



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: May 24, 2006

Time: 5:30 PM to 8:30 PM

Location: Banquet Hall, Carlisle Fire Company, Milford, Delaware

Topic: **Milford Area Working Group Meeting No. 13**

Attendees: Page 7

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:50 PM. Mr. Kramer thanked the working group for their continued attendance and mentioned that tonight's discussion will focus on key issues affecting the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) and project schedule. Mr. Kramer also stated that due to the time since the last working group meeting in February, some of tonight's presentation will reiterate points from the previous meeting.

Monroe Hite, III welcomed the group and reminded the working group that updated notebook materials have been provided, including a copy of tonight's presentation, an updated map of the east bypass alternatives, including the brown alternative, and meeting minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Hite then indicated that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to review Livable Delaware issues, review shifts in the alternatives, discuss key issues for each alternative and the project schedule. Mr. Hite stated that the next round of public workshops will be held in June with a workshop scheduled for 4:00 pm - 7:00 pm on Monday, June 19th at the Evelyn I. Morris Early Childhood Center and Tuesday, June 20th at the Carlisle Fire Hall. He asked that working group members see Ed Thomas and Andrew Bing for extra copies of the flyers for the workshops. Mr. Hite then told the working group that the project team will be adding agricultural impacts to the matrix and economic analysis. Mr. Hite informed the working group about the short-term improvements currently under construction at the intersection of US 113/SR 18/SR 404 and additional improvements planned for the intersection of US 113/SR 24 in the spring of 2007.

Mr. Hite then introduced Jeff Riegner to discuss the aspects of Livable Delaware. Mr. Riegner stated that the project team met with representatives from The Office of State Planning Coordination, Kent and Sussex County and the City of Milford on March 7,



2006 to discuss a qualitative measure of how the US 113 alternatives fit into Livable Delaware. He reviewed the results of that meeting and how the alternatives were rated. Mr. Riegner also mentioned that the brown alternative had not yet been added to the ARDS and therefore was not included in the discussion. Mr. Riegner reminded the working group that Livable Delaware is only one of many criteria for determining a preferred alternative.

Mr. David Edgell, who also attended the meeting, agreed with the project team's assessment of the meeting.

Mr. Riegner then presented the shifts that have been made to the on-alignment (yellow) and east bypass alternatives. Mr. Riegner reminded the working group that some of these shifts were presented at the previous working group meeting in February and there are no alignment shifts to report for the brown alignment.

Mr. Kramer reiterated that some of the shifts presented tonight are required to avoid potential cultural resource/historical property impacts identified by the project team. Mr. Kramer mentioned that these impacts, if unavoidable could become a "fatal flaw" issue. Mr. Kramer also indicated that the shifts may cause the WG to view an alternative as a less attractive option.

Mr. David Mick voiced concern about emergency vehicle access for vehicles coming from the west side of US 113 traveling to the hospital on the east side of US 113.

Mr. Riegner stated that emergency vehicle access is a significant issue associated with the yellow alternative.

Mr. Scott Adkisson mentioned that Shawnee Acres is incorrectly identified as Meadowgate Acres on the east bypass alternatives maps.

Mr. Skip Pikus asked for clarification about how side roads will cross the proposed purple east bypass alternative. Mr. Pikus asked if the proposed roadway will be elevated over Clendaniel Pond Road.

Mr. Riegner replied that in an effort to reduce noise and impacts to homes along Clendaniel Pond Road, the proposed purple alignment will be below existing ground and Clendaniel Pond Road will cross over US 113.

Mr. Pikus asked how high the road will be when crossing the railroad and the cross roads. Mr. Riegner indicated that the proposed roadway will be approximately 30 feet above the railroad and 20 feet above the cross roads.

Mr. Bruce Wright asked how far below Clendaniel Pond Road will the new road be. Mr. Riegner replied it will be approximately 20 feet below the existing ground.



Mr. Elliot Workman questioned the feasibility of excavating so far below ground with the high water table and inability to drain the runoff. Mr. Riegner said that this is something the project team will consider as the alternatives are refined.

Mr. Edgell asked how Rehoboth Boulevard will be accessed from SR 1 with the proposed interchanges associated with the east bypass alternatives. Mr. Riegner indicated that it will require one additional turn via Cedar Neck Road.

Mr. Joe Wutka then presented the shifts in the alignments for the west bypass alternatives.

Mr. Stevenson asked about the increase in traffic along SR 1 and whether the bypass will divert enough traffic. Mr. Stevenson also asked if the project team has looked at future growth east of SR 1.

Mr. Pikus asked about the properties impacted by the on ramp from the blue alternative to northbound SR 1. Mr. Pikus asked which properties would be taken and which will still have access to SR 1. Mr. Wutka replied that none of the properties along SR 1 adjacent to the proposed acceleration lane will have access to SR 1. Mr. Wutka indicated that there is a potential for access along New Wharf Road.

Ms. Connie Fox asked how far north the proposed acceleration lane will extend. Mr. Wutka indicated that the proposed merge ends at Jenkins Road.

Mr. Kramer then asked the group if they had any additional questions regarding the shifts to the alternatives. Mr. Kramer then proceeded to discuss the five key issues that the project team will be focusing on for the rest of 2006. Mr. Kramer indicated that these key issues will drive the project schedule as we move forward to select a preferred alternative. Mr. Kramer recognized that the project is taking longer than originally anticipated due to the fact that we are studying new areas and creating a database for the agencies.

Mr. Kramer reminded the WG that the purpose of this project is to identify, select and protect the corridor for the preferred alternative. Mr. Kramer also stated that there is still an extensive effort required to obtain agency approval and complete the environmental documentation.

Mr. Riegner then presented key issues associated with the yellow and east bypass alternatives. Mr. Riegner mentioned that potential historic properties along both sides of US 113 may incur avoidable 4(f) impacts for the yellow alternative.

Mr. Mick asked if EMS access would be considered as part of the community cohesion concerns.



Mr. Mike Simmons indicated that the EMS access is independent of community cohesion and should be listed separately.

Mr. Mark Mallamo expressed concern about the inability of local north/south access across Haven Lake with the limited access for the yellow alternative. Mr. Mallamo stated that it eliminates one of the most used north/south crossings making it difficult for local residents to get to town.

Mr. Kramer confirmed that Mr. Mallamo's concern is that the yellow alternative reduces the utility of the north/south route.

Mr. Ed Kee asked about direct versus indirect impacts to wetlands and whether consideration is given to the effects of runoff and pollutants to downstream wetlands not directly impacted by the roadway. Mr. Kee stated that although the wetland impacts along the east bypass alternatives are not as big, they are still a concern.

Mr. Riegner stated that there are stormwater management standards for both quantity and quality that are established to reduce impacts to downstream waterways.

Mr. Kee also expressed concern about the mobility of farm equipment across the proposed bypass alternatives. Mr. Kee mentioned it will be difficult for farm equipment to traverse an overpass or access different areas of a farm property split by a proposed alternative.

Mr. Stevenson indicated that all traffic will be affected, limiting access to cross roads and affecting school bus routes south of the proposed alignment.

Mr. Riegner indicated that none of the existing side streets access will be eliminated under any of the bypass alternatives.

Mr. Mick mentioned that the bypass routes impact two fire districts and service along the proposed roadway will be difficult. Mr. Riegner indicated that exclusive gated access and crossovers may be provided to improve EMS access along the bypass route.

Mr. Stevenson expressed concern about the volume of traffic (100,000 veh) along SR 1/US 113 and the amount of weaving necessary to access the bypass route. Mr. Stevenson questioned whether the proposed bypass will divert enough traffic from SR 1.

Mr. Riegner indicated that the traffic models currently being analyzed will demonstrate whether a particular alternative meets the purpose and need for the project. Mr. Riegner also reminded the WG that all the east bypass alternatives include widening a section of SR 1 from the US 113/SR 1 split to where the bypass leaves SR 1.



Mr. Adkisson asked if the proposed improvements include the upgrades at SR 1 and 10th Street. Mr. Hite replied that those improvements were part of the SR 1 Corridor Capacity Program and will most likely be constructed as a short-term/mid-term project. Mr. Hite also indicated that all at-grade intersections along SR 1 will eventually be replaced with an interchange or removed.

Mr. Stevenson asked if the traffic models account for growth east of SR 1. Mr. Riegner indicated that the project team works closely with the county and Milford to account for proposed development and the models predict substantial growth.

Mr. Robert Burris asked if US 113 is congested, won't people automatically use the bypass. Mr. Riegner said the model can't assume that and some intersections in town will continue to be unacceptable.

Mr. Burris asked if the traffic projections will demonstrate a need for the project. Mr. Reigner stated that the current projections based on future growth in the area are expected to continue to show a need for this project.

Mr. Pikus asked about the possibility of US 113 becoming a toll road. Mr. Hite indicated that US 113 is not planned to be a toll road. Mr. Bruce Wright asked how SR 1 became a toll road if it was at this same stage of planning. Mr. Bill Hellmann said that changing US 113 to a toll road will require an EIS re-assessment because our current traffic analysis does not include a toll facility.

Mr. Pikus asked about the impacts to Fitzgerald's associated with the brown alternative. Mr. Riegner said the exact impact will be determined as part of the continued study.

Mr. Brooke Clendaniel asked what will happen if the area between Fitzgerald's and Haflinger Road is "really wet." Mr. Karl Kratzer indicated that it will most likely be a sliver impact and the quality of wetlands is already reduced by swales.

Mr. Wutka then presented key issues associated with the west bypass alternatives.

Mr. Stevenson mentioned that an interchange along the orange alternative is near a future school and access will be critical.

Mr. Wutka indicated that there will be a significant amount of agricultural impacts associated with the west bypass alternatives.

Mr. Stevenson stated there are bald eagles throughout the west bypass study areas including Clendaniel Pond.

Mr. Edgell inquired about access to SR 1 and the proposed orange alternative west of Frederica. Mr. Edgell expressed concern regarding limited access and the amount of



proposed development in the area. Mr. Edgell also asked about access for parcels west of Frederica. Mr. Wutka said there is a possibility to reconfigure the interchange to improve access, but access from Frederica will be similar to present day conditions. Mr. Hite also stated that the SR 1/SR 12 interchange will be upgraded in the future.

Mr. Burris asked if SR 1 will be limited access north of the US 113 split. Mr. Wutka replied that DelDOT has plans to convert SR 1 to limited access beginning as far north as the Dover Air Force Base. Mr. Simmons also mentioned that design is currently underway for a grade separated interchange at SR 1 and Thompsonville Road.

Mr. Kramer asked the working group if there are any additional issues that should be specifically addressed at the workshops in June. Mr. Kramer thanked the working group for all their input because it will be very useful for the project team when discussing the project with the members from the public.

Mr. Burris asked when construction might begin. Mr. Hite reminded the WG that the intent of the project is to identify, select and protect a corridor and it is too early to put a timeline on construction. Mr. Hite added that the project is currently funded to select a preferred alternative and additional funding will be requested in FY 2007 for preliminary design and advanced R/W acquisition. Mr. Hite also stated that final design and construction will not happen in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Pikus asked if cost estimates will be provided. Mr. Hite indicated that cost estimates including construction and r/w costs will be provided at the next WG meeting. Mr. Kramer added that the WG will have ample opportunity to review those costs prior to making a decision.

Mr. Burris asked if the proposed improvements in Milford will happen first once a preferred alternative is chosen. Mr. Kramer said it is too early to determine where construction will start due to future need and political factors. Mr. Kramer stated that the proposed EIS for each project area will be a separate document to allow for each area to progress independently.

Mr. Simmons mentioned that due to the scope of the project it will be funded and constructed piecewise. Mr. Simmons added that DelDOT is committed to moving forward with the project although there is no specific timeline.

Mr. Kee asked if the no-build alternative is still on the table and Mr. Kramer replied yes.

Mr. Adkisson asked about the next steps of the process. Mr. Kramer indicated that the goal is to select a single preferred alternative based on the feedback from the WG, public and agencies and submit the environmental document for final FHWA approval.



Mr. Kramer then reminded the working group about the public workshops scheduled for Monday, June 19th and Tuesday, June 20th and asked that they try to attend for at least one hour. Mr. Kramer also reiterated that the working group will reconvene in January 2007 to allow the project team the remainder of 2006 to address the key issues discussed tonight.

Mr. Kramer adjourned the meeting at 8:35 PM.

Working group members in attendance:

| | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Scott Adkisson | Lawrence Lank |
| Robert Burris | Michael Levensgood |
| I.G. Burton, III | Mark Mallamo |
| F. Brooke Clendaniel | Randy Marvel |
| Mark Davis | David Mick |
| David Edgell | Jerry Pekas |
| Jerry Peters | Skip Pikus |
| Scott Fitzgerald | Ronald Robbins |
| Connie Fox | Mike Simmons |
| Wyatt Hammond | Glen Stevenson |
| Keith Hudson | Elliott Workman |
| Edward Kee | Bruce Wright |

Members of the public in attendance:

| | |
|----------------------|------------------|
| Carl Bouchard | Robert Kennedy |
| John Chemey | Lynda Massey |
| Allen Beachy | Jerrie Pope |
| Gail Corder | Theresa Plummer |
| Ida and Orray Corder | Joe Plummer |
| Will Fox | John Scarborough |
| Robert Glasco | Sally Smith |
| Carolyn Hill | Sonny Vuono |
| Robert Hitchens | Joe Warnell |