

Memorandum of Meeting

Date: 11/22/04

Date of Meeting: 10/18/04

Time: 5:30 pm

Location: Georgetown CHEER Center

Type: Georgetown Area Working Group Meeting #5

Attendance: See Attached

The following is a summary of the discussion at the Working Group meeting:

- The meeting was called to order at 5:45 pm by Mr. Robert Kramer
- Bob thanked those Working Group members in attendance for coming. He indicated that this evening's meeting was going to be low-tech, no Power Point Presentation, emphasis on Working Group members reviewing the plans for the upcoming Public Workshops and providing feedback on how the preliminary alternatives should be presented.
- Bob reviewed the agenda, which was included in the Working Groups hand-out materials and reiterated the emphasis for this evening's meeting. Bob then introduced Monroe Hite, III, DelDOT's Project Manager for the US 113 N/S Study to continue the meeting.
- Monroe welcomed everyone, emphasized the importance of going over the changes to the alternatives from the previous meeting and the Working Group being comfortable with those changes. Monroe then indicated that the Public Workshop for the Georgetown Area would be held on November the 9th in the CHEER Center from 4 pm to 7 pm.
- Monroe then reviewed a summary of the comments generated by the Working Group at their last meeting on September 30th.
- Monroe then introduced Joseph Wutka to review the changes that were made to the Eastern Bypass options, as a result of comments from the previous Working Group meeting.
- Joe reviewed the minor changes to the Eastern Bypass options then introduced Mr. Jeff Riegner to review the changes made to the On-alignment and Western Bypass options.

- Jeff reviewed the changes to the On-alignment and Western Bypass options, including the reduction of the number of On-alignment Options from four to two. He then reviewed with the Working Group the traffic movement graphic, at the US 113/Routes 9/404 intersection, which was included in their hand-out, and indicated that additional work over the next couple of months regarding traffic would be presented in the same format at the next Working Group meeting. Finally, he reviewed the Impacts Matrix, which was also included in their hand-out.
- Jeff then turned the meeting back to Monroe. Monroe indicated that over the next few months the Project Team would be expanding the information on the Matrix to include cost, traffic, economic and additional environmental impact data.
- Lit Dryden asked if the possibility of moving businesses and houses back to accommodate the On-alignment option was addressed in the Matrix. It was indicated to Mr. Dryden that that information is not currently in the Matrix but it would be included prior to the next Working Group meeting.
- Terry Johnson asked for the status of the Toll Road from Denton to Route 1. Jeff indicated that the feasibility study, which was not asked to address tolling, had not yet gotten underway.
- Howard Abbott asked for the status of Route 404 in Maryland. He indicated that a small piece of the dualization of Route 404 around Denton had just opened up but he had heard that Maryland was having financial problems. Bob Kramer indicated that Maryland does plan to move ahead with the dualization of Route 404 to the Delaware line, having the right of way already to do the project, but the timing was unknown.
- Bob then opened the floor for comments/thoughts, in general, regarding things that had occurred to any of the Working Group members since the last meeting.
- Keith Moore indicated that the US 113/Routes 404/9 intersection needs to be worked on. Everyone that he has talked to agrees that something, don't know exactly what, needs to be done to improve that intersection. Secondly, the desire is to improve the intersection without impacting anything. It was indicated that DelDOT is currently doing a couple of studies regarding the intersection and a portion of Route 404/9 west to the Del-Tech entrances to improve traffic flow.
- Lit Dryden asked if the Project Team was looking at adding another road/lane to Route 113 along with signage to indicate that the right hand, outside, lane is for local use and /the median, inside, lanes are for through traffic. Monroe indicated that the Project Team is looking to do that over the entire corridor. He indicated that the up-coming Public Workshop will show that concept through the use of typical sections. He indicated that a similar idea had been generated at a recent meeting of legislators representing the Study Area. The concept would not meet the criteria of providing a limited access facility and would not come close to addressing the Purpose and Need for the project, as reviewed with the Working Group early on in the process. He concluded his comments by

indicating that this approach might be a short-term fix prior to the development of a long term solution.

- Lit Dryden indicated that, in his estimation, the addition of a third lane could be done quickly, as early as next year, since the state already owns the right of way in which to do the widening.
- Guy Phillips indicated that a Western Bypass needs to tie into the study, currently underway, to determine the realignment of Park Avenue around the proposed runway extension at the Sussex County Airport. He asked what the status was of that study. Tom Shafer indicated that he was working on the study on behalf of the County and indicated that three options for the realignment of Park Avenue were currently being evaluated and that wetland delineations, among other environmental constraints, were currently being determined for each of the options. Tom further indicated that the three options included realigning existing Park Avenue by looping out around the proposed runway extension, creating a new alignment for Park Avenue that tied in opposite Arrow Safety Road and, finally, creating a new alignment for Park Avenue that tied in opposite South Bedford Street.
- David Pedersen discussed a modified beltway concept that was the result of the conversations in the previous breakout session that he was involved in at the last Working Group meeting. He indicated that it was important that, at the next Public Workshop, the public be made aware that the options are not either/or but that there is the ability to mix and match and combine solutions to develop the ultimate solution. Monroe indicated that part of this evening's meeting would be dedicated to discussing how this information should be presented to the public.
- Bob Kramer asked each Working Group member, prior to going into their breakout groups to consider, if they were looking at these plans for the first time, what would they recommend to improve the understanding of the general public at the upcoming series of Public Workshops.
- At this point, Monroe broke the Working Group members into their breakout groups.
- As a result of the effort by the Working Group members in their breakout sessions, the following comments were reported back to the entire Working Group:

On-Alignment

General

- Some support if businesses not impacted too severely
- Difficulty understanding impact of overpass/interchange
- Might work farther south on US 113 below US 9.

Option 1

- Dramatic negative impact on DelTech at intersection of SR 404 and US 113.
- If SR 404 goes under US 113 there will be a serious traffic backup on N. Bedford St.
- This option is easier to follow than Option 2 (both on paper and for the driving public).
- May need to clarify that all existing DelTech entrances would remain open. Additional DelTech access point would also be useful.

Option 2

- Will service road from SR 404 to US 113 be only two lanes?
- What will happen at SR 9-overpass, signal or stop sign?
- Traffic will be brought to stop on Market Street, the Circle and other in-town east-west streets.
- OK south of Georgetown.
- Option addresses DelTech access concerns.

East Off-Alignment

- Not the close-in option; it is too near town.
- Farther-out option is better when considering growth plans.
- Doesn't help address east-west beach area oriented traffic.
- In the southeast area connect Truck Route 9 to Arrow Safety Road to handle east-west traffic.
- Closer option appears to have less impact.
- Bypass from US 113 to US 9, northeast of Georgetown would be nice but overall not very supportive

West Off-Alignment

- Does not help with east-west traffic demands.
- Prefer option farthest to the west and suggest that the route go more dramatically to the west from 113 farther to the north in the vicinity of Piglet Path. There would be an interchange at 404, then go over SR 9 and connect to US 113 with an interchange at Arrow Safety Road, then proceed on Arrow Safety to Truck Route 9 and continue on TR 9 to connect with SR 9 at an interchange.
- Basic purpose is to take through traffic away from the center of Georgetown.
- Construct the portion of a Western Bypass from 18/404 to Arrow Safety Road as an initial phase.
- The proximity of the Western Bypass crossings of 18/404 takes away from understanding what each option does where it crosses 18/404. Clarification may be required.
- Favor the shorter bypass option that would allow a tie-in with Truck Route 9 and a potential south bypass of Georgetown back to US 9. Anything west has to have this possibility for a southerly bypass.

General

- Bypasses don't show connections to the On-alignment options. The transition
- from one to the other needs to be shown on the plans.

- Bob Kramer reviewed what he had heard floating between the breakout groups and listening to the summaries just presented: very little support for eastern options, the east to south and north to west movement in Georgetown needs to be addressed, details of the realignment of TR 9 and its possible tie-in with an On-alignment or Western Bypass option is extremely important, there appears to be interest in the Western Bypass options (avoiding wetlands is an issue) and On-alignment options south of US Route 9 does not seem to create a lot of heartburn.
- Discussion took place regarding the large amount of information to be disseminated at the Public Workshops in November.
- Merrill Moore indicated that the close, graphically, proximity of the Western Bypass options could be addressed by providing separate maps for each of the alternative alignments. It was indicated that separate maps could create a problem in finding enough display area for the options.
- Monroe indicated that details at the US 9 and SR 404/18 crossing could be
- developed for each alternative.
- Bob Kramer indicated the following issues and asked the Working Group what three items were critical for people coming to the Workshops: understanding by the public of where we are (given detail, it might be assumed that the project is further along than it actually is), no decisions have been made regarding which options will be carried forward for detailed study (no-build, for legal reasons, and at least one On-alignment option, for comparison against Off-alignment options, will be carried through the process), multiple options may be carried through the process and what will come out of this workshop.
- Merrill Moore asked what the plan of action was for the Workshops. Monroe indicated that he was proposing to provide general background regarding the materials available at the Workshops at regular intervals, otherwise the meeting format was for an open type of Workshop.
- Howard Abbott indicated that he felt the public doesn't appreciate the difficulty in presenting the information in a way that is quickly understood.
- Eric Buehl indicated that he liked putting the On-alignment options on the same graphic for comparative purposes as well as the use of the Matrix.
- Guy Phillips indicated that the only done deal is that the study will be done.
- Keith Moore suggested that an explanation of the set-up of the displays needed to be the introductory piece at the meetings.
- Lit Dryden indicated that the displays should be mounted and placed on easels rather than on the table.

- David Pedersen indicated that information on time frame, the length of the process and how many options will be looked at needs to be included.
- Bob Kramer indicated that DelDOT will tend to keep more options on the table rather than fewer.
- Monroe indicated that the time frame will be presented in a display addressing the next steps in the process.
- Bob Kramer raised the issue of whether the time frame for construction should be part of the presentation material.
- Monroe indicated that an exhibit discussing the right of way acquisition process had been developed by DelDOT Real Estate staff to be used at the Workshops.
- Bob Kramer reiterated that the Georgetown Public Workshop would be held on November 9th. He asked the Working Group members to attend for at least an hour and get a feel for what the public is thinking. He indicated that the Working Group would reconvene after the new year. Finally, he asked that the Working Group members help get the word out about the upcoming workshop.
- Lit Dryden asked if the meeting minutes could be provided in advance of subsequent meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.