Memorandum of Meeting

Date:	March 30, 2005
Time:	4 p.m. to 7 p.m.
Location:	Meeting Hall, Millsboro Fire Company, Millsboro, DE.
Topic:	**Millsboro Area Working Group Meeting No. 7**
Attendees:	See Attached

The meeting was called to order by Bob Kramer at 5:30 p.m. He specified that the Working Group Meetings as to bring the needs of everyone working into the transportation development process. He thanked the helpers from the March 30th meeting for clarifying the issues brought forth regarding traffic data.

After the introductions, Mr. Kramer provided a brief summary of the Working Group's progress throughout the US 113 planning process. He welcomed the project team members to the Working Group Meeting. He also 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. 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 the next Public Workshop was scheduled for May 23rd in Millsboro, and May 24th in Selbyville. He mentioned that the information regarding the workshops and the working group meetings are available on the DelDOT website. Mr. Hite indicated that the next Working Group Meeting was scheduled for April 27th at 5:30 p.m. in the Millsboro Fire Hall. He specified that the project will provide an economic analysis to provide additional background towards the selection of a preferred alternative. He explained that the Project Team has developed a full range of alternatives, but not all of them will receive an evaluation. Evaluating every alternative in detail would produce an ineffective use of time and money. Therefore, the Project Team's goal is to narrow down the full range of alternatives to the shortlist of Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study by the next meeting. Afterwards, the retained alternatives will be studied in detail this summer and compared to each other to determine a "Preferred Alternative". He specified that the Comparison Matrix will assist in narrowing down the alternatives by determining the least amount of natural resource impacts, cultural resource impacts, property impacts, and agricultural impacts in any

given alternative. The Project Team will also consider traffic benefits, cost efficiency, and socioeconomic impacts when narrowing down the alternatives. The recommendation on which alternatives are retained will be in conjunction with the input submitted by the public. These alternatives will be chosen for detailed study and are to be based on a balance of all factors. Mr. Hite then introduced Jeff Riegner to discuss the traffic analysis alternatives.

Mr. Riegner specified that a traffic analysis will be used for the process and general trends of traffic forecasting. Furthermore, he indicated that the Project Team will review the questions that were previously raised at the last working group meeting. However, the results for each alternative from the updated preliminary model will not be presented until the next working group meeting. 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. However, the difficulty in preparing today is that predicting the future is not an exact science. But the way to project future (2030) traffic volumes is to determine the existing and future daily traffic levels on the current road system, and determine the future daily traffic levels with the proposed project. He mentioned that the Project Team typically select alternatives based on annual average daily traffic, however the Project Team will select alternatives for US 113 based on summer average daily traffic (SADT). Essentially, the detailed design will be based on the peak period of traffic of a typical summer Saturday.

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.

After the four steps estimate the volumes of traffic on US 113, the number of trips produced is measured by Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's). This model uses a top down formula for determining the number of trips made in an area from an individual's home to their job and back. Mr. Riegner then specified that little is done with TAZ's and that they are only used for projections. He then referred to the map, and specified that the fixed boundaries were within the orange lines and the TAZ's were within the green lines.

Jim Bennett then asked how the Project Team was planning to address the through traffic. Mr. Riegner specified that determining the Trip Distribution would use the trends

from the jurisdictions to funnel the projections into the external station with the amount of traffic to and from the population centers. 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. Mr. Kramer then thanked those helpers from the previous day's meeting who clarified the understanding of the traffic analysis for the evening's meeting.

He also explained that certain factors may encounter "fatal flaws" which will require the submittal of a Section 4(f) policy paper, federal permitting, or the attainment of broad-based public and/or legislative support. A Working Group Member asked for clarification on the term "fatal flaw". Bill Hellmann explained that a "fatal flaw" was any cultural or natural resource encountered during the project development. Mr. Hellmann explained that cultural and natural resources are protected by federal law. Section 4(f) of the Transportation Act of 1966 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 protects cultural resource and historic property sites from degradation during the construction of a project. However, he indicated that cultural resources that are located underground are not protected by federal law or the Transportation Act. Mr. Hellmann referred to the construction of Route 40 and its issues pertaining to Overton Park. He specified that to follow through with construction of the project, it would have required the taking of 317 homes in place of taking the park. However, the final alternative incorporated plans for the project to go under Overton Park to avoid any of the impacts. Mr. Hite announced that a week before the next Working Group Meeting the Project Team will meet with the Resource Agencies to discuss the project's potential impacts.

Mr. Kramer then claimed that a preferred alternative would not be chosen at this meeting, but the goal is to drop certain alternatives from consideration and select alternatives which will go on for further study.

Mr. Hellmann continued to explain that a Section 4(f) is a "fatal flaw" and the typical process for dealing with them is to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to the environment. Mr. Wutka specified that certain properties containing hazardous waste turned out to be "fatal flaws" and the project did not go through those properties. Mr. Kramer announced that the Project Team would have a better sense of the "fatal flaws" by April 27th after the Resource Agency Meeting with the Project Team. Ron Atherton asked if taking wetlands required replacing them somewhere else. Mr. Hellmann replied that they would have to be replaced with double the amount of wetland acreage taken.

Mr. Kramer announced that the Working Group Meeting was ending early so that the Project Team could prepare for the next meeting. Mr. Wutka specified that a No Build Alternative is required by federal law for comparison, and that no plan changes have been made to the current plans.

Mr. Kramer also announced that the Project Team was to meet with the Resource Agencies on April 20th. This meeting will provide more information for the Matrix and for the Traffic Projections. Mr. Kramer asked which alternatives are worth carrying forward at the next meeting. He then asked if the Working Group Members wanted the facts or if they wanted the conclusions and to exclude the facts. Richard Kautz indicated that he wanted the facts. Jim Bennett specified that he wanted the comments from the Resource Agencies and the Project Team before the Working Group concurs on a decision. Robert Daisy indicated that comparisons should be provided to the Working Group Members. Mr. Hellmann specified that the Project Team will look at the plus and minuses for the comparisons. Mr. Riegner indicated that the next meeting will narrow down the alternatives and that the Resource Agencies will choose the On-Alignment alternative. But, the Project team will keep looking at the East/West bypasses. Mr. Hellmann included that the environmental and social impacts also have to be evaluated. Mr. Bennett asked if costs were a factor. Mr. Kramer replied that there is a broad range of costs. Mr. Hellmann responded that costs are not a critical factor however the natural resources are a factor. Roger Marino specified that the Project Team should stay away from costs at this point in the project. Mr. Riegner indicated that the Project Team is currently identifying the feasibility of the project. Mr. Kramer specified that the range of costs for the project vary at this point and that there is a level of magnitude for those costs. Tom Hannan then explained that the Project Team will track the functionality of traffic based on its determinants.

Jim Bennett asked how the Working Group would reach a consensus for the final decision. Mr. Kramer replied that the Working Group and Project Team will make decisions at the next meeting.

Mr. Kramer then asked for everyone's contact information and email accounts. He also announced that old maps can be given back for recycling.

Mr. Hite concluded and announced that the next Working Group was scheduled for April 27th and the Public Workshop was for May 23rd.

Members who attended the Millsboro Working Group Meeting 03/30/2005

Atherton, Ronald
Bennett, Jim
Brake, Joe
Buehl, Eric
Bullock, Lynn
Connor, S. Bradley
Daisey, Robert
Davis, Mark
Kautz, Richard
Lingo, Faye
Marino, Roger
McComas, Pamela
Mitchell, Margaret
Norwood, Tran
Don Plows for Mike Simmons
Stuart, Robert
Warrington, Michael
White, George

Public Citizens in Attendance:

Tephobock, Kim – Dagsboro Church of God
Christenbury, Ken – Dagsboro Church of God
Mion, Gene – Dagsboro Church of God
Smith, Randall
Baker, Randy – Self
Diehl, James – Sussex Post
McBride, Kevin – MRD
Collins, Donald - Agriculture