

**Memorandum of Meeting****Date:** April 19, 2007**Time:** 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.**Location:** Cheer Center, Georgetown, Delaware**Topic:** Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting No. 16**Attendees:** See Page 6

---

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. He reviewed the evening's agenda and the final results of comments received from the Public Workshops in March on the East-to-East connection options. Mr. Kramer indicated that the Department has dropped the Dark Blue and Violet, East-to-East connection, options from further consideration. All of the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study are still on the table for Working Group consideration. Procedurally, the process will now move to pairing that list to one recommended alternative. He then turned the meeting over to Monroe Hite to continue the discussion.

Mr. Hite thanked Mr. Kramer and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He reviewed the contents of the hand-out package with the Working Group. Mr. Hite then reiterated the comments by Mr. Kramer regarding the Department's decision not to retain the Dark Blue and Violet alternatives for detailed study. He further stated that based on direction from the Secretary, the Project Team had given renewed attention to the On-alignment alternative and that information would be discussed with the Working Group this evening. Mr. Hite then turned the meeting over to Todd Oliver to discuss the effort to modify the existing On-alignment alternative and make it less impactive.

Mr. Oliver reviewed the details of the approach to modify the On-alignment alternative.

Donna Atkinson asked how far north the next interchange was from Wilson Road. Mr. Oliver indicated that the next interchange to the north would be at East Redden Road, approximately 1.8 miles. It was originally intended to be for emergency access only but would be evaluated for full access.

At slide 15 in the presentation addressing the typical cross section from North Bedford Street to north of US 9, David Pedersen asked "if I understand the section correctly, you have curb along the outside of the roadway. Will businesses along the roadway be given access?" Mr. Oliver indicated that curb cuts will be provided for those properties needing access.

Mr. Pedersen asked that consideration be given to bicycle and pedestrian amenities. Mr. Oliver indicated that the issue had come up, it would be considered and that only the shortness in the time between the last Working Group meeting and this evening precluded the inclusion of those items in the typical sections.

At slide 16 in the presentation addressing the typical cross section in the vicinity of US 9, Harold Johnson asked how traffic would get across US 113. Mr. Oliver stated that overpasses at critical intersections would allow traffic to get across US 113 and that ramps at those overpasses would allow for the interchange of traffic between US 113 and the side road at the location of the overpass. Mr. Johnson asked if that meant there would be no crossover at Speedway Road. Mr. Oliver indicated that there would be an overpass at Speedway Road.

Carlton Moore asked if there would be an overpass at South Bedford Street. Mr. Oliver indicated that there would be.

Donna Atkinson asked what was the longest distance between overpasses for vehicles to turn around. Mr. Oliver indicated that the overpasses were generally spaced about 1 to 1.5 miles apart, with the greatest distance occurring at the southern end where the distance from Governor Stokley Road to SR 20 is approximately 3 miles.

Mr. Kramer stated that the more crossovers that are provided the greater the impact. Most impacts are not associated with improvements to US 113 but are associated with the overpasses.

Mr. Oliver then went through a comparison of Wilson Road under the current On-alignment concept versus Wilson Road under the modified concept. He further stated that by reducing ramp radii and requiring slower speeds to negotiate the turns, impacts had been further reduced.

Mr. Oliver then provided a similar comparison at US 113 and SR 18/404.

David Pedersen asked what happens to the portions of existing SR 18/404 that are bypassed with the realigned 18/404. Mr. Oliver explained that those portions of the old roadway, east and west of the intersection, would be removed.

Mr. Hite stated that the overpass details were preliminary and that, if the Working Group thought that we were on the right track, the Project Team would continue to look at ways to reduce impacts further.

Carlton Moore asked if the modified On-alignment approach is defined as a limited access highway. Mr. Oliver indicated that it is something less than full limited access.

Keith Moore asked how a motorist would get in and out of the Hardees. Mr. Oliver indicated that the Hardees would have to be acquired under the concept presented.

Mr. Oliver then went through a comparison at US 9.

Merrill Moore asked what is the property on the corner. Mr. Oliver indicated that Blakey's Service Station was on the northwest corner and Bedford Associates had the property on the southwest corner.

Mr. Oliver then reviewed a comparison at Arrow Safety Road and followed that with a comparison at South Bedford Street.

Harold Johnson asked what would be the width of the overpass. Mr. Oliver indicated approximately 40 feet.

Lt. Benson asked how the State Police Troop on Shortly Road would get access. Mr. Oliver stated that Shortly Road would access US 113 via ramps, which Mr. Oliver explained in detail.

Mr. Oliver then went through a comparison in the vicinity of Speedway Road.

David Pedersen stated that he thought at one time the Sea Coast Speedway was being considered as historic. Mr. Oliver indicated that after review with the SHPO, the property was determined not eligible. He continued that the proposed alignment was chosen to avoid homes and take the open area recognizing that there are plans to develop the Speedway property. Mr. Pedersen stated that he was not aware of the plans to develop the Speedway property.

Mr. Oliver then went through a comparison in the Governor Stockley Road area.

Mr. Oliver then summarized the discussion by listing some advantages to the proposed modified On-alignment concept just presented.

Mike Simmons indicated that the concept would be the same as SR1 from Dover Airforce Base to Milford. The concept allows for a piecemeal approach to achieving the ultimate plan by hitting the worst spots systematically as the need for improvement arises.

Mr. Oliver then went through a list of disadvantages.

Mr. Kramer pointed out that the first bullet under the list of disadvantages addressed the point that Carlton Moore made earlier regarding the allowance for property access to the roadway. He stated that the wider shoulder allows for the merging of traffic getting to and from the adjoining roads and properties with traffic already on US 113. Safety is a trade-off. From an engineering perspective this is not ideal, but the benefits are the reduced property impacts.

Mr. Oliver then went through a discussion on the traffic questions raised at the last Working Group meeting.

Donna Atkinson asked if the Working Group could assume if something is built that traffic will be double. Mr. Oliver indicated that the increase in traffic is about 70% of which about 5,000 vehicles would be diverted from SR 1.

Harold Johnson asked if No-build was selected in Milford, could you have a build selection in Georgetown. Mr. Oliver explained that the traffic modeling was done for each section with build and no-build scenarios on the ends. He further stated that the Milford and Georgetown-South projects are independent of one another so you could choose a build option in one and a no-build option in the other.

Donna Atkinson asked if 25% of SR1 traffic diverted to Georgetown was the figure used with the Milford Working Group. Mr. Oliver stated that the 5,000 vehicles discussed earlier was the same figure used with the Milford Working Group.

Mr. Oliver then reviewed the history of accidents in the US 113 corridor. He then responded to a question raised at the last Working Group meeting regarding the third lane concept and when it was discussed and dismissed by the Working Group.

Donna Atkinson asked if the Third Lane proposal included service roads. Mr. Oliver stated that it did not include frontage roads but did include the addition of a third through lane on US 113 and the grade separation of critical at-grade intersections.

Mr. Kramer stated that the Project Team had presented a lot of information. The Working Group may want to study this information further. We will continue to meet with the Working Group. We can also meet with individuals or smaller groups to review the information. He stated that this concept is a compromise. It is more than the third lane alternative that was previously dropped because it did not meet Project Purpose and Need. This allows for the concept to be phased in, on an as needed basis. It eliminates left turns while maintaining rights in and out to properties along the road. It is not as safe as a completely limited access highway but it has some safety advantages by eliminating the left turns, median crossovers and traffic lights. However, the Project Team would not have presented it if it wasn't an acceptable compromise. The property impacts are associated with the interchanges. On May 3, our next meeting, we will need a sense of where the Working Group is regarding the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study. At that time, he opened the floor for discussion.

Guy Phillips asked if the 404 interchange could be put on the screen. He indicated that large back ups going west on 18/404 occur during summer Sundays. He suggested that an additional (third) lane be considered, through the US 113 area, rather than two lanes to serve as a variable lane to react to traffic flow changes. Mr. Oliver stated that was something that could be looked at.

Keith Moore asked how traffic coming out of Georgetown accessed Route 9. Mr. Oliver went through the details of the interchange at US 9.

Howard Abbott asked if this concept changed the estimate of time required to complete the project. Since conditions will dictate when improvements occur, is 15 years optimistic.

Mr. Kramer stated that the modified On-alignment would be phased in. Traffic counts and other traffic data would be monitored to define hot spots and the timing for their improvement. Much depends on growth and whether the past several years are indicative of the next several years or whether there is a slow down in the economy and a slow down in the growth of traffic.

Carlton Moore asked how does the modified On-alignment concept in Georgetown fit in with other sections. Mr. Oliver explained that the concept meshes with Ellendale on the north and would work with any of the options being considered in the Millsboro-South area.

Guy Phillips asked a question which I missed. NEED HELP

David Pedersen asked if the Working Group adopted this proposal, would the interim improvements preclude new signalization or rights in and out. Mr. Hite indicated that the Department would probably not want to put in an additional signal on US 113 but the situation would have to be looked at on a case by case basis, including what contribution to improvements could be obtained from the developer of the adjacent property.

Mr. Oliver stated that the Project Team could provide a full map of the modified On-alignment concept if Working Group members need it. After discussion, it was agreed that the plan would be sent to all the Working Group members.

Harold Johnson asked if this meant that all the other alternatives are off the table. Mr. Kramer indicated that the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study were still on the table.

Mr. Kramer asked if there were questions on other alternatives.

Hearing no response, Mr. Hite indicated that the Department would accept silence as acceptance of the renewed direction with the modified On-alignment concept. He further stated that the agencies would see the concept and get a review, as did the Working Group, on Monday.

Donna Atkinson asked if emergency services representatives would be contacted during the refinement process. Mr. Hite indicated that they would be contacted and reminded the Working Group that emergency services providers are on the Working Group.

Mr. Kramer stated that the changes that would be discussed and the potential reduction in impacts would be presented at the next Working Group meeting.

# US 113 NORTH SOUTH STUDY

He also stated that a vote may be taken at the next meeting depending upon where the Working Group is at that time. He reviewed the ground rules established by the Working Group, early in the Working Group process, with emphasis on member voting, no proxies and absentee ballots for those who could not attend.

Howard Abbott questioned whether May 3 might be the last meeting of the Working Group. Mr. Hite stated that would depend on how the next meeting went and whether the

Working Group was in a position to make a formal recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Minutes prepared by Joe Wutka

#### Attendees:

Howard Abbott, Jr.  
Kenneth Adams  
Donna Atkinson  
Sherri Benson  
Eric Buehl  
Allison Burris  
Carol R. Campbell-Hansen  
David Diehl  
Martin Donovan  
Harry Dukes  
Matthew Gibbs  
Bryan Hall  
Harold Johnson  
Kyle Serman/Terry Johnson  
Carlton Moore, Sr.  
Keith Moore  
Merrill Moore  
David Pedersen  
Guy Phillips  
Mike Simmons