



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING



DATE: September 30, 2003
MEETING DATE: August 12, 2003
PLACE: Leola Family Restaurant
TIME: 6:30 pm
SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee, Meeting No. 6
KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

BOARDS ON DISPLAY: What We Heard, What We've Done
Traffic Signal Board
Widening Alternative, Option 1 Board
Typical Section Board
Bareville Connector Alternative Board
Typical Section Board
Access Point Options Board
Southern Alternative Map
Typical Section Board
Access Point Options Board
South Option Board

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

HANDOUTS: Draft Survey
June 20, 2003 Letter from Russell Pugh and Response
July 24, 2003 Letter from Russell Pugh and Response
August 2, 2003 Letter from Jake Bare
August 5, 2003 Letter from Russell Pugh (Editorial)
August 5, 2003 Letter from Russell Pugh (Attendance)

ATTENDEES:

Henry Bieler, Member	Heidi Schellenger, Alternate
Frank Christoffel, Member	Wilbur Sollenberger, Alternate
William Ebel, Member	Dan Sweigart, Alternate
Steve Gabriel, Alternate	Karen Weibel, Alternate
Larry Knepper, Member	Fred Wissler, Member
Michael Middleton, Member	
Vincent Paparo, Alternate	Fred Daum, Alternate for Frank Ludwig
John Shiver, Member	and Russell Pugh

Mark Malhenzie, Project Manager, PENNDOT, District 8-0
Deborah Scherkoske, Project Manager, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Lisa Brozey, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Stacey Hostetler, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission
Deborah Hoover, McCormick Taylor and Associates
Matt Best, PE, Gannett Fleming

The purpose of this meeting was to review feedback from the second land use visioning conference, review the public meeting materials, encourage participation and

attendance at the public meeting, distribute CAC related correspondence, and discuss membership issues.

1. Welcome/Opening Remarks – Mark Malhenzie (MM) welcomed everyone to the meeting. MM provided a brief update on the project progress. MM asked the attendees to introduce themselves and asked that the alternates that were attending in place of absent members make mention of that as well. The alternates that were attending in place of absent members included: Dan Sweigart for Tom Baldrige, Wilbur Sollenberger for Jake Bare, Steve Gabriel for Mary Clinton, Fred Daum for Frank Ludwig and Russell Pugh.

2. Feedback from Second Land Use Visioning Conference – Deborah Scherkoske (DS) reviewed the purpose of the visioning conference, meeting participants, and asked the attendees to indicate if they attended. DS stated that as you registered tonight you should have been given a packet that contained the visioning conference minutes, maps and pointed out Appendix A, which listed the comments gathered during the breakout session. DS indicated that project team would mail out the packet to those not in attendance.

DS stated there was a consistent message from the CAC and the municipal officials in what needs to happen to the study area in regards to growth and transportation. DS explained that the maps attached to the minutes represent the consensus view from the breakout sessions and that the same maps will be shown at the public meeting for the public to review.

DS opened the floor for questions or comments.

One member noticed throughout the entire document it says, “should” and questions why it doesn’t say “will”. DS explained the purpose of the exercises at the visioning conference was to gain consensus. With that in mind, it was then the intention at the next conference that a change from “should” to “will” could be made.

One member asked if there was a state agency that currently exists to enforce land use tools. DS stated no, but there was a push from some stakeholders to increase the enforcement abilities.

Discussion continued about development, growth rate, personal future land visions and their results. At this point, Stacey Hostetler (SH) interrupted the discussion because it was taking on a personal nature. SH indicated that the CAC was not the proper arena for this discussion. SH indicated that some of what is coming out in the discussion was addressed at the visioning conference and encourage those to attend the next one when the time comes.

3. PA 23 EIS Public Meeting Overview – One member questioned when the public meeting was being advertised in the Lancaster Newspapers. The member indicated that she had not seen the Monday advertisement. SH indicated that she would call the Lancaster Newspapers and verify the dates. SH explained that the paper was providing proof of publication. Subsequent follow-up with the newspaper did provide proof of publication.

DS reviewed the first three stations of the public meeting. DS explained registration and how we changed registration from last year to accommodate more people. DS explained there would be a project video again this year. DS explained that the project video was draft and that the voice over was correct but that some of the graphics are still missing. DS reviewed the station showing the alternatives not carried forward and explained it was the same information that was presented at the last CAC meeting.

DS reviewed the meeting locations and explained why the first night was moved from Calvary Church to the Worship Center. DS stated that like last year a public officials meeting would be held before the public meeting. One member asked who could attend the public officials meeting. DS explained that letters were mailed out to invite state, county and local officials to the meeting. This is a courtesy short briefing to officials of what will be seen at the public meeting so that they in turn can liaison with their constituency in answering questions that may arise.

One member asked if the survey would be available for the attendees to review. DS explained that a draft survey was available.

At this point, the CAC watched the project video. DS asked for comments or questions on the video. Several members brought up the need for directional arrows and labels on the renderings so people could better understand the renderings.

One member commented that the renderings fade too fast. DS explained that we were trying to keep the video to 15 minutes but that we can add time if necessary.

One member commented that the video does not say much about the widening alternative. DS explained that the purpose of the video is to show what has changed or what is new at scheduled public meeting. DS explained that not as much has changed with the widening alternative, as it did with the others.

One member questioned why the renderings were not more realistic with Sheetz's and other possible developments on the interchanges, not farmland. DS explained the project team can only show what is there now. DS further explained that unless there is a development plan in place it is pure speculation what the owner might or might not do with their property. DS stated that the visioning conference participants envisioned putting growth in the urban growth boundaries, not at the interchanges.

One member would like to see the Eastern Lancaster County Land Use Study develop a map of what the current zoning is today in the study area to see where growth is currently expected.

At this point DS turned the meeting over to Matt Best (MB), one of the project engineers. MB reviewed the Alternatives Carried Forward station and the various boards that will be part of that station.

MB started by reviewing the Widening Alternative, Option 1 mapping and renderings. One member stated that at the last public meeting there was confusion between the Option 1 and Option 2 of the Widening Alternative; specifically where the road would be widened and where the shoulders would stop and start. MB explained that this year we have the map marked to show where the widening would occur and where the shoulders would occur. MB also pointed out these features on the map.

One member indicated he wanted to see what would be lost with all the alternatives. The member asked if the property owner names could be listed on the map so we can see who and what the alternatives will impact. DS explained that at this point since there is not a preferred alternative, the project team cannot list the names because the impacts are preliminary and will change until a preferred alternative is selected and final design and right of way plans completed. She noted that team members familiar with the impacts of the various alternatives will be stationed at the boards to answer questions a potentially affected resident might have regarding the design.

MB then proceeded on to the Bareville Alternative mapping, renderings and access options. One member commented that the industrial connector that is part of the Bareville Alternative would help relieve Route 23 of the industrial traffic.

MB reviewed the Southern Alternative mapping, renderings and access options. One member asked if the townships had looked into the impact a new roadway would have on the Emergency Management Systems. Discussion ensued around this topic.

One member asked if the curve design for the Southern Alternative was too sharp and dangerous. MB indicated that it was standard curve design for that design speed.

At this point, the CAC returned to the table to discuss the survey. Surveys were passed out. DS gave the CAC time to review the survey before asking for questions or concerns.

One member indicated there was not a question asking the public to pick their preferred alternative. DS explained that the project is not at the stage where a preferred alternative is being chosen, and that the goal of the survey is to get feedback rather than a "vote". The goal of this meeting was to show what alternatives have been dismissed and to get more input on the design of the alternatives carried forward.

One member indicated that the survey directed more discussion on the Southern Alternative. DS explained that the Southern Alternative had the most questions and concerns raised at the last public meeting and more changes were made to the Southern Alternative.

One member indicated that the survey doesn't gauge how much people will use each alternative and their reason of using. There was some discussion around this point.

One member questioned if the public would really understand the question about land use. DS explained that the project team thinks they will understand based on the public's concern for growth and the need to manage growth, as well as the involvement at the visioning conferences. DS further explained that is exactly why there is a station dedicated to land use at the public meeting.

One member asked if the booklet could be given to the CAC before the public meeting. DS indicated that the public meeting booklet would be mailed out to the CAC.

One member indicated that questions five and six should be on the same page.

One member indicated that she didn't understand question seven. Some discussion occurred around what the project team was asking and what the CAC felt the question was addressing.

One member indicated that question ten should be a "check all that apply" type question.

4. CAC Participation at the Public Meeting – SH stated that last year some of the CAC members volunteered to help at the public meeting with registration and the survey station. SH asked for help again this year. SH asked that if anyone could help to please let her know or just show up at registration.

5. Distributing CAC Related Correspondence – SH passed out the letters received after mailing the pre-meeting packet. Five letters were passed out to attendees. SH explained that there were several questions regarding what is passed out to the CAC. SH read an email from MM to a CAC alternate to better explain the process. SH explained that if the CAC is aware of a letter sent to the project team that would be beneficial to the CAC to let us know and we will share the letter. SH further explained that it is impossible to share every piece of correspondence that comes into the project team because it would take away from the purpose of the CAC. SH asked for questions or concerns.

One member stated that if names are mentioned in the correspondence that the correspondence be shared with the individuals if they are not already cc'd on the letter. SH indicated that through the process of sharing correspondence with the CAC, the individuals mentioned in letters would receive a copy. The member further stated that some of the correspondence labeled and attacked individuals.

SH explained that this segway nicely into the next topic if there were no other questions. No other questions were noted.

6. CAC Membership Issues – SH indicated that there are several new individuals attending and that it would be beneficial to review some points in the organizational and operating principles (O&OP).

SH read from page 1 of the finalized O&OP, last paragraph and page five, third paragraph regarding the role of the alternate. An alternate indicated that information can be gained from all at the table and each person represents a unique view that might not be heard if alternates are not allowed to speak. Discussion continued around this topic. SH reminded the attendees that they approved and adopted the O&OP and the CAC needs to follow these principles because this is what guides the meetings. SH also indicated that it would be impossible to have every interest at the table and that the CAC represented a variety of interests while maintaining a manageable group size. A primary role of the Alternate was to substitute for a member if an absence would likely occur.

There was more discussion from the CAC about the alternate role and the reasons for changing or not changing the role.

SH again indicated that the O&OP are what she uses to keep the meeting on task. SH stated that in order for the alternate position to change, the O&OP would have to be

changed and there has to be consensus from those attending the meeting. SH stated at this point, she is not hearing a consensus that the alternative role needs to change.

One member questioned the definition of consensus. SH read the definition of consensus from the O&OP.

More discussion ensued around the topic of the alternates' role. SH posed the question if the CAC at the next meeting wanted an agenda topic to further discuss the role of the alternate. SH clarified that the question is an agenda topic, not a change to the role of the alternate. A member indicated that a vote was necessary.

Lisa Brozey (LB) asked if the vote should be verbal or should it be private (written vote). Several members expressed that it could be by a show of hands. Seven members indicated that an agenda topic was warranted and four indicated that an agenda topic was not warranted.

SH determined that with seven votes an agenda topic was warranted at the next meeting.

SH noted two other items to bring to everyone's attention.

SH read from page four, fourth paragraph of the O&OP regarding conduct and the need to treat each other with respect.

SH read from page two, fourth paragraph of the O&OP regarding draft information shared with the CAC and also read from page six, second paragraph regarding media relations.

SH indicated that there were a few more housekeeping items.

SH stated that Ms. Glick resigned as a CAC member due to family responsibilities. SH explained that a letter was sent to her alternate, Ms. Zook, to see if she would like to assume the member position. SH further explained that the project team has not heard from Ms. Zook. SH stated that if Ms. Zook does not wish to fill the member position than the project team will be looking to the CAC to help fill the position per the O&OP. SH stated Mr. Beiler or Mr. Bontrager may be able to provide assistance with this task.

SH indicated that Heidi Schellenger has accepted the CAC's offer to have a member of the Lancaster Farmland Trust on the CAC. SH explained that Ms. Schellenger would assume the role of alternate and that Mike Flanagan would assume the member role. SH asked if the CAC had any comments or concerns. No comments or concerns were noted.

SH noted that several members have missed three or more consecutive meetings and in accordance with the O&OP and with the CAC's permission, she would contact them to see if they are still interested. The members are Sylvan Fisher and Tom Baldrige.

SH thanked everyone for their patience and asked if there were any other topics or items of concerns for Open Discussion.

7. Open Discussion/Conclusion – The CAC voiced no other topics or items of concerns for open discussion. A member thanked the team for their work and effort and stated the meeting materials look good. SH again thanked everyone for coming and adjourned the meeting.

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.

CC: CAC Members, Project Team, and Steering Committee