

Memorandum of Meeting
Working Group

Meeting Date: March 23, 2005
Time: 5:30 PM
Location: Modern Maturity Center

NEXT Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, April 6, 2005
5:30 PM Meeting
Modern Maturity Center
DuPont Ballroom
1121 Forrest Avenue, Dover DE

Community Working Group Members in Attendance:

Brian Belcher	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Robert "Dick" Bewick	Woodbrook Resident
Steve Cain	President, Crossgates/Mayfair Homeowner's Association
Zachary Carter	Director, Dover Parks and Recreation
Gloria Chappell	Lincoln Park Representative
Jane Edwards	Kesselring Property (East of New Burton Road)
Colin Faulkner	Director, Kent County Department of Public Safety
Douglas Greig (for John Still)	17 th Senatorial District
Patricia Gauani	President, Rodney Village Civic Association
Kenneth Hogan	Dover City Councilman – 1 st District
Steve Kitchen (for Darren Harmon)	Kraft Foods
Rob McCleary	DeIDOT Representative
Milton Melendez	Department of Agriculture
Dawn Melson (for James Galvin)	Director, Dover Planning and Inspections
Robert Mooney	Mayor, Town of Camden
Jack Papen	Farmer, Major Property Owner
Hans Reigle	Mayor, Town of Wyoming
Ann Rider	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Eugene Ruane	Dover City Councilman - 2 nd District
Deb Scheller	Eden Hill Farm
Janice Sibbald	Crossgates/Mayfair Resident
Sammy Smith	Rodney Village Resident
Stephen Speed	Mayor, City of Dover
Ali Stark	Holly Drive Resident
Donna Stone	32 nd Representative District
Donald Sylvester	President, Rodney Village Homeowner's Association
Doris Kesselring Taylor	Kesselring Property (West of New Burton Road)
Jeff Davis (for Craig Wearden)	Principal, W. Reilly Brown Elementary School
John Whitby	Kent County Motor Sales
Juanita Wieczoreck	Executive Director, Dover/Kent County MPO

Others in Attendance (Public):

Ben Anderson	Willis Road Resident
Lottie Arthur	Nathaniel Mitchell Road Resident
Gladys Bishop	David Hall Road Resident
Leon Cromer	Willow Grove Road Resident
Bill Edwards	Kennett Square, PA Resident
Renate Fields	John Clark Road Resident
Anee Floyd	Charles Polk Road Resident

Nathaniel Floyd
Phyllis Garhartt
Aeneas Gauani
Shirley Gauani
Douglas Guida Jr.
Nellie Houston
Dave Kesselring
Yvonne King
Daniel Krup
Ron Leet
Billy Lewis
Claude Marks
John Marlmann
Claude Marn
Anthony Matone
Elizabeth Matone
Charles Mattox
Laura Mazzeo
Carol Mosemann
James Sharp
Sean Shaver
Connie Stultz
Wayne Stultz
Karen Walter
Tom and Greta Whittendale
Theresa Winchell
Lettie Yalacus

Charles Polk Road Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Webbs Lane Resident
David Hall Road Resident
Delaware State News
David Hall Road Resident
John Clark Road Resident
Wyoming Mills Resident
Richard Bassett Road Resident
Barley Drive Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Lynn Haven Drive Resident
WBUC
Richard Bassett Road Resident
Alder Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
New Burton Road Resident
New Burton Road Resident

Governors Avenue Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident
Charles Polk Road Resident

Others in Attendance (Project Team):

Darrell Cole	DeIDOT
Jay Kelley	DeIDOT Project Manager
Gary Laing	DeIDOT
Andrew Bing	Kramer & Associates
Chris Fronheiser	DMJM Harris
Mike Girman	DMJM Harris
Gary Hullfish	DMJM Harris
Mayuresh Khare	DMJM Harris
Robert Kramer	Kramer & Associates
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 the preliminary alternatives screening in terms of traffic and the natural and built environments. Other meeting objectives included introducing new Working Group members, introducing the new DMJM Harris Project Manager, reviewing Working Group progress to date, and updating Working Group members on the Rodney Village Civic Association meetings, the status of the Eden Hill Farm development, the project development process and the project schedule.

Introductions and Updates

Bob Kramer of Kramer & Associates, the meeting facilitator, called the meeting to order at 5:50PM and welcomed those attending. Bob provided an overview of the agenda.

Jay Kelley, the DeIDOT Project Manager, welcomed Working Group members and welcomed the Rodney Village community to the meeting. Jay introduced himself as the DeIDOT Project Manager for the West Dover Connector study. Jay introduced Mike Girman, the DMJM Harris Project Manager, DeIDOT's consultant for the West Dover Connector study.

Jay Kelley introduced Mayor Reigle of the Town of Wyoming and Patricia Gauani representing the Rodney Village Civic Association. The Working Group members introduced themselves at Jay's request.

Jay Kelley indicated the new inserts to the project notebook, including tonight's presentation and several tabs of related information.

Bob Kramer reviewed the progress of the previous four Working Group meetings by summarizing the activities undertaken at each meeting. Bob also reviewed the activities undertaken during the previous two Public Workshops.

Bob Kramer reviewed each of the 11 concepts developed with input from the Working Group; he indicated that these concepts were presented at the last Public Workshop in November.

Bob Kramer indicated that since the last Working Group meeting and Public Workshop, the Rodney Village Civic Association invited DeIDOT to attend their meetings and answer questions informally. Bob indicated that Tab 3 of tonight's notebook inserts contains a concept submitted to DeIDOT by the Association's Planning Committee. Further he indicated that DMJM Harris has a new concept that will be presented at the next Working Group meeting.

Bob Kramer stressed that the next step in the process, occurring over the next Working Group meetings, Public Workshop and Resource Agency meetings, will focus on identifying those concepts that do not have sufficient merit to be carried forward for detailed study.

Bob Kramer recognized the input received from the Working Group homework assignments. He summarized the input, indicating a general lack of support for Concepts 6, 8, 9 and 10.

Bob Kramer stated that the November Public Workshop was well attended. He stated that there is public recognition through statements made at the Workshop and submitted written comments that growth in traffic and its local consequences are issues of concern. He noted that Public Workshop comments were previously mailed to Working Group members. He indicated that some ideas for solutions were submitted by the public. Bob summarized by saying that much diversity of opinion and concern was received from the public regarding concepts other than 6, 8, 9 and 10.

Bob Kramer acknowledged that the Rodney Village Civic Association invited DeIDOT to attend two of their meetings for the purposes of answering questions and listening to concerns. Bob asked Working Group members to take the time to familiarize themselves with the information about this interaction that is contained in Tab 3 of tonight's inserts for the project notebook.

Bob Kramer emphasized that all concepts developed or received to date are still under consideration; DeIDOT is still accepting ideas. Input on these concepts is still to come from the public, the Working Group and the resource agencies. Once all input is received, DeIDOT will consider all the information.

Jay Kelley described the involvement of the resource agencies in the West Dover Connector study process. Concurrent with Working Group activity, federal and state agency representatives provide

guidance on natural and built environment issues. He cited the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Delaware Historic Preservation Office as three examples of agencies participating in the process. Jay stressed that the Working Group and resource agency processes are parallel. He stated that DeIDOT had provided the resource agencies with the project Purpose and Need statement in January; the statement had received review and concurrence by the FHWA. At the upcoming April meeting with the resource agencies, DeIDOT will present the concepts to the agencies and invite the agencies to submit their comments or additional alternatives.

Jay Kelley stated that DeIDOT met with Kraft Foods, a major area employer and truck traffic generator, to discuss access issues.

Jay Kelley introduced Dawn Melson, who sat on the Working Group tonight on behalf of Jim Galvin, the Director of the City Planning and Inspections Office. Dawn provided an update on the status of the Eden Hill Farm development. In November, the City adopted a new zoning classification entitled "Traditional Neighborhood Design/TND." This classification allows mixed use development. She explained that the Conceptual Development Plan for Eden Hill Farm was reviewed by the Preliminary Land Use Service (PLUS) at a meeting held on December 22, 2004. She indicated that Eden Hill Farm would have to be rezoned from "Industrial Park" and "Agriculture" to the new "Traditional Neighborhood Design" classification to enable the Conceptual Development Plan to go forward. A zoning change application would have to be filed with the City; this action is expected to occur over the next several months.

Mike Girman introduced himself and spoke about the project development process. He indicated that as of our last working Group Meeting the study was at the Purpose and Need step. Since that meeting, the Purpose and Need for the West Dover Connector has been submitted and approved by the FHWA. Now the study process has progressed to the point where environmental agencies are being formally brought into the process. Among the environmental issues is historic resources; the Section 106 process is a parallel process with its own Consulting Parties and public involvement requirements. At this step, the survey and determination of eligibility phase of Section 106 is beginning.

Mike Girman used the general project schedule to show that the West Dover Connector study is an on-going process with Working Group meetings, Public Workshops and Resource Agency meetings occurring throughout. All ideas received to date have been developed into concepts. Typical corridor bandwidths of 150 feet have been established to enable the evaluation and comparison of the concepts from the perspectives of traffic as well as the natural and built environment. He explained that as a first step (Step 1) the concepts are examined against the Purpose and Need; does the concept meet the Purpose and Need? Does it solve the traffic problems? For those concepts that meet the Purpose and Need, the concepts proceed to Step 2 and are evaluated in terms of potential effects on the natural and built environments.¹

Mike Girman explained that the traffic factors used in Step 1 were derived from the Purpose and Need Statement: traffic circulation, North Street intersection performance improvement, traffic reduction on Camden-Wyoming Avenue, reduction in through traffic, and improved access and mobility across the Norfolk Southern railroad within the study area.

¹In the presentation to the Working Group at tonight's meeting and in this memorandum, all concepts were termed "preliminary alternatives" in discussing the results of the traffic analysis (Step 1) and natural and built environment analysis (Step 2). As a point of clarification, only concepts that were determined to meet the Purpose and Need in Step 1 could proceed to Step 2 and be considered preliminary alternatives. Thus, because Concepts 6, 8, 9 and 10 did not meet the Purpose and Need, they remain concepts.

Mike Girman explained the natural and built environment factors used in Step 2. The following factors were used to initially screen the concepts: number of displacements, acreage of right-of-way required and impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, and agricultural preservation districts. Mike summarized by saying that the desired outcome of Steps 1 and 2 is a balance between traffic benefit and environmental effects. In this process, an alternative can be identified that everyone (DeIDOT, the Working Group, the public and the resource agencies) can live with.

Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that clarifying questions from the Working Group would be welcomed at any time. Bob introduced Marge Quinn who spoke about the traffic analysis studies.

Screening Results Presentation

Marge Quinn presented the results of the traffic analysis studies. She explained that a traffic flow analysis was undertaken for all preliminary alternatives except the Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative. Analysis of the TSM alternative was also undertaken and included comparison with the No-Build alternative. She emphasized that all preliminary alternatives were compared with the No-Build alternative based on Purpose and Need.

Marge Quinn explained that the traffic demand model provided traffic forecasts for each preliminary alternative for the years 2015 and 2030. The traffic patterns provided by the travel demand model provide for an understanding of traffic flow for each preliminary alternative. The model outputs were assessed against the Purpose and Need to determine the potential benefits of each preliminary alternative.

Referring to Tab 5 in tonight's inserts to the project notebook, Marge Quinn explained that the potential benefits relating to the five traffic factors were evaluated and reported using measures of performance on a scale ranging from "Most Improvement" to "Negative Impact." She explained the following findings:

- Traffic Circulation – The preliminary alternatives with the highest traffic circulation benefits are 2A, 2B, 3, 4 and 7.
- Potential North Street Intersection Performance Improvements - The preliminary alternatives with the highest North Street intersection performance benefits are 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7.
- Traffic Reduction on Camden-Wyoming Avenue – Traffic reduction on Camden-Wyoming Avenue and potential for diversion of truck traffic from Camden-Wyoming Avenue would occur with preliminary alternatives 4, 5 and 7.
- Reduction in Through Traffic – The preliminary alternatives with the highest reduction in through traffic benefit on streets between New Burton Road and Governors Avenue are 3, 4 and 5.
- Improved Access and Mobility Across the Norfolk Southern Railroad – Improved access and mobility across the railroad within the study area would be achieved with an underpass or overpass crossing the railroad. Such a crossing would improve access and mobility for heavy vehicles and emergency response vehicles.

Marge Quinn summarized the traffic analysis study results by saying that the results support the perception of the Working Group members and the general public. Preliminary alternatives 6, 8, 9,

and 10 had little support from the Working Group and general public. The traffic analysis results show no significant traffic benefits to the study area with preliminary alternatives 6, 8, 9 and 10. Preliminary alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 have more support from the Working Group and general public. The traffic analysis shows moderate to significant traffic benefits to the study area with preliminary alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7.

Marge Quinn reported the analysis results for the TSM alternative. She explained that the analysis included comparison between existing condition (2003) intersection performance, 2015 and 2030 No-Build condition intersection performance, and 2015 and 2030 intersection performance with the TSM improvements. She defined TSM improvements as including committed (already planned by DeIDOT and funded) improvements as well as signalization where warranted, modified signal phasing and/or timing, and minor intersection approach widening. Marge summarized the analysis findings by saying that significant improvements beyond TSM improvements would be required to improve overall study area traffic operations. The TSM alternative would not achieve study objectives that include improving circulation on the west side of Dover, improving mobility and access across the railroad, discouraging through traffic movements on “cut-through” streets, or improving connections between neighborhoods, parks, and businesses. She noted that the TSM analysis does not specifically include proposed Eden Hill Farm development traffic.

Gene Ruane called attention to the objective contained in the TSM analysis pertaining to improving connections between neighborhoods, parks and businesses. He stated that he is glad to see the issue in the TSM evaluation and he would like to see that same issue evaluated in all of the alternatives. He also stated that he would like to see the issues of failing levels of service (LOS) at intersections with New Burton Road and the extent to which alternatives would relieve traffic on New Burton Road in the evaluation.

Mayuresh Khare responded that level of service information would be generated in detailed analysis of the alternatives retained for detailed study. Mike Girman further reiterated that each of the issues Gene Ruane raised would be examined in the forthcoming detailed analysis of alternatives retained for detailed study. Mike explained that the traffic analysis study completed to date was a first level (Step 1) analysis that focused on the issues contained in the Purpose and Need. Tonight the facts from the analyses to date on how the traffic would be processed on all roads in the network have been presented. Regarding New Burton Road, Mike explained that New Burton Road is a collector road while the intersecting roads are local streets and it is the use of local streets by cut-through traffic that is most problematic. In the forthcoming detailed analysis, intersection LOS will be examined.

Rob McCleary added to Mike Girman’s response regarding the issue of examining connections between neighborhoods, parks and businesses by reminding the Working Group that the Purpose and Need Statement specifically includes the phrase “all modes of travel.”

Steve Cain indicated his concern that the study look at what happens at the termini of each alternative, such as LOS at US 13.

Mike Girman responded by stating that the issue of traffic effects at alternative termini would be examined during the detailed study phase. At that time, the alternatives retained for detailed study will be examined for this and many other detailed traffic and environmental issues.

Mayor Reigle asked whether park connectivity will be part of the West Dover Connector project or whether it might be the subject of another study. Mike Girman responded that park connectivity will

be examined as part of the West Dover Connector project. He noted that park connectivity solutions could be implemented as part of the West Dover Connector project or as part of another project. Mike Girman also mentioned that a reason for implementing such solutions in another project may be if there are significant environmental impacts with building a connection.

Chris Fronheiser presented a summary of the preliminary alternatives comparison in terms of the natural and built environment factors. Referring to Tab 5 in tonight's inserts to the project notebook, Chris explained that all preliminary alternatives except 6, 8, 9, and 10 were compared with the No-Build alternative. Chris explained that the bandwidths used were preliminary and do not represent actual roadway widths. He pointed out that a 150 foot bandwidth was used in most areas, although 80 feet was used in physically constrained areas. The bandwidths have been conceptually engineered. The preliminary alignments were based on a 40 mph design speed for main roadways and a 30 mph design speed for smaller roads and ramps. Mike Girman added that design speed affects the size and shape of roadway curves; it affects the type and extent of physical impacts and speed is a consideration at roadway connecting points.

Chris Fronheiser explained that preliminary alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 11 were evaluated for environmental impacts (Step 2) for two reasons: the traffic analysis (Step 1) determined that preliminary alternatives 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 11 meet the Purpose and Need and they have some support from the Working Group and general public. Chris explained that preliminary alternatives 6, 8, 9, and 10 were not evaluated for environmental impacts for two reasons: the traffic analysis (Step 1) determined that preliminary alternatives 6, 8, 9, and 10 do not meet the Purpose and Need and they have little support from the Working Group and general public.

Referring to Tab 5 in tonight's inserts to the project notebook, Chris Fronheiser explained that the potential benefits relating to the natural and built environment factors were evaluated and reported using measures of performance on a scale ranging from "No Impact" to "Most Impact." He explained the following findings:

- Displacements – Preliminary alternatives 5A and 7, followed by 5B, 5C and 3, would have the most impact in terms of displacements.
- Right-of-way Acquisition – Preliminary alternatives 2D, 4 and 5 would require the most right-of-way.
- Wetlands and Floodplains – Preliminary alternatives 2D, 4, 5, and 7 would have the most impact on wetlands and floodplains.
- Agricultural Districts – Only the extensions to Wyoming Mill Road in preliminary alternatives 4 and 5 would impact agricultural districts.

Bob Kramer asked for questions from the Working Group.

Gene Ruane asked whether wetlands and floodplains occur in other places besides Puncheon Run? Chris Fronheiser responded that the Puncheon Run area is the only area where wetlands and floodplains would be impacted by the current concepts. Bob Kramer explained that detailed field verification will be undertaken during detailed study phase. Jane Edwards asked if Isaac Branch would be evaluated at that time. Chris Fronheiser responded affirmatively; the Isaac Branch area would be field evaluated.

Gene Ruane asked about the elimination of the alternative that crosses Isaac Branch and enters Breck Nock Park. Mike Girman responded by explaining that an alternative with such a crossing

would be considered fatally flawed from the perspective of the Army Corps of Engineers whose mission is to protect waterways and wetlands.

Rob McCleary asked DMJM Harris to quantify the environmental impacts of preliminary alternatives that cross Isaac Branch and enter Brecknock Park."

Ann Rider asked why preliminary alternative 2A was not identified in the summary slide. Chris Fronheiser indicated that preliminary alternative 2A was quantified as shown in the table in Tab 5. The data in the slide includes only the preliminary alternatives having the highest level of impacts. Preliminary alternative has comparatively moderate impacts.

Dawn Melson commented that cultural resources would be an issue examined during detailed study. Mike Girman concurred by saying that the full range of natural and built environment issues would be evaluated during the forthcoming detailed analysis of alternatives retained for detailed study.

Next Steps

Bob Kramer summarized tonight's presentations by acknowledging that a great deal of data was provided. He asked the Working Group members to please take a close look at the data at their leisure. He asked them to remember that they do not have all the information needed to make recommendations as to which alternatives should be dropped from further consideration. Over the next Working Group meetings, additional data will be presented to the Working Group that will enable them to make such a recommendation.

Bob Kramer stated that at the next Working Group meeting, the study team hopes to provide data on the ideas provided by the Rodney Village Civic Association as well as a new concept being developed by DMJM Harris. Bob encouraged everyone to submit any ideas, stating that the sooner the ideas are provided, the sooner data can be developed and presented for them. Bob reinforced the point that it is the study team's intention to neither hold up the process nor allow it to proceed too quickly. Detailed analysis of the alternatives retained for detailed study will take time and will not happen within the time frame of the next 2 meetings.

Questions and Answers

Bob Mooney, Mayor of Camden, asked whether DeIDOT could keep individual communities updated on the project status? Bob Kramer stated that DeIDOT would welcome the opportunity to do that. They should contact Jay Kelley to set up such a meeting. Bob Kramer also indicated DeIDOT's hope that the Working Group members, as representatives, are sharing the information they have about the project with their constituencies.

Gene Ruane indicated interest in the new DMJM Harris concept. Bob Kramer stated that DMJM Harris is still developing the concept. Mike Girman responded that the concept would involve moving a portion of the railroad and would use the existing roadway network. Mike stated that the concept has less environmental impacts than other concepts but has other issues.

Steve Speed, Mayor of Dover, asked what is stopping the Working Group from eliminating preliminary alternatives 6, 8, 9, and 10. Bob Kramer responded that the goal at the moment is to develop a full range of alternatives before eliminating any, and that DeIDOT had made a public

commitment that no action would be taken by the Working Group tonight with regard to dropping alternatives from further consideration.

Janice Sibbald asked about neutrality in considering the DMJM Harris concept. Bob Kramer responded that in collecting ideas, DMJM Harris provided their idea for consideration. However, the study team position on that concept is neutral.

Ann Rider asked whether new ideas can still be submitted? Bob Kramer responded affirmatively and recommended that any idea that is submitted should look like it meets the Purpose and Need.

Mayor Mooney emphasized that new ideas should be truly new ideas and not restatements or modifications of existing ideas and concepts.

Bob Kramer asked for questions from the public.

Leon Cromer asked whether the impact of the alternatives on the historic properties would be evaluated. Mike Girman responded affirmatively.

Next Meeting

With no further questions from the public, Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group members that the next Working Group meeting will be held on **Wednesday, April 6, 2005 at 5:30PM**. It will be held in the **DuPont Ballroom** at **Modern Maturity Center at 5:30PM**. A light dinner will be provided at the meeting. The objectives of this meeting will be to provide data on the ideas provided by the Rodney Village Civic Association as well as the new idea being developed by DMJM Harris.

Bob Kramer adjourned the meeting.