



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: April 25, 2005

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

Location: Banquet Hall, Carlisle Fire Company, Milford, DE.

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

Attendees: See Attached

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. He indicated that this was the seventh Milford Working Group Meeting and that the next meeting is scheduled for May 16th. The purpose of the Working Group Meetings was to provide recommendations on alternatives to be carried forward, in the process, for detailed study.

Monroe Hite, III welcomed everyone to the meeting and also indicated that the Working Group Meeting was open to the public. However, comments from the public were to be held until the Public Workshop on June 6th or indicated on the comment form located at the front desk. He then reviewed the current project status, and indicated that the Working Group has met six times previously to discuss the preliminary alternatives. He specified that there is a full range of alternatives, consisting of a No-Build Alternative, an On-Alignment Alternative, Western Bypass Alternatives, and Eastern Bypass Alternatives. He indicated that these alternatives are part of an overall plan for the future, and that the Project Team and Working Group must work together to plan for the future. The process of participation in the study consists of input from the Working Group, the public through the series of Public Workshops, Agency Comments, and ultimately the General Assembly through their appropriation of funding for the project. The process is necessary with a project that has 40 alternatives that need to be narrowed down to a workable three to six alternatives for documentation in an EIS and ultimately the selection of one as the preferred alternative.

Afterwards, Mr. Hite reviewed the agenda and indicated that this meeting would include a review of the comments from the Agency Meeting on April 20th. He also mentioned that the Project Team would meet with the Agencies again in July to present feedback from the Working Group to the agency representatives. He then directed the Working Group members to their project notebook and reflected on the previous meetings before announcing the upcoming meetings. He reviewed the procedure for the evenings meeting and indicated that the Project Team would present an analysis of traffic in the Milford area. This would then lead into a general discussion among the entire Working Group. The Working Group would then break out into smaller groups to review the alternatives



and then gather back together for a summary of the discussions in the break out sessions and further discussion among the entire Working Group. He also announced that there would be a table for the general public to offer their comments.

Mr. Hite then introduced Jeff Riegner to discuss the analysis of traffic in the Milford Area. Mr. Riegner indicated that the alternatives discussed during the Working Group Meetings must meet project Purpose and Need. He indicated that the project will look ahead to the year 2030 for the model forecasting and that alternatives must meet the future need. The long term plan is to accommodate the future growth in traffic not only in Milford but as far south as Selbyville. He specified that the projections will be revealed at the next meeting. Skip Pikus asked if the analysis included certain intersections. Mr. Riegner replied that this analysis is a system analysis and should not be applied to a specific congestion point. Mr. Kramer indicated that the Peninsula Area Model for DelDOT is designed to model actual time simulations and that the numbers were surprising. Mr. Riegner then introduced Ray Harbeson to discuss cost estimates.

Mr. Harbeson announced that a general “price tag” for the alternatives will be available at the next meeting. He indicated that no alternative will be eliminated on cost and that the estimates will be based on broad assumptions, at this stage in the process. Mr. Kramer explained that an order of magnitude cost is not a reason for not studying an alternative. Mr. Harbeson then re-introduced Mr. Riegner to discuss the economic impacts of the project.

Mr. Riegner described the study of the economic impacts as a two step process of general comparison between the existing business activity and the expected business activity after highway improvements are made. According to Mr. Riegner, there will be no short-listing of alternatives based solely on economic impacts. If an alternative is faced with both economic and environmental issues, the environmental impacts will have greater bearing than the economic impacts. The alternatives with the lowest environmental impacts will likely be the alternatives retained for further study. Mr. Riegner reviewed the impact Matrix handout with the Working Group. Mr. Riegner indicated that there is a lot of concern about the potential economic impacts of the On-Alignment Alternatives and that those potential impacts will be studied in the summer and fall.

Mr. Riegner indicated that the Project Team is currently in the process of determining which alternatives to retain for detailed study. He indicated that a No-Build Alternative must continue through the process for comparison due to federal law. He also specified that upgrades were made to Alternative A and that there are three tools that will be used to narrow down the choice of alternatives. These tools include the Matrix, the traffic analysis, and public opinion. There will be a comparison among the Eastern Bypass Alternatives and a comparison among the Western Bypass Alternatives and this comparison will determine which alternative/s for each area merit further study.



Mr. Kramer stated that the Working Group Members should ask questions as Mr. Riegner and Mr. Harbeson continue their presentations if there are uncertainties concerning the presentation. However, any comments regarding the pros and cons of the project should be reserved for later conversation.

Mr. Riegner indicated that On-alignment Options 1 and 2 would allow for full control of access while Option 3 is a “watered down” version which may not meet the future need. So far, there is little support for an On-Alignment Alternative because it isolates the businesses and provides them with what is perceived as less than adequate access.

Mr. Kramer then asked everyone to open their inserts to tab 2. Mr. Riegner indicated that the On-Alignment and the No-Build Alternatives do not impact natural resources in the project area to the extent that the Off-Alignment options do. He indicated that the On-alignment Alternative A, Options 1 and 2 have minimal environmental impacts while Option 3 has fewer impacts. He indicated that properties on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were places such as the Roosa Farm or could include any potential cultural resource that is 50 years or older. Mr. Hite indicated that the closed blue dots on the maps had the potential to meet the requirements, based on a preliminary assessment, to be a cultural resource and the open blue circled properties had the potential to meet the 50 years or older requirement. Mr. Riegner explained that the path of a roadway must take into consideration the historic sensitivity of archaeological remnants. Mr. Kramer indicated that a “fatal flaw” would be any impact to a resource which could keep the Department from attaining approval for that alternative. Resources must be found early in the project planning phase before the money is spent, otherwise a “fatal flaw” could occur and the project could be terminated.

Mr. Riegner followed Mr. Kramer’s comments with an explanation of the property impacts. The evaluation of a property’s disposition will be determined by the extent of impact imposed on the property. A Working Group Member asked for the metes and bounds of the project location. Mr. Riegner stated that the project study area in Milford was from north of the SR 1/US113 split to Hudson Pond. Continuing with the presentation, Mr. Riegner indicated that any denial of access to US 113 would require a modified access to another outlet. He then concluded the On-Alignment discussion and announced that maps are available. Mr. Kramer asked Mr. Riegner to indicate the Project Team’s conclusions. Mr. Riegner explained that the Project Team combined the On-alignment Options 1 and 2 into one alternative, which would need to be carried forward in the process. He then initiated a discussion of the Eastern Bypass options.

Mr. Riegner indicated that there were 13 options for an Eastern Bypass. He stated that the Milford East Bypass options start at SR1 near SR 14 and continue over to US 113. He indicated that the comments and feedback regarding the Eastern Bypass options were generally positive and that there were fewer impacts with an eastern bypass than with a western bypass. The length of a complete Eastern Bypass option is 11 miles beginning at the SR1/US 113 split to Hudson Pond. The resource and property impacts are shown on



the Matrix. He stated that there were not a lot of issues or differences among the Eastern Bypass options. He also stated that the Project Team will look at the properties that are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. He specified that major widening of the roads could impact some of these properties. However, the Eastern Bypass impacts are relatively low within single digits. However, the length of the new corridor will be a major determinant of how many property impacts there will be. A Working Group Member asked where Alternative B ties into US 113. Mr. Riegner replied that it ties in at Fitzgerald's Auto Auction and Salvage. He also specified that there are more On-Alignment impacts with B than the other alternatives. His concluding comments, regarding the Eastern Bypass Options included that Option B divides Milford from Lincoln, Options F and 3 appeared to receive the most support, Options C and 1 appeared to receive the least support and, finally, there is considerable support behind the petition supporting preservation of the Whitehead Farm and in opposition to Option 1.

Mr. Harbeson was then reintroduced to discuss the Western Bypass options. Mr. Harbeson stated that there are 16 combinations of options that cross the chain of lakes and ponds and through two openings along the Kent/Sussex County line. Alternative J is the smaller bypass with the greater use of the existing alignment. The resource and property impacts are greater on the west due to the length of the Western Bypass options. The majority of the natural resources are also greater on the west side therefore the impacts will be greater. Mr. Harbeson indicated that J tends to have fewer impacts than the other western alternatives due to its short length. He also stated that there were considerable negative comments regarding the Western Bypass options.

Elliot Workman asked if the resource impacts included the length of ditches based on Kent County records. Mr. Riegner indicated that the information relating to ditches was supplied by DNREC and not Kent County and, while they are important, they are not bound by the "fatal flaw" criteria. Mr. Workman asked if the ditches will require bridging. Mr. Riegner replied that a permit must be obtained for any construction and must make sure the project addresses the drainage associated with any ditch. Someone from the Working Group asked if there were any Rare, Threatened or Endangered species in the project area. Mr. Hite indicated that the Project Team is awaiting the most recent updates to further clarify the current information available on RTE's. That is why the Matrix indicates TBD (To Be Determined) at this time. Mr. Kramer asked the Working Group if they had any further questions or observations. Mr. Workman asked if there was a third lane proposed for the Eastern Bypasses on the SR 1 crossing of the Mispillion River. Mr. Kramer replied that there is a third lane proposed for that segment of the bypass. Skip Pikus asked if there is an overpass still being proposed for the SR 1 and SR 14 intersection. Mr. Hite explained that it is still being considered and that it will be funded through the SR 1 Corridor Capacity Preservation Program. A working group member asked if the project complies with the city growth plan. The project team agreed that it would conform to the plan.



Group Comments:

Group 1 (Mr. Pikus's Group)

- Voted unanimously to eliminate B
- Order of preference for alternatives
 - o Highest to lowest
 - o D, E, F, C
- Agreed that missing historic properties and the Whitehead Farm were the highest priority
- Want a compact interchange
- The On-Alignment negatively impacts businesses
- Going west is least desirable
- Retain J
- Preserve Agriculture

Group 2 (Andrew Bing's Group)

- Consensus for not supporting Alternative B
- Order of Preference
 - o Highest to Lowest
 - o E,F,D,C
- F is too far out
- C and D have similar negative impacts
- No support for Option 1
- Option 2 was too close to existing property lines
- No support for J
- Order of preference
 - o Highest to Lowest
 - o G,H,I
- Most support for G
- GN6 was the most favorite

Group 3 (Mr. Riegner's Group)

- They did not look at On-Alignment Alternatives
- Whitehead Farm eligible for National Register
- Order of preference
 - o Highest to Lowest
 - o No support for C, D, E, F
- No benefit for Alternative J5
- Alternative 5 is the least sensible and it goes too far out of the way



Group 4 (Bob's Group, General Public)

- 3 groups wish to drop B
- Drop Alternative 1
 - o Can't impact Whitehead
 - o Wish to go east
- 2 for dropping J
- 1 for keeping J and dropping the others
- Must look at avoiding the veterans home site

Tom Hannan specified that the interchange for the Eastern Bypasses is the least compactive and that they need to connect.

Mr. Kramer indicated that it is decision making time and that they need to identify the problems. Next time traffic will be up for discussion. He announced that the next meeting was set for May 16th at the Carlisle Fire Hall from 5:30 to 8:30. The Public Workshop will be on June 6th at the Carlisle Fire Hall from 4 p.m. to 7p.m.

Mr. Bing indicated that the Milford Annexation Meeting was scheduled for that same night. He also indicated that the Elected Officials need to be present at the Public Workshop. Mr. Burriss asked if the Working Group Members needed to be at the Public Workshop for the entire three hours. Mr. Kramer requested that they attend for at least an hour. Mr. Burriss indicated that it will be interesting to see what happens with the project in the future. Mr. Riegner indicated that the increase in costs, interests rates, and gas prices will have an effect on travelers preference, but the projections indicate that traffic will continue to increase.

Minutes prepared by Timothy DeSchepper.



Members who attended the Milford Area Working Group Meeting 04/25/2005

Burris, Robert
Burton, III, I.G.
Clendaniel, F. Brooke
Davis, Mark
David Diehl representing Terry Feinour
Fitzgerald, Scott
Fox, Connie
Hammond, Wyatt
King, Jr., Carl
Lank, Lawrence
Barry Munoz representing Michael Levensgood
Mallamo, Mark
Marvel, Randy
Mick, David
Pikus, Skip "Michael"
Robbins, Ronald
Stevenson, Glen
Workman, Elliott

Public Citizens in Attendance:

Shafer, Julian – Self	Mancini, Sally - Self
Billings, Herschel – Self	Dupley, Jane - Self
Scarborough, John – Self	Hitchens, Robert – Self
De Esposito – Self	Barlow, Steve - Self
Paper, Jerrie – Self	Wallace, Jon - Self
Andrew, Jerrie – Self	Delikat, Stanley - Self
Andrew, Bill – Self	Bowers, Marel and Norm
Breao, Jim – Self	Webb, Jill and Ben
Pensel, Charles – Self	Bowen, Helene and Gary
De Esposito, Henry – Self	Davis, Marvin J.
Gooding, Tom – Self	Oberender, Dale
Kirk, Rita – Self	Serwalt, Gerald
Warnell, Joe – Self	Metcalf, Barbara E.
Pensel, Virginia – Self	Plummer, Theresa - Self
Kelly, Diana – Milford Beacon	Hill, Carolyn E. - Self
Stewart S. – Self	Marino, Sal - Self
Guyen, Lester – Self	Higgins, Joan
Salieu, Eleanor – Self	Wagner, Pamela G.
Lender, Betty and Bob – Themselves	
Arthurs, Francis J. – Self	



DRAFT