



Memorandum of Meeting

Date: April 27, 2005

Time: 5:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m.

Location: Millsboro Fire Company, Millsboro, Delaware

Topic: Millsboro-South Area Working Group Meeting #8

Attendees: See Page 3 and 4

Call to Order

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. and thanked the working group for their continued attendance. He emphasized that attendance of all working group members is important as the project team continues to provide new information and the working group selects the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS).

Opening Remarks

Monroe Hite, III welcomed attendees and reviewed the handout materials for the project notebook. He mentioned that the information provided includes tonight's presentation, an updated alternatives map for the Millsboro East Bypass, an updated impact matrix and the schedule for upcoming public workshops. Mr. Hite briefly reviewed recent meetings held for the US 113 corridor study and reminded attendees of upcoming meetings. Mr. Hite reviewed the agenda and indicated that the goal is to provide enough time for group discussion so the working group can recommend Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). He reminded the group that we currently have 24 preliminary alternatives and it would not be feasible to study all of those alternatives at a level of detail required for environmental documentation.

Traffic Analysis

Jeff Riegner presented an update on the traffic analysis for the Millsboro-South area. He reiterated that projections provided are preliminary and can be used to compare off-alignment alternatives. He also stated that the data is not yet sufficient to identify traffic composition or compare off-alignment alternatives to on-alignment alternatives. Mr. Riegner provided a summary of the data and some preliminary conclusions that showed approximate volumes of traffic along the bypass routes.

Cost Estimates

Joe Wutka provided a status update on the cost estimates. He reminded attendees that no alternative is being eliminated based on cost and the preliminary cost estimates are underway.



Economic Impact Analysis

Mr. Riegner presented a summary of the cursory review of the off-alignment alternatives. He mentioned that generally speaking, the further the bypass is from the existing highway, the greater the potential economic impact. He also stated that the bypass alternatives in the Millsboro-South area are not so different from each other that economic impact should be used to retain one and drop another.

Review of Alternatives

Mr. Wutka reminded attendees that the goal of tonight's meeting is to determine which of the alternatives (on-alignment, east bypass and west bypass) should be retained. He began the discussion by reviewing the on-alignment alternatives. He also stated that DelDOT is required to retain at least one on-alignment alternative for detailed study. Mr. Wutka confirmed that most of the public opinion received indicates substantial opposition to the on-alignment alternatives. He continued by reviewing the impact matrix for the on-alignment alternatives.

Mr. Wutka then provided a summary of the eastern bypass alternatives, including public comments and a review of the natural resource and property impacts. He stated that there has been extensive public and working group support for an eastern bypass alternative. He reiterated some of the traffic benefits identified by the preliminary traffic analysis and mentioned that the preliminary natural resource impacts are generally comparable between the eastern and western bypasses.

Mr. Riegner next reviewed the western bypass alternatives. He provided a brief summary of the different options, including possible connections to SR 24 and SR 26 to the east and explained why natural resource constraints limit the ability to have a continuous western bypass south of Dagsboro. He also reviewed the impact matrix and indicated that there has been limited public support for a western bypass of Millsboro, essentially no public support for the shorter western bypasses of Dagsboro and Frankford and little support for a western bypass of Selbyville.

Group Discussion

Mr. Hite asked the working group to separate into four smaller groups to review the display maps and discuss the alternatives in more detail. He assigned two project team members to each group to help guide the discussion and answer questions. He asked that each group compile a summary of the discussion and list the alternatives they recommend to be retained for detailed study. He reminded the group that DelDOT is required to retain at least one on-alignment alternative and the no-build alternative. He also recommended that the groups consider at least one eastern bypass and one western bypass due to unknown natural resource or cultural resource issues that may exist.

There was approximately one hour of group discussion during which working group members reviewed the maps and provided feedback on which alternatives should be retained for detailed study. Following the discussion, Bob Kramer asked one project team member from each group to summarize the results of their group's discussion. After each group presented their summary,



Mr. Kramer asked the working group members to vote (by a show of hands) on each alternative to determine if they should be retained for detailed study.

The results of the discussion and subsequent voting indicate that the working group recommends the following alternatives to be retained for detailed study:

- No-Build
- On-alignment alternative A, option 4, a hybrid of:
 - Option 3 in the middle of Millsboro
 - Options 1 and 2 elsewhere
- East bypass alternative B4-1
- East bypass alternative B4-2
- East bypass alternative B4-3
- East bypass alternative B5-1
- East bypass alternative B5-2
- East bypass alternative B5-3
- West bypass alternative D8
- West bypass alternative D9
- SR 24 and SR 26 connectors remain
- Selbyville west bypass alternative I-6

Next Steps

Mr. Kramer reminded attendees that public workshops are scheduled for May 23 in Millsboro and May 24 in Selbyville to review all the alternatives and present the recommendations on Alternatives to be Retained for Detailed Study. He asked that working group members plan to attend at least one hour of the workshop. He also stated that working group members will be notified once the fall schedule of working group meetings has been determined. Mr. Kramer adjourned the meeting at about 8:45 p.m.

Working group members in attendance:

Atherton, Ronald
Bennett, Jim
Boyce, Joan
Brake, Joe
Buehl, Eric
Bullock, Lynn
Collins, Donald
Connor, S. Bradley
Daisey, Robert
Davis, Mark
Dyer, Preston
Frederick, Peter

Kautz, Richard
Lingo, Faye
Marino, Roger
McComas, Pamela
Norwood, Tran
Pfaff, Bill
Plows, Don (for Mike Simmons)
Stuart, Robert
Taylor, Gary
Thoroughgood, John
Townshend, Ann Marie



Members of the public in attendance:

Baker, Randy
Christenbury, Ken
Diehl, James
Kubiak, Sandra
McBride, Kevin
Quigley, Dawn
Smith, Randall
Swingle, Dick
Tephabock, Kim