



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Date: July 20, 2006

Date of Meeting: July 11, 2006

Meeting: US 301 Toll Diversion Working Group

Location: Cecilton Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

Attendees: See Attached

Next Meeting: July 25, 2006, at 5:30 p.m. in the Cecilton Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

Welcome

Bob Kramer, Kramer & Associates, meeting facilitator and a member of the US 301 Project Team, began the meeting at 5:45 p.m. and thanked the Working Group members for devoting their time to address potential US 301 traffic diversion issues. Bob pointed out that in addition to the Working Group (WG), members of the Technical Support Team, interested elected officials, citizens of the area, and staff members were attending. Bob thanked Chief Michael Cooper, of the Cecilton Fire Department, for hosting the meetings. Bob then introduced Mr. Mark Tudor, US 301 Project Director, Delaware Department of Transportation (DelDOT) to provide opening remarks.

Opening Remarks

Mr. Tudor expressed appreciation on behalf of DelDOT to the WG members for their participation and described the WG's composition emphasizing the breadth of elected officials, government, emergency services/law enforcement and community representation. Mark noted the importance of the WG input in identifying issues regarding potential toll diversions and in developing recommendations on how diversions might be reduced or minimized. Mark noted that the initial meeting will involve DelDOT providing a great deal of information to the members. The second meeting will involve a detailed discussion of issues and potential ways to address those issues. The third meeting will involve the Working Group developing its recommendations. Mark then introduced Mr. Douglas Simmons, Deputy Administrator, Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA) to provide opening remarks.

Doug Simmons introduced the elected officials, SHA, and MdTA representatives in attendance. Doug noted concern with the US 301 Study relevant to the possible impacts that may occur in Maryland if a new US 301 toll highway were constructed in Delaware, and stressed the importance of identifying issues and working with DelDOT now on potential ways to address those issues.

Doug stressed that now is the time to identify impacts and develop recommendations to address them – sooner, not later. Doug stated clearly that SHA is not a partner with DelDOT on the US 301 project. The US 301 Project is a DelDOT Project, however, SHA will work cooperatively to raise and address issues. He stressed the importance of identifying and addressing Maryland's issues. He pointed out that MSHA will be examining DelDOT's data and model. He emphasized that MSHA is working cooperatively with DelDOT and looks forward to working with the WG to recommend solutions.

Mr. Simmons explained that, as suggested during prior community meetings, MSHA has employed a consultant to conduct an independent review of DelDOT's data, traffic model, analysis, and projections. He noted that Gannett Fleming has been brought on board to review DelDOT's traffic effort, on behalf of SHA and to determine whether Maryland agrees with the DelDOT traffic effort. Mr. Simmons concluded his remarks by stressing that he and other Maryland transportation participants are committed to protecting Maryland citizens and its roads from unwanted traffic and have already begun looking for solutions.

Self Introductions

At Mr. Kramer's request, each attendee introduced his/herself, explained who they represented and their interests and concerns.

Working Group Purpose and Guidelines

Bob Kramer pointed out that the role of the WG is to provide advice to DelDOT and the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) rather than to make decisions for them. The group will review data, critique traffic projections and the assumptions they are based upon. Essentially, the task is to answer the question, what will a four-lane, limited access tolled US 301 in Delaware mean in Maryland and what steps should be taken to minimize any potential negative consequences.

Bob summarized the WG's Purpose and operating Guidelines (Power Point slides 4–7); pointing out that decisions will be made by consensus or, in the absence of consensus, a super majority of 75% of the members present must concur on any recommendation. While members are free to share the work of the WG with persons outside of the group, they should make it clear they are speaking on their own behalf until the WG has formally taken action.

Getting Organized

Mr. Tudor stated that he expects the WG to complete its assignment over the course of three meetings. If the task is not completed in that time a fourth meeting will be held. The group agreed to the following calendar:

Meeting Two, **Tuesday, July 25**, to discuss issues, ideas and identify potential solutions.
Meeting Three, **Wednesday, August 9**, to discuss and finalize recommendations.
Meeting Four (if needed), **Tuesday, August 29**, to complete recommendations.

Mark drew attention to the contents of the WG Notebook, reviewed the agenda for the remainder of the meeting (slide 3) and elaborated on the WG's Purpose and Guidelines (slides 4–7). Further, Mark explained how the work of the WG is one element of DelDOT's extensive outreach and decision-making process (slide 8), much of which is prescribed by federal rules and regulations since DelDOT plans to use federal funds in this project. He also posed and responded to a series of "Frequently Asked Questions" (see slides 9 and 10) regarding WG meetings and the availability of information and Mark explained the role and composition of the WG Technical Support Team (slide 11). Mark noted that project information, including large maps of the alternatives could be reviewed at the project office, in the Middletown Square Shopping Center between 3:00 and 7:00PM on Thursdays (slide 10).

Project Background Briefing

Mr. Tudor summarized the Purpose and Need for creation of a new US 301 to reduce congestion, improve safety and manage truck traffic (slides 15–18) and provided an overview of the over forty year history (slide 19) of the US 301 project. Mark emphasized Governor Minner's and Secretary Wick's direction to move aggressively to select a recommended alignment and to design, protect the selected alternative and build a new US 301 when funds are available. If steps are not taken to protect an alignment, the opportunity to complete the US 301 project will continue to become more costly and impactive as more development occurs in the Middletown area.

Mark highlighted the major public involvement efforts that have been undertaken to date, including steps taken to notify Maryland residents of the public workshops held in April 2006. Thirteen percent of the attendees were from Maryland.

Mr. Tudor pointed out that the range of alternatives has been narrowed to four alternatives retained for detailed evaluation. The alternatives are a combination of upgrades to existing US 301, a new highway on new alignment, and a combination of these two between the MD/DE State line and SR 1 below the C&D Canal (slides 20–23).

Note: from this point on *italics* will be used to highlight the questions, comments, responses and discussion among the WG members.

Doug Simmons asked if there would be any at-grade intersections as part of the new US 301. Mark responded that there would not; there would be interchanges and grade separations

(over/underpasses). In response to other questions, it was explained that travelers would pay only one toll and the new limited access highway would have four lanes.

In describing the project schedule (slide 24), Mark pointed out that a recommended preferred alternative, Draft Environmental Impact Statement and related public hearings are anticipated to occur late in 2006. The selected alternative and Final Environmental Impact Statement would be presented in early 2007, and federal approval is projected for spring 2007. He stated that the WG recommendations would be used in development of the environmental documents, and thus the need for the WG to complete its charge soon.

Mr. Tudor outlined the project's funding status, beginning with obtaining federal approval in 2007 through project completion under ideal conditions by approximately 2015 or 2020, should limited funding availability require phased construction. Mark indicated that the project's total estimated cost is \$500–\$700 million dollars (in 2005 dollars). He stressed that a project of this magnitude would be one of the State's most expensive, consuming a significant proportion of the funding available to the Department over several years, which is why a toll is recommended as part of the project (slide 25).

Mr. Simmons inquired about the availability of funding for right-of-way acquisition. Mark stated that limited funds were recently approved by the legislature for engineering and protective acquisition so that we will be able to protect the alignment when selected.

Mark stressed that DelDOT's goals (slide 26) are to have the users of the new road pay for it by optimizing toll revenues and minimizing toll diversion, and that is why the WG assistance is needed (slide 26). Success will only be achieved if vehicles stay on US 301 and off local roads in both Maryland and Delaware.

Bonnie Anderson stated that there are major concerns regarding traffic on MD 213 and asked if there is a weight restriction on the MD 213 bridge over the C&D Canal at Chesapeake City. She was informed that there is no restriction on that bridge or the MD 213 bridge over the Sassafras River. She said that weight restrictions on these bridges could help solve the diversion/traffic problems.

Michael Cooper referred to the large volumes of trucks on MD 310.

Traffic Analysis/Results

Mr. Tudor introduced Jim Burnett, Traffic Engineer, RK&K Engineers, and member of the Technical Support Team to present the traffic analysis performed to date and the results. Jim began by explaining the differences between truck traffic on US 301 and MD 213 (slide 27):

- US 301 – predominantly through traffic, 18-wheelers, day and night use
- MD 213 – predominantly local traffic, agricultural, local delivery, & dump trucks, daytime trips

Current characteristics of trucks that use US 301 were described, as well as the origins and destinations throughout the east coast.(slides 28 and 29).

Mayor Pisapia asked if southbound trips are included; Jim said, yes, they are.

Jim presented the results of a comparison of truck travel times and tolls between I-95 at US 50 (Capital Beltway) and I-95/SR 1 (Christiana Mall). Long-haul truckers save 3 to 15 minutes on I-95 and \$18-28 by using US 301 (slide 30).

Mayor Bunnell asked if the recently increased tolls were used in this comparison. Jim said, yes, they were.

Mr. Burnett described the MD 213 traffic characteristics in the Chesapeake City, Cecilton and Galena areas (slide 32).

Mayor Pisapia expressed concern regarding the large reduction in auto traffic (-8,000) between Chesapeake City and Cecilton. It was pointed out by Mr. Cooper and others that currently a considerable number of drivers use MD 285 and MD 310 to go east to SR 896 and US 301 to avoid congested areas.

Jim described the accident history on MD 213 (slide 33), drawing attention to the fact that the percentage of trucks involved in accidents is below the percentage of trucks in the total amount of traffic.

Jim presented a series of factors that will discourage traffic from using MD 213 when compared to the future new US 301 (slides 36-42).

Mayor Bunnell suggested that truckers will divert in order to save money and that this behavior needs to be addressed. Mayor Bunnell considers the MD 213 constraints to be hazards.

The factors, largely highway enhancements, that will encourage traffic to use new US 301 were also presented (slides 43-52).

Several questions and observations were made by WG members:

- *Where will the toll plaza be located? Just north of the MD/DE line.*
- *Will Strawberry Lane be the last exit before paying the toll? No, Strawberry Lane would no longer have access to new US 301, but will overpass US 301.*
- *Which of the US 301, I-95 and SR 1 enhancements are funded and which are in DelDOT's long range plan?The 5th lane widening of I-95 is funded for construction beginning in the current FY 2007 (\$64 million). The modification to the I-95/SR1 interchange is funded for construction in FY 2009 (\$120 million). New US 301 is funded for limited detailed engineering (FY 2007) and some Right-of-Way Acquisition to protect the selected alignment from development (FY 2007 – FY 2009) in DelDOT Work Plan (\$38.5 million). SR 1 widening (SR 1/US 13 split to I-95) and I-95 collector – distributor (C-D) roads are in DelDOT's long-range plan.*
- *With improvements in Delaware, more traffic will divert using Maryland's routes.*

- *Was any consideration given to diversion that will occur during construction of these enhancements? Yes, that is why the major improvements to I-95 and the I-95/SR1 Interchange will be constructed before New US 301. The widening of SR1 and the I-95 C-D Roads are longer-term needs, with no established schedule at this time.*
- *Are the enhancements in the model? Yes, since the improvements are either in DelDOT's Capital Transportation Program (CTP) or WILMAPCO's Long Range Plan, they are included in the traffic model.*
- *Traffic will use MD 285 and MD 286 to avoid a toll. Projections indicate that traffic volumes on MD 285 and MD 286 with a new US 301 with a toll would be lower than if no improvements were made, i.e., the No-Build alternative.*
- *When SR 1 was built with a toll, people said they wouldn't use it – now traffic flies on it and there is growth.*
- *Does Maryland have any plans to improve MD 213 between the C&D Canal and US 301? There are no planned capacity improvements, except for local intersection improvements; MSHA will address safety issues, but does not anticipate capacity improvements.*
- *US 301 improvements will stimulate people to move to Maryland's eastern shore and commute to Wilmington, Philadelphia, etc.; Cecil and Kent (MD) Counties will get more development. Land Use decisions are a local matter, not the responsibility of MSHA or DelDOT. However, the toll on US 301 will somewhat discourage its use by local traffic, which could also discourage development.*
- *What will Maryland do to meet the needs of its citizens that will be generated by what happens in Delaware? The purpose of the Working Group is to identify potential issues and solutions associated with a new US 301 in Delaware. MSHA plans to implement a virtual weigh station with enforcement, with or without a new US 301 in Delaware. Traffic growth on MD 213 is projected to occur with or without a new US 301 in Delaware. MSHA does not anticipate that added capacity on MD 213 will be required to accommodate the projected growth but will make improvements at intersections along MD 213, as required to accommodate traffic growth. Identified safety needs will receive priority attention..*
- *Did Delaware include truck rest areas as an incentive to get truckers to use US 301? No, but DelDOT would be willing to consider such a facility.*
- *Where will the Delaware truck weigh station be located? On northbound lane of US 301 immediately north of MD/DE line.*
- *Toll will not cause diversion; truck weigh stations will cause diversions. Projections show that the toll will cause some diversion of traffic. It is also understood, but difficult to predict, that potential diversion of trucks will occur during the operation of MSHA's and DelDOT's proposed weigh stations. It is anticipated that the Working Group will develop recommendations to minimize potential toll and weigh station diversions.*
- *Truckers sometimes are given bonuses to keep tolls lower, causing diversion.*

Mr. Burnett pointed out that in association with building a new US 301, it was assumed that truck restrictions would be put in place on a number of Maryland and Delaware local roads so that truckers would have few local route choices (slide 55). Mr. Kramer noted that weight restrictions may be a recommendation offered by the WG.

Several questions and comments were made relevant to truck restrictions:

Ms. Anderson informed the WG that while presently there are weight limits on South Sassafras Road, there are none on North Sassafras Road. Axle-based truck restrictions will be considered on several local roads in Delaware and possibly in Maryland, including Warwick Road (the extension of Sassafras Road). Both states are looking to the Working Group for suggestions. Rich Lindsay, MSHA District Engineer, offered to meet with Ms. Anderson to discuss Warwick area issues and solutions (this meeting and tour were arranged soon after the WG meeting).

Doug asked if the truck restrictions would be noted in the environmental documents. Mark said yes, they would be included.

Will restrictions have negative impacts on farm equipment and trucks that need to use the roads on which restrictions would be put? Jim stated that this would not be the case, as these matters are addressed through the signs that notify drivers of the restrictions and enforcement. The intent is to preclude long-haul trucks and allow local truck use.

In response to a question it was clarified that the entire length of a road would have restrictions, not the shorter segments indicated on slide 55. MSHA and DelDOT will work together on this issue.

Mr. Burnett informed the group that pavement core samples have been taken on many local roads and, as suspected, they are “tar and chip” surfaces which would rapidly deteriorate with heavy truck use.

Jim explained that since the Cecilton (March 2006) and Galena (May 2006) meetings, the traffic model has been refined to include several added factors (slide 57) and more detailed analysis has been performed. After incorporating these factors to more accurately portray current and year 2030 conditions, the model was tested/calibrated, and the resulting 2006 projections more closely replicate actual 2006 traffic volumes.

Jim introduced Mark Radovic, Senior Transportation Engineer from Gannett Fleming, Inc., the firm MSHA hired to perform an independent assessment of DelDOT’s traffic data, model, analysis, and projections. Mr. Radovic presented the status of the independent review, and described some of the preliminary findings and recommendations. These included using updated socioeconomic data and further refining the roadway network and its attributes within the study area that allows for better connectivity. Mr. Radovic stated that this should provide improved loadings onto the network, especially along MD 213 and its major crossings. These refinements should improve the overall assignment of the model, and improve its reliability. Mr. Radovic also stated that there has been a lot of information sharing and that when evaluating count data, seasonal variation should be considered, and Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) may be used for validation purposes as to minimize these effects. Mr. Radovic stressed that the suggestions made to date have either been addressed or are being satisfied as model refinements are made. The independent assessment will continue until the final model becomes available, and toll sensitivity tests are evaluated. The collective assessment of the engineers working on the

model is that these refinements should result in changes to the currently available traffic projections of less than 20%, and more likely the new projections will be less than those available now (slide 59).

In response to comments regarding the updates to the model, Bob Kramer explained that to allow the WG to complete its work during the available time frame the group should view the traffic projections as being within a range of 20% above or below the revised traffic projections presented tonight.

Mr. Burnett pointed out that, in addition to making improvements to the traffic model, the principal differences between the preliminary traffic data shared during the Galena and Cecilton meetings and the refined projections being presented tonight is a change in the basic comparison being presented. The prior comparison was between new US 301 with or without a toll. US 301 will be constructed with a toll. Thus, the appropriate comparison is between the “No Build” (nothing is done) and “Build”(a new US 301 limited access highway with a toll (slide 60)).

Mayor Pisapia asked if the traffic model considers installation of the weigh stations. He was informed that there is no known method for considering weigh station diversions; however, the project team continues to research this matter.

Jim presented the refined truck and auto “No-Build vs. Build” 2030 traffic projections (slides 61–68). Key points from this comparison follow:

- MD 213 north of Cecilton and south of MD 310:
 - Auto volumes would be reduced by about 3,000 vehicles per day (shift to MD 282, Warwick-Cecilton Road)
 - Truck traffic would increase by about 200 trucks per day.
- MD 330 between US 301 and MD/DE line:
 - Auto traffic would be reduced by about 500–600 cars per day.
 - Truck volumes would increase by about 300–400 vehicles per day.
- MD 282, Cecilton-Warwick Road (Warwick area):
 - Auto traffic would increase by about 3,500 to 4,400 vehicles per day (traffic will shift from MD 213 to MD 282, drawn by decreased congestion in Delaware, not as a result of toll diversion).
 - Truck restrictions would be placed on numerous local roads.

Following are the comments and questions that were discussed during this presentation:

- *Does any of this data consider new growth? Yes, traffic models are required by federal regulations to use the latest approved population and employment projections (WILMAPCO). These projections are developed for traffic zones, not for individual developments. Details will be provided at the next WG meeting.*
- *Is the new distribution center at Elkton in the model? The model does not contain data for individual businesses or developments, see above answer*
- *Is future development that will result from municipal annexation included in the model? See foregoing answer.*

- *Are the location arrows on the maps shown correctly, specifically the “north of Cecilton” box? No, the maps will be corrected.*
- *Given growth in Cecil County and congestion in the Middletown area, a build alternative will help.*
- *Traffic flies through the Warwick area going between US 301 and Cecilton – more traffic is one matter, but the more relevant issue is the speed of that traffic. As indicated above, Mr. Lindsay is meeting with Ms. Anderson to discuss this matter. Traffic speed through Warwick is an issue for which the WG may develop recommendations.*
- *Traffic will increase on the east-west routes between MD 213 and new US 301. Projections with a new US 301 show this to be correct for local auto traffic through Warwick.*
- *Are there traffic projections for MD 213 south of Cecilton? Yes, they will be made available at or prior to the next WG meeting.*
- *How far back in time does the historic trend data go? Population projections are made by the Delaware Population Consortium by looking at existing census data, and then adjusting those values based on historic data (generally from the past 10 years, but sometimes more) in terms of survival rates, birth rates, migration trends, households, workforce, etc. Similarly, they develop land use forecasts by comparing the amount of existing undeveloped land with nearby land use types and densities, as well as historic regional land use development patterns (10+ years) to estimate the probability of the type and amount of expected new development.*
- *What will the increase in traffic be in Galena? This information will be made available at or prior to the next WG meeting.*
- *The issue is when the traffic volumes will change, not if they will.*
- *What will MSHA do to address the conditions that will impact us with or without a new tolled US 301? Addressing this matter is why MSHA is participating in the WG.*
- *Are there traffic data/projections to show how existing US 301 will be used after new US 301 is built? This information has not been analyzed yet, but will be, and the results will be made available at the next WG meeting.*
- *If traffic lights are added on MD 213 north of Chesapeake City, traffic will back up over the C&D Canal bridge. The new US 301 would slightly reduce traffic using the MD 213 C&D Canal bridge.*

Mark Tudor requested that the Working Group carefully review the traffic slides and submit any requests for additional data to the project team, prior to the next meeting. He noted that the project team would again attempt to provide data to the Working Group prior to the meeting, in order to facilitate accomplishing the meeting goals. Request for additional traffic data or clarification regarding the data should be sent to Jim Burnett (jburnett@rkkengineers.com) or Andrew Bing (ABing@kramerandassoc.com).

Maryland & Delaware Weigh Stations

Bob Kramer introduced Dave Czorapinski, Chief of Motor Carrier Division, MSHA, to describe Maryland’s truck weigh and inspection station plans. Mr. Czorapinski stated that a weigh and inspection station is under construction on the southbound lane of US 301 immediately south of

the US 301/Sassafras Road intersection. He expects the station to be operational by the fall of 2006. Captain Dofflemyer advised that there would be a staff of 11–13 people, including several additional troopers. Dave described the virtual weigh station technology and how it will substantially enhance commercial vehicle enforcement. He emphasized that the weigh station on US 301, the virtual weigh station(s) located off US 301 and enforcement personnel will operate in combination to keep commercial vehicles on US 301 and off local roads.

Mr. Czorapinski stated that enforcement effectiveness is enhanced when local governments participate in the state enforcement program. Dave described the incentives and assistance, including equipment, training and funds provided by the state to local law enforcement agencies to enable them to serve as motor carrier inspection and enforcement personnel (slides 69–80). When local agencies assist with these responsibilities, for which they are compensated by the state, truckers quickly avoid those jurisdictions and go to areas where enforcement isn't as strict or stay on the roads that they are supposed to be on in the first place. The ability to put violating trucks out of service will keep truckers out of your jurisdiction. Finally, Dave noted that with the new DelDOT weigh station, northbound MD 213 would also likely require a virtual weigh station. Current SHA plans only call for a virtual weigh station on southbound MD 213. Dave's presentation resulted in the following discussion among WG members:

Sheriff Price stressed that his department doesn't have sufficient staff to meet current demands and can't undertake additional duties. Mr. Czorapinski noted that MSHA would provide his deputies with overtime funding to do safety inspections so as not to impact patrol staffing levels. Sheriff Price indicated that he did not have sufficient staffing to become involved in the truck safety program. He observed that he doesn't get much help from the Maryland State Police at this time.

Mayor Pisapia pointed out that MD 213 is a state road; therefore, the enforcement responsibility belongs to the state. Furthermore, he believes virtual stations will not stop diversion.

Why was the current location of the Maryland weigh station selected? The weigh station should be farther south/west on US 301 and the current site used as a truck rest area. It was pointed out by Rich Lindsay that considerable analysis, consultation and deliberation preceded selection of the site for the weigh station. The purpose is to identify overweight trucks as soon as they enter Maryland and to minimize the number of potential diversion routes. Site preparation has begun, paving will begin in mid-September, scale house building specs have been advertised, staffing identified. The number and location of the virtual weigh stations should be discussed by the WG and recommendations made to assure their maximum diversion prevention effectiveness.

Captain Dofflemyer noted the importance of appropriate warning signs. Maryland intends to operate the inspection station 16 hours per day, 7 days a week. The hours of operation will vary. A truck inspection would require about 45 minutes.

Mayor Pisapia thanked Rich Lindsay for the signs recently installed prohibiting modified exhaust systems in Cecilton and Galena. The Mayor indicated an improvement in conditions since the signs were erected.

Mr. Simmons concluded the presentation regarding Maryland's weigh stations by explaining that with the growth along and increasing traffic on MD 213, Maryland will be taking these steps to improve safety, regardless of whether US 301 is improved in Delaware or not.

Bob introduced Mr. Greg Oliver, Assistant Director, Statistic Research and Special Programs, DelDOT, to describe Delaware's truck weigh and inspection station program.

Mr. Oliver stated that Delaware has a limited weigh and inspection program. A station is planned for the northbound lane of US 301, near the MD/DE state line. The scales will actually be located in Maryland. Construction is scheduled to commence in spring 2007, with the station in operation during normal business hours beginning in spring 2008. The CVISN technology will be used (slides 81–84). Greg noted that DelDOT intends to include virtual weigh stations as part of their state-wide program, but has not determined the locations.

Next Meeting

Bob reminded attendees that the next WG meeting will be at 5:30 p.m., July 25, same location, same food and refreshments. The purpose of the second meeting will be to discuss issues, ideas and potential solutions. He requested all members to email questions, requests for information or clarification of tonight's presentation to Andrew Bing at abing@kramerandassoc.com so the project team can provide the requested information prior to the next meeting, which will make that meeting more productive.

Mayor Pisapia suggested that the Maryland WG members have a separate meeting prior to the next full WG meeting. After discussion it was decided that the WG should work jointly on issues and solutions that are part of the US 301 DelDOT study. Should separate Maryland-only issues arise that are not part of the US 301 study, the Maryland members may choose to meet as appropriate.

Bob thanked everyone for their presentations and expressed particular appreciation to the WG members for their thoughtful participation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.



TOLL DIVERSION WORKING GROUP JULY 11, 2006

ATTENDEES:

Working Group Members

Bonny Anderson, Warwick Area Resident
John Bunnell, Mayor, Town of Cecilton
Michael Cooper, President, Cecilton Volunteer Fire Company and Cecilton Town
Commissioner
Roy Crow, County Commissioner, Kent County
Captain Bill Dofflemyer, Commander, Commercial Vehicle Enforcement Division,
Maryland State Police
Richard Lindsay, District Engineer, District 2, Maryland State Highway Administration*
Bill Kiessling, Mayor, Town of Chesapeake City
Jeff MacKenzie, designee for Barry Janney, Sheriff, Cecil County
William Manlove, County Commissioner, Cecil County
Harry Pisapia, Mayor, Town of Galena
Chris Powell, Chief, Galena Volunteer Fire Company
John F. Price, Sheriff, Kent County
Douglas Simmons, Deputy Administrator, Maryland State Highway Administration*
Dennis Simpson, Deputy Director, Capital Planning, Maryland Transportation Authority*
Mark Tudor, Project Director, Delaware Department of Transportation*

*Also member of the Technical Support Team

Technical Support Team Members

Jim Burnett, Traffic Engineer, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl
Charles Coppage, designee for Robert Kiel, Assistant District Engineer – Traffic,
Maryland State Highway Administration
Dave Czorapinski, Chief of Motor Carrier Division, Maryland State Highway
Administration
Gary Davis, designee for James Dooley, Regional Planner, Maryland State Highway
Administration
Bill Hellmann, US 301 Project Manager, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl
Bob Kramer, Meeting Facilitator, Kramer & Associates
Greg Oliver, Assistant Director, Statistic Research and Special Programs, Delaware
Department of Transportation
Mark Radovic, Senior Transportation Engineer, Gannett Fleming
Morteza Tadayon, Team Leader, Engineering Support Team, Maryland State Highway
Administration
Don Weber, Chief Traffic Engineer, Delaware Department of Transportation
P.J. Wilkins, Toll Operations Administrator, Delaware Department of Transportation

Additional Attendees

George L. Bartholomew, Jr., Galena Volunteer Fire Company, designee for Chief Chris Powell

Mark Guns, Commissioner, Cecil County

Kameel Holmes, Maryland State Highway Administration, Travel Forecasting

Chris Rogers, Cecilton/Chester

Jennie Schmidt, Chesapeake County National Scenic Biway

John Upp, Cecilton Volunteer Fire Company

Mary Roe Walkup, Delegate, District 36

Jim Wright, Kent County Engineer

Joanne Richart-Young, Cecil County Office of Economic Development

Project Team Staff Members

Andrew Bing, Kramer & Associates

Jeff Kutesch, Rummel, Klepper & Kahl

Edwin Thomas, Kramer & Associates