

Memorandum of Meeting

Date: March 14, 2006

Date of Meeting: January 25, 2006

Time of Meeting: 5:30 p.m.

Location: Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company Banquet Hall

Topic: Millsboro-South Area Working Group Meeting #11

Working Group Attendees:

Name	Representing
Ronald Atherton	Business Owner
Wayne Baker	Mayor, Dagsboro
Jim Bennett	Bennett Orchard
Joe Brake	First State Community Action Agency
Fran Bruce	Millsboro/Dagsboro Chamber of Commerce
Lynn Bullock	Millsboro Volunteer Fire Company
Donald Collins	Sussex County Farm Bureau
Robert Daisey	Frankford Council, President
Preston Dyer	Developer
Peter Frederick	Mayor, Fenwick Island
Richard Kautz	Sussex Co. Planning & Zoning Commission
Faye Lingo	Town Manager, Millsboro
John Mitchell	Indian River School District
James T. Norwood	Nanticoke Indian Association
Bill Pfaff	Delaware Small Business Development Center
Robert Stuart*	Sussex County Emergency Medical Services
Gary Taylor	Town Manager, Selbyville
Josh Thompsom	Center for the Inland Bays
Michael Warrington	Delaware State Police, Troop 4

* attended pre-meeting

Mr. Robert Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. He welcomed everyone and indicated that this evenings meeting was the 11th Millsboro-South Working Group meeting. Bob reminded the Working Group members that the Project Team is continuing to analyze the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). He 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.

Bob then introduced Monroe Hite, III, DelDOT Project Manager for the US 113 North/South Study. Monroe also welcomed the Working Group and then introduced Wayne Baker, newly elected Mayor of Dagsboro who would be taking over for former Mayor, Brad Conner. Monroe 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 reviewed the items included in the handout package. Finally, Monroe introduced Jeff Riegner to briefly review the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study.

Note: Significant details, associated with the presentation, were provided to the Working Group members in their handout package. Rather than duplicate the presentation, these minutes will emphasize additional details that were added and questions from the Working Group regarding the information provided.

Technical difficulties did not allow for a review of the individual alignments, so Jeff concentrated his comments on the combined map provided on page 3 of the presentation. Jeff then introduced Steve Landau, with EDR, to review the results of the Economic Impact Analysis to date.

Bill Pfaff asked Steve to explain the difference between the 2,517 jobs noted as Regional Commerce and the 8,017 jobs noted as total (page 8 of the presentation). Steve indicated that it was, in part the difference between on corridor jobs versus in Project Area jobs. Steve concluded his comments and Bob reiterated for the Working Group that items 1 and 3 of the components of economic impact (page 15 of the presentation) are negative and items 2 and 4 are positive in terms of jobs, lost and gained, and businesses, lost and gained.

Preston Dyer asked how does providing a limited access road, like Route 1, equate to item 4 regarding jobs and businesses. Steve indicated that interchange locations provide opportunities for businesses to locate at or relocate to and, in turn, replace or add jobs.

Bill Pfaff indicated that water and utilities needed to be available. He indicated that without the infrastructure at interchanges, businesses won't locate there. They don't want to be responsible for bringing those items to the site. He also questioned the use of an average dollar value for jobs, indicating that industries all pay differently.

Jim Bennett asked how the poultry industry was classified. Steve indicated that the poultry industry was classified as food processing, a subset of manufacturing.

Jeff Riegner then picked up the presentation, reminding the Working Group members of the reasons for this evenings meeting and initiating the discussion on Livable Delaware. Jeff indicated that at the last Working Group meeting, the issue of the alternatives compatibility with Livable Delaware was discussed and it was the desire of the Working

Group to include a measure in the matrix of how an alternative addressed Livable Delaware. Jeff indicated that the discussion this evening was a first cut intended to solicit comment from the Working Group. He further indicated that meetings with the Office of State Planning, the County and the Towns in the Project Area would be arranged to solicit their comments. The end product was a way that the Working Group felt comfortable in characterizing the alternatives relative to how they addressed the goals of Livable Delaware.

Jeff indicated that there were 6 levels in Livable Delaware. Level 1 was Town Centers, Level 2 was primary growth areas, Level 3 was secondary growth areas, Level 4 was undesirable for growth, Level 5 was out of play for growth and Level 6 was Environmentally Sensitive Developing Areas where future growth was to be carefully pursued. For purposes of discussion, we focused on Levels 2, 3 and 6 for future growth and determined the % of an alternative in those areas (page 19 of the presentation).

Preston Dyer initiated a lively discussion asking if we are assuming that a higher percentage is better. He indicated that On-alignment is inconsistent with the goals of Livable Delaware and that bypasses in growth areas are also inconsistent. Roads in Level 4 areas puts roads around future development rather than through future development.

Gary Taylor indicated that Pret was right. The Towns had to present comprehensive plans providing infra structure to growth areas. Highways (On-alignment) take part of the land for future growth.

Jim Bennett asked if SR 1 was established as the boundary for development. Bob indicated that in Kent County it was perceived to provide an edge for development.

Preston Dyer indicated that it was supposition on the part of the Project Team to believe that highways in Level 4 areas would have a negative impact on growth. He indicated that the limited access nature of the proposed solution was the most important factor.

Josh Thompson asked if the On-alignment option negatively impacted the Level 1, 2 & 3 growth areas. Jeff asked the Working Group for their opinion.

Peter Frederick suggested that the two discussions need to be put together. A Limited access road will limit development growth. Limiting access outside of interchange areas is controlled by what already around the interchanges. Based on his own perception, he would also agree with Pret.

Richard Kautz indicated that we are trying to use numbers to quantify the unquantifiable. Is a low percentage right or wrong? We should be asking what is representation of impact from roadway on growth.

John Mitchell indicated that growth in the Route 30 corridor is in a Level 4 area. Jeff indicated that the goals of Livable Delaware is not to stop growth but to guide growth where no public investment is needed to serve the growth.

Preston Dyer asked if Working Group members could attend the meetings with OSP, the County and the Towns. He indicated that he could hear OSP saying only investment in Level 1, 2 & 3 growth areas.

Monroe interrupted the discussion to suggest that the Project Team meet with OSP, the County and the Towns and bring back the results for continued discussion by the Working Group. Monroe then indicated to the Working Group that it may come down to the fact that each member may have to make their own interpretation of how the alternatives may be characterized as meeting the goals of Livable Delaware and apply that interpretation to the alternatives when it comes down to choosing a preferred alternative. Monroe then asked Jeff Riegner to continue with the presentation.

During the discussion on Section 4 (f) properties (page 27 of presentation), Bob Kramer asked Jeff to indicate to the Working Group what the Project Team is doing to address these properties. Jeff indicated that alternative adjustment is an iterative process. As information is confirmed, that information is passed onto the rest of the Project Team and adjustments are made accordingly.

Jim Bennett asked if 6 (f) (page 28 of presentation) is defined by the source of the dollars or the use of the property. Jeff indicated that is the source (Land and Water Conservation funds) of the funding. Jim further asked when you say impact, do you mean direct impact. Jeff indicated in the affirmative.

During the discussion on traffic, Bill Pfaff asked where the people were going (pages 35 and 36 of the presentation). His feeling was that people in the peak season were going to the eastern side of the county. Jeff indicated that trip ends outside of the corridor are less than 50% of total trips.

Preston Dyer asked if the Project Team had an interpretation of Beach traffic east of the Project Area from Lewes to Ocean City? He further asked if a breakdown in the percentage of traffic that was beach oriented versus growth oriented could be provided. He indicated that if the proposed improvements are not intended to help beach traffic then he would change his approach regarding his selection of a preferred alternative. Monroe indicated that the project Team had indicated from the beginning that the preferred solution would address local growth and regional traffic growth. Jeff followed by indicating that if addressing those needs helps beach traffic then so be it.

Jim Bennett raised the issue of Project creep and referred to SR 1 taking 20 years to complete.

John Mitchell reinforced Jim's comments indicating that the base year traffic is 2003. He then asked how was the 40% increase in traffic between 2003 and 2030 derived? Jeff indicated that changes in population, dwelling units and employment were the basis for the 40% increase.

Bill Pfaff indicated that it also implied that we would still be using automobiles. Jeff reminded the Working Group that this is a Planning study only and the Project Team is trying to get to the selection of a preferred alternative to protect a corridor for future use.

During the discussion of short term traffic improvements (page 37 of presentation), James Norwood indicated that leaving Millsboro only 17 cars get through the signal at Route 24/US 113 on any given signal. He indicated that that in turn backs up traffic in town. Monroe indicated that DelDOT is looking to coordinate signals along Route 24 and US 113. Jeff Riegner indicated that the State Street signal was manually adjusted on the Saturday before Labor Day last year which resulted in improved traffic flow.

Bob Kramer then summarized the meeting. He indicated that it is the Project Teams responsibility to bring you facts. You have questioned certain assumptions and the interpretation of those facts. It is obvious that a solution is not self-evident. Your interpretation may in fact be different than the Project Team. That is why it is important that you share your interpretation, listen to the variety of opinions, absorb and review those opinions and not rush to judgment in forming your final opinion. Bob reminded the Working Group that if Sussex County is to get funding for the project, a solution with support from the Working Group is critical. The data may push members in a variety of directions but a decision with Working Group support is important. The Project Team will continue to finalize data, incorporate it into the matrix and present it to the Working Group for discussion and debate.

Based on the discussion, debate and request for information from this evenings meeting, meeting on the 15th of February may be too short a time frame in which to address your questions and concerns, therefore, we'll skip the February 15th meeting and meet on the next scheduled date of March 15th.

The meeting was then adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Joe Wutka