WEST DOVER Connector

DelDOT
Delaware Department of Transportation

Draft Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group

Meeting Date: April 6, 2005
Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

NEXT Working Group Meeting
Wednesday, May 25, 2005
5:30 PM Meeting
Modern Maturity Center
DuPont Ballroom
1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

Robert "Dick" Bewick	Woodbrook Resident
James Brown	Resident, Town of Wyoming
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Judy Diogo	President, Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce
Jane Edwards	Kesselring Property (East of New Burton Road)
Colin Faulkner	Director, Kent County Department of Public Safety
Patricia Gauani	President, Rodney Village Civic Association
Darren Harmon	Kraft Foods
James Hutchison	Commerce Bank
Rob McCleary	DelDOT Representative
Milton Melendez	Department of Agriculture
James Galvin	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
Frank King	President, Wyoming Mills Homeowner's Association
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 - 2nd District
Robert Sadusky, Sr.	Dover City Councilman – 2nd District
Deb Scheller	Eden Hill Farm
Janice Sibbald	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Stephen Speed	Mayor, City of Dover
Ali Stark	Holly Drive Resident
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
Jeff Davis (for Craig Wearden)	Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
Juanita Wieczoreck	Executive Director, Dover/Kent County MPO

Others in Attendance (Public):

Gladys Bishop	David Hall Road Resident
Robert Day	Colony Drive Resident
Wynell Ebaugh	Richard Bassett Road Resident
Bill Edwards	Kennett Square, PA Resident
John Gaines	Artis Drive Resident
Phyllis Garhartt	David Hall Road Resident
Aeneas Gauani	Charles Polk Road Resident

Shirley Gauani	Charles Polk Road Resident
Angelo Giudici, Jr.	Charles Polk Road Resident
Carol Hotte	John Clark Road Resident
Nellie Houston	David Hall Road Resident
Paula King	Oats Lane Resident
Lorraine Lynch	Shadow Court Resident
Anthony Matone	Charles Polk Road Resident
Elizabeth Matone	Charles Polk Road Resident
Carol Mosemann	Richard Bassett Road Resident
Steve Sax	Dover Resident
Sean Shaver	Charles Polk Road Resident
William Towner	Charles Drive Resident
Drew Volturo	Delaware State News
Ryan Walsh	Shadow Court Resident
Karen Papen Watts	Hazlettville Road Resident
Theresa Winchell	Charles Polk Road Resident

Others in Attendance (Project Team):

Darrell Cole	DelDOT
Andrew Bing	Kramer & Associates
Mike Girman	DMJM Harris
Erich Hizer	DMJM Harris
Gary Hullfish	DMJM Harris
Ed Janda	DMJM Harris
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM Harris
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
Gary Laing	DelDOT
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 12 and 13 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. He explained that information on Concepts 12 and 13 would be presented but that no action would be taken on those concepts this evening.

Bob Kramer explained that tonight's meeting would include a breakout session that would enable Working Group members to discuss the concepts 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.

Bob Kramer explained the contents of the tabs in tonight's notebook materials.

Review Screening Process and Purpose and Need

Mike Girman began the presentation portion of the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. He reviewed the 2 step screening process:

- Step 1 examined the traffic benefits of each concept compared with the No Build alternative to identify the concepts that have little to no benefit to the study area based on the Purpose and Need.

- Step 2 examined the potential impacts to the natural and built environments for each concept that was determined to meet the Step 1 criteria. Mike explained that concepts meeting the Purpose and Need in Step 1 were refined into preliminary alternatives based on engineering criteria.

Mike Girman reviewed the traffic factors used in Step 1 of the screening process:
- Traffic circulation;
- North Street intersection performance improvement;
- Traffic reduction on Camden-Wyoming Avenue;
- Reduction in through traffic (cut through traffic on streets between New Burton Road and Governors Avenue); and,
- Improved access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad within the study area.

Mike Girman reviewed the natural and built environment factors used in the Step 2 screening process:
- Number of displacements/acreage of right of way required;
- Impacts to streams;
- Impacts to wetlands;
- Impacts to floodplains;
- Impacts to agricultural land; and,
- Impacts to cultural resources (to be determined in detailed study).

Mike Girman summarized the project purpose:
- Improve mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad for all modes of travel to and from the west side of Dover;
- Reduce congestion at key intersections in the study area; and,
- Improve connectivity of the roadway network for localized travel.

Mike Girman summarized the 4 major areas of need:
- Existing and future traffic congestion;
- System linkage and continuity;
- Emergency service accessibility; and,
- Safety.

Mike Girman explained that all elements of the Purpose and Need were examined by comparing the concepts to the No Build option.

Concepts 12 and 13 Introduction

Mike Girman introduced and described Concept 12, referring the Working Group to the map provided in Tab 3 of tonight's notebook materials. He explained that Concept 12 would extend Saulsbury Road from its existing terminus at North Street southwest crossing the Norfolk Southern Railroad near Puncheon Run and connect to New Burton Road. Concept 12 would include relocating the portion of the railroad between Puncheon Run and Isaac Branch to the west of its current location. Two railroad alignments are under consideration: a corridor immediately west of the current alignment in front of the Kesselring farmstead, and a corridor behind the Kesselring farmstead. Mike explained that relocating the railroad from the existing alignment would provide the land area needed to widen New Burton Road to the west as opposed to the east as shown in Preliminary Alternative 7, and would result in less impact to the built environment.

Mike Girman explained the traffic pattern that would be allowed by Concept 12. He stated that through movements on New Burton Road would be provided where the new alignment joins New Burton Road. Normal operation of New Burton Road as under existing conditions would continue. In addition, northbound traffic on New Burton Road can use a flyover (bridge) to continue northbound on the new roadway. Similarly southbound traffic on the new alignment would use a flyover to connect to southbound New Burton Road. The connection of the two roads would be by means of ramps; no intersection would be created. Mike explained that it would not be possible to travel southbound on the new alignment and then northbound on New Burton Road, or travel southbound on New Burton Road and then northbound on new alignment. Concept 12 would include alignment options to US 13 along either Webbs Lane (Concept 12A) or Charles Polk Road (Concept 12B).

Mike introduced and described Concept 13, explaining that it was developed from a proposal provided by the Planning Committee of the Rodney Village Civic Association. Concept 13 would extend Saulsbury Road from the existing terminus at North Street and head southwesterly, crossing Puncheon Run and connecting to and proceeding south on Wyoming Mill Road. Concept 13 would turn west at Isaac Branch and parallel the waterway before crossing it and continuing south along the west side of Wyoming and then turning east at the Norfolk Southern railroad crossing. Concept 13 would continue in a southeasterly direction to US 13 in the vicinity of Briar Park.

Mike Girman explained that as with all other concepts, Concepts 12 and 13 were screened to determine the travel benefits to the study area based on Purpose and Need.

Mike Girman explained that the team will be meeting with the resource agencies on April 14, 2005, and that all concepts and preliminary alternatives including Concepts 12 and 13 would be presented to the agencies at that time. Mike explained to the Working Group that another concept was developed by the team, which is a sub-alternative of Preliminary Alternative 7. Rather than the alignment being in the vicinity of Charles Polk Road, this additional concept would use Webbs Lane. Mike explained that as the purpose of the meeting with the resource agencies is to present the full range of alternatives, this additional concept would also be presented. Mike indicated that this concept would be known as 7D and the team will report on it at the next Working Group meeting. Additionally, Mike noted that the outcome of the resource agency meeting including input from the resource agencies will be reported to the Working Group at the next Working Group meeting.

Concepts 12 and 13 Screening Results

Marge Quinn reviewed the concept screening process and scoring methodology for Concepts 12 and 13. She indicated to the Working Group that traffic modeling had been performed for Concepts 12 and 13 and the results are presented on updated Scoring Sheets and Data Matrices provided in Tab 4 of tonight's notebook materials.

Marge Quinn explained that the traffic modeling results for Concepts 12A and 12B show improved continuity for traffic movements around Schutte Park and Eden Hill Farm. Traffic volumes were reduced in movements around Eden Hill Farm and Schutte Park. Trip length reduction would also occur. Marge indicated that, overall, high traffic circulation benefits would occur from Concepts 12A and 12B under 2030 conditions.

Marge Quinn explained that the traffic modeling results for Concepts 12A and 12B show a reduction in turning movements at the North Street intersections as a significant number of turning movements would become through movements at the intersection of North Street and Saulsbury Road. Reducing turning movements would improve intersection performance and safety. Marge summarized by saying that high performance improvement benefits would occur at the North Street intersections from Concepts 12A and 12B under 2030 conditions.

Marge Quinn stated that under 2030 conditions the traffic reduction on Camden-Wyoming Avenue would be moderate for Concept 12A and high for Concept 12B. By comparison, Concept 12B would have a higher benefit since it is in closer proximity to Camden-Wyoming Avenue.

Marge Quinn explained that based on 2030 conditions Concepts 12A and 12B would have a moderate benefit in reducing through traffic (cut through) on streets between New Burton Road and Governors Avenue.

In terms of access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad, Marge Quinn stated that Concepts 12A and 12B would have a moderate benefit. Improved access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad within the study area could be achieved with an underpass or overpass crossing the railroad. Access and mobility for emergency response vehicles and heavy vehicles would also be improved.

Referring to the Scoring Sheet, Marge Quinn explained that Concept 13 would provide a low benefit for traffic circulation. Concept 13 would provide some improvement in continuity for traffic movements around Schutte Park and Eden Hill Farm, but the benefits in terms of reducing traffic volume and trip lengths in those movements would be low.

Marge Quinn stated that performance improvements provided by Concept 13, like Concept 6, would be moderate in terms of reducing turning movements at North Street and reducing traffic volumes on Camden-Wyoming Avenue. Concept 13 would provide a low benefit in reducing through trips on streets between New Burton Road and Governors Avenue, and low benefit in terms of improving access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad.

Marge Quinn summarized her presentation by saying that the traffic analysis determined that Concept 12 meets the Purpose and Need. With respect to Concept 13, she explained that the traffic analysis determined that traffic patterns forecasted to occur would be very similar to the results predicted for Concept 6. Concept 13, like Concept 6, does not improve study area traffic conditions and does not meet the project Purpose and Need.

Gene Ruane asked what the key intersections are in the study area. He stated his opinion that any concept that includes Webbs Lane should be scored as a negative. Marge Quinn responded that the traffic counts included 25 key study area intersections and that the detailed study phase will analyze every study area intersection. She elaborated that the Purpose and Need statement specifically mentions the three North Street intersections and Queen Street at West Street as key. Bob Kramer added that the intersections along US 13 are an issue to be examined in detailed analysis.

Mike Girman reminded the Working Group that the focus beginning tonight is eliminating concepts that do not meet the Purpose and Need. He explained that a preliminary alternative using Webbs Lane would require improving Webbs Lane. If the required improvements to Webbs Lane could not be made, then the viability of the alternative would have to be re-considered.

Gene Ruane asked why the Working Group is only looking at key intersections instead of all intersections in the study area. Bob Kramer responded by explaining the layered screening process. The study begins with a large number of concepts. Concepts meeting the Purpose and Need are then developed into Preliminary Alternatives. Those Preliminary Alternatives are then whittled down to a group of alternatives retained for detailed study. The detailed study phase involves determining what improvements would have to be made to make an alternative work from engineering, traffic, and environmental perspectives, and involves evaluating the feasibility and reasonableness of making those improvements. After the detailed study phase, a preferred alternative will eventually be selected.

Patricia Gauani stated that she concurs with Gene Ruane. She doesn't think she has enough information to make decisions. Bob Kramer reiterated his previous statement that the current focus is on identifying and eliminating concepts that do not meet the Purpose and Need. Bob indicated that the traffic modeling work completed to date is sufficient detail to make those decisions. Bob commented that just because a concept appears to satisfy Purpose and Need at this preliminary level of analysis does not mean it is a "good" or "attractive" option or even that it will be evaluated as performing well in terms of traffic impacts under more detailed analysis. Andrew Bing added that the DelDOT travel demand model is used statewide in Delaware for traffic analysis and is the accepted analytical tool for this decision-making process. Mike Girman reiterated that the focus of the Working Group should be on eliminating concepts tonight that do not meet the Purpose and Need. He stated that enough information is available to make those decisions.

Jan Sibbald asked whether DelDOT had spoken with Norfolk Southern about relocating the railroad since the last Working Group meeting. Mike Girman responded that a preliminary discussion was had with Norfolk Southern which yielded a preliminarily agreement on a railroad design speed in the potential relocated area Mike Girman stated that the cost to relocate the railroad would be borne by DelDOT. Mike Girman referred to the map in Tab 3 of tonight's notebook materials and explained that the railroad relocation would occur south of Puncheon Run, enabling the railroad to continue using the existing bridge structure at Puncheon Run. The railroad would tie back in to the existing alignment north of the Isaac Branch railroad bridge. Mike Girman stated that the red and orange lines on the map are possible new railroad alignments. Bob Kramer explained that moving the railroad to the west would provide additional room for making improvements to New Burton Road with less community impact.

Ann Rider stated that she agrees with Gene Ruane and Patricia Gauani. She is frustrated because there is no data to show that any of the intersections in the study area other than the key

intersections would be improved by any of the preliminary alternatives. Bob Kramer repeated his previous statement that the current focus is on identifying and eliminating concepts that do not meet the Purpose and Need even at this preliminary level of analysis. He agreed that intersection analysis data is vital and that will be provided to the Working Group prior to the time when the Group is asked to make a recommendation of a preferred alternative.

Gene Ruane asked whether Webbs Lane is one of the roads people drive to get to US 13. Mike Girman responded that, yes, Webbs Lane is one of several roads. If a Webbs Lane route were part of the preferred alternative, Webbs Lane would have to be designed to accommodate the traffic that it would handle. Gene Ruane responded that the volume of cut through traffic is highest on Webbs Lane. Marge responded that the highest cut through traffic volume is on Wyoming Avenue and not Webbs Lane. She indicated that this information was presented to the Group at Working Group Meeting 1 by Erich Hizer and is contained in the notebook materials.

The Working Group agreed that they would like additional information on intersection levels of service. Bob Kramer responded that this information would be provided at the detailed level of study phase.

Leslie Roche presented the findings of the natural and built environment screening of Concept 12. She explained that the scoring and data sheets (Tab 4 of tonight's notebook materials) have been updated since the last Working Group meeting to include access to parks. In addition, she stated that in response to a question at the last Working Group meeting, Concepts 5C Spur and 7C Spur (concepts with an Isaac Branch crossing and connection to US 13 through Brecknock Park) were added to the scoring and data sheets and the impacts to the natural and built environments have been provided.

Leslie Roche reiterated Marge Quinn's statement that Concept 12 meets the Purpose and Need at this preliminary level of analysis and was developed into a preliminary alternative. The screening of potential natural and built environment impacts determined that Preliminary Alternative 12 would have relatively fewer wetlands and floodplain impacts compared to other alternatives with Puncheon Run crossings. This is because the alignment can more closely follow that of New Burton Road in the vicinity of Puncheon Run than the other alternatives. Preliminary Alternative 12 would have no impacts to Agricultural Districts. A similar number of displacements to Preliminary Alternative 7C would occur depending on the connection point to US 13. A moderate amount of right of way would be required depending on the connection point to US 13.

Questions and Answers

Bob Kramer asked if the Working Group had any questions. Ann Rider asked whether Preliminary Alternative 12 would have impacts to agricultural lands. Leslie Roche responded that the analysis examined potential impacts to Agricultural Districts, those lands that have been set aside for agricultural preservation. Leslie explained that the Agricultural Districts are located along Wyoming Mill Road and would not be impacted by Preliminary Alternative 12. Leslie commented that the property in the Agricultural District is in preservation for another five years. Only spurs connecting to Wyoming Mill Road would impact Agricultural Districts. Mike Girman noted to the Working Group that impacts to Agricultural Lands as a result of relocating the railroad would be added to the scoring and data sheets.

Bob Kramer explained that Tab 4 includes scoring sheets as well as the supporting data tables and encouraged the Working Group to take some time on their own to look at the information provided.

He explained that the data sheets show the actual numbers and help to explain why the symbols are noted as they are on the scoring sheets.

Milton Melendez suggested that Concept 12A and 12B Agricultural District Land Impacts associated with relocating the railroad should be added to the scoring and data sheets. Mike Girman responded that the scoring and data sheets would be updated and included in the memorandum of the meeting (see Action Item 1 at the end of this memorandum).

Mike Petit De Mange asked why the scoring for Concepts 5C Spur and 7C Spur show different results for impacts to streams, floodplains, and wetlands. Mike Girman responded that the data would be re-examined and the scoring updated if needed (see Action Item 2 at the end of this memorandum). Bob Kramer noted that the Resource Agencies will most likely view the 5C Spur and 7C Spur as having fatal flaws because of environmental and parkland impacts. Bob noted that without the spur, the Resource Agencies would find Preliminary Alternative 7 more acceptable than Preliminary Alternative 5 as it would use existing New Burton Road.

Steve Speed made a motion that the Working Group should drop Concepts 6, 8, 9 and 10 as they have insufficient merit and should not be carried forward for further study. Before asking the Working Group for a second to Steve Speed's motion, Bob Kramer asked the Working Group whether they had any new ideas to present tonight. The Working Group provided no new ideas.

Bob Mooney offered to second Steve Speed's motion. James Galvin offered an amended motion that all concepts and Preliminary Alternatives be retained until the Working Group has an opportunity to look at all ideas including Concepts 12 and 13. Jim Galvin's amendment did not receive a second.

Gene Ruane asked who the voters would be. Bob Kramer responded that the Working Group members would be the voters. He introduced Judy Diogo, President of the Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce, as the new Chamber representative. The Working Group includes 41 members with 31 in attendance at tonight's meeting. Bob Kramer clarified the changes in the Working Group membership. Gene Ruane stated that the number of members is large and asked if all defeated elected officials would be allowed to remain on the Working Group as the Group would continue to grow. He asked whether neighborhoods like Sherwood should be more represented. Bob Kramer responded that there is no pretense that the Working Group is a completely representative group, but that an effort has been made to be as inclusive as possible. He reminded the Group that the Working Group is only one element of the process. Bob Mooney concurred that Gene Ruane has a valid point in terms of the size of the group and future growth. Rob McCleary indicated he shares the concern that if the Working Group gets larger, it may be unwieldy. Bob Kramer stated that in view of these concerns, Working Group growth beyond its current size would be brought to the Working Group prior to increasing membership.

Nancy Wagner stated her opinion that the Working Group is part of the public process but the work would still need to be done by the project team. In the end, DelDOT will do what it wants. Bob Kramer responded that the Working Group is important and it has input, but DelDOT can not cede its authority to make decisions.

Jim Galvin stated his opinion that the Working Group is a mechanism that provides community value in the project development process, which is part of the equation in coming up with a preferred alternative. DelDOT does not know the community values, which is why they need the Working Group.

Donna Stone commended the effort of the Working Group. She said this is time well spent. The project is an emotional issue for many in the study area and on the Working Group. She reminded the Group that impacts will occur somewhere. As a result, time on the Working Group is well spent; DelDOT does listen.

Patty Gauani agreed that the Working Group is important and we are not wasting our time.

Bob Kramer reminded the Group that Steve Speed's motion remains on the floor. He asked whether members were in favor of dropping Concepts 6, 8 9 and 10. The "ayes" were unanimous; no nays were heard.

Ann Rider asked whether the directional ramps in Concepts 12A and 12B are merges. Mike Girman responded affirmatively.

Gene Ruane asked whether the electrical substation along New Burton Road would be impacted or moved. Ed Janda preliminarily responded that the substation would not be impacted or moved. Bob Kramer asked DMJM Harris to make a determination and provide a response (see Action Item 3 at the end of this memorandum).

Breakout Sessions

Bob Kramer introduced the purpose and tasks of the break-out group session: using the Scoring Sheets and Data Matrices, discuss the preliminary alternatives and determine whether each may not merit further study and why. The preliminary alternatives discussed in the break-out sessions should include the 2's, 3, 4, 5's, 7's, and 11.

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 2 – Stop at New Burton Road via
- A. Straight line
- B. Wyoming Avenue vicinity
- C. Blue Beach vicinity
- D. Kesselring Farm vicinity

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
- Option C Spur: Across Isaac Branch and Brecknock Park

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 C Spur: Across Isaac Branch and Brecknock Park

Preliminary Alternative 11 – Transportation System Management (TSM)

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 1 **Members:** James Galvin Milton Melendez Ali Stark Jane Edwards Jeff Davis Doris Kesselring Taylor Ann Rider Robert Mooney **Facilitator:** Marge Quinn **Recorder:** Ed Janda	2	- 2A access restriction to local streets where retaining wall would occur - 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D would put additional traffic on New Burton Road	- 2C impacts due to length of bridge	–	2A – Yes 2B – Yes 2C – Yes 2D - Yes
	3	- Enough benefits to traffic to keep in study	-	-	No
	4	-	-	-	No
	5	-	- 5C Spur, unacceptable impacts to Brecknock Park	-	5A – Yes 5B – No 5C – No 5C Spur - Yes
	7	- 7A would put more traffic on Webbs Lane	- 5C Spur, unacceptable impacts to Brecknock Park	-	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – No 7C Spur – Yes
	11	-	-	- Idea: consider network capacity improvements as well as intersection improvements - Idea: consider capacity improvements to Wyoming Avenue, Webbs Lane and New Burton Road	No

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 2 **Members:** Nancy Wagner Eugene Ruane Michael Petit de Mange Rob McCleary Donald Sylvester Colin Faulkner Steve Speed Robert "Dick" Bewick **Facilitator:** Ed Thomas **Recorder:** Mike Girman	2	- 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D have insufficient traffic benefits; would not get traffic to US 13	-	- 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D are not consistent with goals and objectives	2A – Yes 2B – Yes 2C – Yes 2D - Yes
	3	- Some believe traffic benefits are insufficient; will not reduce cut through traffic; would not get traffic to US 13 -Some believe there would be traffic benefits to North Street	- Some believe community impacts are unacceptably high	- Some opinion that some goals and objectives would be met	3 - Yes
	4	- Some believe traffic benefits are insufficient; doesn't get traffic to US 13 - Some believe there are traffic benefits; does get traffic to US 13; would help North Street intersections - Some support for spur to Wyoming Mill Road	- Some concerned for negative impacts	- Some concerned about cost - Some concerned about safety at school and in residential areas	4 - Yes
	5	- 5A, 5B, 5C, 5C Spur would benefit traffic	- 5C Spur would have unacceptable impacts on Brecknock Park - 5A, 5B, 5C would have few negative impacts - Would like to see the Kesselring House preserved	- 5A, 5B, 5C would meet goals and objectives	5A – Yes 5B – Yes 5C – No 5C Spur - Yes
	7	-7A, 7B, 7C traffic benefits are insufficient; no reduction in cut through traffic - There would be some traffic benefit at the North Street intersections; would get traffic to US 13	-	-	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – Yes 7C Spur - Yes
	11	- Some believe traffic benefits are insufficient - Some believe it will provide benefits for several years	-	- Some believe concept does not meet goals and objectives	11 – No (the group was evenly split)

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 3 **Members:** Donna Stone James Hutchison Zachary Carter Patty Gauani Hans Reigle Judy Diogo Randi Pawlowski **Facilitator:** Andrew Bing **Recorder:** Mayuresh Khare	2	- 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D traffic benefits are insufficient; would not address cut through traffic	-	- Does not meet the goals and objectives of the study	2A – Yes 2B – Yes 2C – Yes 2D - Yes
	3	- Access to US13; worth looking at in detail - Improvements would be needed on Wyoming Avenue	- Concerns about homes, but worth studying in detail	-	3 - No
	4	- Access to 13 makes this worth looking at in detail - Convenient connection to Puncheon Run Connector	- Impact to school and safety of school children is an important consideration	-	4 - No
	5	-	- Would have significant displacement impacts on the Charles Polk Rd neighborhood; would rather impact natural resources than impact Charles Polk Rd homes - 5C Spur should be studied further as it eliminates direct impacts on Charles Polk Rd. homes	-	5A – No 5B – No 5C - No 5C Spur - No
	7	-	- Would have significant displacement impacts on the Charles Polk Rd neighborhood; would rather impact natural resources than impact Charles Polk Rd homes - 7C Spur should be studied further as it eliminates direct impacts on Charles Polk Rd. homes	-	7A – No 7B – No 7C - No 7C Spur - No
	11	- Intersection improvements would be required under each of the alternatives - Stand-alone intersection improvements would not help solve traffic problems significantly	-	- Feel TSM becomes a viable option if the no build is selected, but only in that scenario	11 - Yes

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 4 **Members:** Robert Sadusky James Brown Deb Scheller Janice Sibbald Jack Papen Juanita Wieczoreck Frank King **Facilitator:** Leslie Roche **Recorder:** Gary Hullfish	2	- The 2's do not have acceptable traffic benefits; do not reduce through traffic	-	- The 2's do not connect to US 13	2A – Yes 2B – Yes 2C – Yes 2D - Yes
	3	- Truck traffic on Wyoming Avenue is a concern - Needs to address traffic filtering onto State Street prior to connection to US 13 - Does not significantly reduce cut through traffic - Partial solution	-	- Large impact on community surrounding Wyoming Avenue	3 - No
	4	- Heavy traffic at Webbs Lane and US 13 at 2:30 pm; must address significant traffic at US 13 connection.	- Impact on Agricultural Preservation land; connection to Wyoming Mill Road does not add value - There is a distinction between the potential number of walking students and the actual number of walking students - What is the capacity of the existing school? If expansion is imminent, may want to consider moving the school if a Webbs Lane alternative moves forward	- Location of Reilly Brown Elementary School is a negative	4 - No
	5	- 5A Garton Road is not a viable route	- 5A - The connection to Wyoming Mill Road is a better alignment as impacts to preserved agricultural land are reduced compared with 4 and 5C - Significant impact to Charles Polk Road community - 5C Spur – unacceptable impact on Brecknock Park	-	5A – Yes 5B – Yes 5C – No 5C Spur - Yes
	7	- 7A, 7B, 7C Does not significantly reduce cut through traffic - 7A, 7B, 7C Reduce traffic on Webbs Lane	- 7A, 7B, 7C Widening New Burton Road to the east would have significant community impacts; Preliminary Alternatives 4, 5C, and 12 would achieve the same traffic benefit without these impacts - 7A, 7B, 7C would have significant impacts on Charles Polk Road neighborhood - 7C Spur would have an unacceptable impact on Brecknock Park	-	7A – Yes 7B – Yes 7C – Yes 7C Spur – Yes

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
	11	- Does not provide a connection to US 13 - TSM improvements alone will not address all traffic factors - TSM improvement will not address many existing intersection problems	-	-	11 - Yes

Group	Preliminary Alternative	Opinions on Traffic	Opinions Natural and Built Environment	Opinions on Working Group Goals and Objectives	Drop From Further Study?
Group # 5 **Members:** Public **Facilitator:** Bob Kramer **Recorder:** Erich Hizer	2	- 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D do not go far enough to address traffic factors	-	-	2A – Yes 2B – Yes 2C – Yes 2D - Yes
	3	- Would cause more congestion on US13 and Governors Avenue - Improvements would be needed on Wyoming Avenue - Does not address southern part of the study area	- Would use Wyoming Avenue	-	3 - Yes
	4	- Addresses traffic needs - Intersections will have to be improved	- Improvements would be needed to mitigate impacts to the Reilly Brown Elementary School	-	4 - No
	5	-	- 5A, 5B, 5C would split Kesselring Farm in half - 5A, 5B, 5C would displace residents on the south side of Charles Polk Road - 5A, 5B, 5C could have a negative impact on shopping centers - 5C Spur through Brecknock Park and US 13 intersection would be difficult	-	5A – Yes 5B – Yes 5C – Yes 5C Spur - Yes
	7	- 7A, 7B, 7C, 7C Spur would not link Wyoming Mill Road and would not help Camden or Wyoming; recommend adding connection to Wyoming Mill Road	-	-	7A – No 7B – Yes 7C – No 7C Spur - Yes
	11	- Would not improve operations enough; little merit on its own	-	-	11 - Yes

Brief Breakout Team Reports

- Each of the five 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 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.

Group → Preliminary Alternative ↓	Marge Quinn	Ed Thomas	Andrew Bing	Leslie Roche	Does Not Merit Further Study (×)	Merits Further Study (√)
2A	×	×	×	×	4	0
2B	×	×	×	×	4	0
2C	×	×	×	×	4	0
2D	×	×	×	×	4	0
3	√	×	√	√	1	3
4	√	×	√	√	1	3
5A	×	×	√	×	3	1
5B	√	×	√	×	2	2
5C	√	√	√	√	0	4
5C Spur	×	×	√	×	3	1
7A	×	×	√	×	3	1
7B	×	×	√	×	3	1
7C	√	×	√	×	2	2
7C Spur	×	×	√	×	3	1
11	√	√	×	×	2	2

Gene Ruane asked whether Preliminary Alternative 11 would include adding lanes and capacity. Marge Quinn responded that capacity issues at intersections would not be addressed by Preliminary Alternative 11 which focuses on system management improvements not capacity improvements. Marge mentioned that this idea was raised in her breakout group but there was not time to discuss it.

Gene Ruane asked why TSM analysis was conducted at only a few intersections. Mayuresh Khare of DMJM Harris replied that the TSM analysis was conducted for all 25 studied intersections and the intersections included in the TSM alternative are the only intersections where TSM strategies can improve intersection performance. At the remaining intersections, the analysis showed that TSM strategies can not improve intersection performance. Hence, TSM improvements are not proposed for those intersections. Gene Ruane expressed interest in looking at the TSM analysis. Bob Kramer indicated that the TSM analysis would be provided to Gene Ruane.

Bob Kramer summarized the breakout session reports by saying that he heard unanimous support for eliminating Preliminary Alternative 2. He heard a mixed response to Preliminary Alternative 3 and 4. Differing views were heard on the four versions of Preliminary Alternative 5. In general, there is less support for 5A, 5B and 5C Spur. Preliminary Alternative 7 got mixed reviews. Preliminary Alternative 11 had no support from two breakout groups, but some support from two other groups.

Next Steps

Bob Kramer explained to the Working Group that all remaining Preliminary Alternatives will be discussed at the next Working Group meeting which is on **Wednesday, May 25, 2005 at Modern Maturity Center at 5:30** in the **DuPont Ballroom**. A light dinner will be provided at the meeting. The meeting will include further discussion of the Preliminary Alternatives. We will discuss and will entertain motions regarding Concepts 12 and 13, along with the remaining Preliminary Alternatives. We will report the results of the April 14, 2005 Resource Agency meeting. We will not choose a Preferred Alternative at the next Working Group meeting.

Steve Speed made a motion to eliminate all versions of Concept 2. His motion was seconded by Donna Stone. “Ayes” were unanimous; no nays were heard.

Donna Stone asked when the next public workshop would be. Bob Kramer responded that the next public workshop would be in mid to late July. Bob Kramer said there would be another meeting with the Resource Agencies in July.

Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group to encourage other members to attend the next meeting. Bob Kramer adjourned the meeting.

Action Items

Several questions were raised at the Working Group meeting. These questions have been investigated and the responses are provided below.

1. Milton Melendez suggested that Concept 12A and 12B Agricultural District Land Impacts associated with relocating the railroad should be added to the scoring and data sheets. The scoring and data sheets would be updated and the impact acreage would be included in the memorandum of the meeting. Accordingly, Agricultural District Land impacts for either Concepts 12A or 12B would be 1.82 acres. These totals include impact acreage for relocating the railroad.

2. Mike Petit De Mange asked why the scoring for Concepts 5C Spur and 7C Spur show different results for impacts to streams, floodplains, and wetlands. Mike Girman responded that the data would be re-examined and the scoring will be updated if needed. Accordingly, the DMJM Harris team has reviewed the data and has found it to be accurate. Although impacts to the natural environment in the vicinity of Isaac Branch would be equivalent for each concept, overall natural environment impacts of Concept 5C Spur at Puncheon Run would be much greater than those of Concept 7C Spur. Concept 5C Spur would involve constructing a new crossing of Puncheon Run whereas Concept 7C Spur would use New Burton Road with some widening.

3. Gene Ruane asked whether the electrical substation along New Burton Road would be impacted or moved. Ed Janda preliminarily responded that the substation would not be

impacted or moved. The DMJM Harris team has reviewed this issue and determined that a partial impact to the grounds of the substation could occur in Preliminary Alternative 7 if widening is required on the east side of New Burton Road. If such an impact were to occur, substation operations would not be affected and relocation of the substation would not be required.