



## Memorandum of Meeting

**Date:** April 21, 2005

**Time:** 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

**Location:** Cheer Senior Center, Georgetown, DE.

**Topic:** **Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting No. 7**

**Attendees:** See Attached

---

Monroe Hite, III welcomed everyone to the meeting and specified that the next Working Group Meeting was set for Wednesday, May 18<sup>th</sup> from 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at the Cheer Senior Center. He also announced that the Georgetown Public Workshop was scheduled for Monday, June 13<sup>th</sup> from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Cheer Senior Center. He then indicated that the information pertaining to this meeting was posted on the DelDOT website. He first discussed the agenda and then indicated that the impact matrix is available within the insert. He specified that there is a new alternative which is a hybrid between the West Bypass Alternative and the On-Alignment Alternative. He then addressed the Agency's concern for the East/West Bypass and their consensus for wanting the On-Alignment Option. He continued with a broad overview of the tabs, the previous Project Meetings and Workshops, and the recent meetings. Mr. Hite introduced Jeff Riegner to speak about traffic. Bob Kramer expressed that the Project Team presents a lot of information and that the Working Group Members could ask a question for understanding at anytime. However, if anyone had a comment on the alternatives, that they should save it for the group discussion.

Mr. Riegner started discussing the traffic analysis and specified that the project maps are inside the handout. He explained the general alternatives and the effects of the roadway volumes and trends on the existing roadway. He also indicated that the traffic projections presented at the meeting are preliminary and that comparisons are needed for the selection of "good data" to make decisions on a bypass option. Mr. Riegner explained that the existing traffic numbers for US 113 are currently 22,000 to 28,000 vehicles per day, however the No-build alternative shows that traffic will double (46,000) with future projections. David Pederson asked if the Project Team considered population projections in their calculations. Mr. Riegner replied that no population projections were calculated, and that only projections for local and through traffic will be available. He indicated that East Bedford St. carries approximately 16,000 cars per day and that the east/west traffic was expected to continue growing. Guy Phillips asked why east/west routes were expected to change. Jeff explained that if a faster route exists, that the model will provide



calculations for that route. He also specified that US 113 under Alternative B will carry less traffic (14,000 vpd) than the amount shifted to the East Bypass (34,000). Howard Abbott asked if this alternative would go through the Georgetown Airport. Everyone concurred that the Alternative would avoid the Airport and it was discussed that the Airport had plans for a bypass of their own. Lit Dryden clarified that the local traffic will maintain its current level of traffic while the bypass will consume the growth. He then asked how one would know the Bypass route is the route travelers need to take. Joe Wutka specified that SR 1 around Dover consumed the growth in traffic and the local traffic on US 13 maintained its normal numbers. Tom Hannan specified that the bypass will look like the mainline and travelers will not take the business route. Jeff continued to explain the alternatives, he specified that Alternative D1 ties in at US 9, and D2 goes further south. Mr. Dryden then expressed his concern for the miscommunication regarding the traffic numbers for each bypass. Mr. Moore asked if B2 was referring to the traffic off of SR 404. Mr. Riegner indicated that Options 2, 3, and 4 carry the same amount of traffic, and that E is located closer to Bedford Street. Mr. Riegner specified that no conclusions from these drawings should be made and no determination of the preferred alternative is available.

Afterwards, Mr. Baird followed with a relative question concerning population trends and their affect on figures. Mr. Riegner replied that all the population figures were provided by Ed Ratledge at the University of Delaware's Center for Applied Demography and Survey Research. He indicated that the figures were based on a land use and traffic model assembled by Mr. Ratledge and the University of Delaware. He also specified that Intrazonal Trips are not included in the model, and that they were only inclusive of trips outside the zone. Mr. Dryden voiced his concern for the figures provided by Mr. Ratledge, and asked if the Project Team was coordinating with Mr. Baird and the Town of Georgetown for more local figures. Mr. Dryden felt the UD figures would not resemble the figures collaborated by the Town of Georgetown. Mr. Hite indicated that the Project Team has coordinated with the Town of Georgetown, and Mr. Ratledge has been working with the Project Team. Mr. Kramer announced that the level of coordination for the US 113 updates to the transportation and land use data is outreaching. Carlton Moore, Sr. questioned that if the project was to occur now due to the development, why has there been a four day lack of traffic through Georgetown. He also suggested that many developments won't happen, and others will take longer to construct. Mr. Riegner indicated that Mr. Ratledge's growth projections will change and they may not increase, but the Project Team's projections are pretty close in showing that traffic will increase.

As for Alternative F2, there is less traffic and less diversion from US 113. Mr. Wutka then announced that cost estimates will be available for discussion at the next Working Group Meeting.



Mr. Riegner then discussed the role of consultants and the work on towns to reduce economic impacts. He indicated that the further out a bypass is extended from the town the greater the impacts will be on the businesses of that town. All of the alternatives will carry positive and negative impacts. The idea is to select the alternative with the least amount of economic impacts. Mr. Hite specified that the Project Team will be retaining a range of alternatives for detailed study. Mr. Riegner indicated that there are 17 different alternatives that will require short listing for further study. The recommended alternatives should be narrowed down by the next Public Workshop. The No-Build Alternative will be retained due to federal law and one On-Alignment Alternative will be retained for detailed study. The alternatives will be chosen based on their sensitivity to the matrix, the traffic information, and the Public Working Group opinion.

Mr. Baird then asked if there were a maximum number of alternatives to attain. Mr. Riegner replied that an On-Alignment option will be retained, as well as Option 1 and Option 2. He then explained that the Project Team is doing what is in the long term interest for Georgetown's transportation needs. He specified that it has not grown much, but future growth is expected to occur.

Merrill Moore asked the Project Team if they have been in contact with the Airport for their future bypass and realignment, if so he replied, when are they expecting to build? Mr. Riegner answered that they were looking at a 5 to 10 year timeframe.

David Pedersen asked how an impact on the Water's of the U.S. may occur. Mr. Riegner responded that the building of a road through any Water's of the U.S. will have a significant impact on those resources. Mr. Pedersen asked if any costs were involved with the impacts. Mr. Riegner replied that it was more of an environmental cost issue. Mr. Riegner specified that there is not a significant difference between Alternatives 1 and 2 in terms of cost. Afterwards, a question concerning cultural resources was interjected into the conversation, and Mr. Riegner answered that the predictive models determine the probability of a Cultural Resource for its eligibility on the National Register's list of historic places. The Cultural Resource Study will not look at all of the historic places within the study area which are 50 years or older, but it will look at those places which make the predictive model's cut. Mr. Hite indicated that the Project Team will be out along the alignment taking a look at the properties to determine the integrity criteria for its historic value. He also specified that the Project Team will meet with the property owner to discuss its historic value and its significance to the project. The cultural resource is potentially a "fatal flaw" which could make or break a project. The On-Alignment section was then concluded.

According to Mr. Wutka, the Eastern Bypass alternatives focus on avoiding impacts to the Airport and tie into the future plans it has for development. Both alternatives



have interchanges with US 9 and interchanges with the Perdue Plant and the truck stop. However, these alternatives do not address the east/west traffic concerns. The description of the alternatives include, Alternative B being far out to the east and Alternative C carrying slightly more traffic but staying close to the existing growth.

The impact matrix demonstrates that the wetland impacts are comparable on the east as they are on the west. Mr. Dryden asked how many individual sites were impacted by the project. Mr. Riegner replied that all of the impacts were listed on the matrix. Mr. Dryden asked if the impacts to the individual properties were a concern to the overall importance of the project. Mr. Wutka replied that the impacts to the individual properties were a concern. Mr. Pedersen mentioned that B has the highest impacts. He explained that the project will not require the taking of 151 properties, but will impact 151 properties with potential takes, partial takes, purchase of access rights, and modified access. Mr. Pedersen was not clear on why the matrix did not show the total number of properties with impacts. Mr. Riegner replied with clarification. Afterwards, a question was interjected concerning the impacts to businesses. Mr. Wutka replied that there will not be that many impacts to the businesses in the area. Mr. Hite specified that what the Project Team is trying to do right now is clarify what the Agency's concerns entail. Mr. Dryden indicated that this explanation doesn't show which Alternative is of lesser concern. Mr. Hite and Mr. Wutka specified that it does not show which Alternative is of lesser concern, but it gives a break out of the potential alternatives.

Mr. Moore asked about the Project Team's timeframe for helping out individuals with the buyout of their property. Mr. Hite explained that the Project Team's milestone is to get to the end of the summer, and by next summer the Team wants to have a preferred alternative. Advanced Acquisition and relocations can occur at that time. The other alternative is to follow through with the project and wait 10-15 years until each individual phase is needed for construction. At the point of acquisition, the process takes approximately 8-12 months for approval and review by legislators, and they either pass it on or reject it. If they pass it, the Project Team negotiates a price with an appraisal. If the homeowner doesn't like the appraisal, they can get another appraisal and can work for compromise. Otherwise, the home will undergo condemnation through Eminent Domain of the Federal Government. Mr. Dryden asked about the timetable the Project Team uses for the appraisal process. Mr. Hite replied that DelDOT uses the past, present, and future potential appraisals for the process. Mr. Riegner explained that money needs to be available for those willing or wanting to sell. Mr. Moore asked about those who were in "limbo" until the project planning takes place. Mr. Hite specified that they can take Advanced Acquisition if they choose.

Mr. Wutka continued with the explanation of the East Bypass and specified that the cultural resources are higher on the east side than on the west. He also mentioned that traffic conditions are improved on the east side than the west. Mr. Davis commented that there is less traffic through the town on the east than the west. Mr. Riegner specified that the model was picking up the traffic patterns and that the east bypass will consume the



west traffic. Mr. Wutka explained that east bypass will help with traffic on US 113 and SR 9 arrive at the beach. These comments were then followed by the Eastern Bypass conclusions.

Mr. Dryden followed with a question or concern regarding the lack of conversation regarding schools, homes, and other public amenities. Mr. Hite explained that the number of impacts will be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Dryden specified that Georgetown is the county seat, and then questioned if the content concerning growth was inclusive of local traffic. Mr. Riegner clarified that institutional land uses draw people to and from a larger area. Mr. Kramer specified that institutional places such as DelTech are accounted for in the project. Mr. Wutka said that the model is calibrated on current or today's trips. Mr. Pedersen voiced his concern for the school. Mr. Hite indicated that the constraint map is used for clarification, and that coordination with Mr. Baird occurs on a regular basis. He also specified that property owners in "limbo" will be spoken to at the Public Workshops. Mr. Dryden asked if someone owns an acre lot and one-quarter of the property is needed for the project, will the whole property not be taken. Mr. Riegner replied that it depends on the issues and the location of the property. Mr. Dryden clarified that if the DelDOT right-of-way is located right in front of the house that it may not constitute a full take. Mr. Riegner responded that it was not necessarily no. Mr. Dryden then indicated that he needed more clarity.

Mr. Riegner continued with the Agencies' comments and specified that the Western Bypass received more support than the Eastern Bypass. He also indicated that east/west routes can be addressed in the project as long as the Purpose and Need is restructured to study both north/south and east/west issues. Other items discussed included SR18 and SR 404 traffic movements as well as roadway lengths???

Mr. Moore asked for clarity on Alternative D1 and its whereabouts of it tying into the mainline. Mr. Riegner indicated that it ties into the mainline behind the shopping center.

Mr. Riegner specified that Alternative D1 through D5 accumulate 100 acres of total wetlands. He also indicated that if Alternative E or F will work, then Alternative D will be a "fatal flaw". Afterwards, a Working Group Member commented on the integrity of preserving farmland while "drawing lines across the board". Mr. Wutka indicated that roadway alignments are generally drawn between property lines in efforts to retain the property's function. Mr. Pedersen asked for a key code for understanding the maps.

Further comments from the Working Group Members on Alternative E included Option 3 being too close to Pepperidge Farm and having indirect impacts and Option 4 had too many impacts to farm land. Mr. Dryden asked for clarity on who speaks for the homeowners. Mr. Hite indicated that they gain representation from the Public Workshops and the Working Group Members. Mr. Kramer specified that they receive a personal invitation to the meeting. Mr. Riegner also said that the Project Team represents the public as the State of Delaware. Don Plows indicated that if the project directly



impacts the property as a potential take then it is necessary that those property owners receive a personal invite. Andrew Bing also announced that the homeowners can contact their local legislator about their properties. Mr. Riegner also suggested that at the same time the legislator is concerned about their own house. It was also indicated that there are more impacts in the east than the west. Traffic benefits for one are less diverting than two through five (using truck route 9). He also specified that the Alternative Route is more beneficial when using common sense. He then finalized the Western Bypass through the use of concluding points.

Mr. Kramer summarized some key facts from the Project Team. He also addressed Mr. Dryden's concerns pertaining to the property impacts. Furthermore, he indicated that an order of magnitude must occur to narrow down the number of alternatives. The next time will require conversation on the Third Lane Option and the similarities between Option 2 and Option 5. Mr. Kramer then asked if anyone had any questions or comments for narrowing down which options are flawed. He announced that the Working Group will breakout into smaller groups at the next meeting. Everyone will be put on spot at the next meeting.

Mr. Baird asked the Project Team to check the link from US 113 to US 9 on the eastern side from the west to address the E/W problem. Mr. Moore indicated that an Eastern Bypass does not address SR 404, but east must connect with the west. He claimed that there needs to be a combination alternative between the two.

Mr. Baird indicated that cultural resources require attention and must be avoided. Mr. Riegner replied that there are cultural resources to the north. Mr. Wutka also indicated that there are cultural resources north of US 9. Mr. Baird asked if they can be overcome. Mr. Wutka replied that they cannot be eliminated. Mr. Kramer specified that there still needs to be clarification on the data for the connection to the Eastern Bypass. Mr. Baird asked if the Project Team could use a method to avoid the wetlands. Mr. Riegner answered that the Project Team will go with the alternative that has the least impacts, that is acceptable, and that meets the project purpose and need. However, they will not be able to attain a 60 year permit. He also indicated that either one will not meet the need required.

Mr. Pederson asked if all the alternatives look at a split highway when bypassing the town, what other way will they be able to swing around the town. Also, he questioned what the threshold was for dealing with or choosing a four-lane or two-lane road (for the truck route). Mr. Riegner then specified that for a two-lane road it required 12,000 to 15,000 and for a four lane...?? Mr. Baird questioned the need for a two-lane road and the additional need for right-of-way. Mr. Kramer indicated that the alternative with the least amount of impacts will be the balancing act for the overall choice for the preferred alternative. Whatever options the Agencies' look at will be selected by the number of impacts. Mr. Riegner concurred with this comment. Mr. Kramer indicated that 50



percent of the wetland impacts will be more difficult to pass along through the purpose and need. Bill Hellmann specified that an alternative with twice as many wetlands than the other alternatives will be harder to pass along than the alternative with less wetland impacts. The alternative with the least amount of impacts will win, unless there is a reasonable explanation. The question is what is the right thing to do? Mr. Hite indicated that there are close comparisons for the east/west options, and that the legislators are aware of these comparisons. Mr. Pedersen asked for a comparison of Alternative D versus E. Mr. Riegner explained that the Project Team goes with the most practical alternative. He specified that the Project Team understands that the project can't go through such establishments as the Wal-Mart or DelTech. Mr. Hite indicated that there are more problems with Alternative D. Mr. Davis stated that no one used to speak out for wetlands. Mr. Hellmann explained that the Project Team can shift Alternative E and F to the south, but they can't take out DelTech. He also specified that the Purpose and Need must include the practicalities of the wetlands. For instance, it must identify the type of wetlands. Is the wetland a ditch or a pristine natural wetland? Will there be a need to file a Section 4f document? Can we avoid recreational areas? He indicated that these issues can be the "fatal flaw" which eliminates a particular alternative. Mr. Hellmann then explained that Option 3 will meet purpose and need with the construction of the third lane. He warned that the Army Corps of Engineers will have a difficult time approving any other alternative.

Mr. Pederson asked about the reasoning for changing the purpose of the East/West Study. Mr. Baird asked if there was a higher emphasis on the east/west. Mr. Hite replied that the East/West Study is on hold until the North/South Study is complete. Mr. Baird showed his concern for the East/West Study with digression. Mr. Hellmann indicated that the Project Team cannot plan for the east/west roads during the North/South Study.

Mr. Kramer asked if there were any further comments. He announced that everyone must come prepared next time. Mr. Dryden addressed the incorrect cover to the inserts. Mr. Hite emphasized the importance of being in attendance at the next Working Group Meeting. Mr. Kramer also informed that the next Working Group Meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, May 18 and the Public Workshop was scheduled for June 13. Eric Buehl noted that he wants brownies at the next meeting.



---

**Members who attended the Georgetown Working Group Meeting 04/21/2005**

Abbot, Jr., Howard  
Baird, David  
Buehl, Eric  
Burris, Allison  
Cambell-Hansen, R. Carol  
Cooper, Mitch  
Davis, Mark  
Diehl, David  
Dryden, Lit  
Edwards, Bernice  
Gibbs, Matthew  
Johnson, Harold  
Martin Donovan for Messick, Lynda  
Moore, Sr., Carlton  
Moore, Keith  
Moore, Merrill  
Pedersen, David  
Phillips, Guy  
Don Plows for Simmons, Mike

**Public Citizens in Attendance:**

Penuel, John – Self  
Mumford, Jim – Self  
Mumford, Kenneth P. – Self  
Atkinson, Donna – Self