Post Development (Current Detention Practices) vs Post Development (with Over-Detention)
Hidden Creek / Nottingham Meadows Modeled as-built / Proposed

		Post-Develoment (current detention)			Post-Development (Over-Detention)			Difference 2-year		10-year		100-year	
		2-year	10-year	100-year	2-year	10-year	100-year	cfs	%	cfs	%	cfs	%
	J1	42.07	98.07	184.56	35.33	77.24	128.34	-6.74	-16.02%	-20.83	-21.24%	-56.22	-30.46%
	J10	123.52	313.2	596.78	123.52	313.20	596.78	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J11	64.32	174.45	318.21	64.32	174.45	318.21	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J12	123.71	309.21	550.08	123.71	309.21	550.08	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J13	213.98	406.55	713.23	172.56	388.51	738.64	-41.42	-19.36%	-18.04	-4.44%	25.41	3.56%
	J14	186.86	352.66	556.97	186.86	352.66	556.97	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J15	266.43	522.64	958.38	224.40	511.36	926.16	-42.03	-15.78%	-11.28	-2.16%	-32.22	-3.36%
	J16	292.76	583.66	1065.25	238.51	536.61	996.49	-54.25	-18.53%	-47.05	-8.06%	-68.76	-6.45%
NEW BURTON	J17	331.16	706.97	1279.56	275.17	578.50	1110.56	-55.99	-16.91%	-128.47	-18.17%	-169.00	-13.21%
	J18	4.2	12.27	38.44	4.20	12.27	38.44						
	J19	4.57	19.66	60.6	4.57	19.66	60.60						
WOODBROOK	J2	361.22	774.52	1399.15	298.79	624.98	1194.38	-62.43	-17.28%	-149.54	-19.31%	-204.77	-14.64%
	J20	6.03	20.9	64.9	6.03	20.90	64.90						
	J22	40.06	70.86	117.94	40.06	70.86	117.94	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J23	128.76	231.55	364.06	128.76	231.55	364.06	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J24	104.78	211.52	346.55	104.78	211.52	346.55	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J25	78.67	134.69	201.62	78.67	134.69	201.62	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J26	36.72	81.91	157.13	20.95	39.55	86.03	-15.77	-42.95%	-42.36	-51.72%	-71.10	-45.25%
	J27	88.59	211.44	376.15	88.59	211.44	376.15	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J28	49.39	119.05	212.95	49.39	119.05	212.95	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
TENNANT CT	J3	341.34	725.52	1311.6	280.16	587.76	1125.15	-61.18	-17.92%	-137.76	-18.99%	-186.45	-14.22%
REEK STONE	J4	351.35	744	1343.16	289.81	597.61	1140.97	-61.54	-17.52%	-146.39	-19.68%	-202.19	-15.05%
GOVERNORS	J5	402.35	853.13	1534.24	340.29	689.28	1269.58	-62.06	-15.42%	-163.85	-19.21%	-264.66	-17.25%
	J6	50.48	139.43	310.64	50.48	139.43	310.64	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J7	72.33	170.45	372.43	72.33	170.45	372.43	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J8	108.47	229.72	409.16	108.47	229.72	409.16	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
	J9	122.53	270.08	483.89	122.53	270.08	483.89	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%

Exisiting Conditions vs Post-Development (Over-Detention)
PRE: All areas modeled as predevopment condtion
POST: Over-Detention at Kesselring and Eden Hill Farm, Hidden Creek / Nottingham Meadows modeled as-built / Proposed

	Existing (HC pre)			Post-Development (Over-Detention)			Difference					
							2-year		10-year		100-year	
	2-year	10-year	100-year	2-year	10-year	100-year	cfs	%	cfs	%	cfs	%
J1	54.21	125.47	220.58	35.33	77.24	128.34	-18.88	-34.83%	-48.23	-38.44%	-92.24	-41.82%
J10	135.99	342.98	639.75	123.52	313.20	596.78	-12.47	-9.17%	-29.78	-8.68%	-42.97	-6.72%
J11	78.06	207.69	377.88	64.32	174.45	318.21	-13.74	-17.60%	-33.24	-16.00%	-59.67	-15.79%
J12	133.45	322.36	568.12	123.71	309.21	550.08	-9.74	-7.30%	-13.15	-4.08%	-18.04	-3.18%
J13	165.09	363.76	690.15	172.56	388.51	738.64	7.47	4.52%	24.75	6.80%	48.49	7.03%
J14	186.86	352.66	556.97	186.86	352.66	556.97	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J15	219.91	484.99	863.80	224.40	511.36	926.16	4.49	2.04%	26.37	5.44%	62.36	7.22%
J16	235.89	524.31	925.15	238.51	536.61	996.49	2.62	1.11%	12.30	2.35%	71.34	7.71%
IEW BURTON J17	299.17	656.26	1143.71	275.17	578.50	1110.56	-24.00	-8.02%	-77.76	-11.85%	-33.15	-2.90%
J18				4.20	12.27	38.44						
J19				4.57	19.66	60.60						
DOAD BROOK J2	330.39	729.12	1271.96	298.79	624.98	1194.38	-31.60	-9.56%	-104.14	-14.28%	-77.58	-6.10%
J20				6.03	20.90	64.90						
J22	40.06	70.86	117.94	40.06	70.86	117.94	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J23	128.76	231.55	364.06	128.76	231.55	364.06	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J24	104.78	211.52	346.55	104.78	211.52	346.55	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J25	78.67	134.69	201.62	78.67	134.69	201.62	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J26	39.36	94.08	168.07	20.95	39.55	86.03	-18.41	-46.77%	-54.53	-57.96%	-82.04	-48.81%
J27	88.59	211.44	376.15	88.59	211.44	376.15	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
J28	49.39	119.05	212.95	49.39	119.05	212.95	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%
STEWART CT J3	309.09	676.56	1176.80	280.16	587.76	1125.15	-28.93	-9.36%	-88.80	-13.13%	-51.65	-4.39%
CREEKSIDE J4	318.54	696.14	1209.53	289.81	597.61	1140.97	-28.73	-9.02%	-98.53	-14.15%	-68.56	-5.67%
GOVERNORS J5	370.60	812.44	1409.61	340.29	689.28	1269.58	-30.31	-8.18%	-123.16	-15.16%	-140.03	-9.93%
J6	60.44	162.54	348.06	50.48	139.43	310.64	-9.96	-16.48%	-23.11	-14.22%	-37.42	-10.75%
J7	83.56	198.34	415.67	72.33	170.45	372.43	-11.23	-13.44%	-27.89	-14.06%	-43.24	-10.40%
J8	112.48	242.28	455.83	108.47	229.72	409.16	-4.01	-3.57%	-12.56	-5.18%	-46.67	-10.24%
J9	134.24	289.32	494.66	122.53	270.08	483.89	-11.71	-8.72%	-19.24	-6.65%	-10.77	-2.18%

Constituent Response

The Softball Surveys will be used as a guidance tool for our department giving us direction for the softball program and the athletic fields.

Next steps include reporting to the softball players in the Spring Summer season of 2007 on the results. Our will include a short term needs follow up and a long term needs follow up.

Our CIP and Goals have been geared towards improving the program over all.

ACTION FORM

PROCEEDING: Parks, Recreation, & Community Enhancement	**AGENDA ITEM NO.:** 11/28/06 - 2
DEPARTMENT OF ORIGIN: Parks, Recreation, & Library	**DATE SUBMITTED**: 11/15/06
PREPARED BY: Zachery Carter & Anthony DePrima	
SUBJECT: Evaluation of Bids – John W. Pitts Recreation Center	
REFERENCE: N/A	
RELATED PROJECT: N/A	
APPROVALS: N/A	
EXHIBITS: Exhibit A - Bid Talley Form and Exhibit B - Low Bid Comparison With and Without Gym A/C	
EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: $2,745,000 with Gym A/C or $2,706,000 w/o Gym A/C **AMOUNT BUDGETED**: $3,000,000 **FUNDING SOURCE (Dept./Page in CIP & Budget)**: Parks, Recreation and Library Budget CIP page 141	
TIMETABLE: Begin construction this winter with a target completion date of Fall 2007.	
RECOMMENDED ACTION: Staff recommends that the Committee recommend the low bid proposal of **either** Kent Construction (gym with air conditioning) or Bob Smith Contracting (gym without air conditioning) after discussion of the pros and cons of air conditioning the gym.	

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The City of Dover received six bids for the construction of the John W. Pitts Recreation Center. The bid documents required a single general price and four alternatives that would deduct material from the Center, and one alternative that would add a mezzanine. We also asked for the unit price for concrete because each manufacturer's design of the building is slightly different. The precise location of the columns--especially the corner columns--almost always varies among manufacturers. The concrete price helps guage possible costs of design changes. After analyzing the bids, staff determined that it was not to the City's advantage to remove the interior or exterior masonry (Alternates #1 & #2 on Exhibit A) or the Kalwal (Alternate #3, Exhibit A) which lets natural light into the gym. It was also decided not to add a mezzanine to save on expenses. Staff was willing to evaluate dropping the air conditioning for the gym with the idea that it could be added later--perhaps using a geothermal cooling, a green technology which may qualify for grant funding. Exhibit A is the Bid Tally sheet.

An analysis was done for the gym using scenarios of "with" and "without" air conditioning as shown in Exhibit B. As can be seen, the project with air conditioning leaves $61,605 for contingency costs, while the project without air conditioning leaves $100,605 for contingency. Obviously, it is better to have a larger contingency. The project architect has determined that the differences in concrete unit prices will not impact the low bidder status of each option.

Constructing the project without air conditioning will result in the gym not being able to be used on some days. While there has been no analysis, it would be more costly to retrofit the gym unless some grant or funding for green energy can be found. However, operating expenses without air conditioning would be less. Retrofitting with geothermal will have a long term cost savings on related energy costs and show leadership in this area by the City.

Staff is comfortable with either alternate and believes a solid discussion of the pros and cons at the Committee level will render the appropriate decision.

It is very important to note that fundraising continues. We expect to have other legislators contribute Community Transportation Funds, and private sector fundraising will be easier once construction has been approved. These will increase our project contingency.

Exhibit A

JOHN W. PITTS RECREATION CENTER

BID TALLY / November 6, 2006 / 4:00 PM / Dover City Hall / City Clerk's Office

	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor	Contractor
	Kent Construction Company	**Bob Smith Contractors, Inc.**	**Conventional Builders, Inc.**	**Integrated Construction Services, Inc.**	**Bancroft Construction Company**	**Emory Hill & Company, Inc.**
Base Bid	2,745,000	2,749,000	2,772,000	2,894,000	2,999,000	3,006,805
Alternate 1 NO Outside Brick	34,600	47,800	49,251	44,395	84,000	70,000
Alternate 2 NO KalWall (natural lighting)	79,000	97,500	110,226	134,248	206,000	150,000
Alternate 3 NO Interior Masonry	7,000	21,187	12,179	33,451	10,975	30,000
Alternate 4 / ADD ADD Mezzanine	+ 114,000	+ 7,000	+ 43,800	+ 102,022	+ 32,900	+ 62,000
Alternate 5 NO HVAC in gym	34,500	42,000	37,900	31,220	49,500	45,000
Concrete Unit Price	20.30	1,000.00	17.00	300.00	450.00	N/A

EXHIBIT B

JWP Center Evaluation of Low Bids With and Without Gym Air Conditioning

	With Air Conditioning	W/O Air Conditioning
FUNDS		
Parkland Reserve	$ 2,967,032.00	$ 2,967,032.00
CURRENT PLEDGES		
John Still- CTF*	$ 30,000.00	$ 30,000.00
Donna Stone-CTF*	$ 25,000.00	$ 25,000.00
Greater Dover	$ 10,000.00	$ 10,000.00
Anonymous -TBA	$ 8,000.00	$ 8,000.00
TOTAL	$ 3,040,032.00	$ 3,040,032.00
EXPENSES		
Construction Bid Price	$ 2,745,000.00	$ 2,706,000.00
Becker Morgan Balance	$ 163,427.00	$ 163,427.00
Budeted FFI*	$ 70,000.00	$ 70,000.00
TOTAL	$ 2,978,427.00	$ 2,939,427.00
LEFT FOR CONTINGENCIES	$ 61,605.00	$ 100,605.00
%	2%	3%
LOW BIDDERS	Kent Construction	Bob Smith Contracting

*CTF= Community Transportation Funds for Parking Lot Constructon
*FFI = Furniture, Fixtures, Incidentals.
z:City Manger\JWP Center Evaluation.xls

ACTION FORM

PROCEEDING: PR & Community Enhancement	**AGENDA ITEM NO.:**
DEPARTMENT OF ORIGIN: Community Development	**DATE SUBMITTED**: 11/13/06
PREPARED BY: Tracey Harvey	
SUBJECT: Amendment to the 2005 Consolidated Plan Citizen Participation Plan	
REFERENCE: The functions of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Group be assigned to PR & CE Committee	
RELATED PROJECT: n/a	
APPROVALS: Council	
EXHIBITS: n/a	
EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: n/a **AMOUNT BUDGETED**: n/a **FUNDING SOURCE (Dept./Page in CIP & Budget)**: n/a	
TIMETABLE: Approval requested for the November 27th Council Meeting	
RECOMMENDED ACTION:	

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

An amendment to the City of Dover Community Development Block Grant Citizen Participation Plan is being proposed to assign the functions of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Group to the Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee. This action would be an amendment to the 2005 Consolidated Plan.

ACTION FORM

AGENDA ITEM: **11-27-2006 - 4**

PROCEEDING: Parks, Recreation, and Community Enhancement Committee
DEPARTMENT OF ORIGIN: City Council
PREPARED BY: Traci A. McDowell, City Clerk on behalf of Councilman Ruane

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendment to Preliminary Land Use Services Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Dover and the State of Delaware (Adopted 02/09/04) **DATE SUBMITTED**: **11-22-2006**
RELATED PROJECT: N/A
APPROVALS: N/A
EXHIBITS: #1 - Draft Amendment to PLUS Memorandum of Understanding #2 - Garrison Tract Memorandum of Understanding
EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: $ N/A **AMOUNT BUDGETED**: $ N/A **FUNDING SOURCE (Dept./Page in CIP & Budget)**: N/A
TIMETABLE: Upon Committee approval, the amendment will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to Council. Once approved, the revised agreement will be forwarded to the Office of State Planning Coordination for concurrence and signatures.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend amending paragraph 4 of section C of the PLUS MOU by adding "or rezoning" after the word "size".

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

On February 9, 2004, City Council approved a Preliminary Land Use Services (PLUS) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) *(Exhibit #1)* between the State of Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination and the City of Dover. The PLUS MOU established a coordinated review of certain development activities in order to achieve a more efficient, effective and timely use of resources and consistency and coordination between the various levels of government and other interested parties.

Paragraph 4 of Section C of the PLUS agreement acknowledges that "Any project of any size proposed to the east of Delaware Route 1 and north of South Little Creek Road" would be subject to the State PLUS review in recognition of the Garrison Tract MOU *(Exhibit #2)*, which acknowledges in Section 2 that the City shall "Strongly adhere to existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations for the remaining areas east of SR1, which support agricultural uses and low-density development."

A recent application to the City for rezoning of a property east of SR1 provided evidence that Paragraph 4 of Section C of the PLUS MOU should be amended to include such rezoning applications east of SR1 in the PLUS review process, as well as "any project of any size".

Memorandum of Understanding
between
The City of Dover, Delaware
and the
Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination

WHEREAS, the State of Delaware has determined that certain local land use decisions have far reaching and complex effects on the region, resulting in development which often requires the commitment of finite resources by the various levels of government as well as private investors; and

WHEREAS, coordinated review of certain development activities would result in a more efficient, effective and timely use of resources and would also achieve consistency and coordination between the various levels of government and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, under Title 29, Chapter 92 of the Delaware Code, local land use planning actions by local governments are subject to pre-application review processes by the Office of State Planning Coordination (OSPC); and

WHEREAS, under Title 29, Section 9205 (c) of the Delaware Code, the OSPC shall, through a Memorandum of Understanding, exempt a local jurisdiction from the provisions of the Land Use Planning Act or modify the pre-application process when the local jurisdiction has a Certified Comprehensive Plan and imposes a more stringent review of projects;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD by and between The City of Dover, Delaware and the Office of State Planning Coordination as follows:

A. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to deny The City of Dover its final decision-making authority over proposed land use planning actions in the corporate limits of The City of Dover. Additionally, any comments received from state agencies, pursuant to Title 29, Chapter 92 of the Delaware Code, shall not exempt applicants from the responsibility of meeting all requirements set forth in The City of Dover's adopted land use regulations.

B. The Development Advisory Committee (DAC) of The City of Dover will continue to review development proposals on a monthly basis, and will continue to include representation from various state agencies as is currently the practice.

C. The following land use planning actions are and shall remain subject to State review under Title 29, Chapter 92, Delaware Code:

1. All residential projects containing 125 or more dwelling units**.**

2. Any non-residential subdivision or site plan involving new construction of structures or buildings with a total floor area equal to or exceeding 75,000 square feet.

3. Any application for rezoning or annexation that is inconsistent with The City of Dover's Comprehensive Plan Update certified September 22, 2003, or as amended, except where the non-conformity is of a minor, relatively insignificant nature. A rezoning shall be considered minor variation from the Comprehensive Plan when the following conditions are met:

   (a) The rezoning is of a unique circumstance and can not set precedence for other lands in the vicinity of the rezoning.
   (b) The relative size of the rezoning or the variation from the land use recommended by the Comprehensive Plan is so minor that it would have no impact on the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
   (c) The proposed zoning is adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of other similarly zoned lands and would not alter the pattern of development in the area.

   Upon notification of a rezoning in the City of Dover that meets these criteria, the State will concur in writing to the City thereby waiving the PLUS review process in that instance.

4. Any project of any size ***or rezoning*** proposed to the east of Delaware Route 1 and north of South Little Creek Road.

5. Any local land use regulation, ordinance or requirement referred to the Office of State Planning Coordination by The City of Dover for the purpose of providing the City with advisory comments. These include the modifications to the City's zoning and subdivision ordinances that implement the Comprehensive Plan.

6. Any development projects voluntarily submitted by the developer to the Office of State Planning Coordination for review.

7. Any other project which is required to be referred to the State for pre-application review by City of Dover regulations.

8. Any amendment, modification or update to The City of Dover's Comprehensive Plan, as required by Title 22 of the Delaware Code.

9. All projects in the Downtown Dover Redevelopment Target Area, defined by The City of Dover Code shall be exempt from State review unless voluntarily submitted by the developer or The City of Dover.

D. The City of Dover shall, at the time of the required pre-application meeting, identify those projects meeting the criteria defined in this agreement for State review, direct applicants whose projects meet State review criteria to submit necessary documents to the Office of State Planning Coordination (OSPC) in order to initiate the PLUS review process, and not accept applications for those projects requiring PLUS review until such time as the OSPC has issued comments, as defined in Title 29, Section 9204 (c) of the Delaware code, to the applicant and The City of Dover.

E. In special circumstances, the Office of State Planning Coordination may waive the pre-application requirements of Title 29, Chapter 92 of the Delaware Code. Where such waiver is granted, the Office of State Planning Coordination shall provide a written explanation of the causes for the waiver to the relevant local jurisdiction and the applicant. These circumstances may include, but are not limited to, a local government's imposition of a more stringent review of projects enumerated in §9203(a) than required by Title 29, Chapter 92 of the Delaware Code, and/or projects expected to provide an extraordinary benefit to the State and the local jurisdiction through economic development, job creation, educational opportunities, public services or facilities, agricultural preservation, or protection and enhancement of the natural environment.

F. This Memorandum of Understanding may be revised from time to time as circumstances warrant, only with the concurrence of both The City of Dover and the Office of State Planning Coordination.

_____ _____

The Honorable James Hutchison Date
Mayor, City of Dover
Dover, Delaware

_____ _____

The Honorable William McGlumphy Date
President, Dover City Council
Dover, Delaware

_____ _____

John Friedman Date
Chair, Dover Planning Commission
Dover, Delaware

_____ _____

Constance C. Holland, Director Date
Office of State Planning Coordination

Memorandum of Understanding
Garrison Tract – City of Dover

April 8, 1999

The State of Delaware, in an effort to create jobs and provide economic stability, is pursuing site locations throughout the State to locate potential major employers. In pursuit of that goal, the Garrison Tract located within the City of Dover and in central Kent County has been identified as a potential location to promote economic activity.

The City of Dover has proposed to Kent County and the State of Delaware the Garrison site consisting of 415 acres located on the north side of White Oak Road, east of SR1 as a suitable location for future economic development efforts. From a planning prospective, this site is suitable because it is within the existing urban area of the City of Dover. It has public sewer and water available. Access is available from the recently improved White Oak Road and can be served by a dedicated interchange from SR1.

The State of Delaware has designated the area east of SR1 in Kent County as Limited Growth Area with the intent of discouraging costly sprawling development along SR1. The City of Dover and Kent County comprehensive plans have respected this policy and have designated this area as agricultural. An appropriate combination of City, State and County growth controls can protect the areas east of SR1 from premature sprawling development even with development of the Garrison Tract.

Therefore, the City of Dover, State of Delaware and County of Kent agree that further environmental and location studies of the Garrison Tract should go forward. If these studies find the Garrison Tract feasible for economic activity, then the site would be promoted by the State of Delaware as a desirable location and included in its publications and presentations. Understanding that premature sprawling development is not desirable, the following is agreed:

The City of Dover shall:

1. Pursue a zoning change of the Garrison Tract to an appropriate zone specific to a major employer.

2. Strongly adhere to existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations for the remaining areas east of SR1, which support agricultural uses and low-density development.

3. Strongly adhere to the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations, which maintain White Oak Road west of SR1 as a residential area. Rezoning to commercial use will be discouraged.

4. Support an interchange at SR 1 dedicated for Dover Downs and the Garrison site only. No public access to White Oak Road will be permitted.

5. Limit the extension of electric, water and sewer utilities to the remaining areas east of SR1 until such time that State, City and County plans indicate that growth in this area is desirable.

6. Limit development in environmentally sensitive areas as prescribed in the zoning ordinance including flood hazard areas, water bodies and wetlands, significant wildlife habitat, scenic resources, prime agricultural land remaining east of SR1.

Kent County shall:

1. Strongly adhere to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning designations for remaining areas east of SR 1 which support agricultural uses and low density residential development.

2. Pursue an overlay zone that would increase minimum lot sizes to 20 acres in the limited growth area remaining east of SR1, and discourage use of the Village development.

3. Limit the extension of sewer to the areas remaining east of SR 1 until such time that State, City and County plans indicate that growth in this area is desirable or a need arises for purpose of environmental protection.

4. Support the creation of agricultural preservation districts in the areas remaining east of SR1.

5. Support the preservation of historic districts and structures in the area.

The State of Delaware shall:

1. Invest Open Space Funds, Agricultural Land Preservation Funds, Enhancement Funds and Growth Management Funds for purchase of land and/or development rights where appropriate in the areas remaining east of SR1.

2. Pursue regulations to limit septic system permits in the areas remaining east of SR1.

3. Develop an access management plan for State roads in the vicinity.

4. Provide limited funding of improvements to local roads remaining east of SR1 as the need arises.