

Appendix H
Summary of Comments and Responses

Churchman's Crossing Plan Update – Summary of Comments and Responses

In addition to responses to the project comment form following Public Workshop #3, which are included in Appendix D, the project team received a number of written comments on the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update. Copies of all written comments are attached, and responses are summarized in the table below:

Comment (See attachments)	Response
Email from Vic Singer, September 15, 2020	Mr. Singer's comment and question was posed to the project team and answered during the live question and answer period during the 1 st Virtual Public Workshop on September 16, 2020.
Shipps Realty Comments, 12.15.2020	<p>The design of individual projects, including Projects O & P (the New Castle Transit Center) referenced in Shipps Realty's comments, will be refined during the project development process.</p> <p>Individual projects that may be included in one or more Transportation Improvement Districts (TIDs) in the study area would be identified as part of the TID implementation process. Additional details about implementing a TID are included in Appendix G.</p>
Email from Francis Warnock, July 18, 2021	<p>Project F includes closing gaps in the East Coast Greenway within the Churchman's Crossing study area, is included on WILMAPCO's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) financially constrained project list, and is recommended as part of the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update.</p> <p>The design of individual projects, including improvements to the East Coast Greenway, will be refined during the project development process.</p>

Churchman's Crossing Plan Update – Summary of Comments and Responses

Comment (See attachments)	Response
<p>Email from Francis Warnock, August 18, 2021</p>	<p><i>Comments 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11</i> – Project F, Project NN, and Project OO include closing gaps in the East Coast Greenway, as well as pedestrian and bicycle improvements along existing roads, and from existing communities to lower-stress routes and shared-use paths outside those communities. The report includes specific locations that have been identified including a connector along SR 7 near Ogletown Stanton Road, a connector from the Lewden-Greene and Coventry Park trails to the East Coast Greenway along SR 58, connections for communities near the SR 7 / SR 4 Stanton Split, and a pedestrian and bicycle-only connection extending from Brownleaf Road to Samoset Drive. Additional pedestrian and bicycle connections and upgrades should be pursued through capital improvements or other funding programs.</p> <p><i>Comment 2</i> – The design of individual projects, including shared-use pathways, will be refined during the project development process.</p> <p><i>Comment 6</i> – Parks and placemaking considerations are beyond the scope of the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update. These elements are best addressed through the ongoing New Castle County Comprehensive Plan update process.</p> <p><i>Comments 8 and 10</i> – Posted speed limits are beyond the scope of the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update. Requests for modifications to the posted speed limit and implementation of traffic calming measures on specific roadways can be addressed to DelDOT.</p>
<p>The project team received one verbal comment during Public Workshop #4 that was evaluated and addressed after publication of the Draft Final Report:</p> <p>Mr. Bill Dunn expressed concerns about operations on Churchman's Road south/east of I-95, citing the proposed Cavaliers Country Club redevelopment.</p>	<p>The Cavaliers Country Club Traffic Impact Study (TIS) completed in 2017 did not include completion of the roadway connections included in the New Castle Transit Center project or additional projects included in the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update. The Churchman's Crossing Plan Update accounts for the redevelopment of Cavaliers Country Club and includes additional roadway and multimodal connections and improvements. The results indicate that intersections along Churchman's Road south/east of I-95 would operate at LOS D or better and the relative arterial mobility for arterials in that subarea would be LOS D during both the AM and PM peaks by the 2050 analysis year.</p>



From: vsinger01@aol.com
To: Randi Novakoff
Cc: vsinger01@aol.com; nancywilling@yahoo.com; Bill_Done@msn.com; donnashankie10@gmail.com; abing@kramerassociates.net; severett@rkk.com; Dave Gula; Tigist Zegeye
Subject: Re: Churchman's Crossing Plan Update FIRST Virtual Public Workshop
Date: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 11:21:48 PM

RE: Randi's message 9/15/2020 8:21 am EDT message, below under line of #####:

Randi:

I suggest that the following one sentence question -- emboldened, italicized, underlined -- is appropriate to be addressed at the Churchman's Crossing First Virtual Public Workshop:

" Unless the boundaries of a Transportation Improvement District, TID, that would enable otherwise unacceptable land use intensifications within the Churchman's Crossing area designated in the WILMAPCO announcement of this workshop were expanded to include either NC County in its entirety or NC County north of the C&D Canal in its entirety, how can a TID with the currently announced boundaries be regarded as satisfying the "equal protection" requirement of Amendment 14 of the US Constitution?"

A broader exploration of the underlying issue follows: Because Churchman's Crossing seems quite attractive as a TID, it's appropriate to consider what's logically necessary to satisfy the "equal protection" demand of the 14th Amendment to the US Constitution, which logically requires an equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of otherwise unacceptable land use intensifications that a TID could enable, among land owners and developers who profit from the enabled construction, wage earners who benefit from temporary jobs during the construction, and residents of the area who are forced to endure until a Target Year as far as 20 years in the future (under DelDOT's DCM Section 2.4.2.4 and NC County Code Section 40.11.310.C.2.b) increased air pollution and travel delays, more frequent collisions, bodily injuries, accidental deaths, as well as increased real estate tax bills, all of which are components of the total public cost of the otherwise unacceptable land use intensifications that a TID could enable.

WILMAPCO may well escape from needing to address these unpleasant public cost components on the premise that they are not itemized in its Scope of Work for DelDOT and NC County. That may be sustainable unless none of WILMAPCO's planners are members of AICP. But the GM of NC County's Land Use Department is indeed a member of AICP.

And remember that in the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, Section A.1 describes as Our Overall Responsibility to the Public: "Our primary obligation is to serve the public interest . . . that is formulated through continuous and open debate. . . We shall have special concern for the long range consequences of present actions. . . We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons . . . We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on . . . plans and programs. . .". Further, Section B.1 of the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct says: "We shall not deliberately or with reckless indifference fail to provide adequate, timely clear and accurate information on planning issues."

I would be happy to be advised that we (note the unbounded scope of that pronoun) will discuss the broader exploration at some point in the not distant future. But the one sentence question belongs in a "What's this all about?" presentation.

Vic

#####

Vic, to your first underlined point, an equitable distribution is one that as closely as possible, matches that of the project area. So for example, if we have 25% of residents who identify as low income, then in an ideal world, we'd want to have 25% of study participants also identify as low

income. The demographics of the study area are the threshold and census data is used to quantify this. This data is available on the Census website.

Also, to your first underlined point, the objective of seeking equitable participation isn't to exclude those outside the target demographics, but to strive to have a representative sample of those live, work or play in the area. Ultimately, the voices of all who want to participate have the right to be heard, regardless of demographics, but it's important for us to work to make sure those who should be included, are included, so we end up with a plan that meets the needs of all. Also if we find we aren't getting equitable participation, we would conduct targeted outreach to the groups that are not represented.

To your next underlined point, I placed my response before your AICP citation because I didn't see your question within the citation. To answer that question, yes the study will provide timely, clear and accurate information on the planning process to the best of our ability and within our available resources; and no, the study is not being conducted to benefit private business interests. There is no hidden agenda. Information obtained from the stakeholder meetings isn't being weighted. It's being used as a starting point in developing an initial understanding of key issues for the area, which will be revised as necessary, as we gain additional feedback from community members.

With regard to your point on the inclusion of congestion costs in this study, you've asked for this to be included in several other studies and my answer will be equally unsatisfying to you. This level of detail is not included in the scope of this study. Should the implementing agencies (DelDOT/County) determine a more detailed study is necessary, then a follow-up study would need to be initiated.

Thank you as always for your interest and comments.

Thanks,

Randi Novakoff

Outreach Manager

Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)

(302) 737-6205 ext. 111

100 Discovery Blvd, Suite 800

Newark | Delaware 19713

www.wilmapco.org | www.facebook.com/wilmapco

From: vsinger01@aol.com [<mailto:vsinger01@aol.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2020 12:19 PM

To: Randi Novakoff <rnovakoff@wilmapco.org>

Cc: nancywilling@yahoo.com; Bill_Done@msn.com; donnashankie10@gmail.com; abing@kramerassociates.net; severett@rkk.com; Dave Gula <dgula@wilmapco.org>; Tigest Zegeye <tzegeye@wilmapco.org>; vsinger01@aol.com

Subject: Re: Churchman's Crossing Plan Update FIRST Virtual Public Workshop

Randi

.
Thank for your 9:07 am reply this morning --- below, under double line of %%%%% --- to my 9:00 pm e-mail last night, especially in light of the 9/9/2020 9:32 pm "Automatic reply" message advising that you were unavailable until Monday 9/14.

.
Immediately below (before the lines of %%%%), I repeat several points in my e-mail last night that I asked you to address, along with excisions from your e-mail this morning, which seem to me to be less than fully responsive. Following each of them is my further elucidation on what I asked for, in distinctive font, emboldened, italicized and underlined.

<> Please advise what are the quantitative thresholds for deciding what constitutes "an equitable distribution of people" for attending this "first public workshop" ("first public workshop" is Andrew Bing's terminology).

We use census data to quantify this.

Please provide the quantitative thresholds which distinguish between equitable and inequitable distributions of workshop participants. Your response addresses what the thresholds are based on but doesn't quantify the thresholds (as I asked). Your advice as to whether points of view expressed by "inequitable" workshop participants will be identified as such during the course of the Update. If no, why bother at all with judging whether the participation is or is not "equitable?"

<> The flyer for the first public workshop includes the following sentence: "The update will include **revised recommendations for transportation improvements, land use strategies**, and other updates **to guide the future of the Churchman's Crossing area** thru the next 20 years." (emphasis added). Please advise how much weight will be given to Mr. Bing's summaries of comments from anonymous participants in his "Listening Tour"

The comments received during the listening tour were the first step in developing a better understanding of key issues in the area from those who have been identified as having an interest or concern. The summaries provided the project team with some key themes for the study area. Subsequent public comment and feedback during workshops will help further refine those concerns, as well as help to develop and refine solutions, that consider the needs of all.

Your response suggests subliminally the notion that "those who have been identified as having an interest or concern" will be reflected somehow in the weighing of "key issues in the area." The underlying issue, obviously, is multi-dimensional, but key among the dimensions is how the interests of the residents of the study area are to be balanced with the interests of people concerned with the profitability of development ventures and/or those whose interests are based on wages from temporary employment during construction. The fact that you ducked on quantifying thresholds, together with the fact that you placed your response BEFORE my citations from the AICP Code of Ethics, together reinforce that what's

[being hidden here is the conduct of the public's business for private advantage.](#)

(Hopefully, your response will reflect the following excerpt from the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct where Section A.1 describes Our Overall Responsibility to the Public as: "Our primary obligation is to serve the public interest . . . that is formulated through continuous and open debate. . . We shall have special concern for the long range consequences of present actions. . . We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons . . . We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on . . . plans and programs. . .").

<> And in light of Section B.1 of the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, which says: "We shall not deliberately or with reckless indifference fail to provide adequate, timely clear and accurate information on planning issues" please provide assurance that the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update will explore the total public cost of transportation system congestion --- including the cost of increases of collision frequency, personal injuries, deaths, time wasted in delay beyond the presently lawful upper bound of level of service (in Land Use regulatory proceedings), and air pollution, whether such costs are imposed on government or on the public in or beyond the congested area.

You didn't respond at all to this prompt. Again you ducked an opportunity to reach what ought to be the heart of the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update. The AICP Code of Ethics says: " We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons" whether or not "affected persons" are within or beyond your thus far secret interpretation of census data. And you ducked my KEY suggestion, that an important focal point of the Update should be to "explore the total public cost of transportation system congestion --- including the cost of increases of collision frequency, personal injuries, deaths, time wasted in delay beyond the presently lawful upper bound of level of service (in Land Use regulatory proceedings), and air pollution, whether such costs are imposed on government or on the public in or beyond the congested area."

Your ducks strongly suggest that at least in part, the Update will serve as justification for imposing on Churchman's Crossing residents as much of the total cost of Land Use intensifications as can be hidden by falling far short of the AICP Code of Ethics provision B.1 which says: "We shall not deliberately or with reckless indifference fail to provide adequate, timely clear and accurate information on planning issues."

I ask that you complete your response to my 9/9/2020 e-mail, particularly to the issues your initial response ducked.

Vic

%%%%%%%%%

%%%%%%%%%

In a message dated 9/10/2020 9:07:41 AM Eastern Standard Time, rnovakoff@wilmapco.org writes:

Hi Vic,

Thank you Vic for always doing a good job reviewing our materials. Please see my

responses in blue below.

Thanks,

Randi Novakoff

Outreach Manager

Wilmington Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)

(302) 737-6205 ext. 111

100 Discovery Blvd, Suite 800

Newark | Delaware 19713

www.wilmapco.org | www.facebook.com/wilmapco

From: vsinger01@aol.com [<mailto:vsinger01@aol.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2020 9:00 PM

To: Randi Novakoff <rnovakoff@wilmapco.org>

Cc: nancywilling@yahoo.com; Bill_Done@msn.com; donnashankie10@gmail.com; vsinger01@aol.com

Subject: RE: Churchman's Crossing Plan Update FIRST Virtual Public Workshop

Randi

.

Please provide responses to ALL of the following points relevant to the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update, rather than just the first few. If that requires more than one e-mail, please provide "not later than" dates for the responses to be forthcoming.

.

<> Your 9/5/2020 12:01 am e-mail, below under &&&&, requested that I provide my zip code and my racial identity as responses to the following statement: "To help ensure that we reach an equitable distribution of people, please provide the following:" Please define your term "an equitable distribution of people."

An equitable distribution of people at the workshop would be one that mirrors the demographics of those in the study area.

.

<> Please advise what are the quantitative thresholds for deciding what constitutes "an equitable distribution of people" for attending this "first public workshop" ("first public workshop" is Andrew Bing's terminology).

We use census data to quantify this.

<> Please advise whether or not whatever quantitative thresholds are contemplated for assuring achievement of "an equitable distribution of people" will be used before the start of the first public workshop to exclude any among those who might wish to participate.

We do not exclude anyone from participating, anyone who wishes to participate is welcome.

<> Please advise whether or not whatever quantitative thresholds are contemplated for assuring achievement of "an equitable distribution of people" will be used after the end of the first public workshop to decide which remarks by which participants will be disregarded.

All comments received are considered, we do not use demographic data to disregard any comments.

<> Please advise whether the same criteria and thresholds apply to any of the anonymous people whose remarks will be summarized by Mr. Bing's "Key Themes and Messages" board (or PowerPoint slide/document)

(Andrew Bing's terminology, from his 8/5/2020 3:31 pm e-mail to me, Nancy and Bill).

The listening session was an opportunity for stakeholders, regardless of their demographics, to share their thoughts. The criteria does not apply.

<> Please advise whether Mr. Bing's summary "Key Themes and Messages" board(or PowerPoint slide/document) will be made available to participants in the first public workshop BEFORE the start of the first public workshop to give them a clue as to what is regarded as important to the designer(s) of the workshop.

Key themes derived from the listening tour will be presented during the workshop.

<> Additionally, please advise that these PowerPoint slides and all the others that will be used in the first public workshop will be available to the general public AFTER the workshop.

Yes, the workshop presentation will be available on the project webpage within a few days of the workshop.

<> The flyer for the first public workshop includes the following sentence: "The update will include **revised recommendations for transportation improvements, land use strategies**, and other updates **to guide the future of the Churchman's Crossing area** thru the next 20 years." (emphasis added). Please advise how much weight will be given to Mr. Bing's summaries of comments from anonymous participants in his "Listening Tour"

The comments received during the listening tour were the first step in developing a better understanding of key issues in the area from those who have been identified as having an interest or concern. The summaries provided the project team with some key themes for the study area. Subsequent public comment and feedback during workshops will help further refine those concerns, as well as help to develop and refine solutions, that consider the needs of all.

(Hopefully, your response will reflect the following excerpt from the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct where Section A.1 describes Our Overall Responsibility to the Public as: "Our primary obligation is to serve the public interest . . . that is formulated through continuous and open debate. . . We shall have special concern for the long range consequences of present actions. . . We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons . . . We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on . . . plans and programs. . .")

<> And in light of Section B.1 of the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, which says: "We shall not deliberately or with reckless indifference fail to provide adequate, timely clear and accurate information on planning issues" please provide assurance that the Churchman's Crossing Plan Update will explore the total public cost of transportation system congestion --- including the cost of increases of collision frequency, personal injuries, deaths, time wasted in delay beyond the presently lawful upper bound of level of service (in Land Use regulatory proceedings), and air pollution, whether such costs are imposed on government or on the public in or beyond the congested area.

Vic

From: rnovakoff@wilmapco.org

To: vsinger01@aol.com

Sent: 9/5/2020 12:00:36 AM Eastern Standard Time

Subject: Thank you for registering for Churchman's Crossing Plan Update Virtual Public Workshop

Churchmans Crossing Plan Update Virtual Public Workshop

Help Plan for the Future of Churchmans Crossing! WILMAPCO, DeIDOT, and New Castle County Department of Land Use are developing a comprehensive update to the 1997 Churchman's Crossing Plan.

Wednesday, September 16, 2020 from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM EDT

This is an online event.

Thank you for registering for the Churchman's Crossing Landuse and Transportation Plan Virtual Public Workshop!

You will receive login information as we get closer to the workshop date. To learn more about this project, please visit: <http://www.wilmapco.org/churchmans/>.

Your participation is vitally important in developing a plan that meets the needs of all. Please help us by sharing the event information with your friends and neighbors, on Facebook and Nextdoor, and with any civic or other organizations you think would be interested.

To share this information on social media, please visit:

<https://www.facebook.com/events/724097561496993/>.

To view and print a workshop flyer, please visit: <http://www.wilmapco.org/ChurchmansFlyer.pdf>

If you have any other questions, please email Randi Novakoff at rnovakoff@wilmapco.org.

Online event access

Event URL: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86369899331?pwd=MS9HYXgxL25sZlBkc2wwTlMrbXgZz09>

Personal Information

First Name: Vic
Last Name: Singer
Email Address: vsinger01@aol.com
Organization (including civic and/or other community groups) NCC Civic League

To help ensure we that reach an equitable distribution of people, please provide the following:

What is your zip code? 19713
Which of the following do you consider yourself? White/Caucasian

Attendee list

Do you consent to have your name listed Yes
on a publicly displayed attendee list? No
contact details will be included.

Contact

Randi Novakoff
WILMAPCO
302-737-6205 ext 111
rnovakoff@wilmaco.org

[Add to Calendar](#)

This email was sent to vsinger01@aol.com by rnovakoff@wilmaco.org
because you registered for Churchmans Crossing Plan Update Virtual Public Workshop. [Click here if
you no longer wish to receive emails about this event.](#)

WILMAPCO | 100 Discovery Blvd Suite 800 | Newark | Delaware | 19713

CHURCHMAN'S CROSSING PLAN UPDATE
Shippo Realty Comments, 12.15.2020

Introduction: At the first meeting of the Churchman's Crossing Advisory Committee, held on 2 December 2020, the Committee was presented with a "Handout" containing excellent material and asked to consider three questions:

1. Transportation Improvement Projects – Have we identified all of the roadway connections?
2. Land Use Considerations – Do the "bookends" make sense?
3. Scenario/Screening Metrics – Are the metrics understandable and meaningful?

Shippo Realty believes that the Committee cannot usefully or responsibly address these questions without considering them in context of the existing traffic crisis at and around the Christiana Mall. Together with Christiana Retail Center, Phase 1 and the Christiana Fashion Center, the Christiana Mall constitutes one of the largest regional retail shopping hubs in the United States. It is a major driver of Delaware's economy. Yet, it is the only hub of its kind to which access is constrained by an inadequate combination of interstate access and local roads. The resulting traffic jams are not only an inexcusable embarrassment but also a needless hindrance to the State's recovery from the recent economic downturn.

As explained at our last meeting by Steve Chambliss, Senior General Manager of the Mall, the design of the high-speed interstate interchange ramps accessing the Mall from the north and west cause shoppers wishing to access Christiana Retail Center and Christiana Fashion Center to drive across the Mall by the Ring Road in order to attempt making right or left turns at the signalized intersections with Center Boulevard. At this point, traffic backs up on the Ring Road in both directions. Traffic attempting to access Costco, Michaels, Men's Warehouse and Raymour Flanigan needs to make a left into the stores at its signalized entrance which is only about 200 linear feet from the Ring Road signal. There is insufficient distance for stacking and lane transition. Near grid lock is routine every weekend, even with the reduction in traffic resulting from the pandemic. Last Fall, Costco sustained more than a \$500,000 loss in single day sales due to customers being unable to reach its store. Correcting this situation should be one of our highest priorities.

Unfortunately, the New Castle Transit Center Project, as proposed, including the extension of Center Boulevard between the Mall Interchange and Churchman's Road, identified as Projects O and P on page 8 of the Handout, and set forth in greater detail as "Alternate A/Alternate B" in the virtual "Stakeholder Meeting Handout" of 22 September 2020, will worsen rather than improve the situation. The proposed "Churchman's Connector" extension of Center Boulevard in Alternates A/B and "Cavaliers Country Club Drive" in the recent record plan of the Cavalier's Country Club redevelopment are designed as "local streets" with direct access, rather than the limited

access prescribed by the urban collector envisioned by the original 1997 Churchman's Crossing Study. Similarly, access to Costco, Michaels, Men's Warehouse and Raymour Flanigan from the Ring Road is also made more difficult, not better. And by locating the transit center in a location remote from the Mall, its employees will need shuttle service to get to work, commuters will be deprived of ancillary services normally provided with such regional facilities and the surface lot will present a security liability to Costco and the Mall overnight, when not in use.

Shippo Realty believes that a much better long-term solution can be achieved by locating the Transit Center adjacent to the Ring Road as a structured parking garage for 500 cars where, in cooperation with the Mall, the adjacent retail development and the garage will be included within the Mall's 24/7 security operation, commuters have ready access to transit bus service, employees have direct pedestrian access to the Mall, the garage is conveniently available for overflow parking during the weekends and the connection between the Mall interchange and Churchman's Road may be designed and built in accordance with the County's recently adopted Transportation Improvement District ("TID") Ordinance, pursuant to Del. C. Title 2, Chapter 20, the "Public-Private Initiatives Program in Transportation". A copy of Shippo Realty's "Developer Proposal, Exhibit 6E of 6" conceptual plan is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**. Subject to further review and refinement, this plan has the support of Steve Chambliss and the Mall.

Comments regarding the Handout: Andrea Trabelski's (Assistant Land Use Manager) comment for the New Castle Department of Land Use in support of the TID espoused by Bill Fasey at the meeting, regarding the extension of Churchman's Road through Delaware Park, may be key to overcoming the financial constraints underlying the evaluation of Transportation Projects set forth on pages 8, 9 and 10 of the Handout. By further reclassifying the projects in accordance with the original 1997 Churchman's Crossing Study's *New Roadway Connections and Intersection Improvements*, and applying the TID as the financial catalyst for implementation under public-private partnerships, the "Preferred Concept Plan" we seek may best be achieved. For example:

- Projects B and K on page 8, Project S on page 9, and Project W on Page 10 could be combined and evaluated as a TID vis a vis Delaware Racing Association's contemplated redevelopment of Delaware Park;
- Projects N, O and P on page 8 could be combined with Projects AA, CC and DD on Page 10 and evaluated as a TID as part of Shippo Realty's proposal;
- Projects C, D and J on Page 8, Projects U, V on page 9 and Projects GG, HH, JJ and X on page 10 could be combined and evaluated as a TID by major property owners served thereby; e. g., Delle Donne & Associates/Christiana Executive Campus, Christiana Hospital, Bank of America, "Delmarva Power & Light" (PECO), University Plaza, and Christiana Town Center.

We look forward to further meetings and dialogue with the Project Team.

From: [Francis Warnock](#)
To: [Dave Gula](#); [Randi Novakoff](#)
Cc: [Angela Connolly](#)
Subject: Churchmans Project
Date: Sunday, July 18, 2021 4:54:25 PM

Greetings,

Our main concern with this project is the SR4 sidepath, aka "East Coast Greenway", from approx Pearson Dr to SR7. There also needs to be a 8' sidepath all the way down SR58/Churchmans incl under SR7/1 to at least Cavaliers. There is already a good side bike/ped path along the hospital property and a well designed bridge over I95.

We have written Peter Haag asking for an approx timeline on SR4 rehab, so that we can try and attach a rehab of the ECG as well. As expected, this is far off into the future. The ECG needs rehab and to be brought up to design & engineering best practices. As it stands now, it varies between 8' asphalt and 5' sidewalks, in terrible condition. Most intersection crossings turn into sidewalks and follow radial turns and force bicyclists into off-alignment narrow unregulated crosswalks. Unacceptable. DelDOT TOTALLY dropped the ball at Augusta, with an opportunity there (the ONLY opportunity for years to come) to address pathway continuity here in Ogletown:
<https://www.1stbikes.org/2020/10/east-coast-greenway-fail-in-ogletown.html>

The ECG where it passes the WaWa and Chick Fila' is well designed, and should be the model for how this pathway feeds through all intersections -- straight through with an R10-15 yield sign:
<https://goo.gl/maps/TDsUakiQ3BUX1UBt6>

Please let us know where to comment, and/or if you have any info on this aspect of the project -- if it's even being considered. Thank you so much and take care.

--

Frank Warnock & Angela Connolly
www.ogletownresilience.org
www.bryan-townsend.com
www.magichalo.org
www.1stbikes.org
(302) 471-7578

From: [Francis Warnock](#)
To: [Randi Novakoff](#)
Cc: [Angela Connolly](#); [Daniel Blevins](#); [Tigist Zegeye](#); [Dave Gula](#)
Subject: Churchmans Crossing Comments
Date: Wednesday, August 18, 2021 10:29:09 PM

Greetings Randi, et al. Here are our comments for the Churchmans Crossing Project. These can also be found here: <https://www.1stbikes.org/2021/08/our-comments-on-churchmans-crossing-plan.html>

1. The project scope contains several bi-directional SUP facilities (Shared Use Pathways) that were built decades ago. Along SR4 and SR58 is the East Coast Greenway (ECG). These need to be improved and/or rehabbed using best design & engineering guidance (APBP/NACTO compliance) esp where crossing through intersections. This has been ignored so far:

<https://www.1stbikes.org/2020/10/east-coast-greenway-fail-in-ogletown.html>

2. Where SUP facilities exist, or will be added, these should never go off-alignment with acute zig-zagging through intersections via narrow sidewalks; SUPs should maintain their full width (min. 8' wide asphalt, buffered where possible) and continue in parallel to the road they are on, including through radial turns. Look to DelDOT's "SR299, SR1 to Catherine Street Project (pdf)" as a good example, or APBP/NACTO guidelines: <https://nacto.org/2019/05/20/dont-give-up-at-the-intersection/>

3. An 8' asphalt SUP facility should replace the narrow sidewalk on SR58/Churchmans Rd from just east of Christiana Hospital to at least Cavaliers, and include a marked, button actuated crosswalk (of equal width) under SR7/1. A SUP currently exists along the Christiana Hospital property, and there is a well designed bike-ped bridge over I95 further east on SR58 as you approach Cavaliers. These should all be connected in one contiguous 8' bi-directional facility, as an improvement to the ECG.

4. Upgrade/improve/rehab the following SUP connectors using best design & engineering guidance (APBP/NACTO compliance):

=> Lisbeth Rd to Brennen School parking lot: <https://goo.gl/maps/ALipFGJ4PkXc86FN6>

=> Old Ogletown Rd to SR4-Salem Church Jct: <https://goo.gl/maps/QXgafoiksrPeEkGSA>

=> Prides Crossing to SR4 SUP/ECG: <https://goo.gl/maps/jRR8JVjwjVjbhBB87>

=> E. Cherokee Dr to Johnson Rd: <https://goo.gl/maps/mLTStDhUNnNGkTvJ7>

=> SR4 SUP/ECG continuity at Augusta: <https://www.1stbikes.org/2020/10/east-coast-greenway-fail-in-ogletown.html>

5. Convert abandoned roads into SUPs:

=> Old Harmony Rd from north of Greenridge Rd to Old Capitol Trail:

<https://goo.gl/maps/uE7DvDaJq5eMxeiE7>

=> S. Wakefield thru Leathermans Run: <https://goo.gl/maps/BasGhwsFvXzT7ATh8>

6. A park that includes ball courts, walking & biking paths, benches and other forms of place and destination-making is desperately needed for Harmony Woods and the region in general: <https://www.ogletownresilience.org/2020/03/another-lost-park-opportunity-in.html>

7. Add a shoulder bike lane on Salem Church Rd between I95 and Old Baltimore Pike, on what is technically "Bike Route 1". Cars and trucks cannot safely pass cyclists here without

entering the opposing lane, and road rage commonly ensues.

8. Reduce the speed limit on SR4 from 50 mph to 40 mph, and 35 mph in school zones: DE Deaf-Blind, Kirk MS. Several speed studies over the years have shown rampant speeding along this corridor, in excess of 57 mph avg. Investigate the use of traffic calming measures such as median vegetation plantings, and signage, to protect the children from these schools, as well as the surrounding neighborhoods, as they walk and cross the road on their trips to 7/11 for their after school snacks. Reducing the speed limit cannot be emphasized enough: <https://www.1stbikes.org/2021/08/us-news-world-report-delaware-1.html>

9. Recognize and honor the passing of Thomas Ogle, founder of Ogletown, who died exactly 250 years ago on 12/23/1771: <https://www.ogletownresilience.org/2021/08/abandoned-and-forgotten-thomas-ogle.html>. This should include a spur pathway connector from the existing SR4 SUP aka ECG, along with a historical wayside and some bike parking (as seen at regular intervals along, e.g. the Markell Trail/Indus Track). This article in Delaware on-line from 2015 highlights that very need, which went ignored: <https://www.delawareonline.com/story/news/local/2015/02/02/delaware-backstory-historic-grave-saved-shared/22770887/>

10. Reduce neighborhood street speed limits from 25 to 20 mph. Cost estimate here: <https://www.1stbikes.org/2020/04/senator-jack-walsh-obtains-quotes-for.html>

11. Assess, formalize and convert all "goat path" connections into SUPs. These are commonly visible coming off existing SUPs, usually connecting to adjacent shopping centers and strip malls. These occur when numerous people walk or bike across grass that eventually erodes and forms its own trail. These should be upgraded to pathways: <https://www.1stbikes.org/2020/04/where-is-bike-delaware-on-these-top-5.html>

Please advise how we may track our comments through the process, to verify if they are being considered for implementation or not. Thank you very much for listening.

SIGNED: Angela Connolly and Frank Warnock

--
Frank Warnock & Angela Connolly
www.ogletownresilience.org
www.bryan-townsend.com
www.magichalo.org
www.1stbikes.org
(302) 471-7578