

Date of Meeting: February 11, 2004
Time: 5:30 PM – 8:30 PM
Location: Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall
Topic: US 113 North/South Study
Millsboro-South Area Working Group
Meeting No. 1
Attendees: See attached

The following is a summary of the meeting discussion:

- The Working Group viewed the US 113 video “The Time to Act is Now” prior to the meeting.
- Bob Kramer called the meeting to order and welcomed the Millsboro-South Working Group members to their first meeting. The Working Group members then introduced themselves and their affiliation.
- Mike Simmons thanked the members for agreeing to serve on the Working Group. He noted the value of public involvement in DeIDOT projects and stressed the importance of the North/South study to DeIDOT, Sussex County and the Millsboro-South area along the US 113 corridor. He stated that the involvement and active participation of each of the towns along US 113, as well as local business and community leaders, farmers and other property owners is essential to the success of this study. Mr. Simmons noted that the US 113 North/South study will carry out the recommendations in the Sussex County North/South Transportation Feasibility Study. In a cooperative effort between Sussex County and DeIDOT, the feasibility study confirmed the feasibility of a north/south limited access highway through Sussex County and recommended that the US 113 corridor be studied for that purpose. Mr. Simmons noted that US 113 will be the spine of the Sussex County Transportation system for years to come.
- Mr. Simmons noted that the purpose of the Working Group was to help DeIDOT develop, analyze and review alternatives for establishing a limited access highway in this area of the US 113 corridor, using the existing roadway where feasible. Mr. Simmons further noted that the Working Group will serve an important advisory role to the department as one component of an overall public involvement effort that will also include public workshops, a project web site and consultation and coordination with state and federal environmental resource agencies. Mr. Simmons referred to the extensive listening tour effort to date involving over 150 interviews with individuals and representatives of various organizations in the US 113 corridor. He stressed that this study is a joint effort by DeIDOT and Sussex County government. Mr. Simmons then introduced Bob Stickels, Administrator for Sussex County.
- Mr. Stickels referred to DeIDOT as a partner in this study effort and emphasized the need for a limited access north/south highway in Sussex County. He noted the importance of all three north/south routes (US 13, US 113, and SR 1). Mr. Stickels referred to Maryland’s plans to dualize MD 404 and US 113. He also noted that requests for DeIDOT to increase transportation funding in Sussex County had been ignored until the last three years and commended Secretary Hayward for his significant support. He discussed the importance of the County’s partnership with DeIDOT and indicated that this project will hopefully be a model for future land use/transportation efforts. He stated that the County is going to grow – like it or not.
- Monroe Hite, III, DeIDOT Project Manager for the US 113 North/South study, thanked the Working Group for accepting the challenge. Mr. Hite noted DeIDOT realizes the rapid pace of development in the US 113 Corridor, therefore, timing is critical. He stressed the importance of developing a plan that has broad-based support. He noted that the process that DeIDOT must follow will be discussed later in the meeting, and that the Department intends to move forward as quickly and efficiently as possible. He then introduced the Project Team members, also noting the role each will play during the study (see project notebook Tab 2 and Tab 3, slide 4). Mr. Hite then quickly reviewed the contents of the project notebook and stated that the Project Team would provide material at each meeting for easy insertion into the notebook. Mr. Hite reviewed the dates established for Working Group meetings Nos. 2 and 3, i.e., March 10 and April 28, respectively. He noted that tonight’s meeting will primarily involve the Project Team providing information to the Working Group, but future meetings will involve a more active exchange between the members of the

Working Group and Project Team. Mr. Hite then reviewed the Project Team effort to date including the video preparation, the listening tour involving over 150 interviews, 3 public workshops in October, data collection, etc. (see Tab 2). Mr. Hite advised that any Working Group member who wished to receive a copy of the video should contact him.

- Mr. Kramer then briefly discussed the Working Group guidelines (Tab 1) and requested that members review the guidelines prior to discussion, potential modification, and approval at the next Working Group meeting. Mr. Kramer noted that these guidelines attempt to describe how the Working Group will function. The guidelines discuss “how we treat each other,” “how we make recommendations,” “how we communicate with the outside,” etc. He noted that hopefully the Group will work by consensus, (“i.e., a sense of the Group”) and will only formally vote when absolutely necessary. He stressed that all opinions are valid and that there will be no suppression of ideas. He stated that it is his job, as facilitator, to keep the Group moving ahead.
- Mr. Kramer then discussed the results of the more than 150 interviews completed to date as part of the listening tour effort, and the October Public Workshops. The results are summarized on slides 8 – 10 (Tab 3) and in more detail under Tab 4.
- Mr. Hite then reviewed the Project Team Purpose and Need and the Overall Goals and Objectives for the Study (Tab 3, slides 11 and 12). All alternatives subsequently developed will be evaluated with respect to the project Purpose and Need. Alternatives that do not meet Purpose and Need will not be retained for detailed study.
- Mr. Hite then reviewed the draft Vision, Goals and Objectives for the study area (Tab 3, slide 13, and Tab 5). Mr. Hite expressed the Department’s goal to convert US 113 to a limited access highway, utilizing as much of the existing US 113 general alignment as possible, while addressing existing and projected transportation needs and anticipated land development in the US 113 corridor. He noted that the Project Team developed this “first cut” of the Vision, Goals and Objectives, and stressed the importance of Working Group, Resource Agency, and Public comments on these items. The goals and objectives are extremely important, and although somewhat general in nature, will guide the development and evaluation of short, mid, and long-term alternatives. Mr. Hite requested that Working Group members review the “first-cut”, which was developed using information from several appropriate documents (Tab 3, slide 13) and be ready to discuss these at the next meeting.
- Faye Lingo briefly reviewed the development outlook for Millsboro. She noted that the Millsboro comprehensive plan was adopted in September 2001. Ms. Lingo noted that 1,000 new units were currently moving ahead with an additional 3,000 units in the planning stage. She referred to the recent past where Millsboro was dealing with developments in the 20 to 50-acre range as compared to current proposals in the 50- to 200/-300-acre range. She stressed that the 4,000 potential units did not include anticipated commercial development and noted the town’s desire to have people live and work in Millsboro. Finally Ms. Lingo expressed concern over the future of US 113.
- Gary Taylor discussed the current and anticipated development in the Selbyville area. He noted that 175 units have been approved and groundbreaking was imminent. Mr. Taylor also noted that an additional 160 units have been proposed on SR 54 east of town and that additional development is likely to occur both east and west of US 113. Mr. Taylor described the town’s efforts to upgrade the sewage system to accommodate development. East of US 113 the town is currently upgrading the sewage pumping station to accommodate development. Mr. Taylor then described the future potential business expansion along both sides of US 113 to the north of town. He emphasized the need for the Project Team and Working Group to carefully consider how US 113 improvements are implemented in this area of vital importance to the town. Finally, Mr. Taylor expressed concern over the east/west highway corridors in Sussex County and the need for appropriate consideration of these critical routes, as well as US 113. He stated that the town is expanding sewer and water and getting ready for growth.
- Jeff Riegner noted that representatives from Frankford and Dagsboro were unable to attend the Working Group meeting. He stated that Frankford anticipated no significant development at this time. Mr. Riegner also noted that Dagsboro, which currently has a population of about 600 and 200-300 homes, has indicated the potential for 3,500 additional units.
- Lynn Bullock asked whether the US 113 study would evaluate connections to major east/west routes. Mr. Hite responded that the US 113 North/South study would include consideration of connections between US 113 and east/west routes. Joan Boyce added that it will be difficult to only look at US 113 when there are issues regarding Routes 24, 26,

54 and other east/west routes. She noted that it would be helpful to have Maureen Mauger and other DelDOT personnel provide updates on other studies within the area to help guide the Working Group efforts.

- Ms. Lingo also raised concern with focusing on just north/south routes without dealing with the east/west routes. Ms. Lingo referred to Long Neck and the 3,500 – 4,000 units located on the east/west routes to the east of Millsboro.
- Mr. Hite noted that Mr. Simmons would discuss prior, current and future DelDOT efforts in the east/west corridors, later in the meeting.
- Peter Frederick questioned whether only limited access facilities would be studied. Mr. Hite responded that DelDOT's goal is to provide a limited access highway, but that short, mid and long-term alternatives will be considered ranging from immediate operational improvements to a longer-term limited-access highway. Compatibility between short, mid and long-term improvements will be considered.
- Bruce Richards asked whether there are any limitations on funding for the Working Group recommendations and whether federal funds were going to be used to meet these recommendations. Mr. Hite noted that the option to use federal funds for improvements will be retained throughout the study by complying with appropriate federal procedures and requirements. The cost of an improvement will be a factor that DelDOT will consider, particularly in determining when to proceed with an improvement.
- Bob Stuart asked whether the Working Group would have access to traffic studies and data to help understand where people are going. Mr. Hite responded "yes."
- Bill Hellmann re-introduced the Project Team Task Managers for the three broad study components, i.e. Traffic, Safety and Engineering (Tom Hannan), Community Involvement (Bob Kramer) and Environmental/Land Use (Tom Heil).
- Mr. Hellmann then briefly described that the data gathered and developed for the three study components and the Study Vision, Goals and Objectives would guide the development and evaluation of alternatives. All of this information will be provided to the Resource Agencies, the Working Groups and the General Public for their input (Tab 3, slide 14). Mr. Hellmann then very briefly reviewed the environmental coordination and consultation process for the study, referred to as the Mid-Atlantic Transportation and Environmental Streamlining Process (MATE) (Tab 3, slide 15), noting that Step 1 (Planning) was virtually complete, that Steps 2 and 3 were underway (Scoping and Purpose and Need) and that Step 4 would get underway shortly (Alternatives Development).
- Mr. Hannan then reviewed the efforts to date in collecting traffic, accidents and land use data and how that data would be used in developing and evaluating alternatives. He explained that existing traffic data that was collected included counts, composition (trucks/cars), other users (transit/peds/cyclists), usage characteristics (by day, week, month, season and local/through), origins/destinations, access points and system performance. Future traffic was forecast using DelDOT's regional model. This effort yielded two key finds about traffic levels in the out year of the model, about 20 years from now:
 - Average daily traffic will approach current peak season traffic levels.
 - Peak season traffic will be as much as 2/3 higher than it is today.
- Safety was assessed using three years of accident data. There was a high percentage of rear end accidents, which is common for a road with traffic signals such as US 113. In addition, 4.5 miles of the 21 miles of 1113 in the study section has a higher accident rate in the evening, than the statewide average for similar roads.
- Socioeconomic studies indicated that there has been and will continue to be a steady climb in population in all of Sussex County – approximately 28% on average between 1990 and 2000; approximately 12% projected every 10 years through 2030. Households and employment will grow at a similar rate.
- Land coverage in the County has changed over the past ten years. Agricultural and forested lands and wetlands declined slightly while residential land use increased. Known land development information presented earlier in the evening will be used to help the Working Group and Project Team develop solutions that better fit this area. The land use maps will be continually updated during the study.
- Mr. Kramer then reviewed the overall community involvement effort including ongoing interviews, the October Public Workshops and smaller meetings anticipated during subsequent phases of the study with those most directly affected. Mr. Kramer indicated that the Working Group will be advised of the results of all meetings held by the Project Team. Mr. Kramer pointed out that in addition to the advice and recommendations that the Working

Group will provide, the Department will consider input from the federal and state resource agencies and the general public (largely from the Public Workshops and e-mails). Furthermore, he indicated that given the magnitude of this project and the likely improvements that will be proposed, the Governor and General Assembly will be involved, particularly when it comes to funding decisions.

- Mr. Heil then reviewed the effort to date to collect environmental and cultural resources data and noted that ultimately alternatives will be developed in a manner that attempts first to avoid resources and, if not possible, to minimize impacts on resources and to mitigate unavoidable impacts.
- Mr. Heil then discussed the coordination to date between the Project Team and the Environmental Resource Agencies, which has involved sharing data collected, along with two field reviews of the US 113 corridor. Mr. Heil discussed the constraints map provided to all Working Group members, which indicates the environmental and cultural resources identified to date in the Millsboro-South study area. Mr. Heil reviewed the various resources noted on the map and requested that Working Group members review the map and provide, at the next meeting, comments on resources that may have been missed. Mr. Heil expressed the importance of attempting to identify resources early in the process, prior to developing and subsequently evaluating alternatives.
- Mr. Hannan then presented information about alternatives development. He noted that should the Working Group identify problems that can be addressed with feasible short-term solutions, these solutions could proceed in advance of the long-term-solutions. Examples of these types of solutions include:
 - Traffic Signal Modifications
 - Improved signing
 - Turn lanes/prohibitions
- Mr. Hannan mentioned the work that the Engineering team is working with DelDOT Traffic to upgrade signals along 113 and the east/west routes south of Millsboro. Phased implementation of the improvements will take place over the next several years.
- For the long-term plan, the Project Team will solicit input from the Working Group on alternatives that:
 - Respond to the Purpose and the Need and Vision, Goals and Objectives
 - DelDOT can secure approval and can build (environmental documents, permits, funding, etc.)
- The types of limited-access roadway alternatives that will be considered include:
 - No-Build
 - More significant improvements to existing US 113 (e.g. Interchanges and/or frontage roads)
 - Upgrade of existing road systems (essentially the same type of roadway as today, but with minor modifications – e.g. reduce signals, driveways, crossovers, etc.)
 - New roadway alignments (bypasses)
- Richard Kautz asked about the area within the Cypress Swamp that is not wetlands and how is it accessed. Mr. Heil responded that the upland area is a series of fields used for agricultural purposes. The area appears to have been drained using ditches and has access from the west.
- Ann Marie Townshend asked whether the wetland files were based on NWI and DNREC mapping or were they based on the newest SWAMP data. Tom responded the environmental inventory is based on the latest DRREC mapping and the DelDOT is awaiting the updated SWAMP data from DNREC. Once the new SWAMP mapping is available, the environmental constraints mapping will be revised and updated.
- Tran Norwood requested a copy of the environmental Inventory book. **Note:** A copy was forwarded to Mr. Norwood following the meeting.
- Mr. Simmons then reviewed the substantial DelDOT projects in various stages of development throughout Sussex County, referring to a list and map of the projects (Tab 3, slides 16 and 17). Mr. Simmons noted that these projects involve a DelDOT commitment of \$350 million in transportation funds to Sussex County.
- Mr. Simmons then reviewed prior DelDOT East/West Corridor Study efforts in the 1970's, 1980's and 1990's, many of which considered major capacity improvements. He noted, however, that none of these studies led to construction due to significant local opposition. Mr. Simmons stated that this opposition led DelDOT to change direction, i.e., recent efforts have focused on operational improvements, such as the addition of center turning lanes,

bypass lanes, and local road improvements which result in a better overall transportation network/highway grid. Mr. Simmons referred to the East-West Study currently being conducted by DelDOT's Planning Division in the Southeast and Northwest areas of Sussex County. The study is scheduled to be completed in the summer and will establish priorities for projects that will move from planning to project development (Transportation Solutions Division). Mr. Simmons referred to the significant commitment of DelDOT funds in the 6-year Capital Transportation Program (CTP) for east/west routes, e.g., SR 26 (\$28M), SR 54 (\$30M), SR 24 (\$72M), among others. Finally, Mr. Simmons encouraged the members to review the projects in the CTP (Tab 3, slides 16 and 17) and to call him should they have questions. He acknowledged that Sussex County has significant needs, but noted that DelDOT has made a significant financial commitment (\$350M) and is making a significant manpower effort to address those needs.

- Mr. Hite then reviewed the Study Schedule (Tab 7), noting that the next two or three meetings would involve brainstorming and evaluating conceptual alternatives for the US 113 corridor. This effort would be followed by a series of workshops requesting public comments on the project effort to date. Mr. Hite further noted that, following the Public Workshops, the Project Team would begin a period of more detailed analysis of retained alternatives.
- Mr. Hite reminded the Working Group of the importance of their providing comments on the Draft Vision, Goals and Objectives and the constraints map.
- Mr. Hite then spoke about future meetings. The March 10 and April 28 Working Group meetings will address alternatives development and will lead up to a public workshop. He indicated that the proposed schedule called for the Working Group to take the summer off, then reconvene in the fall for 2 or 3 meetings (alternatives retained for detailed analysis phase), then picking up again in early 2005 with a series of meetings to determine preferred/recommended alternatives. Mr. Hite anticipates the study will take about 18 months to complete with about nine Working Group meetings, i.e., meeting about every two months (excluding the Christmas Holiday and summer periods).
- Mr. Hite reminded members that, should anyone want a copy of the Environmental Inventory or video, to please let him know.
- Mr. Hite then offered two options for beginning the development of alternatives. The first option would begin with a "blank slate", using a map of the corridor as a base, with the Working Group members developing suggestions and conceptual alternatives to upgrade US 113 in this study area to a limited-access highway. Mr. Hite then presented a second option that would have the Project Team using what they have learned from the listening tour and workshops, as well as background research to date on various constraints, and provide initial ideas and concepts to the Working Group as a starting point. The Working Group would then offer comments and suggestions on these ideas and concepts as well as propose additional alternatives.
- Mr. Kramer again reviewed the two approaches. Following a brief discussion by the members, the Working Group reached a consensus to pursue Option 2.
- Mr. Kramer noted that the next meeting would be held on March 10, 2004 beginning at 5:30 at the Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall.
- Mr. Kramer asked the Working Group to review 3 items, prior to the next meeting, and come prepared for a discussion:
 - Working Group Guidelines
 - Vision, Goals and Objectives
 - Constraints Map
- Mr. Kramer said the agenda for the next meeting will include those three items and initial discussion on the development of conceptual alternatives.
- The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.

MILLSBORO-SOUTH AREA WORKING GROUP

MEETING NO. 1

February 11, 2004

5:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

ATTENDANCE (Indicated by √)	WORKING GROUP MEMBERS	REPRESENTING
---------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------

(Indicated by √)		
	Atherton, Ronald	Frankford Town Council
	Becton, Thea	First State Community Action Agency
	Bennett, Jim	Bennett Orchard
√	Boyce, Joan	Millsboro/Dagsboro Chamber of Commerce
√	Bullock, Lynn	Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company
√	Collins, Donald	Sussex County Farm Bureau
	Conner, S. Bradley	Mayor, Dagsboro
	Daisey, Robert	Business Owner
√	Davis, Mark	Delaware Department of Agriculture
	Dismuke, Charles	Frankford Planning Commission
√	Dyer, Preston	Developer
√	Frederick, Peter	Councilman, Fenwick Island
√	Kautz, Richard	Sussex County Planning & Zoning Commission
√	Lingo, Faye	Town Manager, Millsboro
	Marino, Roger	Mountaire Farms, Inc.
√	McGrath, Karen	Bethany/Fenwick Chamber of Commerce
√	Mitchell, John	Indian River School District
√	Mitchell, Margaret	Millsboro Historical Society
√	Norwood, Tran	Nanticoke Indian Association
	Parker, Clifton	Farmer
√	Pfaff, Bill	Delaware Small Business Development Center
√	Richards, Bruce	Center for the Inland Bays
√	Simmons, Mike	Project Development (South Region), DelDOT
√	Stuart, Robert	Sussex County Emergency Medical Services
√	Taylor, Gary	Town Manager, Selbyville
	Thoroughgood, John	Millsboro Town Council, Planning Commission
√	Townshend, Ann Marie	Office of State Planning Coordination
	VonVille, Marissa	La Esperanza, Inc.
	Warrington, Michael	Delaware State Police, Troop 4
	White, George	Townsend, Inc.

MILLSBORO-SOUTH WORKING GROUP MEETING NO. 1 February 11, 2004 5:30 PM – 8:30 PM Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall		
CITIZENS	REPRESENTING (if applicable)	ADDRESS
Robert Stickels	Sussex County Council	PO Box 589 Georgetown DE 19947