



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING



DATE: May 8, 2006

MEETING DATE: April 6, 2006

PLACE: Leola Restaurant

TIME: 6:30 pm – 8:00 pm

SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee Meeting No. 8

HANDOUTS: Packet containing six (6) 11x17 representations of Land Use Display Boards
Updated CAC membership roster

The date of the next CAC Meeting will be announced via a separate mailing.

ATTENDEES:

John Bare, Member	Frank Ludwig, Member
Henry Bieler, Member	Doug Maitland, Member
Herman Bontrager, Member	Michael Middleton, Member
Mary Clinton, Member	Timothy Shay, Alternate
Lisa Greaves, Member	Joe Shriver, Member
Bill Hoffman, Alternate	Dan Sweigart, Alternate
Larry Knepper, Member	Karen Weibel, Alternate
Calvin Lapp, Member	

OTHER ATTENDEES: Fred Daum
Larry Shirk, Lancaster Farmland Trust

Mark Malhenzie, Project Manager, PennDOT, District 8-0
Deborah Scherkoske, Project Manager, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Lugene Keys, Facilitator, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission
Deb Hoover, McCormick Taylor, Inc.
Matt Best, Gannett Fleming, Inc.

The primary purpose of this meeting was to review the upcoming public meeting format and related materials with the CAC and obtain their input.

1. Welcome/Opening Remarks - Mark Malhenzie (MM) welcomed everyone to the meeting, and asked everyone to introduce him or herself. In addition to the CAC members and alternates, Fred Daum, and Larry Shirk - Lancaster Farmland Trust were also in attendance.

2. Welcome New Members – Lugene Keys (LK) pointed out that the CAC had decided at the June 2005 meeting to extend an invitation to Calvin Lapp to fill Katie Glick’s vacancy. Calvin accepted the invitation with this meeting being his first as a CAC member. Mike Flanagan had advised following the June 2005 meeting that his alternate would be Karen Martynick, Executive Director of the Lancaster Farmland Trust. We were recently advised that the new Upper Leacock Township Manager, Mike Morris, would be replacing Steve Gabriel as alternate to member Mary Clinton.

3. Project Update - MM noted that at the last CAC meeting in June 2005 we discussed the re-initiation of the project. The project team has been busy since then, meeting with local public officials to present conceptual designs of the reevaluated alternatives, which vary from the versions presented at the 2003 public meetings. MM reiterated that the Department is using a process called “right-sizing” due to financial constraints; however, while projects were being evaluated for ways to reduce costs, they must still meet project needs and environmental issues must also be considered.

MM said that the project team was continuing to engage stakeholders at different times, including all of the municipalities throughout the project corridor, and the Amish Safety Committee for the purposes of getting their perspective on the various designs as it relates to horse and buggy safety and functionality. This meeting would allow the project team to get input from the CAC on the upcoming public meeting. MM reminded the CAC that they were their community’s liaisons, and that while everyone would be seeing advertisements about the public meeting, he asked that the CAC help get the word out as well.

4. Public Meeting Update - Deb Scherkoske (DS) noted that everyone should have received a postcard recently announcing the upcoming public meeting. The dates are April 18 and 19 from 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm at the Worship Center on Route 23. A public officials’ briefing will be held at 4:30 pm, and invitation letters are ready to be mailed to all elected officials, Mennonite and Amish Bishops, and adjacent municipalities involved in ELCLUS. The public officials meeting will be held only on the 18th. Time has also been set aside for the media to meet with PennDOT – 5:45 pm.

The format is similar to past meetings with registration, meeting booklets, and an introductory video that will be about 14 minutes in length. The video will go over in summary fashion what will be presented at the meeting – particularly since there is so much technical information being presented. The public meeting booklet will be very detailed containing the alternatives carried forward since our last public meeting and the right-sized alternatives. A survey form will be handed out to everyone, and we will have a public survey station. The survey form will also be available for people to take home to complete and return to us within 30 days of April 19. Copies of the draft public survey will be distributed to look at toward the end of our discussion.

Matt Best (MB) invited the members to gather around the display boards, and began his discussion with the western section, which extends from US 30 to PA 772. MB noted that there are two widening alternatives in this section – one similar to that shown in 2003, and a right-sized widening alternative which includes narrower lanes in some locations and narrower shoulders. Due to the definition of the Widening Alternative on the existing corridor, more variation will be seen with the limited access Southern and Bareville alternatives. MB then described the 4-lane Bareville Connector Alternative, and the 4-Lane Southern Alternative in the Western Section. MB indicated that the

context of the Western Section is defined by the presence of the Goat Path. MB pointed out that the access point at Willow Road was shifted to Greenfield Road based on input received at the 2003 public meeting. Access would also be provided at Horseshoe and Newport roads.

Right-sizing in the western context included developing 2-lane alternatives instead of 4-lanes. The 2-lane roadway would be built on the westbound lanes of the previously graded Goat Path, and the eastbound lanes could be used for stormwater management and a potential pedestrian/bicycle trail. MM noted that feedback from some of the non-motorized community has indicated that they wouldn't have much use for the trail with the new road reducing traffic volumes on secondary routes, which is their primary network. MB added that no passing zones are being planned for the 2-lane roadway; the speed limit in the western section would be 55 mph. A park and ride area for users of the pedestrian/bike trail is also under consideration. In response to a question from a CAC representative, MM and MB indicated that all stormwater requirements would be followed with respect to any nearby watersheds.

Another CAC representative asked if the 2-lane roadway would be divided. MB responded that there are some site-specific locations that do have a separated boulevard-like median for added safety consideration. It was also noted that speeding is a concern, but 2-lane roads get built frequently because that's what is called for. There would be no passing on this stretch because of safety issues - it will have a double yellow line outside of the area with the median. The access points may be signaled in the western section, but additional traffic analysis is needed.

MB explained the alternatives to be shown in the middle section, from PA 772 to Diller Avenue. With the widening alternative we have the same right-sizing throughout the corridor (narrowing lanes and shoulders where appropriate). Sidewalks would be provided through Bareville. MB further explained that the 4-lane Bareville Connector Alternative extends from the Goat Path to existing Route 23. An Industrial Connector, a 2-lane, 35 mph collector roadway, would connect with the industrial areas of southwest New Holland bringing traffic more directly to the Bareville Connector. The industrial connector would have at-grade intersections with cross streets and would be proposed to be a managed access road only along its length. The 2-lane Bareville Connector Alternative is similar to the 4-lane, except that it is a 2-lane roadway on same location as the 4-lane.

MB then discussed the 4-lane Southern Alternative in the middle section. A change in this alternative from 2003 was a result of discussions with adjacent property owners that led to the development of the alignment you see based on perspectives that weren't visible from looking at a map. A 36-foot median and a 55 mph posted speed limit are still planned in this section.

MB explained that the 2-lane Southern Alternative has two options in the middle section: a north alignment and south alignment. The south alignment follows the same footprint as the 4-lane Southern, and would have no access points between PA 772 and Diller Avenue. The 2-lane north alignment closely follows the Bareville Connector alignment. With the north alignment, an access point with a relocated Peters Road has been added. Either would be limited access.

MB noted that the eastern section extends from Diller Avenue to US 322. In this section the Widening Alternative and Bareville Connector Alternative are the same. From New Holland out to Route 322 there are no shoulders. Where we can provide shoulders in some sections we will, and a center turn lane.

MB explained that in the eastern section, the 4-lane Southern Alternative is similar to what has been presented previously, with 4-lanes separated by an 18-foot median. More access points are provided because there are more local roads with greater traffic volumes. The general design concept is to keep close to urban growth areas and serve traffic generators. The residential areas between Kinzer Road and Ranck Road have been difficult to avoid as development continues.

MB explained that the final alternative we will be presenting for public comments is a 2-lane Southern Alternative. This does reduce the cost of the roadway, and makes it fit into the terrain better – but it adds more risks from a land use perspective due to increased access. The access points would probably not initially be signalized.

A main part of the new information being presented at the public meeting are the access points associated with the 2-lane Southern Alternative. All of the existing access points presented at the 2003 public meeting plus additional access points are being presented. The project team is looking for feedback from the public on which access points are most desirable. There is a question on the survey form to address this issue.

At this point, DS addressed several other displays that will be presented at the public meeting including a Preliminary Performance Matrix that will give the public an idea of what the impacts would be. An Alternative Summary board will also be presented for each of the alternatives, and this information will be included in the public meeting booklets. DS then asked the members to return to their seats so that we could distribute and review the draft public survey form. In reviewing the draft survey form, DS pointed out that in general, the intent is to get public input on the alternatives and land use information. It says draft because it is still under review, and coordination is still ongoing. As a result, we will collect the surveys at the end of the meeting. DS asked the CAC to take some time to review the draft survey form.

The CAC offered several comments on Question 8, the land –use question. Concerns were expressed with the potential to get responses that were not very meaningful due to the public being unfamiliar with the ongoing land use planning efforts, or not being able to understand what is being proposed. Additionally, it was noted that the question itself was very general. Several members indicated the question was too general, and that more land-use information may need to be provided. Several members proposed a different format for the question. DS noted that the team would examine ways to clarify the question yet still keep it brief. A CAC member suggested modifying the word magenta to pink if still possible. Another CAC member inquired as to whether or not the 2003 public survey results were made available to the public. DS responded that we thought they had been, but that we would get back to the CAC with that information. *(After the meeting, it was confirmed that the 2003 public survey results were posted on the project web site at www.paroute23.com in October of 2003. They are still available under the section entitled Public Meeting Archives – Public Meeting #2. A copy of this summary is attached.)* Another member suggested that pre-addressed envelopes be provided for those who wanted to mail their

surveys in later. MM said that this could probably be done, and that the individual would need to provide the postage stamp. *(Pre-addressed envelopes were provided at public meetings held April 18 and 19.)*

The CAC members asked if they could have a few days to consider the questionnaire, and an opportunity to forward their comments back to the project team. It was agreed that comments on the draft survey could be emailed to Lugene Keys at lkeys@kci.com by close of business Monday, April 10, or members could call DS. *(There were no additional comments received on the public meetings survey from the CAC membership).*

Following the discussion on the draft survey, DS distributed a packet of six 11 x 17 sheets representing land use display boards that would be utilized at the public meeting.

5. Open Discussion – LK advised the CAC membership that Karen Martynick had been corresponding with her about the Lancaster Farmland Trusts' desire to have a representative member on the CAC. Mike Flanagan was at one time a member of the Lancaster Farmland Trust Board, but has since stepped down from that role but remains as a CAC member. As a result, the Lancaster Farmland Trust nominated Larry Shirk to represent them on the CAC. LK advised Karen that the decision to add another member to the CAC was the committee's decision. After some discussion among the membership, the CAC agreed to provide the Lancaster Farmland Trust with a membership position on the committee. Larry Shirk was welcomed to the committee, provided with the CAC membership form to complete, and was advised that he would be responsible for identifying an alternate.

6. Conclusion – MM asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none, and the meeting concluded at 8:25 pm.

We believe that the above accurately reflects the key points of discussion during this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding, or further explanation important to the purpose of the CAC and the meeting summary is encouraged. A request for modification or inclusion of additional information should be forwarded to Lugene Keys, Facilitator, within ten (10) days of receipt of the meeting summary. If no requests are received within this time frame, we will assume that all in attendance concur with the accuracy of this summary.

Attachment (Public Meeting#2 Summary from the PA Route 23 Web Site, posted October 2003)

Cc: CAC Members
Steering Committee