

Memorandum of Meeting

Date: May 3, 2007

Time: 5:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Location: Cheer Center, Georgetown, Delaware

Topic: Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting No. 17

Attendees: See Page 7

Bob Kramer called the meeting to order at 5:50 p.m. He welcomed everyone and reminded the Working Group that this was their 17th meeting. He then introduced Don Plows.

Mr. Plows thanked Mr. Kramer, welcomed everyone and explained that Monroe Hite was unavailable this evening, that he would be standing in for Monroe and that Monroe had asked him to convey his thanks to the group for their efforts. Mr. Plows then turned the meeting back to Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Kramer reviewed the agenda and the contents of the hand-out package. He indicated that the map of the On-alignment alternative in their package reflected the discussion from the last meeting and depicted the Refined On-alignment Alternative. Mr. Kramer then indicated that several members of the Working Group, following the last meeting, had asked to meet with the Project Team. He indicated that those meetings took place over the past two weeks and had included meetings with Perdue, the Town of Georgetown, Carol Campbell-Hansen, Martin Donovan and Lit Dryden/Carlton Moore.

Lit Dryden asked that the record show that neither he nor Mr. Moore had asked for a meeting, that the Project Team had asked to meet with them.

Mr. Kramer then turned the meeting over to Todd Oliver to review adjustments to the Refined On-alignment Alternative. Mr. Oliver indicated, in reviewing the proposed interchange locations associated with the alternative, that the proposed emergency access at East Redden Road would be reconsidered and evaluated with the Old State Road (S213) interchange in the Ellendale portion of the project area to provide access between the local road system and limited access US 113. He also indicated that an additional interchange was evaluated on the southern end of the Georgetown Project Area, in the vicinity of Avenue of Honor to provide reasonable spacing between interchanges should an On-alignment option be chosen in the Millsboro-South portion of the project area.

Mr. Oliver then reviewed the details of the interchange modifications for the Refined On-alignment alternative.

Allison Burris asked, during the discussion of the interchange at SR 18/404, that the movement from NB US 113 to WB 18 be explained again. Todd explained the details of how that movement would be handled, including the proposal to add an additional lane to WB 18/404 so that the movement in question would be continuous, unimpeded by any other movement.

David Pedersen asked, during the discussion of the interchange at SR 9, what happens with Trap Pond Road (Old Landing Road) where it intersects US 113. Mr. Oliver explained that, because of its close proximity to SR 9, it could possibly be closed or at best become rights in and out with SB US 113 and would most likely be closed to NB US 113 because of the ramp from NB US 113 to SR 9.

Lit Dryden and Lieutenant Benson asked, during the discussion of the interchange at South Bedford Street/Shortly Road, how Troop 4 would get northbound access to US 113. Mr. Oliver explained that Troop vehicles would take their driveway to Shortly Road, turn left, go over US 113 and turn left again on the ramp from S. Bedford Street to NB US 113. Bob Kramer reminded the Working Group that if this alternative moves ahead in the process and recognizing that we are at a conceptual stage in the plan development process, DeDOT would be working with the State Police, emergency responders, etc. to address emergency access, as well as, normal response access as the details evolve and eventually get constructed.

Keith Moore asked about the NB US 113 movement to EB US 113 at Arrow Safety Road. Mr. Oliver explained that the movement in question would be made by way of the ramp from NB US 113 to S. Bedford Street, making the right onto S. Bedford Street, a left at Zoar Road and then accessing Arrow Safety Road. Mr. Oliver indicated that this is facilitated by the fact that Arrow Safety Road and S. Bedford Street almost make a triangle with US 113 being the third leg. The distance on Zoar Road from S. Bedford Street to Arrow Safety Road is very short.

The discussion of the proposed interchange at Wood Branch/Speedway/Kruger and Alms House Roads precipitated considerable discussion.

Harold Johnson asked how he would get a combine across US 113. Mr. Oliver indicated that an overpass between Speedway Road and Kruger Road would provide access across US 113.

Donna Atkinson asked how wide the road over US 113 would be and wouldn't a combine block traffic. Mr. Oliver stated that the overpass would have 12 foot lanes with 8 foot shoulders allowing for the movement of farm equipment without blocking traffic.

Merrill Moore asked what happens to Wood Branch Road. Mr. Oliver responded that it would be cul-de-saced at Speedway Road.

David Pedersen stated that he had problems with the proposed interchange. He asked why an interchange was even needed and why such a convoluted interchange. He further stated that he disagreed with the State Historic Preservation Office regarding the historic significance of the Seacoast Speedway and that it should be preserved and protected as an historic resource. Finally, he asked who chose to go around the Kruger property and take the overpass through the Speedway property. Mr. Oliver explained that the area is currently a safety problem. When you

look at the spacing of interchanges, an interchange in this area makes spacing sense and would reduce the trip length for homes in the area. In an effort to minimize impacts on existing homes, an interchange that may appear somewhat unusual but provides all the movements necessary seems to be preferable to a conventional interchange which would disregard property impacts. For this same reason, impacting the Speedway property, which we understand is being proposed for development and with whom DeIDOT could work in the future as the property changes rather than take homes seemed to be the proper approach in developing this interchange.

Donna Atkinson asked if US 113 could be taken over and access for vehicles, including farm equipment, at-grade. Mr. Oliver explained that taking US 113 over results in the homes currently accessing US 113 in the area needing to be acquired, and would involve more homes being acquired than the current plan. In addition, taking US 113 over results in maintenance of traffic issues. At SR 9, it is possible to take US 113 over because of the wider median. In the area of Kruger/Speedway Roads, the median is narrower and maintaining traffic on US 113 becomes a very complex and costly issue.

David Pedersen stated that the Zoar Road/Speedway Road intersection is not shown on the graphic and is a bad intersection. Mike Simmons responded by stating that DeIDOT is currently pursuing a project to fix the problems at that intersection.

Mr. Oliver concluded his remarks on the interchange modifications and indicated that the Project Team will be meeting with the environmental resource agencies in one week to discuss the Refined On-alignment Alternative. He then moved to a discussion on key issues associated with the Georgetown Area Alternatives.

Lit Dryden made the statement that maybe 100 properties are exposed to US 113 along its existing alignment while that number is higher on the bypass alternatives.

David Pedersen asked if the concept of driving from Milford to Selbyville with no lights is now gone. Mr. Kramer indicated that it was not gone. The improvements to US 113, with the Refined On-alignment Alternative would be phased over time, removing signals and cross-overs as they failed. The difference with the Refined On-alignment Alternative and previous On-alignment Alternatives is that the new option allows more right-in/right-out movements, except, for safety reasons, at interchanges. David Pedersen followed by stating that exiting and entering high speed ramps would be subject to driveways within short distances. Mr. Kramer reiterated that driveways, for safety reasons, would be limited in areas around interchanges. Mr. Pedersen asked what consideration had been given to bicycle/pedestrian movements. Mr. Oliver stated that bicyclists wouldn't be allowed on the shoulder of US 113 with the weaving traffic. Additional details, including

Bike/Pedestrian access would be looked at in detail as the plans progress.

Keith Moore asked if time studies to get through the area had been conducted. Mr. Oliver indicated that time/delay studies had been conducted for existing US 113 early in the study. Mr. Moore asked how the Refined On-alignment Alternative affected those studies. Mr. Oliver indicated that he did not know.

Donna Atkinson stated that the third lane with proper signing should work for new businesses.

Howard Abbott stated that the US 113/SR 18/SR 404 intersection was currently at failure. Mr. Kramer and Mr. Oliver stated that the current peak hour failure of this intersection will expand to all day in the future. Howard Abbott stated that he could vouch for the left turn accident problem, having recently been in an accident at that intersection.

Allison Burris asked if the Refined On-alignment Alternative was still limited access. Mr. Oliver stated that it was not by definition but met many of the criteria of a limited access roadway. Ms. Burris stated that future access to properties along US 113 should be limited to minimize the amount of traffic weaving in and out in the future.

Mr. Oliver turned the meeting back to Mr. Kramer. He reminded the Working Group that all of the alternatives are on the table. He reiterated that their role was to provide advice to the Secretary of Transportation. Mr. Kramer then reviewed the process forward, stating that within weeks of a recommendation by the Working Group, DelDOT would announce its decision on a recommended preferred alternative. A Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including all of the alternatives as well as a recommended preferred alternative would be completed and published. A Public Hearing, possibly conducted jointly with the Corps of Engineers, would be held. The Department of Transportation would consider input from the Hearing and select a corridor. A Final Environmental Impact Statement, focusing on the selected alternative would be prepared and published and a Record of Decision by the Federal Highway Administration would be requested. Mr. Kramer then reminded the Working Group that a formal recommendation from the group to the Secretary of Transportation requires a super majority of the members or 22 members concurring. He then indicated that 22 members of the Working Group were in attendance this evening. He stated that Mike Simmons, while a DelDOT employee, is a member of the Working Group. Neither Mr. Plows nor Mr. Hite is a member of the Working Group. Absentee ballots will be sent out to those members unable to attend this evening. At this point, he opened the floor for comments.

Carlton Moore stated that he was not comfortable with the super majority. Mr. Kramer explained that in Meeting #3 of the Working Group, the details of how they would make decisions as a group were proposed, discussed and agreed to by the members. Mr. Moore indicated that he would see what happens under the agreed upon process.

Carlton Moore read a prepared motion recommending that the Working Group drop the bypass alternatives. Mr. Kramer indicated that a yes vote for this motion was a vote to drop the bypass alternatives. A no vote was a vote to retain the bypass alternatives.

David Pedersen seconded the motion but indicated that he was not aware of the requirements for a super majority. Mr. Kramer stated that David was not a member at the time that the ground rules were set, that he replaced a former Planning Commission member after the discussion on the Working Group guidelines.

Harold Johnson indicated that he also did not like the method of using written ballots in the absence of total agreement by Working Group members on this recommendation.

Howard Abbott asked if they could vote or not on this question. Mr. Kramer indicated that they could.

Merrill Moore asked how many were needed to pass the motion. Mr. Kramer responded that as this was a vote on process, the motion would require a super majority (75%) of those present.

Harold Johnson asked how many members were on the Working Group. Mr. Kramer responded that there were 29 members with 21 present at this time.

Keith Moore directed a question at Lit Dryden and asked if the business community was okay with this alternative. In his opinion, it seems that businesses would be hurt by this alternative. Mr. Dryden indicated that this alternative minimizes the impact on businesses by maintaining visibility for the businesses, which the bypass alternatives would not.

A lengthy discussion on the process and the Working Group guidelines followed with many people speaking at once and answers intermingling with debate. Near the conclusion of this debate, David Pedersen walked out of the meeting.

Carol Campbell-Hansen requested, in an effort to save her business property at the US 113/SR 18/SR 404 intersection, that she be given the same consideration as Wilmington Trust, referring to the proposed interchange concept at the US 113/SR 9 intersection.

As a result of the debate, Mr. Kramer asked for a vote by the Working Group to determine whether there was a consensus among the group to vote by a show of hands. A yes vote was a vote for a show of hands, while a no vote was a vote for paper ballots. 12 members voted yes (show of hands). 9 members voted no (paper ballot). Since there was not a consensus (defined by super majority) votes would be conducted by ballot.

Harold Johnson seconded Carlton Moore's motion in the absence of Mr. Pedersen. Ballots were handed out. 18 members voted yes (to drop the bypass alternatives), 3 members voted no (to retain consideration of the bypass alternatives). Mr. Kramer indicated that 4 more votes in the affirmative from the 8 Working Group members absent would provide a super majority.

Mr. Kramer opened the floor for other motions.

Guy Phillips made a motion that the Working Group support the Refined On-alignment Alternative. Howard Abbott seconded the motion.

Mr. Kramer suggested that Mr. Phillips may want to add to the motion that DeIDOT would continue to work with property owners and emergency responders.

Guy Phillips asked if the motion needed to say that.

Harold Johnson asked that the No-build Alternative be explained. Mr. Kramer stated that the No-build Alternative included improvements already in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, maintenance and safety improvements. Mike Simmons added that DeIDOT was working on interchanges throughout the state and picking up property as people wanted to sell. As conceptual plans, it has to be expected that they will change over time and suggested that the first bullet on page 14 of the Power Point presentation be added to the motion.

Carlton Moore stated that the people affected have not provided input and he is fearful of voting without their input.

Mike Simmons stated that each interchange will have its own public process. Mr. Kramer explained a potential sequence for the development of the project. The sequence could start with the addition of a lane in each direction, followed by the widening of the outside shoulders, closing unsignalized cross-overs, restricting left turns and then constructing overpasses and ramps. Interchanges would be spaced approximately 1 mile apart. Right-in/right-out access would be allowed except around interchanges.

Harold Johnson stated that it sounded like No-build in a sense. You are taking care of safety. Mr. Kramer stated that the difference was in the intent.

Keith Moore stated that the Department (Transportation) wouldn't purchase properties that are available. A response, indicating that the Department would only consider the purchase of needed parcels through an advanced acquisition process initiated by the property owner prior to the need to build the improvements and the completion of construction plans, was provided.

Kenneth Adams stated that the Working Group might as well vote on diamonds (in reference to the Power Point graphic depicting interchange locations as diamonds).

Mr. Kramer stated that we don't know what the details are going to be until the need is there and the actual design for the interchange gets underway. He then asked if there were anymore questions/comments.

Guy Phillips agreed to amend his motion to include recommendations to work with property owners and emergency responders as the interchange plans are developed in detail. Howard Abbott agreed as the second.

Ballots were handed out. The result was 19 votes for, no votes opposed, 2 abstentions.

Mr. Kramer stated that the vote effectively addressed all the alternatives. He indicated that absentee ballots would be hand delivered to those Working Group members not in attendance. He further stated that the Working Group members would be notified of the final results and that a decision from the Department of Transportation would probably be announced by the end of May.

Donna Atkinson asked if there was no super majority, will there be another Working Group meeting. Mr. Kramer stated that there would not be another meeting.

Mr. Kramer then turned the meeting over to Don Plows. Mr. Plows thanked the Working Group for their efforts, handed out certificates of appreciation and commented on the success of the process. He also extended Monroe's heart felt thank you and pleasure in working with the group.

Carlton Moore extended the thanks of the Working Group to DelDOT and the Project Team.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Joe Wutka

Attendees:

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

* Mr. Pedersen left midway through the meeting and did not participate in the voting process.