily facilitated as with other alternatives.

Breakout Sessions

Bob Kramer turned the Working Group's attention to tonight's breakout session. He explained that the purpose of the breakout session is to identify alternatives and concepts that the members of the Working Group feel should not be studied any further. At its April 6, 2005 meeting, the Working Group voted to drop Preliminary Alternatives 2A through D as well as Concepts 6, 8, 9, and 10 from further consideration. In the report outs some support was shown for dropping 5A, 7A and 7B. Mixed support was reported for dropping 11. The Working Group has not yet reported on 7D, 12A, 12B, 13, and 14. Bob Kramer encouraged Working Group members to use the matrices in the breakout sessions, and indicated that an engineer and a scribe would be provided with each group.

Jane Edwards asked about her version of Concept 14. Bob Kramer responded that the project team believes the traffic modeling for Jane's alternative, Concept 14B, would perform somewhat better than 7D. Bob indicated to the Working Group that if members don't like 14B and/or Concept 14 that the team presented, the Working Group can make a recommendation on either. The project team, however, is ready to develop Concept 14B as requested.

Patty Gauani read two letters submitted to the Rodney Village Civic Association by the Fire Chief and Ambulance Captain of the Camden Wyoming Fire Company.

In response to a one of the letters Patty read, Ken Hogan asked where the "closing of Charles Polk Road" and "dead end" roads in Rodney Village would be. Mike Girman responded that Charles Polk Road would not be closed under any of the alternatives being considered by the Working Group and that no dead end roads would be created by any alternative.

Patty Gauani stated that she despises the West Dover Connector study process and thinks the Working Group is a scapegoat for DeIDOT. She stated that she thinks the Working Group is going to be blamed for the decision that DeIDOT makes.

Donna Stone asked whether it is appropriate that the Working Group continue to consider the 5C and 7C Spurs that the agencies feel are fatally flawed. She asked whether the Working Group can introduce a motion to eliminate the 5C and 7C Spurs. Bob Kramer asked whether any Working Group members would like to continue to discuss the 5C and 7C Spurs. Donna Stone introduced a motion to drop the 5C and 7C Spurs from further study; the motion was seconded, and the Working Group agreed unanimously; no nays were heard.

Jim Galvin asked whether the breakout groups should be Working Group members only. Bob Kramer responded that the public should get together with him and asked the public not to interact with the Working Group breakout sessions.

Andrew Bing announced the members of each break-out session group, and the facilitator and recorder for each group.

The following matrix presents the information discussed in each break-out group based on the recorder's notes.

Preliminary Alternative Index

- Preliminary Alternative 3 – Tie in to Wyoming Avenue to US13
- Preliminary Alternative 4 – Tie in to Webbs Lane to US13; auxiliary connection to Wyoming Mill Road
- Preliminary Alternative 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 the southern boundary of Kesselring Farm near the parkland
- Preliminary Alternative 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 the southern boundary of Kesselring Farm near the parkland
 - Option D: Along Webbs Lane
- Preliminary Alternative 11 – Transportation System Management (TSM)
- Preliminary Alternative 12A – Tie into Webbs lane to US 13; relocate railroad
- Preliminary Alternative 12B – Tie into Charles Polk Road to US 13; relocate railroad
 - Concept 13 – Tie to US 13 via a route west and south of Wyoming and Camden
 - Concept 14 – Widen Wyoming Avenue and Webbs Lane and improve New Burton Road
- Preliminary Alternative 14B – Tie into New Burton Road near Wyoming Avenue; widen Wyoming Avenue and Webbs Lane and improve New Burton Road

Group	Concept/ Preliminary Alternative	Comments	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 1 Members: Gloria Chappell James Galvin Milton Melendez Jane Edwards Jeff Davis Doris Kesselring Taylor Mary Harris (for Ann Rider) Robert Mooney Facilitator: Marge Quinn Recorder: Ed Janda	3	Bridge height too high	3 - No
	4	Impacts agricultural property; high partial impacts	4 - Yes
	5	5A – High impacts to agricultural property; dislike Webbs Lane connection 5B - High impacts to agricultural property; splits farmland 5C – Revise connector alignment	5A – Yes 5B – Yes 5C - No
	7	7A – Dislike Garton Road alignment; high number of displacements	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – Yes 7D - No
	11	Inadequate	11 - Yes
	12	12A – Dislike railroad behind house; like Charles Polk Road alignment	12A – Yes 12B - Yes
	13	High agricultural property impacts	13 - Yes
	14	-	14B - No

Group	Concept/ Preliminary Alternative	Comments	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 2 Members: Eugene Ruane Michael Petit de Mange Rob McCleary Donald Sylvester Steve Speed Steve Kitchen Carl Solberg Frank King Facilitator: Ed Thomas Recorder: Mike Girman	3	Few overall negative environmental impacts; community impacts (displacements) may be great; few traffic benefits	3 – mixed: 3 yes, 5 no
	4	Would not address cut-through traffic, would increase it; would widen New Burton Road, worsen conditions; negative environmental impacts; negative impacts on school; would reduce congestion on some intersections; trip reduction benefits	4 – mixed: 4 yes, 4 no
	5	5C - fewer environmental impacts; would not split Kesselring property; concern regarding noise impacts (Wyoming Mills); few agriculture land impacts; need to examine the connection between New Burton Road and Wyoming Mills Road	5A – Yes 5B – Yes 5C - No
	7	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D - Connection at New Burton Road and Wyoming Avenue will create a major problem; several residential displacements	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – Yes 7D - Yes
	11	Would not meet purpose and need	11 – mixed: yes 7, no 1
	12	12A - Negative residential impacts; would keep traffic on New Burton Road; no help with cut-through traffic 12B - Greater trip reduction; would get away from sub-station	12A – Yes 12B – mixed: yes 5, no 3)
	13	Would not meet purpose and need	13 - Yes
	14	Would not meet purpose and need	14 - Yes

Group	Concept/ Preliminary Alternative	Comments	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 3 Members: Zachary Carter Patty Gauani Hans Reigle Randi Pawlowski Ken Hogan Steve Cain Facilitator: Andrew Bing Recorder: Mayuresh Khare	3	Would not reduce cut through traffic; connector along Wyoming Avenue would split neighborhoods; traffic benefits may be insufficient; would not connect to US 13; concerned about height of flyover near existing residences	3 - Yes
	4	Webbs Lane route would split neighborhoods; concerned about children and the Reilly Brown school (possible to relocate and upgrade school?); large neighborhood between New Burton Road and US13; logical connection to Puncheon Run Connector	4 – mixed: No 4, Yes 2
	5	5A - Some think this provides an option to use Webbs Lane or the new connector depending on the final destination, others think traffic would mainly head along the new connector; impacts to Charles Polk homes 5B and 5C - Connector along Charles Polk Road would not split the neighborhood; would provide a better connection to US13 for southbound travelers; concerned about impacts to Charles Polk homes; would reduce traffic from Camden-Wyoming Avenue	5A – mixed: No 3, Yes 3 5B and 5C – mixed: No 5, Yes 1
	7	Would not address cut-through traffic; New Burton Road would change from a neighborhood access road to higher classification road; connection to New Burton Road north of Wyoming Avenue is not appealing and would impact church property	7A, 7B, 7C, 7D - Yes
	11	Intersection improvements would be required whether or not there is a new connector road	11 – mixed: No 4, Yes 2
	12	Would not address cut-through traffic; New Burton Road would change from a neighborhood access road to higher classification road; feasibility of moving railroad, will NS Railroad agree to relocation?; concerned about height of flyover near residences; a better choice only if DelDOT is required to study an on-alignment alternative	12A and 12B - Yes
	13	Would not solve local traffic issues; possible candidate for a western bypass project but not a suitable West Dover Connector alternative	13 -Yes
	14	14 - Would not solve the traffic problem; may increase cut-through traffic 14B - Improvements along both Wyoming Avenue and Webbs Lane would impact more properties while traffic benefits would not be significantly higher; would not solve the cut-through traffic issue	14 - Yes 14B – mixed: No 1, Yes 5

Group	Concepts/ Preliminary Alternative	Comments	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 4 Members: Robert Sadusky James Brown Deb Scheller Sandy Kinkus (for Janice Sibbald) Jack Papen Juanita Wiczoreck Gerald Buckworth Facilitator: Chris Fronheiser Recorder: Leslie Roche	3	No direct connection to US 13	3 - Yes
	4	A new road west of New Burton Road would do a better job of removing cut through traffic than a New Burton Road route May be a good comparison to Preliminary Alternative 12	4 - No
	5	5A – Best location for a Wyoming Mill Rd auxiliary connector 5B – Shift Wyoming Mill Connector to north as in 5A 5C - Shift Wyoming Mill Connector to north as in 5A; best of the 5's	5A - mixed 5B – No 5C - No
	7	7C – Dislike connection north of Puncheon Run 7D – Wouldn't do enough to reduce cut through traffic; many more displacements than other Webbs Lane alternatives, although Webbs is most direct route to US 13; no value in having direct access to Puncheon Run	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – Yes 7D - Yes
	11	Should be included with another alternative; not a sole solution	11 - No
	12	12A – Impacts on residential properties are not desirable; not sure alternative would address cut through traffic; farmland impacts due to moving the railroad are not desirable; mixed opinion on whether a Charles Polk Road connection should be considered 12B – A complete buyout of properties on Charles Polk Road (14 homes) may be a better result for the property owners than partial impacts (50 homes) along Charles Polk Road; mixed opinion on whether a Charles Polk Road connection should be considered	12A – No 12B - No
	13	-	13 - Yes
	14	-	14 – Yes 14B - Yes

Brief Breakout Team Reports

- Each of the facilitators reported a brief summary of the discussion in his/her group to the entire Working Group. Each group's summary reflected the general consensus in the group about which Preliminary Alternatives and Concepts did not merit further study and why.
- At the end of summary, each facilitator asked his/her group members whether the summary reflected their discussion properly.
- 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 of the breakout group's views about which preliminary alternatives should (√) or should not (x) be retained for further study. The symbol (m) denotes a mixed vote. The symbol (-) denotes no consideration of the Concept or Preliminary Alternative by the group.

Group à Concept/ Preliminary Alternative ↓	Marge Quinn	Ed Thomas	Andrew Bing	Leslie Roche	Does Not Merit Further Study (x)	Merits Further Study (√)
3	√	m	x	m	1	1
4	x	m	m	√	1	1
5A	x	x	m	m	2	0
5B	x	x	m	√	2	1
5C	√	√	m	√	0	3
7A	x	x	x	x	4	0
7B	x	x	x	x	4	0
7C	x	x	x	x	4	0
7D	√	x	x	x	3	1
11	x	m	m	√	1	1
12A	x	x	x	√	3	1
12B	x	m	x	√	2	1
13	x	x	x	x	4	0
14	x	x	x	x	4	0
14B	√	-	m	x	1	1

Public comments:

- Public concerns were received during the breakout session on many of the same issues under consideration by the Working Group: cut through traffic; safety of children near Reilly Brown School on Webbs Lane; safety at the railroad; truck volumes; existing traffic congestion on US 13; uncontrolled development; local flooding due to old development in floodplains; and property values.

Discussion and Motions

Bob Kramer stated that based on the results of the breakout session, there was consensus among Working Group members to eliminate Preliminary Alternatives 7A, 7B, 7C and Concepts 13 and 14 (team version). Bob Kramer asked for a motion from the Working Group to formally eliminate these Preliminary Alternatives and Concepts. Zach Carter introduced a motion that was seconded. The Working Group unanimously agreed, no nays were heard.

Bob Kramer asked for other motions. Steve Cain introduced a motion to eliminate Preliminary Alternative 7D that was seconded. The Working Group unanimously agreed to drop 7D; no nays were heard.

Ken Hogan introduced a motion to eliminate Preliminary Alternative 3 that was seconded. The Working Group unanimously agreed to eliminate 3; no nays were heard.

Steve Speed introduced a motion to eliminate Preliminary Alternative 5A that was seconded.

Steve Cain stated he likes the opportunity provided in Preliminary Alternative 5A for traffic to head north and south using Webbs Lane and the new connector, respectively. He commented that in the

last breakout session discussion it was stated that 60% of traffic moves north. Mayuresh Khare corrected Steve's statement by saying that the north-south traffic split depends on the time of day and is different during the morning and evening peak periods due to predominant traffic directions. As 5A provides an opportunity for vehicles to choose separate routes based on whether they are heading north or south, Steve would like to see 5A stay on the table for further study.

Bob Kramer stated that the following concepts and Preliminary Alternatives remain: 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 11, 12A, 12B, and 14B.

Bob Kramer asked for a show of hands from Working Group members as to whether Preliminary Alternative 5A should be eliminated from further study. In favor of elimination were 21 Working Group members; 8 members were opposed. The motion did not meet the 75% supermajority requirement; the motion failed.

Steve Speed introduced a motion to eliminate Preliminary Alternative 12A that was seconded.

Steve Cain stated that 12A includes accepting widening of New Burton Road.

Bob Kramer asked for a show of hands from Working Group members as to whether Preliminary Alternative 12A should be eliminated from further study. In favor of elimination were 27 Working Group members; 2 members were opposed. The motion met the 75% supermajority requirement; the motion passed.

Steve Cain introduced a motion to eliminate Preliminary Alternative 12B as he felt it would result in unacceptable impacts to a church. The motion was seconded.

Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that if all alternatives using New Burton Road were eliminated, DelDOT may decide to pursue one or more despite the recommendation of the Working Group.

Steve Speed commented that in the presentations there was never any discussion of imposing restrictions as to traffic movements onto and off of Webbs Lane or other roads.

Bob Sadusky recommended keeping Preliminary Alternative 12B because of its relatively high level of performance in addressing the purpose and need.

James Galvin stated that the flyover is less intrusive and should be retained.

Bob Kramer asked for a show of hands from Working Group members as to whether Preliminary Alternative 12B should be eliminated from further study. In favor of elimination were 12 Working Group members; 15 members were opposed. The motion did not meet the 75% supermajority requirement; the motion failed.

Bob Kramer stated that the Concepts and Preliminary Alternatives remaining included: 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 11, 12B, and 14B.

Ken Hogan introduced a motion to drop Concept 14B that was seconded. Jim Galvin stated that support was shown for 14B but that it would provide a large flyover. Jane Edwards stated that her group wanted to consider 14B as a way of crossing the railroad with less impact. Rob McCleary

stated his group felt they didn't have enough information and that the team should bring information back to the Working Group prior to considering dropping it.

Janice Sibbald asked whether an at-grade crossing could be provided. Bob Kramer responded that the railroad does not have an interest in allowing another at-grade crossing. DeIDOT is concerned for traffic and safety issues. Steve Cain asked whether the railroad may consider a tradeoff of one at-grade crossing for another. Bob Kramer responded that such an exchange is unlikely. Chris Fronheiser added that the presence of multiple sidings at the 14B crossing would prohibit an at-grade crossing. Milton Melendez stated that the Working Group would be short-changing itself by not waiting for the detailed information on 14B.

Jeff Davis introduced a motion to consider an idea known as Concept 14K. 14K would be similar to 14B except that it would use Wyoming Avenue and Charles Polk Road rather than Wyoming Avenue and Webbs Lane. Bob Kramer explained that initial screening of 14K (using Steps 1 and 2) would be done if the motion passed. Jeff Davis's motion was seconded.

Bob Kramer asked for a show of hands from Working Group members as to whether Preliminary Alternative 14K should be considered along with 14B as concepts for the project team to develop more information. In favor of adding 14K were 13 Working Group members; 15 members were opposed. The motion did not meet the 75% supermajority requirement; the motion failed.

Gene Ruane questioned why new alignments are being considered. Bob Kramer responded that at the last meeting new ideas were requested.

Bob Kramer asked for a show of hands from Working Group members as to whether Preliminary Alternative 14B should be eliminated from further study. In favor of elimination were 8 Working Group members; 19 members were opposed. The motion did not meet the 75% supermajority requirement; the motion failed.

James Brown introduced a motion that future Breakout Group sessions be started by 7 pm to allow more time to deliberate. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously; no nays were heard.

Next Meetings and Adjournment

Bob Kramer thanked the Working Group for staying to the end of a longer meeting than expected. He reminded the Working Group that the team would present the progress of the Working Group at the July 14th resource agency meeting. He stated that August 17 is next Working Group meeting date during which more information will be provided about Concept 14B as well as a report on the resource agency meeting. Bob Kramer explained that no issues will be re-opened that were decided at tonight's meeting. The Public workshop will be held on Sept 20, 2005.

Bob Kramer adjourned the meeting.

Action Items

Several questions were raised at the Working Group meeting. Responses will be provided.

1. Jim Galvin asked whether the material the Working Group receives could be provided on a CD. Jay Kelley responded that, yes, electronic information will be made available at the specific request of Working Group members.
2. Jeff Davis asked whether the team could analyze the combination of Preliminary Alternatives 3 and 7C. This concept was labeled 14K during this meeting. During the latter part of the meeting, the Working Group voted to eliminate Concept 14K. As a result, Concept 14K will not be analyzed by the team.
3. Steve Cain asked that dimensional information be presented to the public as well as the impact data. The team will use visualization tools such as artist's renderings at the public workshops to illustrate the grade-separated crossings in the context of the surrounding area.
4. Steve Cain asked that the matrices be put on the website. Bob responded that, yes, the scoring sheets and data matrices would be put on the website.
5. Jim Galvin asked whether the study will include an examination of other areas that have had impacts from similar projects. The environmental assessment will include an analysis of socioeconomic impacts. The team would welcome data from other similar locations from the Working Group.
6. The project team will develop and analyze a Concept 14B as presented by Jane Edwards.