



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: February 21, 2006

Time: 5:30 PM to 8:30 PM

Location: Banquet Hall, Carlisle Fire Company, Milford, Delaware

Topic: **Milford Area Working Group Meeting No. 12**

Attendees: See Below

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:45 PM. He indicated that this was the twelfth Milford area working group meeting and thanked the working group for their continued attendance. He reminded the members that their input is vital to the success of selecting a preferred alternative and requested that they continue to ask questions and make comments if there is something in the material presented that they do not agree with or understand.

Monroe Hite, III welcomed the group and reminded the working group that updated notebook materials have been provided, including a copy of tonight's presentation, an updated matrix and meeting minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Hite then indicated the purpose of the meeting: to discuss DeIDOT's acquisition procedures, results of the economic analysis, and revisions to the alternatives and impact matrix. He then discussed the current project schedule and stated that a public workshop will be held in May or June, and the selection of a preferred alternative is expected sometime in 2007.

Mr. Hite then introduced Charles Jones to provide an overview of DeIDOT's real estate process and compensation for impacts to private property. Mr. Jones explained that the process used by a government agency, such as DeIDOT, to purchase real estate is much different than a private-sector approach. He mentioned that about 16 years ago, DeIDOT implemented a policy to provide for advanced acquisition. He discussed the timeframe and process for partial and total acquisitions, which may include notification, appraisal, and negotiation. He stressed that DeIDOT is required by federal law to offer fair market value and just compensation as determined by qualified, licensed independent appraisers.

Mr. Hite then asked Mr. Jones to elaborate on his experience with the condemnation process if DeIDOT and the property owner cannot reach an agreement. Mr. Jones replied



that he has not been involved in any condemnation hearings in his 15 years with the department, emphasizing how rare it is for DeIDOT to resort to that process. Mr. Jones then asked Nancy Carney, a DeIDOT real estate representative, if she had been involved with any condemnation proceedings; she recalled one or two hearings during her similar tenure with DeIDOT.

Skip Pikus asked if a property owner declining DeIDOT's offer would stop the project. Mr. Jones replied that DeIDOT's offer is held as a deposit during the condemnation process and right of possession is granted to DeIDOT so construction can continue. Settlement is then determined by the courts.

Robert Burris asked how close the roadway must be to a property to merit acquisition. Mr. Jones replied that property is only acquired when the right of way crosses into the property. Richard Carmean asked how close the roadway can be to a house or building. Mr. Jones replied that owners will be compensated for the fair market value of the land, with consideration given to how it will affect the value of the remaining property.

Mr. Kramer then addressed the working group to inquire about a tentative date for the next working group meeting. He polled the members about a meeting date of April 18, 2006, but many members indicated they would not be available. Mr. Kramer then stated that the project team will contact the working group about additional potential meeting dates in April.

Mr. Kramer next introduced Steven Landau to discuss the results of the economic impact analysis. Mr. Landau provided an overview of the components of the economic study and types of impacts. He discussed how the results presented tonight relate to the preliminary information presented at the last meeting. He said the analysis incorporates traffic forecasts, and the results are based on "typical businesses" in different industries. The results were presented in ranges to address any uncertainty.

Mr. Landau presented the results for each alternative and highlighted the key findings. The yellow (on-alignment) alternative has the most new construction impacts. However, the blue alternative has the highest overall job/business loss because of construction impacts and the reduction in pass-by traffic along existing US 113. Mr. Kramer explained that the west bypass alternatives – blue and orange – divert the most traffic off existing US 113, which leads to high job loss.

Richard Carmean asked for clarification regarding the effect of an increase in pass-by traffic along the yellow alternative. He asked if the analysis results indicate that the additional congestion may help some and hurt others. Mr. Landau confirmed that is correct.



Jeff Riegner then indicated that the analysis for each alternative, on-alignment and bypass, includes job/business loss or gain for existing and potential business along both existing US 113 and the bypass alternative.

Mr. Pikus asked if the analysis included agricultural impacts. Mr. Landau indicated that the analysis does not specifically address agricultural impacts.

Mr. Carmean asked if the yellow (on-alignment) results incorporated inconveniences associated with changes in access along existing US 113; for example, how customers on the east will access businesses on the west. Mr. Landau responded that the analysis included changes in access, which, in this case, would cause a reduction in business.

Ed Kee asked for a clarification on the definition of net business impact. Mr. Landau explained that although it is not summarized in the table, it represents the net gain or loss in business along the corridor. Mr. Riegner clarified that it includes business impacts along both existing US 113 and the bypass alternatives.

Glen Stevenson then described his interpretation of how the reduction in pass-by traffic might cause a business, such as Wal-Mart, to relocate closer to one of the bypass alternatives if the opportunity presents itself.

Scott Adkisson asked how increases in travel speed could lead to job growth. Mr. Landau explained that higher travel speeds primarily benefit regional businesses, such as trucking and manufacturing companies, because of the reduced travel time costs. He stated that his analysis assumes that half of the savings is re-invested in the expansion of companies. Mr. Landau said that destination businesses, such as hardware stores and automobile sales companies, will also benefit from the increased travel speed because more customers will be able to travel to the business in less time.

Mr. Landau next discussed potential development near the bypass interchanges for each of the alternatives. He stated that this component of the analysis has the highest level of uncertainty, and corresponding range, because it is completely dependent on local government land use and zoning decisions, development pressures, and available infrastructure.

Mr. Pikus stated that the Milford area economy would most likely change dramatically by 2030. Mr. Landau responded that the analysis uses 2030 economic forecasts using local business and economic data and standard industry sources (e.g., Federal Highway Administration and Institute of Transportation Engineers). Mr. Kramer stressed that the results should be looked at comparatively because the forecasts are not absolute.

Elliott Workman asked if the job growth results represent full-time or part-time jobs. Mr. Landau answered that results are “head counts,” or an aggregated total of both full-time and part-time jobs.



Mr. Kee asked that the economic impacts on active farms be included in the analysis. He pointed out the potential affect on the regional economy caused by impacts to irrigation systems and farms associated with Southern States. Mr. Hite responded that the project team would look into evaluating those agricultural impacts.

Mr. Riegner continued the presentation discussing shifts and refinements in the alternatives to minimize impacts. All shifts, except for the bridge at Clendaniel Pond Road along the purple alternative (slide 31), are incorporated in the maps handed out at the January working group meeting.

Mr. Levensgood asked if the yellow (on-alignment) alternative allows for full movements at the SR 36 interchange. Mr. Riegner responded yes. However, only southbound on/off ramps are provided at Old Shawnee Road because of the close proximity of many homes to existing US 113. Mr. Riegner added that the grade-separation near the county line for the on-alignment alternative begins north of SR 14. Carl King, Jr. asked if a double-deck highway was considered for the on-alignment alternative. Mr. Riegner said that the alternative was ruled out because the construction costs would be too high – possibly as much as \$100 million per mile. Mike Simmons added that there still would be significant impacts to properties adjacent to US 113 because of interchanges.

Mr. Riegner then discussed potential impacts to 4(f) and 6(f) resources. He indicated that the project team is waiting for information regarding state parks; however, no impacts are anticipated.

Mr. Burris asked what the implications are if an alternative directly impacts a historic property. Mr. Riegner responded that historic property impacts are very serious. Depending on the circumstances, they *could* result in other alternatives, including no-build, being favored. He reminded the working group that properties currently labeled as historic are based only on consultant recommendations. Final eligibility will be determined by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Mr. Hite discussed the next steps for the project team and what the working group can expect at the next meeting, including construction and real estate cost estimates.

Mr. Pikus asked if he could address the working group and project team about the status of the conflict that is developing between Milford and Lincoln residents regarding the east bypass alternatives. He provided the working group and project team members with a memorandum summarizing the issues related to the east bypass alternatives and requested that Alternative B, previously eliminated from consideration, be reinstated for detailed study. Mr. Hite said the project team would take another look at Alternative B and report back to the working group.



Mr. Kramer reminded the working group that the project team will contact working group members about possible dates for the next meeting.

Mr. Kramer adjourned the meeting at 8:30 PM.

Working group members in attendance:

Scott Adkisson	Carl King, Jr.
Robert Burris	Lawrence Lank
I.G. Burton, III	Michael Levensgood
Richard Carmean	Mark Mallamo
F. Brooke Clendaniel	Randy Marvel
Scott Fitzgerald	David Mick
Connie Fox	Skip Pikus
Dean Geyer	Mike Simmons
Wyatt Hammond	Glen Stevenson
Edward Kee	Elliott Workman

Members of the public in attendance:

Marie Barlow	Will Fox
Ned Blair	Sara Kay French
Carl Bouchard	Susan and Bruce Geyer
John Boyer	Mike Green
Debra Bridgens	Beth Hammond
Dolores Bridgens	Margaret Helsdon
Margaret Bridgens	John Ingram
Walter Brittingham	Greg Layton, <i>Milford Chronicle</i>
Randy Burton	Ruth and Ben Maksym
Patsy Carpenter	Holly Melzer
Shirlene Cartwright	Theresa and Joe Plummer
Don Chandler	Orville Shockley
Fran Chandler	Barry Sites
Gail Corder	Eleanor Surnie
Ida and Orray Corder	Sonja Viram
Mike Deshaies	Lucius Webb
Debbie and Dennis Dixon, <i>Wright's Auto Parts</i>	David Wilson
Kenneth Fitzgerald	[Names of two attendees could not be read]