





# ALTERNATIVES / IMPACTS / WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

113

## US 113 North / South Study

May / June 2005

### Millsboro-South Area - Preliminary West Bypass Alternatives

#### Description of Alternatives

- Due to resource constraints, western bypass alternatives are limited to short bypasses of one or two towns each
- **Millsboro:**
  - Alternative C begins near Rich Road, while Alternative D begins further south near Sheep Pen Ditch
  - Alternatives 4, 5, and 8 connect Alternatives C and D to US 113 north of SR 20 (east)
  - Alternative 9 continues south from Alternative C to bypass Dagsboro, returning to US 113 south of SR 26
  - Each western bypass of Millsboro will include a connector to SR 24 north and east of Millsboro
- **Dagsboro:**
  - Alternatives E and F both have a full interchange with SR 26; US 113 would not connect to the bypass at either end
- **Frankford:**
  - Alternative G bypasses Frankford further west than Alternative H
  - Alternative G has a full interchange with Blueberry Lane; US 113 would not connect to the bypass at either end
  - Alternative H has southbound ramps at Blueberry Lane; US 113 would connect to the bypass only as northbound ramps
- **Selbyville:**
  - Alternative I begins just north of SR 54
  - Alternative 6 bypasses most developed properties in Selbyville, tying into US 113 about ½ mile into Maryland
  - Alternative 7 minimizes impact in Maryland, resulting in greater impacts to Selbyville residences and businesses

#### Working Group Recommendations

##### WEST ALTERNATIVES

- There was consensus among the Working Group members to recommend to DeIDOT that in the Selbyville area Alternative I-6 be retained for detailed study and that Alternative I-7 be dropped from further consideration.
- There was consensus among the Working Group members to recommend to DeIDOT that Alternatives E and F to the west of Dagsboro and G and H to the west of Frankford be dropped from further consideration.
- There was consensus among the Working Group members to recommend to DeIDOT that Alternatives C4, C5, C8, and D4 to the west of Millsboro be dropped from further consideration.
- The Working Group was unable to reach consensus on Alternatives C9 and D8:
  - ▶ Eleven (11) members voted to recommend that Alternatives C9 and D8 be dropped from further consideration; but that if DeIDOT decides that a West Alternative will be retained for detailed study, then Alternatives C9 and D8 be studied.
  - ▶ Eleven (11) members of the Working Group voted to recommend that Alternatives C9 and D8 be dropped from further consideration.

#### Western Bypass Conclusions

- All western bypasses appear to be effective in reducing traffic on existing US 113.
- The Dagsboro and Frankford bypasses have generally been perceived as having no real benefit to those towns.
- The close-in Selbyville bypass (Alternative I-7) has no public support.
- Among the short Millsboro western bypasses, Alternative D8 has the least resource impacts almost across the board.
- Natural resource impacts are generally comparable between eastern and western bypasses.





# ALTERNATIVES / IMPACTS / WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

113

## US 113 North / South Study

May / June 2005

### Millsboro-South Area - Impact Comparison of Preliminary West Bypass Alternatives - Environmental

(Resource Impacts in Delaware Only)

Considerations	No Build Alternative	Millsboro West Bypasses						SR 24 connectors (one will be included with each Millsboro west bypass)				Dagsboro West Bypasses		Frankford West Bypasses		Selbyville West Bypasses	
		C 4	C 5	C 8	C 9	D 4	D 8	C north	C south	D north	D south	E	F	G	H	I 6	I 7
<b>Wetlands and Waters of the US</b>																	
Wetlands (acres)	0	11	11	7	4	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	11
Waters of the US (linear feet)	0	4,100	3,900	3,900	25,900	3,400	3,200	100	800	400	1,100	9,300	7,600	5,200	3,700	7,200	5,700
<b>Historic and Archeological Resources</b>																	
Number of Known Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects, and Districts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Known Archeological Sites	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Potentially Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects, and Districts - currently being evaluated	0	9	8	9	14	9	9	11	12	11	12	2	1	1	5	3	2
Number of Potentially Significant Archeological Sites - currently being evaluated	0	9	8	9	8	7	7	5	3	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Cemeteries	0	2	1	2	3	2	2	5	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Section 4(f) Properties</b>																	
Number of Publicly-Owned Parks and Recreation Areas	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Publicly-Owned Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of Historic Properties - same as number of Known Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects and Districts (above)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Section 6(f) Properties</b>																	
Properties purchased by Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) (number)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Area (acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species</b>																	
Potential Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species Areas (acres)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
<b>Other Considerations</b>																	
Agricultural Districts (Ten-Year) (number of properties)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(acres within properties)	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agricultural Preservation Easements (Permanent) (number of properties)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(acres within properties)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forestland: 2002 Land Use (acres)	0	74	77	69	80	56	51	24	22	41	40	2	5	6	0	5	5
State Forest Lands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note 1: Includes streams and ditches. Only linear feet have been calculated until determination is made on ditch or stream.