



**US 113  
Project Team**

Delaware Department of Transportation  
Sussex County  
Whitman, Requardt and Associates, LLP  
Rummel, Klepper & Kahl, LLP  
Kramer & Associates, Inc.  
Primary Phone: (410) 235-3450 Fax: (410) 235-2695

**Memorandum of Meeting**

**Date:** August 30, 2005  
**Date of Meeting:** May 16, 2005  
**Time of Meeting:** 5:30 PM - 8:30 PM  
**Location:** Carlisle Fire Company Banquet Hall Milford, Delaware  
**Topic:** Working Group Meeting

**Working Group Attendees:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Adkisson, Scott	Milford Area Resident
Burris, Robert	Burris Logistics
Burton, III, I. G.	Businessman
Carmean, Richard	City Manager, City of Milford
Clendaniel, F. Brooke	Milford Historical Society
Edgell, David	Office of State Planning Coordination
Fox, Connie	Farmer, Realtor
Hammond, Wyatt	Milford Chamber of Commerce
Levengood, Michael	Perdue Farms, Inc.
Mick, David	Carlisle Fire Company
Pikus, Skip "Michael"	Downtown Milford Incorporated
Robbins, Ronald	Farm Bureau
Simmons, Mike	Project Development (South Region), DelDOT
Stevenson, Glen	Milford School District

Mr. Kramer started the 8<sup>th</sup> Working Group Meeting on May 16<sup>th</sup> by welcoming Senator Gary Simpson to the meeting. He then summarized the previous meetings and explained where the Project Team was in the planning process. Mr. Kramer introduced Monroe Hite who announced that the next Public Workshop was scheduled for Monday, June 6<sup>th</sup> from 4-7 p.m.

Mr. Hite explained that this Working Group Meeting would review Alternatives Summary of on-alignment, Eastern/Western Bypass Options, breakout into groups for discussion, and have a summary as far as recap the recommendations from the Working Group for the workshop and adjourn with the closing remarks.

There was a review for those unable to attend

At the last meeting, the Working Group Members broke out into small groups and went over alternatives  
Each group had a leader who reported back general ideas and recommended alternatives.

What was presented at the meeting:

Point 1: At least one on-alignment alternative must be retained for detailed study for comparison to the other alternatives.

Point 2: Small groups agreed to drop alternative B (Northern most eastern bypass)

Point 3: There was a general consensus to drop Alternative 1 which ties back into US113 near Whitehead Farm. It is historic and there are too many fatal flaws with this particular alternative.

Point 4: No consensus yet on alternative C, D, E, and F Eastern bypass options and how they relate or tie back into US 113 w/ 2 & 3. We must keep abreast / amid to avoid historic properties and to buy compact interchange at SR1 C, D, E, and F 2 & 3.

Point 5: The Westside is less desirable than the east. Possible candidates that we did here for the west alternative J closer in bypass. One group suggests retaining possible candidates to drop were Alternative J although one group said to keep that one.

Point 6: Alternative L rendered feasible by the new veterans home. Alt. 5 has more impacts than Alt 4&6? It may not be as well versed with the numbering/ lettering system but will have a chance in the groups to ask questions.

Mr. Riegner indicated that the whole goal of this meeting is to narrow down the overall range of 19 or more alternatives in the Milford area down to a much more manageable number for detailed study. He indicated that the Project Team is trying to pick the alternatives that meet the Project Needs, in other words, keep traffic on US 113 in the future at a reasonable level. Mr. Riegner also explained that if nothing is done today, there will be a substantial increase in traffic along 113 in Milford during peak hours and peak times. He explained that if a No Build alternative is chosen and nothing

is done for the next 25 years, instead of 30,000 cars crossing that bridge everyday there will be 48,000. Obviously, he said that this is a pretty substantial increase – over 50% for the next 25 years.

He then discussed the On-alignment alternatives and indicated that existing US 113 will become more attractive promoting more north/south traffic through town. By making this limited access, the capacity will increase to 60,000 cars per day. Of course, there will be a highway that handles 60,000 cars per day.

Option 3 does not address the future need of the corridor but because it has signals at a number of locations and because it has a number of at grade intersections, the numbers would revert back to 48,000. In other words, making the improvements in the existing alignment under option 3 would not be enough to divert people to use US 113. It's not going to do much in terms of travel time. He indicated that these are a lot of improvements for not a lot of benefits.

He next explained the Off-Alignment Alternatives. Alternative B is a single eastern bypass alternative that passes north of Lincoln. It does not work from a traffic standpoint. Essentially from the maps it goes south then loops back north to go south again on US 113 and vice versa.

C, D, E, F work a lot better than B, because it is not required to go out of the way to come back to US 113 and it's more of a straight shot. These also meet the need for the project.

Mr. Riegner then discussed key elements of the Western Bypass. He explained that the traffic today is 30,000 cars and if no improvements are made that there will be 48,000 cars driving on US 113 in the future and an increase of 62,000 if the existing alignment is receives upgrades.

The bypass options include:

Alternative B – Traffic will be the same (rounding these to the nearest 2,000)  
Traffic will be the same as No-build. So, if alternative B is built, there will be no improvement on existing US 113.

Alternatives C, D, E, and F – traffic today would increase from 30,000 to 36,000 in the future, which is manageable.

Western bypass – G&H take off furthest to the north. G takes off a short distance from Frederica; H is a little further south. They are particularly effective at diverting traffic. So, traffic is actually not much more than half of what it is today. In other words, the bypass would take 40-50% of existing traffic levels through the middle of Milford. This is good for traffic congestion, but it may not be in terms of business impacts.

Alternative I is a little bit out of the way, and is a little bit more different between the bypasses and existing US 113. But it is somewhat in the same range as C, D, E, and F on the east side. Apparently effective, but not as much so as G.

For Alternative J the bypass is only in the Kent County part of Milford. It takes off right at US 113 and SR1 split and goes behind all of the businesses and the

industrial park on the west side of US 113 and ties back at the bridge over Haven Lake. So, Traffic volumes will be the same because you are back on –alignment at Haven Lake. That bypass will take about 40,000 cars off of the Kent County portion of US113. Leaving roughly 6,000-8,000 remaining in the future. So, there will be some concern about viability of businesses in that area because 80-90% of traffic will be removed from the road. By the same token, congestion concerns that you are experiencing at SR14 and west extent of Airport Road would be alleviated.

Mr. Riegner thanked the working group. Mr. Hite thanked Jeff and reminded the Working Group about the three legged stool model for public involvement, the working group, the public and the environmental resource agencies.

Mr. Riegner informed the Working Group that the Project Team is retaining the No-Build and On-Alignment Alternatives for further study and that some of the major concerns regarding the study is safety, the existing SR 1 north of Milford and the existing US 113 south of the State line are essentially limited access, and with having signals between the section of US 113 in Southern Kent County and Sussex County poses a safety problem. He then indicated that Project Team recommends not carrying forward Option 3 for further study because it does not meet Purpose and Need.

Mr. Riegner explained the use of the Matrix and its significance and public's role in the decision making process. He indicated that an On-Alignment and an Off-Alignment decision was the goal to meet by the end of the meeting. He then mentioned that Opt 1 & 2 has been combined and that it is full control of access so that it is a true limited access highway along existing US 113.

The major concerns regarding On-Alignment are the emergency service access, business access, and in general cutting it in two.

In the East, B passes north of Lincoln, the other 12 options to south of Lincoln. Each interchange starts with Route 1 at the northeast end of 113 towards the southwest near Hudson Pond. Each one includes the addition of the third lane in each direction on the existing Milford bypass.

Mr. Riegner informed the Working Group to keep in mind is that development is occurring rapidly in the area and that the Project Team needs to continue the ongoing development coordination with the city and the developers to ensure DelDOT retains the ability to do that option. One important thing to note, he added, is that each of these alternatives includes only between 4 and 5 miles of the new highway which is substantially less than on the west side. He also indicated that the information regarding cost estimates is inconclusive, the western bypass alternatives that are 12 miles long will cost somewhere in the range of 3 times the western bypass alternatives.

He then referred to the impact matrix for the eastern bypass and explained that some key things to keep in mind are historic resources and wetlands are very important which Mr.

Hellmann and Mr. Wutka have discussed in the past. Furthermore, he discussed the total number of properties affected, the total acreage within the Right-of-Way, the limits of disturbance, which are all shown on the plans

Furthermore, he indicated that the East Bypass will result in lower traffic on existing US 113 than the No build. He also suggested that B is not effective and that C-F are similar so they should be grouped together. They are moderately effective and meet purpose and need.

To conclude, all East bypasses with the possible exception of B work. All of them have a fairly united resource impacts to the west. B is longer; effects more aquatic resources and forest land than C-F. 2/3 of the comments from the last Public Workshop were positive on the East Bypass alternatives – FN3 (Southern most alternatives) received the most public support. CN1 furthest north, above Lincoln, received the least. Public support, the general support is to go south.

He then summarized comments for the west.

- Most of the alternatives are to the west of Milford

- Alternatives were chosen to minimize natural and cultural resources

- A lot of cultural resources on the west – Haven Lake, Blairs Pond, Griffins Pond

- Try to fit the narrow spots on pond

- All the Alternatives on the west side have an interchange through SR14 as well as interchanges at either end.

- Alternative 6 has an interchange at SR26 – longer bypass

- J close bypass with just a portion of Kent, western bypass requires “too much new road” is the general public concern

- May encourage even more development west of Milford.

- Goes though more land not staked for development

- Much of the land in the east is already in development, but not all

- Terms of length – total length of 113 through study area is 11 miles

- Western alternative would b/n 1 and 3 miles to the 11.2 mile length

Mr. Riegner summarized his presentation by adding that there was no reason to discount the alternatives based on traffic but they do have resource impacts and in general the comments from the public 2/3 concerning the western bypasses were negative. We didn't hear that one part alternative on the west was worse than the other, but the key themes that were heard that were impacting farmland and Natural resources.

Mr. Kramer stated that we would break into 2 groups to look at maps. Are there any questions or comments? Terms of clarification, traffic, comments for the whole group to hear. The purpose tonight is to make decisions in terms of which options should be carried forward and not carried forward. There are concerns of whether the 3<sup>rd</sup> lane option meets the purpose and need of the project. There was some consensus last time about which options should go forth and the Project Team wants to reflect that consensus.

The Project Team assigned the Working Group into small breakout groups.

Group 1 consisted of Mr. Pikus, Mr. Edgell, Mr. Wutka, Ms. Mallem, Mr. Burton, Mr. Mick, Mr. Thomas, Ms. LaGrande, Mr. Clendaniel, and Mr. Fox

Group 2 consisted of Mr. Riegner, Mr. Bing., Mr. Oliver, and everyone not called into the 1<sup>st</sup> group

Mr. Hite directed the general public to the table to right.

Mr. Kramer introduced the first group to speak with Mr. Pikus leading the way.

Afterwards he summarized that group 1 wished to:

Drop A3

Don't support A1 & A2 on-alignment. Understand that it must be carried forward in study.

West bypass – drop all but H,K, N, 6

Mixed views pros & cons. Things in the west but must keep viable something that can be studied on the west in case something becomes insurmountable in the east

In the East they wished to:

Drop B and all the one's

Keep C, D, E, and F, 2, 3 to find best options with the least impacts on properties and deal with the issues that have the best of each case on terms of Jonathan's Road. Concerns for emergency (Addressed by WGM)

Summary for Group 2 included to:

Drop J, I, L options on west

In the northern area G and H, carry forward both, but preference for G

In the southern area, drop 5, carry forward 4 & 6, but prefer 6

GN6 preferred

In the East:

2 & 3 further study, prefer 2, drop B, C, F some combination or look at D & E, prefer E. Must come back to 3<sup>rd</sup> lane issue.

Mr. Riegner restated position regarding east and indicated retaining 2 alternatives E2 & B2 in the east

Mr. Kramer specified that the west had some areas of consensus. Dropping J, I, L both groups agreed on that. Further consensus on carrying forward H & 6. One group

preferred G and also N (preference for GN6). The other group said to drop all but NKN6

One group preferred G and the other had not enumerated G as one to keep. The other has to do with the one group that eliminated G. It had not been recommended that 4 be dropped.

The other groups recommended that they preferred G and though they did not prefer 4 they felt it should be carried forward in case there are flaws with carrying forward 5 & 6. Narrowing down whether to carry forward G4

Everything else there is an agreement on.

Mr. Riegner emphasized that G & D have similar likenesses

Mr. Bing stated that his group had a preference for 6, but the groups want back ups just in case.

Mr. Hellmann specified that 4 will be difficult to get through the Resource Agencies. He suggested that G will be more attractive to the Agencies

Mr. Kramer indicated that the group is comfortable with carrying forward G but have heartburn with carrying forward 4 because it has problems from our agency point of view. That's not the decision. He specified that this group wanted more comment from other members.

2 things on the table at this time included

- Adding G to the ones that prefer it or drop it

- 4 one wants to carry it forward but project team recommends that it not get carried forward.

After collaboration, Mr. Kramer was able to announce that everyone was comfortable with that the third lane option to be dropped from further study. At the same time, there is no support for on-alignment but everyone understands that it will be carried forward for further study. There is support east bypass but the Working Group does not support options on the west. And at the same time the following should be carried forward for further study as well as the others that were agreed upon.

Mr. Kramer then concluded the meeting by reminding everyone that the Public Workshop was on June 6<sup>th</sup> from 4-7. Need to be there for just an hour to interact with members of the public. We are going to the resource agencies in July. DelDOT will meet after meetings with the agencies making its final decisions on alternatives retained. Then the project team will be going into detailed analysis and will be coming back in the fall to share.

Mr. Hite thanked everyone for attending the meeting and then reminded the members that the flyers for the next workshop are with Ed Thomas.

Mr. Kramer asked everyone to get the word out. He indicated that the Project Team does not like to hear information second hand about impacts to property after a public meeting. He specified that everyone needs to come out for the Workshops.



Project Team Attendees:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Monroe Hite, III	DeIDOT
Sonya LaGrande	DeIDOT
Andrew Bing	KA
Bob Kramer	KA
Ed Thomas	KA
Linda Moreland	Remline
Bill Hellmann	RK&K
Joe Wutka	RK&K
Shilpa Mallem	RK&K
Tim DeSchepper	RK&K
Jeff Riegner	WRA
Todd Oliver	WRA
Tom Shafer	WRA

Citizens in Attendance:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Address</b>
Bob Wink	Bonanza Restaurant	
Bill Links	Seacoast Realty	P.O. Box 878 Bethany Beach, DE. 19930
Bill and Betty Willoughby		Milford, DE. 19963
Robert Hitchens		Milford, DE.
Gwen Guerke	Milford Chronicle	P.O. Box 297 Milford, DE. 19963
Joe Warnell	Self	720 A McColley Ct. Milford, DE. 19963
Steve Barlow	Self	10109 N. Old State Rd. Lincoln, DE. 19960
Marie Barlow	Self	10109 N. Old State Rd. Lincoln, DE. 19960
Mark Yoder	Self	8289 Greenwood Rd.
Gary Simpson	Senate	Carlisle Fire Company
Diana Kelly	Milford Beacon	12 S. Walnut St. Milford, DE.
Terrie Pope	Self	919 Roush Rd. Milford, DE. 19963
Joe Wells	Self	P.O. Box 599 Milford, DE. 19963