



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: January 24, 2006

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

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

Topic: **Milford Area Working Group Meeting No. 11**

Attendees: See Attached

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:42 p.m. He indicated that this was the eleventh Milford Working Group Meeting and that the next meeting is scheduled for February 21st. Bob reminded the working group members that the project team will continue to analyze the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). Bob thanked the working group for their continued attendance and reminded them of the importance of their input as we present information and work through the process to determine a preferred alternative.

Monroe Hite, III welcomed the group and indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to review information added to the matrix since the last meeting and discuss how that information may affect recommendations. He then mentioned the Lincoln Community Meeting held January 10, 2006. The meeting was arranged by the Concerned Citizens of Greater Lincoln Committee and there were approximately 600 people in attendance. He thanked those working group members who attended. He reviewed some of the major issues addressed during the meeting and many of the comments and questions provided by the attendees. Mr. Hite discussed the current project schedule and how we have reached this point in the process. He reiterated that no final decisions have been made.

Ed Kee agreed with Mr. Hite that the Lincoln meeting was beneficial, but he felt there was some acknowledgment by the public that “doing nothing” is an option.

Carl King then submitted a petition to Mr. Hite with 826 signatures of those residents who oppose the east bypass alternatives.



Glenn Stevenson complimented the project team members on their efforts at the Lincoln meeting and reiterated that the meeting went well. He agreed with Mr. Kee about the fact that some residents consider “doing nothing” a viable option.

Ronald Robbins then indicated that he has heard support for the on-alignment alternative.

Mr. Hite continued reviewing comments and issues discussed at the Lincoln meeting including funding, development and traffic issues. He reminded everyone that we are working towards a goal of identifying a preferred alternative so that when funding becomes available, it can be used to begin to preserve the corridor and eventually fund construction, even if that doesn’t begin until 15 to 20 years from now.

Mr. Hite then introduced Jeff Riegner to discuss the ARDS and the adjustments that have been made since the last meeting. Mr. Riegner discussed updates to the on-alignment (Yellow) and the two east bypass (Green and Purple) alternatives retained for detailed study. A few shifts in the alignments of the east bypass alternatives have occurred to avoid cultural resources identified in the current matrix. Mr. Riegner then introduced Joe Wutka to discuss changes to the west bypass alternatives (Orange and Blue).

Mr. Riegner then introduced Steve Landau to discuss the preliminary results of the economic impact analysis. Mr. Landau provided a brief summary of the components of the economic study, including the results of the business surveys, an overview of the US 113 corridor economy, and direct and indirect economic impacts. Mr. Kramer clarified that the information presented at this meeting was only one of three parts of the direct/indirect economic impact analysis. Mr. Landau indicated that the results of the impact analysis will ultimately provide a net loss/gain in jobs and businesses for the whole US 113 corridor and the Milford study area. Mr. Landau continued discussion about the results of the business survey and presented preliminary job loss numbers associated with direct impacts to businesses that will be physically impacted by each alternative.

Richard Carmean asked Mr. Landau how comfortable he was with the accuracy of the “500 or more” jobs that will be lost as a result of the on-alignment alternative, since it seemed like a lot. Mr. Landau said he felt it was a reasonable number, but also mentioned it is not a complete analysis.

Skip Pikus asked how many jobs are in the corridor. Mr. Landau indicated that based on the analysis, he estimates that there are approximately 2,100 jobs in the Milford/Lincoln section of the US 113 corridor.

David Edgell asked if the preliminary job loss data included farms. He requested that, as part of the detailed economic study, Mr. Landau include agriculture income losses for each alternative. Mr. Landau replied that he will investigate the potential for determining agricultural impacts and report his findings at a future meeting.



Mr. Riegner then presented information about the Livable Delaware initiative and how it relates to the US 113 project. He indicated that it is a state strategy to provide infrastructure improvements to projected or planned growth areas. In order to provide a qualitative measure for comparison between alternatives, the project team developed a

quantitative measure based on the impact areas within each level of anticipated growth. Mr. Edgell clarified that the growth areas shown on the map are based on a strategy developed during 2003-2004 while the US 113 project was still on-going. The limits of the expected levels of development were not intended to coincide with a particular alternative.

Mr. Carmean indicated that the Livable Delaware map did not show the boundaries developed by the Milford Comprehensive Plan. He stated that if one of the east alternatives is chosen, the city has no interest in expanding beyond the proposed roadway. Mr. Carmean stressed that the city has no intentions of annexing Lincoln.

Mr. Riegner clarified that a property may not be annexed unless requested by the owner. He mentioned that the project team will use the Livable Delaware map to include the Milford Comprehensive Plan boundaries.

Mr. Riegner continued the presentation discussing the remaining items listed in the matrix and providing updates on the status of wetland impacts. He indicated that the project team has completed a field review of the areas impacted by the ARDS and quantified wetlands based on their preliminary analysis. The values currently shown in the matrix represent preliminary findings and require confirmation from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The preliminary impact comparison indicates that the greatest wetland impacts are associated with the west bypass alternatives.

Mr. Carmean asked if bridges will be constructed over wetland areas. Mr. Riegner replied that wetlands will typically be bridged similar to SR 1, and the Corps will take into account the shading impacts of the bridges on habitats and wildlife.

Mr. Riegner then introduced Wade Catts to discuss cultural resource impacts. Mr. Catts indicated that the project team has reviewed several hundred properties throughout the corridor, including 300+ properties in the Milford area. He clarified that the historic properties listed on or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are based *solely* on consultant recommendations as of January 1, 2006. Additional research and field reviews with the State Historic Preservation Office are needed to confirm the preliminary findings. A detailed archeological study will be completed once a preferred alternative is chosen.

Mr. Catts then discussed indirect and direct impacts on historic properties for the alternatives. He explained that the term direct impact refers to demolition of the actual



structure, while indirect impact refers to visual, noise, or air quality effects. He explained that under 4(f) language, it is important for the project team to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any of these effects. He reminded the group that project engineers are refining the alternatives to minimize direct impacts: for example, relocating interchange ramps near the Houston-Whitehead property.

Mr. Riegner continued the presentation discussing potential impacts to 4(f) and 6(f) resources. He indicated that the project team is waiting for information regarding state parks; however, no impacts are anticipated. Some other adjustments will be required to the on-alignment alternative to avoid a 6(f) impact and historic property impacts. Mr. Riegner also briefly discussed farmland and forestland impacts.

Mr. Riegner then gave a description of the how the project team assessed property impacts, including right-of-way acquisition and access rights. He indicated that the number of properties and total acreage is based on a measure of area impacted by the proposed right-of-way for a specific alternative. It does not consider a qualitative measurement distinguishing between a partial or total property take.

Mr. Riegner provided the working group with an update of the traffic analysis since the previous meeting. He indicated that all the alternatives meet the purpose and need for the project and the west bypass alternatives divert slightly more traffic than the east bypass alternatives.

Mr. Riegner stated that the project team has developed preliminary construction cost estimates and real estate cost estimates are in process. He also mentioned that real estate costs in this part of the state will constitute a large portion of the total project costs. Mr. Riegner also said that total cost is not expected to be a significant factor in selecting a preferred alternative unless there is a very substantial difference between alternatives.

Mr. Riegner then explained how the alternative lengths were determined and how they compare regarding length of new roadway.

Mr. Hite discussed the next steps for the project team and what the working group can expect at the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 2006.

Mr. Kramer reminded the working group that the next steps are all part of a six- to nine-month process of continuing refinement of the alternatives. The project team will continue to provide a significant amount of new information at each working group meeting and the working group members' attendance is vital to the success of the project.

Mr. Kramer adjourned the meeting at 8:40 pm.



Working Group members in attendance:

Scott Adkisson
Robert Burris
I.G. Burton, III
Richard Carmean
F. Brooke Clendaniel
Mark Davis
David Edgell
Terry Feinour
Scott Fitzgerald
Connie Fox
Wyatt Hammond
Keith Hudson
Edward Kee

Carl King, Jr.
Lawrence Lank
Michael Levensgood
Mark Mallamo
Randy Marvel
William Matthews
David Mick
Michael Petit de Mange
Pikus, Michael "Skip"
Ronald Robbins
Glen Stevenson
Elliott Workman

Members of the public in attendance:

Bill Andrew
Jerrie Andrew
Francis J. Arthurs
Steve Barlow
Herschel Billings
Helene and Gary Bowen
Mareal and Norm Bowers
Jim Breao
Marvin J. Davis
Henry De Esposito
Stanley Delikat
Jane Dupley
Tom Gooding
Lester Guyen
Joan Higgins
Carolyn E. Hill
Robert Hitchens
Diana Kelly, Milford Beacon
Rita Kirk

Betty and Bob Lender
Sally Mancini
Sal Marino
Barbara E. Metcalf
Dale Oberender
Jerrie Paper
Charles Pense
Virginia Pense
Theresa Plummer
Eleanor Salieu
John Scarborough
Gerald Serwalt
Julian Shafer
S. Stewart
Pamela G. Wagner
Jon Wallace
Joe Warnell
Jill and Ben Webb