

Memorandum of Meeting

Date: March 7, 2007

Time: 5:30 p.m. to 7:45 p.m.

Location: Carlisle Fire Hall, Milford, Delaware

Topic: **Milford Working Group Meeting # 15**

Attendees: See Page 7

Introduction

Andrew Bing called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. Mr. Bing indicated that with only three scheduled meetings left, the Working Group was in the home stretch. He concluded his introductory remarks by stating that there would be no effort this evening to get a recommendation from the Working Group on a recommended preferred alternative. One, because a number of Working Group members are not in attendance; two, because the comment period for the recent Milford Area Public Workshops has not yet concluded and three, that in sharing information with the Working Group this evening, the Project Team seeks feedback on information that the group considered still lacking in terms of initiating a discussion on developing a recommendation on a preferred alternative. Mr. Bing then turned the meeting over to Monroe Hite, III, to discuss the results, to date of the recent Milford Area Public Workshops.

Mr. Hite welcomed the Working Group and thanked them for their attendance, particularly given the inclement weather. He then reviewed with the Working Group the contents of their hand-out package.

Workshop Summary

Mr. Hite summarized the results, to date, of the two most recent Milford Area Public Workshops. He stated that the turnout in Lincoln was lower than expected, which could mean that Lincoln area residents were ready for a recommendation on a preferred alternative. He further stated that all the Milford Area Public Workshop materials were on the project Web site.

Carl King, Jr. asked if copies of the comment form were available this evening. Monroe indicated that they were not but could be obtained from the Web site.

Mr. Hite concluded the review of the workshops and asked if there were any observations from those Working Group members that attended either or both of the workshops.

Glen Stevenson stated that he did not agree with Monroe's assessment that the people in Lincoln are ready for a recommendation on a preferred alternative. He felt that the less than anticipated turnout was a result of the public feeling that they are not being heard.

Skip Pikus stated that the public feels that the decision has already been made without their opinion being considered.

Mr. Hite reminded the Working Group that the public is one of three important elements of input on the project, the others being the Working Group and the resource agencies.

David Edgell stated that 21 favorable East Bypass responses seemed contrary to the discussion that he heard, which focused on the no-build alternative.

Glen Stevenson asked if the information presented was combined information from both of the workshops. Jeff Riegner indicated that the information was combined.

Mr. Bing indicated that it was the Project Team's perception that there was some project fatigue on the part of the public.

Mr. Hite then stated to the Working Group that the Secretary of Transportation and the Department of Transportation remain committed to select an alternative and obtain funds to protect the corridor for its use in the future when needed.

Skip Pikus asked three questions related to the selection of a preferred alternative.

- If DeIDOT chooses a corridor and purchases land to protect the corridor, what happens to the land? Mr. Hite explained that DeIDOT tries to keep purchased property in use. For instance, if the land is agricultural, DeIDOT will try to rent the land to keep it in an agricultural use until it is needed for construction.
- Secondly, on the northwest corner at Route 14 and SR 1, a right turn deceleration lane is going to be needed. Hasn't DeIDOT committed that land to something else? Mr. Bing indicated that the details of the specific property on the corner of Route 14 and SR 1 are not known but they will be looked into and if DeIDOT has disposed of the property in question we will get back to the Working Group.
- What is to happen at Northeast 10th Street and SR 1? Mike Simmons indicated that the Milford Bypass is part of DeIDOT's Corridor Preservation Plan for SR 1 from the Dover AFB to Lewes. That Plan involves the conversion of SR 1 to limited access over time. The first step is to eliminate the signals along SR 1. Glen Stevenson stated that he had contacted A. Charles Altevogt, with DeIDOT, and that 10th Street would become rights-in, rights-out and the cross-over would be removed. Mr. Riegner stated that the plans, for the SR 1 portion of the East Bypass alternatives, reflect the CCPP for the Milford Bypass and its conversion to limited access.

Mr. Hite then introduced Mr. Riegner to discuss additional data with the group.

Presentation of Additional Data

Mr. Riegner first presented the noise analysis for the project. He explained that the Project Team conducted field measurements of existing (ambient) noise levels at approximately 60 locations throughout the various alternatives. The loudest hour was then calculated, which fell on a summer weekday. (Although there is more traffic on a summer Saturday, there is a higher percentage of trucks on a summer weekday.) Mr. Riegner indicated that the ambient readings were, in turn, used to calibrate the noise model and future 2030 noise levels were then established by the noise model. He explained the criteria for determining whether a property was impacted and indicated that the results, in terms of the number of parcels that may experience noise levels above the criteria, was in the Matrix on page 7 of the presentation. The data were then reviewed with the Working Group.

Ed Kee asked if the 89 total impacts on the Orange alternative were additional impacted properties. Mr. Riegner explained that they were not. He further indicated that the 15 properties along existing US 113 would most likely experience greater noise levels anyway and that the 74 properties along the new alignment portions of the alternatives would likely be additional impacted properties.

Carl King, Jr. stated that he lives between US 113 and SR 1 and can hear the trucks on those roads. He further stated that if you live along an existing road, you experience noise impacts.

Glen Stevenson asked if the 239 residential properties for the Yellow, On-alignment, alternative were along US 113 now. Mr. Riegner indicated that they were.

Mr. Riegner then explained that the N/A on the No-build alternative meant that, since there would be no capacity increase, no calculation of impacts was made but as traffic volumes go up, noise increases.

Wyatt Hammond asked if the noise readings were taken when traffic was moving. Mr. Riegner explained that the noise readings were continuous over time, generally for 20 minutes, and that traffic volumes were also counted for the roadway adjacent to the receptor site during the same period.

Carl King, Jr. asked if any measurements had been taken in the “middle of no-where”. Mr. Riegner indicated that the receptor locations were chosen based on Federal Highway Administration criteria and were focused on residential impacts.

The discussion then moved to air quality. Mr. Riegner explained that the results of the air quality analysis showed that the No-build alternative generally was the worst along US 113 because of congestion and that all alternatives meet applicable air quality standards.

Skip Pikus asked where the noise receptors were located. Mr. Riegner indicated that the receptor locations were indicated on the maps presented at the most recent Milford Area Public Workshops but the team did not have a copy of the map.

Scott Adkisson asked why the No-build numbers weren't higher. Mr. Riegner indicated that it was probably a result of the traffic spreading out to find alternative routes as the better used routes become more congested, resulting in air quality issues over a broader area in the future without improvements.

Ed Kee asked if a statistical analysis was conducted to compare alternatives. Mr. Riegner indicated that a comparison between the alternatives was not made. The air quality model is a state of the art model used nationally that provides results on an alternative by alternative basis.

The discussion then moved to the final topic, economic impact. Mr. Riegner reviewed for the Working Group the information they were provided on this subject at Working Group meeting #12 by explaining the three types of economic impacts: acquisition due to highway construction, impacts to traffic-sensitive businesses, and increase in travel speed. He indicated that based on current trends, 2374 additional jobs will be developed through 2030 in the Milford area. Mr. Riegner then reviewed the results of the economic impact analysis for each alternative as indicated in the table on page 10 of the presentation. As a result of the congestion anticipated with the no-build alternative, job growth would be about 25% less than the trend data.

Mr. Bing asked, for clarification purposes, how far off of US 113 economic impacts would be felt. Mr. Riegner indicated that economic impacts were calculated for the entire Milford area. He reviewed the numbers for the build alternatives and asked the Working Group if the numbers made sense.

Ed Kee asked if the analysis was conducted in a way which made the results repeatable. Mr. Riegner indicated that the economic model (IMPLAN) was a state of the art model used by economists nationwide to estimate economic impacts associated with major investments such as highway improvements. Mr. Kee indicated that he was aware of the model and its reliability.

Wyatt Hammond asked what the best column was for the Chamber of Commerce to use in understanding economic impacts. Mr. Riegner indicated that that depended on the type of business and the orientation of the market.

Mr. Riegner then reviewed the two footnotes under the job growth table, indicating that the numbers did not include potential jobs associated with the roadway construction or jobs created as a result of induced development around future interchanges.

David Edgell stated that, based on the SR 1 experience, he was not sure if redevelopment in the Dover area would have happened if SR 1 had not been built. Business has followed

as a result of reduced congestion on US 13. In his estimation, the No-build alternative would be the worst for the Milford area and that he felt the job growth was overstated.

Alternative by Alternative Presentation

Mr. Bing reintroduced Mr. Riegner to review the details of each alternative. He asked the Working Group members to consider during the presentation what additional information is needed to initiate a discussion and come to a resolution on a recommendation on a preferred alternative.

Mr. Riegner first reviewed the No-build alternative. He indicated that this alternative does not address anticipated growth along the US 113 corridor, which will result in increased congestion and travel times. Milford has the highest density of traffic signals in the entire 32 mile US 113 corridor. In addition, US 113 in the Milford area would be inconsistent with limited-access upgrades proposed to the north (SR 1 in Delaware) and south (US 113 in Maryland), presenting the potential for safety concerns as drivers leave limited-access highways and enter an area with signals and cross traffic. He further indicated that, if the No-build alternative is pursued, opportunities to address transportation needs in the future will be even further restricted by development.

Mr. Riegner then reviewed the Yellow, On-alignment, alternative. He indicated that the On-alignment solution generally had fewer natural resource impacts but greater impacts to properties, especially businesses. He stated that the Yellow alternative had eight unavoidable impacts to properties determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. This is a fatal flaw if Federal monies are to be spent on this project.

Ronnie Robins asked about adding a third lane in the existing corridor? Mr. Bing asked the Working Group to hold their questions to the end and that Mr. Robbins question and other questions would be answered then. He did indicate that if one of the Working Group members did not understand something that was said or how it was presented that they should ask for a clarification.

Mr. Riegner next reviewed the Orange and Blue, Western Bypass, alternatives. He indicated that none of the bypass alternatives have a direct impact on structures determined eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Riegner then began the discussion of the Green and Purple alternatives by describing shifts in those alternatives that were suggested at the Lincoln workshop to reduce residential impacts. He indicated that by shifting the Purple alternative to the south, approximately 100 to 150 feet, in the vicinity of Logan's Run and both the Green and Purple alternatives from Greentop Road south to US 113, 6 residential acquisitions could be avoided. In the Logan's Run area, the residents at the workshop realized that they would be left next to the road but indicated a preference for that rather than having to move. In the Greentop Road area, the shift would place the Green and Purple alternative through a vacant lot where it crosses Greentop Road reducing the number of residential

impacts in this area by one. At US 113, an additional residence would be saved but the Morgan Farm to the south would lose about ten acres.

Skip Pikus asked several questions about the Green and Purple alternatives:

- How close are the existing homes on Greentop Road to the shift? Mr. Riegner replied that they would be adjacent to the Green and Purple alternatives, as they were before the shift.
- How will the shift impact wetlands? Mr. Riegner indicated that there was no material difference between the original alignment and the shift in terms of wetland impacts.
- How close will the shift come to the houses on Cabbage Pond? Mr. Riegner estimated approximately 200 feet.
- How close would the alternatives come to the Christian Tabernacle property? Mr. Riegner indicated that the Green alternative would require acquisition of about the back third of the property, not impacting the church or school buildings. The Purple alternative does not impact the property.

Mr. Riegner then concluded his remarks by reviewing the Brown alternative..

Preparation for Upcoming Meetings

Mr. Hite then reviewed with the Working Group the things that they needed to keep in mind as they prepared for the next two meetings and developing a recommendation on a preferred alternative.

Mr. Hite then responded to Mr. Robbins earlier question by indicating that the third lane alternative was examined early in the process, and it was concluded that it did not meet Project Purpose and Need due to its inconsistency with proposed limited-access improvements to the north and south. As such, it was not included as an Alternative Retained for Detailed Study.

At this point, Mr. Bing interjected that he had gotten word from one of the Working Group members that had to leave the meeting early that the roads were icing up. He suggested for homework that the Working Group review the differences between the Green and Purple alternatives and refresh themselves on the Working Group guidelines reviewed at the second Working Group meeting. Both items are located in the presentation materials in their hand-out package. He also stressed the importance of all Working Group members being present for the last two meetings. Alternates will not be permitted in discussion and recommendation of a preferred alternative.

Schedule/Next Steps

Mr. Hite stated that the Project Team's goal is for the Working Group to recommend a preferred alternative by April 11. He indicated that the next two Working Group meetings were March 21 and April 11. A Public Hearing on the Milford Area portion of the US 113 North/South Study is scheduled for June 18 and 19. He reminded the Working

Group, as homework, to review pages 30 through 43 of the presentation for preparation for the next two meetings.

Mr. Bing asked if there was any additional information that any of the Working Group members needed for the upcoming meetings. In response, Randy Marvel asked that information on the acquisition process and funding for that process be provided, in detail, at the next meeting.

Mr. Bing adjourned the meeting at 7:45.

Working Group members in attendance

Scott Adkisson

I.G. Burton, III

F. Brooke Clendaniel

Mark Davis

David Edgell

Scott Fitzgerald

Dean Geyer

Wyatt Hammond

Ed Kee

Carl King, Jr.

Mark Mallamo

Randy Marvel

Barry Munoz

Michael Petit de Mange

Skip Pikus

Ronald Robbins

Mike Simmons

Glen Stevenson