



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: March 31, 2005

Time: 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Location: CHEER Center, Georgetown, Delaware

Topic: Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting #6

Attendees: See Page 3

Call to Order

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. He welcomed everyone and thanked the Working Group members for their attendance. He indicated that there were several items in the agenda and a significant amount of material to cover as we move toward selection of Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS).

Opening Remarks

Monroe Hite, III welcomed attendees and reviewed the handout materials for the project notebook. He updated everyone on the many project meetings and workshops that have occurred and proposed meetings that are currently planned throughout the different project areas.

Traffic Analysis

Jeff Riegner presented information about the project planning process and the four stages associated with that process. He mentioned that we were at Stage 1 of the traffic analysis, which includes establishing future traffic for the year 2030. He reminded the group that traffic volumes are predicted using a peninsula model network that analyzes traffic throughout an area much larger than Sussex County and the State of Delaware. Mr. Riegner also indicated that the future volumes for this project would be based on summer average daily traffic (SADT) due to the impact of seasonal travel.

He mentioned that travel demand models are used to approximate current use and forecast future use of roadways in a study area. He reviewed some of the data sources that are utilized for predicting traffic in a given area and how the model is calibrated to help provide better results. Mr. Riegner continued by presenting some of the preliminary findings along existing roadways within the corridor, including existing and future no-build conditions.



Cost Estimates

Joe Wutka presented some preliminary information about how cost estimates are developed at this stage of the project. He reiterated that no preliminary alternative is being considered for elimination because of cost. He reviewed some of the major quantity items that are typically considered and can be approximated based on the information currently available. He then explained how other quantity items are estimated based on a percentage of the total anticipated cost. Mr. Wutka mentioned that the costs are then compared with actual per mile costs along SR

Economic Impact Analysis

Mr. Riegner presented information about economic impact and how it is determined. He stated that economic impact could be analyzed in two ways: regionally and locally. He indicated that the project team would be analyzing both to determine the economic impact for the project.

Review of Comments

Bill Hellmann and Joe Wutka reviewed a general comment summary from stakeholders at recent meetings. Mr. Hellmann reminded the group that the project team receives comments from the Working Groups, the general public and the environmental resource agencies to help with the decision making process.

Alternatives Review

Mr. Riegner and Mr. Wutka reviewed the preliminary alternatives and specific comments from the public and resource agencies. They reviewed the bypass and on-alignment alternatives and presented some alignment changes that have been made since the last working group meeting.

Mr. Riegner then presented some specific information about the third lane on-alignment option. At the request of working group members as well as the general public, the project team reviewed the potential for adding a third lane AT GRADE in each direction along US 113 to increase capacity. Based on preliminary traffic analyses, the results indicate that two signalized intersections at SR 18/SR 404 and US 9 will operate at unacceptable levels of service with the third lane option. Mr. Riegner indicated this option needs further study to determine if it meets long-term transportation needs.

MATE Process

Mr. Hellmann next reviewed the project status with respect to the MATE Environmental Streamlining Process. He reminded attendees that the next step in Alternatives Development is to select the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). He indicated that studying a full range of alternatives in detail would not be an effective approach.

Mr. Hellmann then explained how we narrow down the alternatives based on a comparison matrix that includes impacts to natural resources, cultural resources, properties, etc. as well as traffic benefit and costs. The recommendation on which alternatives will be retained for detailed study will be based on a balance among all of these factors.



Schedule/Next Steps

Mr. Hite presented the upcoming project schedule and reminded the group that their attendance is important as we move toward the selection of the ARDS.

Upcoming Working Group meetings for the Georgetown area are scheduled for April 21 and May 18 and a public workshop is scheduled for June 13. He asked members to plan to attend the public workshop for at least one hour if possible.

To wrap up, Mr. Kramer said that the project team continues to move forward on an aggressive schedule and the project team is working hard to provide as much information as possible to the public and the resource agencies. He thanked members for their attendance and adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.

Working group members in attendance:

Howard Abbott, Jr.
Corp. Lance Abbott (for Lt. Mitch Cooper)
David Baird
Eric Buehl
Carol R. Campbell-Hansen
Mark Davis
David Diehl
Martin Donovan (for Lynda Messick)
Lit Dryden
Matthew Gibbs
Harold Johnson
Terry Johnson
Wesley Jones
Carlton Moore, Sr.
Karen O'Neill
Guy Phillips
Don Plows (for Mike Simmons)

Others in attendance:

Donna Atkinson – Landowner on Parker Rd