



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: March 21, 2005

Time: 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Location: Banquet Hall, Carlisle Fire Company, Milford, DE.

Topic: **Milford Area Working Group Meeting No. 6**

Attendees: See Attached

The meeting was called to order by Bob Kramer at 5:45 p.m. He specified that the purpose of the Working Group Meetings as to bring the needs of everyone working in the transportation development process and the preferences addressed at the Public Workshop in November into a plan that would have broad support. He welcomed new members from the Lincoln Area to the Working Group and then everyone introduced themselves.

After the introductions, Mr. Kramer provided a brief summary of the Working Group's progress throughout the US 113 planning process. He specified that a preferred alternative had not been selected among the available options and that no decisions were to be made during the Working Group Meeting. He then welcomed Mr. Bill Fox, Mr. Bob Ross, and other residents of Lincoln, Delaware who were in attendance, to the Working Group Meeting. He also welcomed the project team members to the Working Group Meeting. He then explained that the Working Group Meetings were open to the public and that the Project Team will provide a background of the project. He also mentioned that another round of public workshops is scheduled for May. These workshops will allow for comments, suggestions, and questions from anyone in attendance. If anyone had any specific questions regarding their community, Mr. Kramer specified that Monroe Hite, III, DelDOT Project Manager and the project team are available for personal neighborhood briefings and community discussion. Mr. Kramer then introduced Mr. Hite to explain the next steps in the planning process.

Mr. Hite welcomed everyone to the meeting. He specified that this meeting was open to the public. However, comments were to be saved for the next Public Workshop on Monday, May 16th from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. He mentioned that the information regarding the workshops and the working group meetings are available on the DelDOT website. He also specified that information pertaining to the project can be obtained through Ed Thomas. Mr. Hite indicated that the next Working Group Meeting was scheduled for April 25th at



5:30 p.m. in the Carlisle Fire Hall. He then thanked everyone for their patience and resumed with the program. He specified that the project will provide an economic analysis to provide additional background towards the selection of a preferred alternative. The project will be a collaboration of feedback from the Working Group Members, the Public Agencies, and the citizenry. He indicated that the Working Group should focus on narrowing the 30 alternatives down to a more reasonable number for further study and to carry on to the next round of analysis and feedback. Afterwards, Mr. Hite welcomed Scott Fitzgerald and Carl King Jr. from Lincoln to the Working Group. Mr. Kramer announced that project maps are available and that they can be requested from Bill Hellmann. Mr. Hite specified that maps can also be requested online through the DelDOT website. He then introduced Tom Hannan.

Mr. Hannan specified that a traffic analysis will be used to assist the Working Group in narrowing down the alternatives and determining future needs. Furthermore, he indicated that DelDOT's Peninsula Travel Demand Model will be used in the planning process to predict future traffic and present information regarding general trends and projections of traffic. Currently, there are no specific numbers, but they will be presented at the next working group meeting. In describing the Peninsula Model, he compared it to the Kent-Sussex Model Network and explained that the Peninsula Model was inclusive of the entire Delmarva Peninsula. He explained that the Kent-Sussex Model limited the traffic analysis to just the two counties. Currently, the traffic analysis of the project planning process is at the first stage in determining the existing daily traffic levels on the current road system. The existing daily traffic levels combined with the proposed project will help to determine the facility size in Stage 2. Intersection and interchange concepts can be established to accommodate specific types of access in Stage 3. In Stage 4, preliminary designs can be developed based on physical and environmental constraints.

Mr. Hannan then discussed the Stage 1 details with the audience. He further explained that travel demand models are used to approximate future use of roadways in a study area. The Travel Demand Model Work Flow is a top down approach which uses the number of trips that are produced and attracted to each zone, while determining where they start and end, which mode of transportation they use, and which roads they take between each zone for the prediction of traffic volumes that acceptably match the existing traffic counts. Mr. Hannan then revealed the preliminary Stage 1 findings. He specified that the No Build Traffic Assignment was used to calibrate the model. The model revealed that Daily Traffic averages change throughout the year especially during the summer. Mr. Kramer asked for clarification on the meaning of the 2003 No-Build Traffic Assignment. Mr. Hannan explained that the 2003 No Build is strictly the DelDOT roadway system as recorded in the 2003 DelDOT Traffic Summary. He also verified that the 2030 No-Build Traffic Assignment involved forecasting for the next 25 to 30 years. He explained that the traffic growth, north of Milford (Screenline 1), will experience 70% growth. The Screenline Growth Rates for the northern beach area (Screenline 2) will experience 45% growth. The growth rates throughout southern



Sussex County and along the Maryland-Delaware Line are expected to grow by 45% (Screenline 3). Meanwhile, the southern beach area (Screenline 4) is expected to grow by 41% and its east-west routes (Screenline 5) will increase by 43%. As Mr. Hannan concluded, Mr. Kramer then asked if anyone had any questions. Mr. Kramer clarified that the calibration of the model is required using today's figures to accurately predict future traffic.

David Mick asked why future growth on SR 1 increased by 200% and US 13 only increased by 50%. Mr. Kramer then clarified the question by specifying that if traffic congests US 113 and SR 1 why don't vehicles use US 13. Jeff Riegner specified that US 13 is a viable alternative route, however this study mostly focuses on the land use of SR 1 and US 113. Therefore, the project must concentrate on the local development occurring on US 113 and SR 1. Mr. Kramer informed the members that future local traffic figures were to increase with the increase in local growth. Mr. Hannan then specified that US 113 can be improved to accommodate future growth. Joe Wutka explained that the removal of the traffic signals on SR 1 allowed for more traffic to use the corridor. Meanwhile, the US 13 corridor is signalized and carries less traffic volumes than SR 1. Therefore, providing a limited access corridor along US 113 in Sussex County will help to address the traffic from SR 1.

Elliot Workman asked if the limited access corridor would address the east/west routes such as SR 24. Mr. Hannan specified that opening up the limited access corridor will improve those roads in the model which exceed the existing capacity. Mr. Hite then concluded and specified that the plans and notes are available on the DeIDOT website. Mr. Kramer introduced Mr. Wutka to speak about cost estimates for the construction of the US 113 Project.

Mr. Wutka explained that the Cost Estimates are based on a major quantity approach to provide estimates for the various alternatives. Mr. Kramer asked for clarification on the term structures. Mr. Wutka answered that structures include bridges for overpasses or interchanges. Drainage culverts would be included in the Drainage Multiplier. Mr. Wutka specified that the final estimated costs for the project will be compared to the dollars spent for the completion of SR 1 in Dover equated to 2005 dollars. Mr. Kramer asked if there were any questions and then explained that there are a lot of details that will be provided at the next meeting to quantify the impacts.

He then introduced Mr. Riegner to explain the economic impacts and their effects on the local businesses within the US 113 study area. He explained that economic impacts will be determined by making decisions on a regional and local basis. The team will provide this information to the Working Group to assist them in narrowing down the alternatives. The economic impact analysis will start with a survey of the local businesses and determine the local and through traffic with regards to the customer base. This study will also make an evaluation of the businesses and determine their future viability after the



construction of the project. This analysis was comparable to the Dover economic impact study which determined the viability of the businesses in Dover after the construction of SR 1. Mr. Kramer asked for questions and then asked if the economic impact study was just a study of the jobs in the area. Mr. Riegner explained that the economic impact study considers multiple factors including businesses, residencies, and agricultural industries. He also specified that the project team will examine the balance between “gain versus pain”. DeIDOT must act as advocates to represent a balance between the public agencies’ and the communities’ interests. However, the detailed study will provide information to the Working Group to assist in the process of narrowing the number of alternatives. Mr. Riegner referred to Tab 6 in the insert and explained that each alternative will compare the economic impact costs versus the benefits. Mr. Hite explained that the economic impact analysis will also include property acquisitions. He then referred to the three legged stool approach in explaining how decisions are obtained through the overall detailed study.

Mr. Wutka then explained the Stakeholder Input and the comments from the previous meetings to the Working Group. Mr. Kramer asked the Working Group members to let the Project Team know how they feel about the project and its occurrences. Mr. Wutka discussed the comments and addressed the overall “Big Picture” of the current status of the project. He explained that the general theme of the Milford area was that shorter bypasses cost less and had fewer impacts. In general, he indicated that the Agency comments focus more on the extent of the impacts as the overriding concern. Therefore the On-Alignment Alternative is their primary choice due to the limited impacts to natural resources such as wetlands. They also indicated that an Eastern Bypass Alternative may be acceptable and that the Western Bypasses are their least favorable choice. Mr. Wutka also explained that the No-Build Alternative is required by law to be carried through the Environmental Documentation process to serve as the basis of comparison to the other alternatives.

Mr. Riegner addressed the public comments regarding the Eastern Bypass and mentioned that they will be less impactful on cultural resources. He also specified that farmland is a concern in the east and that a bypass will form a development barrier in the east. Richard Carmean addressed the project’s corraling effect on the City’s growth. He specified that the bypass will not stop the growth from occurring and that it will spill over any Eastern Bypass. Mr. Riegner concurred with Mr. Carmean’s comment. Mr. Carmean explained that the new growth from the bypass will incur business benefits. Mr. Hite explained that early property development is being addressed through coordination with the City and the State to discuss new plans for development on available land. Mr. Carmean recalled the PLUS meeting for the City’s changes in their growth boundary. Mr. Hite indicated that updates are currently in the process for various development plans. Mr. Wutka specified that the new developments reflect the spillover of the new growth to the area. Brooke F. Clendaniel asked how the State addresses and catches new development. Mr. Hite explained that they use a GIS Database for updates to sites currently and potentially available for development. He also specified that the PLUS Process catches the sites in



the early stages of development. Mr. Riegner explained that DelDOT can catch the development in the early phases to make it compatible with the project plans. Mr. Hite indicated that Kent County and Sussex County are working together with DelDOT to plan for development. Mr. Riegner specified that the project options are still on the table and available for further discussion.

Mr. Riegner explained that the Eastern Bypass south of the split between SR 1 and SR 14 has received no substantial changes. He specified that there will be an additional lane in each direction and that the three lane highway will only be for this section. He included that all impacts will be identified for this project. Mr. Clendaniel asked about the application process for agriculture preservation. He specifically had concern for the Whitehead Farm. Mr. Hite specified that there are 75 cultural resource properties and 36 properties which have been identified south and east of Milford in the vicinity of the Eastern Bypasses. Mr. Riegner added that retaining all the options helps to make decisions. Mr. Kramer indicated that there are 13 different options on the eastern side.

Mr. Wutka addressed the comments from the Working Group, the Public Workshop, and the Public Agencies with regards to the Western Bypass Alternatives. The matrix emphasizes the Agencies' concerns for the western bypass and indicates it being their least favored choice. Bob asked the Working Group if the Project Team needs to look anymore at the Western Bypass for alternatives. He specified that there are 16 possible alternatives, with the exception of J, and all of them are included in the Matrix.

Mr. Riegner explained that the On-Alignment Alternatives will impact the businesses by isolating and dividing the city. He indicated that the Agencies prefer the On-Alignment Options due to the limited impacts to natural resources. There are two limited impacts available for evaluation which will be used for comparison against the other alternatives. Mr. Kramer asked if there were any questions in regards to the third lane in each direction. Mr. Riegner specified that this option grew out of controversy concerning land and economic impacts. However, all but two intersections will not work this includes Airport Road and SR 14. Furthermore, DelDOT must address the safety concerns for US 113. The US 113 corridor is limited access to the north of Milford and to the south of Selbyville, throughout Sussex County and part of Kent County it is signalized.

Mr. Kramer announced that more information on the third lane will be available at the next meeting. He then concluded and announced an early finish to the meeting. He specified that the time must be used efficiently to narrow the options down to select a viable range of alternatives to be included in an environmental document. Therefore, it is imperative that every Working Group Member must be present at the next meeting. Mr. Hite asked everyone in attendance in the group to let the other members know that it is important for them to be present at the next meeting. Mr. Hite then reviewed the next steps for April, which included a Resource Agency Meeting on April 20, a Working Group Meeting on April 25, and a Public Workshop. If necessary, the Project Team can schedule another meeting in May. Someone from the Working Group asked what impact



the use of federal money involved. Mr. Hite concluded that once a preferred alternative is established then the Department will determine the appropriate funding. Until then, the project will develop in such a way that all funding sources can be used.

DRAFT



Members who attended the Milford Working Group Meeting 03/21/2005

Adkisson, Scott
Burris, Robert
Burton, III, I.G.
Carmean, Richard
Clendaniel, F. Brooke
Davis, Mark
Terry Peters representing Terry Feinour
Fitzgerald, Scott
Fox, Connie
Hammond, Wyatt
Hudson, E. Keith
King, Jr., Carl
Lank, Lawrence
Michael, Levengood
Mallamo, Mark
Marvel, Randy
Mick, David
Pikus, Skip "Michael"
Robbins, Ronald
Simmons, Mike
Stevenson, Glen
Workman, Elliott

Public Citizens in Attendance:

D'esposito, Henry
Fox, Will
Bowman, Jimmy
Kelly, Diana – Milford Beacon
Whitehead, Robert – Self
Fisher, Teresa – Self
Webb, Thomas P. – Self
Spruill, Wesley
Webb, Richard – Self
Willoughby, Mr. and Mrs.
Conway, Joe
Pope, Jerrie
Roosa, Gary
Gross, George & Sean
James, Craig & Alice
Caudale, Paul Michele
Williams, Janet & Walt

D'esposito, Mary
Steerland, Jane & Rich
Guerke, Gwen – Milford Chronicle
Russ, Robert
Sockrider, Linda
Warren, David
Hitchens, Robert - Self
Brooks, Jr., Owen S.