

APPENDIX A: Section 106 of the NHPA Coordination

*SR 26, Atlantic Avenue from Clarksville to Assawoman Canal
Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Evaluation*



*U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration*



STATE OF DELAWARE
Department of Transportation

MEETING NOTES

DATE: August 23, 2004

PROJECT: 24-112-10
SR 26 MAINLINE, CLARKSVILLE TO ASSAWOMAN CANAL

ATTENDEES:

Mike Hahn	DelDOT
Patrick Carpenter	DelDOT
Rob McCleary	DelDOT
Dave Manley	Century Engineering
Frank Belen	Century Engineering
Alan Marteney	Century Engineering
Jill Frey	Century Engineering

PREPARED BY: Jill F. Frey

Discussion:

The meeting was held with Mike Hahn and Patrick Carpenter to discuss the proposed Alternatives for the SR 26 Mainline Improvements. This project will widen existing SR 26 to provide 2 – 11' travel lanes with 5' shoulders, left turn lanes will be added at the intersections. The improvements are the same as was developed in the concept plan developed by McCormick Taylor and Associates (MTA) in 1999 with a few changes. The concept plans showed bypass lanes being constructed at the intersections; DelDOT does not allow bypass lanes to be constructed and therefore left turn lanes will be added at these intersections. The plans have also been updated to more accurately reflect the right of way required for this project.

The determination of eligibility report has been completed since the concept plans were developed. Fifteen parcels along the project corridor were determined to be eligible for the National Register, with one property being listed on the register. Due to the proximity of the historic parcels, Century has looked at alternative alignments to minimize or avoid impacts to these parcels.

Mike Hahn suggested that recent photos of the historic structures be added to the aerial display for the public workshop. The photos will give the public a better perspective to what is being avoided and preserved by the alignment shifts. He also stated that he has a 1973 video of the SR 26 corridor that could be used to show the differences in the character of the roadway and also the need for the project. Mike will provide the project team with a copy of this video. Mike also stated that he and Patrick would be available to attend the public workshop to help discuss these issues with the public if needed.

The project will be centered along the existing roadway centerline for the majority of the project length. In areas where historic properties are adjacent to the roadway, CEI looked at different alternatives of shifting the alignment to avoid impacting the parcels. The project was broken into four sections where alternative alignments need to be analyzed to try and minimize/avoid impacts to the

24-112-10
August 23, 2004
Page 2 of 4

historic properties. The following is a brief description of the sections and the alternatives that were explored in each one.

SECTION ONE

Section one begins at the west project limits and continues east to beyond the Campbell Farm (S-9771). This section passes by the following eligible properties: Edmund J. and Sadie E. Evans House (S-243), M.O. Webb House (S-2484), and the Mark Hiestand House (S-2439) along with the Spring Banke House(S-454) which is listed on the National Register. CEI looked at three alternatives within this section.

Alternative A keeps the widening about the roadway centerline and follows the original concept plan with the addition of a left turn lane at Irons Lane. This alternative would require right of way from all 44 adjacent properties. One residence will be displaced and right of way would be required from all five historic properties, both eligible and listed. No historic structure will be affected by this alternative. No forest, streams or archeological sites will be affected by this alternative, but 44 trees will be removed in this alternative.

Alternative B shifts the alignment 10' to the north to avoid the Webb House property, then shifts 10' to the south to avoid the Evans House property and continues the shift to the south past the Spring Banke and Campbell Farm properties. This alternative would require right of way from the Hiestand property while avoiding the four other historic properties. The structure is set back on the Hiestand property. Since the structure on this property is not shown on the survey, CEI will add the building to the plans. The shifts at the west end of the section will cause an additional three residential displacements in order to not require right of way from the two historic properties.

Alternative C starts out the same as B with the 10' shifts to the north and south to avoid the Evans and Webb properties. The alignment then shifts back to the centerline before shifting south again to avoid right of way acquisitions from the Spring Banke and Campbell Farm properties. The shift back to the centerline will require right of way from the properties on the north and south side of the roadway equally where no shift is needed. Right of way would still be required from the Hiestand property under this alternative. Again the project will require a strip acquisition with no direct impact to the historic structure on that property.

DelDOT stated that they would prefer a combination of alternatives A and C. On the west end of the project the improvements will center on the existing roadway centerline to avoid the relocation of three properties caused by the shift in the roadway alignment. On the east end of the section, the alignment will be shifted to the south to avoid right of way acquisition from the Spring Banke and Campbell Farm properties. As stated above, the improvements will require right of way from the Hiestand property.

SECTION TWO

Section two starts at station 81+00 and continues east past Whites Neck Road to station 97+00. One historic property is located within this section. The O. T. Collins Family property is located on the northwest corner of the SR 26/Whites Neck Road intersection. CEI looked at two alternatives for this section.

24-112-10
August 23, 2004
Page 3 of 4

Alternative A keeps the widening about the existing centerline. This alternative affects all 24 properties adjacent to the roadway. No residences or commercial businesses will be displaced, but right of way will be required from the one historic parcel. No wetlands, streams or archeological sites will be affected by this alternative, but a portion of the roadway is within the 100 year floodplain. No forested land will be affected, but 15 trees will be removed under this alternative.

Alternative B shifts the widening 10' to the south to avoid right of way acquisition from the historic parcel. This alternative reduces the total number of parcels which need right of way acquisition from 24 to 21. No residences or business are displaced by this alternative.

DelDOT stated that this section may need to be shown with both alternatives. They would prefer taking both alternatives to the meeting with SHPO and FHWA. Alternative A will require right of way from the historic parcel, and may displace the business (gas station) from this parcel due to impacts to the circulation and gas pumps. Alternative B will avoid these impacts, but the access to the parcel will need to be modified for safety reasons and this may affect the use of the parcel. Shifting of the alignment through this section may cause public opposition to the project based on comments at the first advisory committee meeting. Both the alternatives will be shown to the SHPO and FHWA at the meeting scheduled for 9/13/04.

SECTION THREE

Section three begins at station 97+00 and continues east to station 109+00 at Railway Road. This section passes by the following eligible properties: Paul and Margaret McGinn Property (S-9753) and the Howard Hickman property (S-9757). A small barn is the only portion of the McGinn property which is eligible, whereas the entire Hickman property is eligible. CEI looked at two alternatives within this section.

Alternative A keeps the widening about the roadway centerline and follows the original concept plans with the addition of a left turn lane at Railway Road. This alternative requires right of way from all eight adjacent parcels and the one eligible parcel. Three residences will be displaced by this alternative. No forest, streams or archeological sites will be affected by this alternative, but 15 trees will be removed.

Alternative B shifts the alignment 10' to the south to avoid the McGinn parcel. This alternative will require right of way from the seven adjacent parcels, but not from the one historic parcel. One additional residence will be displaced by this alternative. No forest, streams or archeological sites will be affected by this alternative and no additional trees will need to be removed.

DelDOT stated that they would prefer Alternative B for this section. This alternative avoids right of way acquisition to the historic property.

SECTION FOUR

Section four begins at Clubhouse Road and continues east to Grants Avenue. This section passes by the following eligible properties: Grace D. Wolf House (S-9119), Blaine T. Phillips Property (S-9741),

24-112-10
August 23, 2004
Page 4 of 4

Townsend Store and Dwelling (S-9120), Ralph & Geraldine B. West Property (S-9115), and Mark & Paul Brown Property (S-9737). CEI looked at three alternatives within this section.

Alternative A keeps the widening about the roadway centerline and follows the original concept plans. This alternative requires right of way from all 37 adjacent properties, one residential property will be displaced and one commercial property will be displaced. All five eligible properties will have right of way acquisitions. No forest or archeological sites will be affected, but 26 trees will be removed by this alternative. One stream will be crossed and portions of the 100 year and 500 year floodplains will be affected.

Alternative B shifts the alignment 10' to the north to avoid the Wolf, Phillips and Townsend Store properties, then shifts to the south to avoid the West and Brown properties. This alternative will affect 32 adjacent properties with no business or residential displacements. This alternative eliminates the right of way acquisition from the historic properties. Though the acquisition is avoided, the Townsend Store and Dwelling could still be affected since the existing porch is within the roadway right of way. This alternative does not increase the affects to the streams, farms or floodplains, and reduces the number of trees to be removed to 13.

Alternative C shifts the alignment to the north to avoid the Wolf, Phillips and Townsend Store properties, then shifts to the south to avoid the West and Brown properties similar to Alternative B. Alternative C returns to the existing centerline between the West and Brown properties; thus requiring an equal amount of right of way acquisition from the properties on both sides of the roadway. Thirty-four properties will be affected by this alternative with one residential displacement. This alternative does not increase the affects to the streams, farms or floodplains and reduces the number of trees to be removed to 16.

DelDOT stated that they prefer Alternative C for this section. This alternative balances the right of way acquisition to non-historic properties and other resources while limiting the acquisition from the historic resources. It was also stated that even though a portion of the Townsend Store and Dwelling exists within the roadway right of way, a total acquisition of the property should be avoided. This situation will be discussed with the SHPO and FHWA at the alternative review meeting.

DelDOT also suggested that the project team meet with the affected property owners of the historic resources. The owner's feeling towards the project and the potential impact may affect the final alternative. A conversation with the owner of the gas station at Whites Neck Road is important since this property may be affected by either Alternative due to the access issues.

The alternatives will be discussed on 9/13/04 with SHPO and FHWA and then one preferred Alternative will be chosen. This alternative will be displayed at the public workshop to be held this fall.

These notes represent the author's best recollection of the discussion. If there are any revisions, please notify the author in writing within seven days of receipt of these notes.

Cc: Attendees
T. Banez
File (J:\projects\sr26mainline\alternative anaysis\mtg with mike hahn 8-23-04.doc)

MEETING NOTES

DATE: September 13, 2004

PROJECT: 24-112-10
SR 26 MAINLINE, CLARKSVILLE TO ASSAWOMAN CANAL

ATTENDEES:

Mike Hahn	DelDOT
Patrick Carpenter	DelDOT
Rob McCleary	DelDOT
Terry Fulmer	DelDOT
Dan Griffith	Delaware SHPO
Gwen Davis	Delaware SHPO
Bob Kleinburd	FHWA
Dave Manley	Century Engineering
Alan Marteney	Century Engineering
Jill Frey	Century Engineering

PREPARED BY: Jill F. Frey

Discussion:

A meeting was held with representatives from the Delaware State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and DelDOT's Environmental Section to discuss the proposed improvements on the SR 26 Mainline project. The project will widen existing SR 26 from Clarksville to the Assawoman Canal. Two 11' travel lanes with 5' shoulders and turn lanes at the intersections will be constructed. Fifteen historic properties (one listed on the national register and 14 eligible) line the roadway within the project limits. One structure that was deemed eligible in the project's DOE report has been removed by the owner and the property is being developed as a commercial site. CEI has looked at Alternatives for the design of the project to minimize and avoid impacts to the historic properties.

The project will utilize two typical sections, one with an open drainage section and the second will be closed drainage. The closed drainage section will be constructed from the eastern project limits to approximately Old Mill Road. The open drainage section will be constructed from Old Mill Road to the western project limits in Clarksville. The original intent of the project was to widen the existing roadway about the centerline to construct the improvements. In order to minimize the impacts to the cultural resources, the widening may be shifted to the north or south of the existing roadway centerline in the vicinity of the resources.

The project was broken into four sections for the purpose of reviewing the minimization of impacts. Alternatives were developed for each section to minimize the impacts to the cultural resources. The four sections are separated from each other by lengths of roadway, therefore the Alternatives developed for each section are independent of and do not influence the Alternatives in the other sections. A meeting was held on 8/23/04 with the DelDOT Environmental section to discuss these

24-112-10
September 13, 2004
Page 2 of 3

Alternatives. The meeting minutes from the 8/23/04 meeting are attached. These meeting minutes describe the Alternatives in detail.

Section one begins at the western project limits and continues east to Irons Lane. Five historic properties are located within the section limits on both sides of SR 26. They are the Evans, Spring Banke (listed), Webb, Hiestand and Campbell properties. The preferred Alternative is a combination of A and C. This combination of Alternatives will require right of way acquisitions from three historic properties, the Evans, Webb and Hiestand properties. The group felt that the combination of Alternatives best balanced the takes on the historic properties and the total acquisitions required due to shifts in the alignment to minimize the historic impacts. The chart will be updated to show the impacts from this combined Alternative. This Alternative will be shown at the public workshop in November.

Section two is in the vicinity of Whites Neck Road, and has two historic properties within the section limits. The properties within the limits are the Collins and the Banks property. The eligible feature on the Collins property is a small barn that sits off of the roadway, and it was determined that the limits of the historic resource is the outline of the barn, so the project will not affect this property. The preferred Alternative for section two is Alternative B. This Alternative holds the existing right of way line in front of the Banks property. The effect on the property will need to be determined since the access to the property will be changed during this project. The property is a functioning gas station/store with no control of the access along SR 26. The project will channelize the access to this property and therefore may affect the function of the property. This will be discussed in the cultural resources documentation for the project.

Section three is in the vicinity of Railway Road and has two historic properties within the section limits. The properties within the limits are the McGinn and Hickman property. The eligible feature on the McGinn property is a small barn that sits off of the roadway and it was determined that the limits of the historic resource is the outline of the barn, so the project will not affect this property. The preferred Alternative for section three is Alternative B. This Alternative holds the existing right of way line in front of the Hickman property and therefore will not require right of way acquisitions from this property.

Section four begins just west of Dukes Drive and continues east to Old School Road. Five historic properties are located within the section limits. These properties are: Wolf, Philips, West, and Brown properties and the Townsend store and Dwelling. The preferred Alternative for this section is Alternative C. This Alternative shifts to minimize impacts to the historic resources. A small take is required on the West property due to its location with respect to the other historic parcels. This is the Alternative that will be shown at the public meeting in November.

The Lord Baltimore School historic property is located in a section of the project that does not have any other historic properties. At this time, it is believed that the project will not encroach into the property beyond the existing sidewalk that is along SR 26.

The next issue discussed was the need to review the proposed Alternatives, not just the preferred Alternative, with the public. SHPO stated that the method to review the Alternatives with the public is left to the state to decide, but recommended discussing the Alternatives with the local municipalities within the project limits. Dan offered to attend the next advisory committee meeting to discuss the Section 106 process with the committee so that they can better understand their involvement. The next

24-112-10
September 13, 2004
Page 3 of 3

advisory committee meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2004 at 5:30 p.m. at the Village of Bear Trap Dunes.

SHPO had some questions regarding the archeological report prepared for the project. The report was prepared by Skelly and Loy and was based on the 2001 conceptual plans prepared by MTA. The first concern was the limits of the testing completed for the project. The conceptual plans showed most of the improvements being done within the existing right of way. Since the existing right of way is 40' additional right of way will be required for the majority of the project. Additional right of way will also be required for stormwater management areas and the location of the proposed stormwater facilities is still being determined. DelDOT will schedule a meeting with Skelly and Loy to discuss this report. DelDOT and SHPO will determine the extent of any additional archeological investigation that will need to be done for this project.

The second issue SHPO stated was at the Clarksville intersection. A cemetery is located on the southwest and northwest corner of this intersection along Omar Road. Some gravestones within the cemetery predate the church located across the street. A retaining wall separates the cemetery from the roadway. Some graves are located close to this wall. The conceptual plans show impacts to the wall and possibly to a marked grave in this location. DelDOT stated that the intent of the project is to not impact the wall or the cemetery and all attempts will be made to avoid this area.

Another area of concern is the Parsons Store site. The remains of the store were uncovered during the investigation of the cemetery at Central Avenue. SHPO will review the findings regarding the Store with Skelly and Loy and DelDOT.

DelDOT will schedule a field meeting to review each historic property to better understand the possible effects of the project on the property. This meeting will be scheduled before the next advisory committee meeting for the project.

These notes represent the author's best recollection of the discussion. If there are any revisions, please notify the author in writing within seven days of receipt of these notes.

Cc: Attendees
T. Banez
File (J:\projects\sr26mainline\alternative anaysis\mtg with shop 9-13-04.doc)

MEETING NOTES

DATE: October 15, 2004

PROJECT: 24-112-10
SR 26, Clarksville to Assawoman Canal

ATTENDEES:

Mike Hahn	DeIDOT
Rob McCleary	DeIDOT
Dan Griffin	DeSHPO
Gwen Davis	DeSHPO
Bob Kleinburd	FHWA
Dave Manly	Century Engineering
Jill Frey	Century Engineering

PREPARED BY: Jill F. Frey

Discussion:

The meeting was held on site of the SR 26, Clarksville to Assawoman Canal project to review the cultural resource properties with respect to the project. Fourteen sites are located within the limits of the project.

The first stop was at the St. Georges Church in Clarksville. SHPO asked if the parking lot was still being impacted by the project; if so, additional archeology work will need to be completed. Once the preliminary design is complete, we will know if the existing parking lot will be impacted and will therefore need to be reconstructed. Additional archeological testing will be required through out the project once the stormwater management pond locations are determined. If the parking lot will be impacted, the additional archeological work will be completed at that time.

The Church has a cemetery located adjacent to the roadway. The existing stone wall is at the edge of the pavement. Gravestones which pre-date the church are located behind the wall, in close proximity to the existing pavement. SHPO noted that there is a possibility that remains may be under the roadway and caution will need to be used for any work done in this location. Excavation for utility relocations, pavement reconstruction or drainage should be avoided in this area if possible to avoid disturbing any possible remains. A project note should be added at this location requiring the contractor to use extreme caution during construction.

For the purposes of evaluating avoidance and minimization to cultural resources, the project has been divided into four sections. Section 1 includes the Webb, Evans, Spring-Banke, Campbell and Hiestand properties. It was decided to hold the existing right-of-way line along the Webb House, utilizing the existing ditch, if possible. The Evans House will be avoided. The existing Sycamore tree in the front yard is a contributing element to the site. The Spring Banke property and the Campbell Farm will be avoided. As a result, there will be adverse impacts to the Hiestand House. SHPO requested that an alternative be developed which avoids takes to the Spring-Banke parcel and splits the

24-112-10
October 15, 2004
Page 2 of 3

take between the Campbell and Hiestand properties. FHWA stated they would prefer to take land from only one parcel and not split the take between the two. These minimization/avoidance alternatives will be evaluated as part of the Environmental Assessment. It was noted that alternative design elements should be considered to minimize impacts to the Hiestand property.

Section 2 encompasses the Collins property (small barn) and the Banks property. The small barn on the Collins property sits off of the roadway and therefore has no right of way acquisitions associated with it. Mike Hahn indicated that this resource may not be NR eligible. The Banks property is a functioning gas station located on the northwest corner of SR 26 and Whites Neck Road. The preferred alternative in this section will shift the roadway to the south to avoid right of way acquisition from the Banks property. Currently, this parcel has open (non-controlled) access on both SR 26 and Whites Neck Road. The preferred alternative, while not acquiring right of way, will modify the entrances to create controlled access points. SHPO noted that part of the historical significance of the property is the commercial aspect and that the entrance modifications should ensure that the gas station function can be maintained. If the property could not function as a gas station, the commercial viability of the property may be limited. There is a possibility that the pumps can be relocated to the east side of the property. DelDOT will contact the property owner to discuss design options. This property should be monitored for possible redevelopment.

Section 3 includes the McGinn property (small barn) and the Hickman property. The small barn on the McGinn property sits off of the roadway, but right of way will be acquired from the overall property. (The McGinn property is currently for sale). SHPO noted that as long as the property is not a total acquisition that this would be acceptable. The preferred alternative in this section will shift the roadway to the south to avoid right of way acquisition from the Hickman parcel. The Hickman property is in an area where the houses on the south side of SR 26 are close to the roadway. The alignment shift will cause one additional acquisition on the south side of the roadway.

Section 4 includes the Wolf, Phillips, Townsend, West and Brown properties. The preferred alternative in this section shifts the alignment first to the north and then to the south to avoid the right of way acquisitions from the Wolf, Phillips and Brown properties. A small amount of land will need to be acquired from the West property..

The Townsend Store is located such that the overhang of the building is within the existing roadway right of way. Acquisition of this property was avoided, but the overhang will be a safety issue and may need to be altered.

After the meeting, one change was noted in the display created for this project. The Townsend property has two structures – the store and an adjacent house. The store is labeled as the Townsend property and the house is labeled as the Phillips property. The Phillips property is located one parcel to the west of the Townsend property and no picture is shown for this property. The display will be updated to correctly show the properties.

Lord Baltimore Elementary School is located within the project limits. No right of way acquisitions will be required from this property. The sidewalk may be removed and replaced in the existing location, without the acquisition of additional right of way.

24-112-10
October 15, 2004
Page 3 of 3

The discussions and concurrence reached regarding cultural resources at this meeting will be included in the Environmental Assessment.

These notes represent the author's best recollection of the discussion. If there are any revisions, please notify the author in writing within seven days of receipt of these notes.

cc: Tom Banez
Alan Marteney
Attendees
File (J:\projects\sr26mainline\alternate analysis\field meeting shpo 10-15-04.doc)

MEETING NOTES

DATE: January 13, 2005

PROJECT: 24-112-10
SR 26 MAINLINE, CLARKSVILLE TO ASSAWOMAN CANAL

ATTENDEES: Rob McCleary DelDOT
Tom Banez DelDOT
Mike Hahn DelDOT
Bob Kleinburd FHWA
Jill Frey Century Engineering

PREPARED BY: Jill F. Frey

Discussion:

The meeting was held to discuss the possibility of adding a center turn lane on the SR 26 mainline project. The current design calls for two 11' travel lanes, 5' shoulders and 12' left turn lanes at the major roadway intersections. An alternative analysis has been completed and reviewed by both SHPO and FHWA with respect to the cultural resources located within the project limits. The final Environment Assessment has not yet been approved for this project.

Due to public comment, the Department is looking at adding a center left turn lane for the entire length of the project. The addition of this turn lane will require right of way takes from some of the eligible parcels. Some of these takes are new, as in no take is required for the project as it stands today, and some are larger takes to the eligible parcels than that is required for the current project. The Department is in the preliminary stages of reviewing the center left turn lane for this project.

Mr. Kleinburd stated that FHWA would look at an analysis of the addition of the center turn lane and determine if the associated impacts are feasible. He also stated that this would need to be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office. He suggested that DelDOT prepare an alternative analysis looking at a no-build and build scenario with respect to the center turn lane. In areas where the center turn lane in addition to the alignment shift will cause the relocation of several additional properties, he suggested also looking partial shifts of the alignment to minimize both right of way acquisitions from the eligible parcel and relocations to the properties across the street. Once this alternatives analysis is completed and the impacts tabulated, the concept can be reviewed by SHPO and FHWA.

Mr. Kleinburd also noted that the addition of the center turn lane needs to be justified. Century is in the process of looking at the before and after traffic numbers to substantiate that the center turn lane reduces mid-block congestion. This information will need to be presented along with the alternatives analysis.

These notes represent the author's best recollection of the discussion. If there are any revisions, please notify the author in writing within seven days of receipt of these notes.

Cc: Attendees
T. Banez
File (J:\projects\sr26mainline\alternative anaysis\mtg with shop 9-13-04.doc)

CENTURY
ENGINEERING
NOTES OF MEETING

CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Date: March 9, 2005

Attendees: Bob Kleinburd FHWA
Gwen Davis DESHPO
Rob McCleary DelDOT
Tom Banez DelDOT
Terry Fulmer DelDOT
Kevin Cunningham DelDOT
Patrick Carpenter DelDOT
Alan Marteney Century Engineering
Dave Manly Century Engineering
Jill Frey Century Engineering

RE: Contract 24-112-10
SR 26 Clarksville to Assawoman Canal
Shared Center Left Turn Lane Alternative Analysis

Prepared By: Jill F. Frey JFF

Meeting was held to discuss the SR 26 Clarksville to Assawoman Canal project with respect to potential effects to historic and cultural resources in the project APE. The proposed improvements on SR26 had been developed from a study that began in 1998. Based on traffic volumes, safety data and public input at that time, a concept for the improvements was presented to the public in 2001 that included a minimum of two 11' travel lanes with 5' shoulders and left turn lanes at major roadway intersections and a few other strategic areas. A Determination of Eligibility report has been done that identified the listed and eligible to be listed historic resources. Archaeology investigations have been done in the limits shown in the concept plans and wetland delineations have been made throughout the project limits. A minimization and avoidance study to implement the concept plan was previously reviewed with FHWA & SHPO. A Public Workshop was held in November 2004 to show the resulting implementation of the 2001 concept plans. Due to increased traffic volumes and accidents since 2001, the extensive development being proposed in the study area and comments from the public, elected officials and local business groups, a shared center turn lane between intersections as was constructed on SR 26 between SR 1 and the Assawoman Canal is now being investigated.

Following the same approach for minimizing effects that was used for the initial concept plans, the potential effects of adding the shared center left turn lane has been evaluated. A tabulation of these potential effects along with information regarding the updated traffic and accident data was distributed at the meeting and is attached. According to the information presented, there is a justified need for a shared center turn lane between

Contract 24-110-12
Center turn lane alternatives analysis
March 9, 2005
Page 2 of 3

intersections within the project limits. The project team feels that this center turn lane can be added to the project with minimal additional effects to the historic and cultural resources within the project limits.

The project was broken into seven segments in order to analyze the potential effects. These seven segments are the areas between intersections where left turn lanes were originally proposed. The project team reviewed four of these segments with representatives from DelDOT, FHWA and SHPO. A second meeting will be held to discuss the remaining segments.

Section one includes both the Webb house and the Evans house. These parcels are located across the street from one another. Under the original concept plan, takes from both parcels were needed to minimize takes from both. With the addition of the third lane, the Webb house will have an additional take of 29 S.F. Concerns were raised about impacts to the landscaping in front of the Webb house. Though this landscaping is not historic, it does provide a screen from the roadway and should be preserved if possible.

Section two includes the Spring-Banke (NRHP registered), Campbell Farm and Hiestand properties. The Spring-Banke and Campbell Farm are on the north side of the roadway and the Hiestand is on the south side of the roadway. Since it was not geometrically feasible to shift the alignment to avoid all three of these parcels, the decision was made to shift the roadway to the south to avoid the Spring-Banke property and, subsequently, the Campbell property. Right of way acquisition will be required from the Hiestand property, though the structure will not be taken due to the added lane. Concerns were raised about the amount of land needed from the Hiestand property and the question was asked whether the take could be split between the Hiestand and Campbell properties. The project team stated that while it was not possible to split the take, additional minimization measures would be looked at on the Hiestand property.

The third segment includes the Collins property (barn only) and the Banks property (gas station). No additional right of way takes are needed from these properties due to the addition of the shared left center turn lane.

The fourth segment includes the McGinn property (barn only) and the Hickman parcel. These parcels are located across the street from one another. One alternative for the addition of the shared left turn lane, with no minimization effort, will require a take of the house associated with the barn on the McGinn property but no additional right of way from the Hickman parcel. SHPO stated that they would consider a take of the McGinn house an adverse effect even though this structure was found not eligible during the cultural resources evaluation. The alignment that requires no take from the Hickman parcel will require up to seven total acquisitions on the south side of the roadway. The project team looked at additional minimization alternatives in this section. These alternatives will require right of way acquisition from the Hickman parcel, but may reduce the total acquisitions to two. Due to time restrictions, these alternatives along with the remaining sections of the roadway will be discussed at a future meeting.

Contract 24-110-12
Center turn lane alternatives analysis
March 9, 2005
Page 3 of 3

At the end of the meeting, FHWA concurred that the need for the shared left center turn lane could be justified with the traffic and accident data.

Enclosures

cc: Attendees
M. Hahn – DelDOT
D. Bernardo – DelDOT
File (g:\projects\03517\03517.06\alternatives analysis\center turn lane shpo 3-9-05)



CONSULTING ENGINEERS

NOTES OF MEETING

Date: April 4, 2005

Attendees: Bob Kleinburd FHWA
 Gwen Davis DESHPO
 Rob McCleary DelDOT
 Tom Banez DelDOT
 Terry Fulmer DelDOT
 Mike Hahn DelDOT
 Kevin Cunningham DelDOT
 Patrick Carpenter DelDOT
 Alan Marteney Century Engineering
 Dave Manly Century Engineering
 Jill Frey Century Engineering

RE: Contract 24-112-10
 SR 26 Clarksville to Assawoman Canal
 Shared Center Left Turn Lane Alternative Analysis

Prepared By: Jill F. Frey *JFF*

A meeting was held to continue discussion on the SR 26 Clarksville to Assawoman Canal project with respect to potential effects to historic and cultural resources in the project APE. The project has been broken into seven segments for purposes of analyzing the shared center turn lane impacts. These segments are between areas where left turn lanes were shown on the concept plans presented at the November 2004 workshop. The first three segments were discussed at a meeting held on 3/9/05. The final four segments were discussed today.

Segment four includes the Hickman property on the north side of SR26 and the McGinn property on the south side. The historic resource identified on the McGinn property was only the barn to the rear of the property. The Hickman parcel is located within the Town of Millville and is located within the proposed open drainage section for the project. To avoid right-of-way acquisition on this parcel, the alignment was shifted 10' to the south. With the alignment shift and the open drainage section, up to eight relocations will be needed in this section. These relocations include the main house at the McGinn property. Though the house was not identified as an eligible historic resource, the historic setting of the barn is felt to be related to the house. Closed drainage alternatives with and without sidewalk were also reviewed. These alternatives reduce the number of potential relocations to six, while still having no acquisition on the Hickman parcel. These potential relocations still include the house on the McGinn property. The final alternative

Contract 24-110-12
Center turn lane alternatives analysis
April 4, 2005
Page 2 of 3

reviewed was closed drainage, no sidewalk with all improvements shifted about the existing roadway centerline. This alternative requires an 826 sf take from the Hickman parcel but reduces the number of potential relocations to two and does not require the relocation of the house on the McGinn property. FHWA stated that the final alternative was acceptable. The small take on the Hickman parcel is justified due to the potential savings of up to six relocations. The determination of effect on the Hickman property should include contact with the property owners.

Segment five contains the Wolfe, Phillips and Townsend Store properties on the south side of SR26 and the West property on the north side. The alignment has been shifted to the north to avoid acquisition on the Wolfe, Phillips and Townsend properties. A small take (56 sf) is needed on the West property. Questions were asked regarding the impact to the overhang of the Townsend store. Part of the overhang is in the existing roadway right of way. All attempts will be made to not impact this overhang. The design may be modified to avoid the overhang while still providing the sidewalk in this area. As the details are finalized, the project team will coordinate with SHPO and FHWA. A License Agreement with the owner of the Townsend Store may be needed for their structure to remain within the Public Right-of-Way.

Segment six contains the Brown property on the north side of SR26 and the Lord Baltimore Elementary School on the south side. No take is required from either parcel due to the project. It has been reported that the Brown property has either been sold or is in the process of being sold to a developer. SHPO stated that we need to take into account what the property is today, though with the amount of time before the project goes to construction, things can be updated later. DelDOT also noted that the school district has a project at the Lord Baltimore Elementary School. Preliminary plans for the expansion have been submitted to the Town of Ocean View for review. Approvals are still needed from DelDOT and other agencies. DelDOT will be requiring a 20' right-of-way dedication along SR 26, as is required from any new development along the roadway. It was asked if this additional ROW could be used for the project, or if is still protected by the federal guidelines. After a discussion on the subject, FHWA stated that this additional land can be used for the project without having a 4(f) impact. The effect of the project under Section 106 would still need to be considered. The alignment may be shifted to minimize parking and other impacts on the north side of the roadway once this land has been dedicated.

Segment seven does not contain any historic resources. The shared left center turn lane will be centered about the previously proposed roadway centerline.

SHPO noted that even though takes are avoided on most historic parcels, an adverse affect may not have been avoided through out the project. The project needs to be looked at as a whole corridor and the addition of a center turn lane for the length of the project could change the feel of the surrounding land, and therefore may have an affect on the parcels. The project team needs to look at minimization and mitigation along the

Contract 24-110-12
Center turn lane alternatives analysis
April 4, 2005
Page 3 of 3

corridor. CEI stated that as the design continues, the project team will continually look for areas where the impacts can be minimized (such as the Hiestand property).

The archaeological report for the project has yet to be completed. SHPO has not given technical comments on the report yet due to the change in concept for the project. Once the final concept has been determined and the proposed stormwater management facility locations are set, the project team will meet with Skelly and Loy, DelDOT's archaeological subconsultant for the project. The updated limits of investigation will include the revised right-of-way and stormwater management facilities, parking mitigations and sites where structures will be relocated or demolished may also need review for archaeological resources.

The alternative discussed at this meeting will be taken to the public for a workshop on May 9, 2005 at the Roxana Fire Hall. Once comments are received from the public, the draft environmental assessment will be completed and submitted for review.

cc: Attendees
D. Bernardo – DelDOT
File (g:\projects\03517\03517.06\alternatives analysis\center turn lane shpo 4-04-05)