

Memorandum of Meeting

Date: 1/12/05

Date of Meeting: 10/26/04

Time: 5:30 pm

Location: Millsboro Fire Company

Type: Millsboro-South Area Working Group #5

Attendance: See Attached

The following is a summary of the discussion at the Working Group meeting:

The meeting was called to order at 5:50 by Mr. Robert Kramer.

- Bob Kramer thanked those Working Group members in attendance for coming. He indicated that the Project Team would be back here on November 15th and in Selbyville, at the Selbyville Fire Hall, on November 16th for Public Workshops. He further indicated that the purpose of this evening's meeting was to correctly capture the comments of the Working Group, through their feedback and changes this evening, so that those comments could be shared with the public at the upcoming Workshops. He held up a copy of a flyer advertising the upcoming Public Workshops and asked that the members of the Working Group help to get the word out to the public so that the upcoming meetings would attract a large turnout. He asked that members of the Working Group attend at least one hour to get the flavor of the public. He ended his introductory comments by indicating that another reason for this evening's meeting was to get the Working Groups input into how the materials for the Public Workshops could best be presented to the public considering the fact that there is a large amount of information and they are coming in cold to consider that information.
- Bob Kramer then introduced Mr. Monroe Hite, III, DelDOT's Project Manager for the US 113 N/S Study, to continue the meeting.
- Monroe Hite welcomed the Working Group members. He indicated that the changes to the plans were minor and that the Working Group would be breaking into groups, shortly to review the plans. He emphasized Mr. Kramer's comments regarding the presentation of the materials and the importance of the Working Groups feedback regarding how those materials should be presented. Mr. Hite referred the Working Group members to their hand-out package. He noted and emphasized the first draft of the alternatives Matrix included in their package. He reviewed the comments from the breakout groups at the last Millsboro-South Area Working Group meeting on September 29, 2004. Finally, he

discussed the details of the Third Lane option that would graphically be presented at the upcoming Public Workshops.

- Mr. Hite then introduced Mr. Joseph Wutka to review the changes that were made to the Eastern Bypass and On-alignment options, as a result of the comments from the previous Working Group meeting.
 - Mr. Wutka went over minor changes that were suggested from the previous Working Group meeting for the Eastern Bypass and On-alignment options.
- Joe Wutka then introduced Mr. Jeff Riegner to review the changes to the Western Bypass options.
- Jeff Riegner went over the changes that were suggested from the previous Working Group meeting for the Western Bypass options. He then reviewed the traffic graphic included in the hand-out package and explained that future traffic information relating to the various options would be presented in this fashion. He then turned the meeting back to Bob.
 - Peter Frederick asked what was being done to consider transit as an option in the project. It was indicated that, given the present level of the study, transit was a consideration in the modeling effort in the form of a reduction in the overall future traffic. Mr. Frederick then asked how future changes were reflected in the model. It was indicated that population, employment and dwelling units form the basis for information in the model. These factors are allocated on the basis of future land-use changes that are shown on the plans in the various shades of red. Traffic is allocated to the road system based on these land-use changes. The future traffic, cost and economic impact are additional tools that the Working Group will be able to use along with the information in the Matrix to help them in pairing down the options in the upcoming months.
 - Roger Marino indicated that even though the volume of traffic on Route 54 is smaller, percentage wise, than Route 24, it doesn't mean that there won't be problems in Selbyville like Millsboro is currently experiencing with Route 24. A Route 54 bypass around Selbyville needs to be looked at.
- Bob Kramer reviewed where we are in the process. We are not choosing an alternative or narrowing down the alternatives, we are showing a full range of alternatives at the upcoming Public Workshops. We will obtain feedback from the public in the next couple of weeks. We will obtain feedback from the agencies in January. At the same time, the Project Team will be developing traffic results, preliminary costs and economic impacts to be added to the Matrix. We will then reengage the Working Group to begin the process of pairing down the alternatives and determining the list of alternatives that will be carried forward for detailed study. By law, the No-build alternative must be carried forward. In addition, it is anticipated that at least one On-alignment alternative will be carried forward in the process. Following input from the Working Group, agency input in April and public input, probably in May, a decision will be made by the Department on those alternatives that will receive detailed consideration in an environmental document.

- Bob Kramer asked if there were any comments or feedback from the Working Group since the last meeting.
- Preston Dyer asked why Option 3 isn't the first and primary option. It was indicated that Option 3 would not, in all likelihood, meet the goals and objectives that had been set out by the Working Group when the study started and that it would not meet the original legislative mandate.
- Gary Taylor indicated that the original legislative mandate was for a new highway. Building on US 113 is not a new highway.
- Roger Marino asked if the General Assembly was being kept abreast of the study. It was indicated that they were being briefed on the study and that the consideration of Option 3 was an outcome of one of those briefings.
- Brad Conner indicated with 3,300 homes anticipated for the Dagsboro area, commercial development to support those new homes was needed. He indicated that the commercial, in all likelihood will be located on US 113 and that to get there they will need access.
- John Thoroughgood indicated that he thought that Option 3, with the addition of a third lane, could be a safety problem.
- Peter Frederick asked if Option 3 was the same as Route 1 between Lewes and Rehoboth. It was indicated that it was the same.
- Robert Stuart indicated that he thought that it would be good for their business. (Emergency Services)
- Joan Boyce indicated that if Option 3 is presented at the Public Workshops, it would need good explanation. Monroe indicated that the Project team needs feedback from the Working Group on presenting the information in a way, as indicated by Joan, that it would be explained well.
- John Mitchell indicated that getting folks there faster did not mean getting them there safer under Option 3.
- Robert Stuart asked if every cross-over would be signalized.
- Hearing no more comments, the Working Group members gathered into their break-out groups.
- As a result of the effort by the Working Group members in their breakout sessions, the following comments were reported back to the entire Working Group:

On-alignment

General

- On-alignment has too many negative impacts to retrofit into developed areas; will work in undeveloped locations.
- The Team should consider elevating US 113 over the side roads, rather than vice versa, because it would be less impactful to the east-west routes that are most important to local traffic and would permit current development to remain.
- The On-alignment alternatives would divide the communities as much as an elevated freeway would.
- Developers are not going to be willing to adjust their development plans around a build-out plan that is 10-20 years in the future, which makes the on-alignment solution infeasible.

Millsboro

- Will wipe out many businesses, will hurt economy.
- Will make travel easier for north-south traffic and much more difficult for local residents; will divide the town.
- Though revised options have some improvements, there are still serious negative impacts on provision of emergency service.
- Doesn't help east-west traffic.
- Will cause congestion in center of Millsboro.
- Even with this alternative, there would still be congestion along SR 24 on the east side of town.
- East-west traffic on SR 24 is a major problem and will only get worse, with over 30,000 additional residential units projected along its frontage (including 4,000 new units in Long Neck)
- Option 2 is like a band-aid applied to a jugular wound. It would create a new set of unorthodox traffic patterns in an area of town that is already well developed. The Team needs to look at proposed sewer upgrades, including those being implemented by private developers, and the Livable Delaware Growth Plan in order to understand where development will take place.

Dagsboro, Frankford

- Limits use of US 113 which is critical to businesses in these towns.
- Towns have invested in plans, infrastructure and meeting Livable Delaware requirements, and this alternative is contradictory to that progress.
- Disruptive to annexation and development plans that are in the pipeline; will curtail growth.
- Negative impact on Mountaire, a major employer.
- The west side has no major development planned and would be a better place for a solution.

Selbyville

- On-alignment is appropriate in the area north of town where development has not taken place but is planned.
- In developed area, too many established businesses will be damaged.
- Negative impacts on Mountaire a major factor in the area's economic well being.

On-alignment, add a lane in each direction

- May work from Maryland line to SR 20.
- Doesn't help east-west traffic flow.
- Deserves close scrutiny.
- Having three lanes would make the road less safe and, because signals can not be eliminated, would not fully address the congestion problem.
- Having a third lane plus interchanges at key intersections may be an acceptable alternative.

East Off-alignment

- Prefer longer easternmost option, section from US 113 north of Millsboro to SR 24 is critical.
- Option B will impact Mountaire's spray irrigation and sludge disposal sites.
- Allows town to grow.
- Leaves US 113 to serve local needs.
- Consider making it a toll road; "those who use it should pay for it."
- The Indian River crossing and the creek crossing to the south were objectionable due to environmental impacts. Two-for-one replacement of impacted wetlands would not address concerns about the loss of a well-established ecosystem.
- Generally okay with the connection between US 113 and SR 24, north of SR 24; however, stopping it at 24 would only partially address the north-south capacity issue and, therefore, not accomplish one of the stated project objectives.
- A connection south of SR 24 would divide the community, break-up well established farms and provide redundant capacity.
- The section south of SR 24 would provide a much needed connection between SR 24 and SR 26. Because of the barrier formed by Indian River, with no intermediate crossings between US 113 and SR 1, people living in Long Neck and traveling to Ocean View, and vice versa, now need to go west to US 113 and back east again.

West Off-alignment**General**

- This alternative would provide no benefit to east-west traffic but would address the stated objective of the US 113 North/South Study, that is, to better accommodate north-south traffic.
- This set of alternatives would be less devastating to most businesses than the on-alignment alternatives and more realistic from a cost standpoint than the east bypass alternatives.
- The Alternative 9 alignment would work well with the proposed realignment of SR 26. SR 26, east of US 113, could serve as a pivot point for people coming from the north going either to SR 26 or to SR 24, bypassing Millsboro entirely.
- The alignment should be kept as close to US 113 as possible.
- By diverting through traffic, either bypass would let US 113 work better, similar to what Route 1 has done for US 13 in Dover.
- Alternative 9 is unnecessary south of the Alternative 4/5 take-off. Alternative 4/5 will Work just as well if combined with On-alignment improvements south of Millsboro and potentially an interchange at SR 26.

Millsboro

- Doesn't help east-west traffic.
- Cuts up town's annexation and development plans.
- May provide some relief for west side residents.
- Why not consider a much longer west Off-alignment alternative comparable to the one on the east?

Dagsboro, Frankford

- Contradictory to towns' annexation and growth plans.
- No interest in western bypass options.

Selbyville

- Favor option I-6 as long as it is adjusted to honor property lines and does not divide planned growth areas.
- Farther west option accommodates future growth.
- Bob Kramer then asked the committee members if there were specific things that they felt the Project Team could use to best share the voluminous amount of information with the public at the upcoming Public Meetings.
- Josh Thompson, representing Eric Buehl, asked if the Team could illustrate how the cross-overs would work.
- Peter Frederick indicated that the effort of getting the information out to the public was similar to a marketing effort. He felt that the On-alignment options limit community access and the Bypass options limited transients. He felt they should be portrayed that way. He felt that the right of way for US 113 should be held as a long-term reserve. Finally, he indicated that the major concern is for east/west, that more east/west options should be developed and that these items will help build public support.
- John Mitchell asked if the Route 26 alternate alignment could be disconnected from the on-going study or if it were part of the study. It was indicated that it could be an independent entity.
- Bob Kramer then reviewed with the Working Group the general things that he had heard while he circulated among the Break-out groups: On-alignment is disliked, with the possible exception of the area south of Frankford; the Third Lane Option needs to be presented in a balanced fashion and has possibilities south of Millsboro; the Western Bypass Options might be easier, more doable, cheaper, but at less benefit. Luke-warm interest in Selbyville; the Eastern Bypass Options produced mixed feelings, from US 113 to Route 24 seemed to be okay, beyond the question of do-ability was an issue for some.
- Gary Taylor indicated that a Western Bypass around Selbyville might be workable but it needed to be located outside of the towns anticipated growth area.

- Jeff Riegner indicated that each north/south option will be judged on what it does for east/west access.
- Richard Kautz indicated that facility planning needed to occur around the east/west accesses with the north/south in mind.
- Jim Bennett asked if Newspaper articles were to be developed prior to the Public Meetings. If not they should be and if possible should include pictures.
- Bob Kramer pointed out that most people would be coming in cold, irregardless of DeIDOT's efforts to /inform the public prior to the meetings. Understanding this, what are the first points that need to be made to the public to help them in their understanding?
- Mike Simmonds indicated that they need to know that this is early in the process and that no decisions have been made.
- Bob Stuart indicated that the public needs to understand what the process is seeking to accomplish and how they are a part of that.
- Peter Frederick indicated that we should not be telling the public that we must consider no-build or On-alignment. All Options are on the table.
- John Thoroughgood indicated that the public is being asked to voice their opinion with regard to all of the Options.
- Joan Boyce indicated that we should emphasize with the public that we need their input and opinions and that those are highly valued. In-sets and cut-outs to explain details of the various options should be used.
- Roger Marino indicated that the KISS (Keep it simple, stupid) principle should be employed.
- Bob Kramer reiterated that the Public Meeting in Millsboro would be on November 15th here in this building and the Public Meeting in Selbyville would be held the following evening. Both meetings will run from 4pm to 7pm.
- The meeting was then adjourned at 8:30pm.