



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

DATE: August 26, 2002
MEETING DATE: August 15, 2002
PLACE: Leola Family Restaurant
TIME: 6:30 pm
SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee,
Meeting No. 3
KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

*The date of the next
CAC meeting will be
announced via a
separate mailing*

ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Fred Wissler, Member | Lisa Greaves, Member |
| John Bare, Member | Larry Knepper, Member |
| Henry Beiler, Member | J. Wilbur Sollenberger, Alternate |
| Herman Bontrager, Member | Frank Ludwig, Member |
| William Brubaker, Member | Joe Shriver, Member |
| Frank Christoffel, Member | Russell Pugh, Alternate |
| Mary Clinton, Member | Karen Weibel, Alternate |
| Bill Ebel, Member | Neil Kinsey, Member |
| Katie Glick, Member | Clyde Martin, Alternate |

- Mark Malhenzie, PENNDOT, District 8-0
Deb Scherkoske, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Deb Holland, McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission
Scott Sternberger, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Laura Leimbach, KCI Technologies, Inc.
John Derr, P.E., Gannett Fleming
Matt Best, P.E., Gannett Fleming

The purpose of this meeting was to provide a project update, an overview of the plans and alternative displays for the upcoming public meetings, and complete the discussion on Organization and Operating Principles.

- Welcome/Opening Remarks** – Mark Malhenzie (MM) welcomed the CAC members to the meeting. MM began the meeting with an acknowledgement to the CAC of the passing of Norman Day, Land Use Planner on the project. He also shared the news of the birth of Lisa Brozey’s baby. In Lisa’s absence, MM noted

that Deb Scherkoske (DS) would be serving as Project Manager until Lisa returns from maternity leave.

MM updated the CAC on the current status of the project following the May Land Use Visioning Conferences. MM noted that the team had conducted approximately 70 farmland interviews, and were working on refining the alternatives and developed some hybrid options. He commented on the team's efforts to be sensitive to the horse/buggy issues and thanked Katie Glick for providing some of the team members with a "horse and buggy" field view. MM also mentioned that several team members would meet with the Amish Safety Committee the following day for additional perspectives. MM advised that the second issue of the project newsletter had been distributed, and that copies were available for CAC members if they had not received copies already.

MM went on to talk about the public meetings scheduled for Tuesday, August 27 and Wednesday, August 28. MM indicated that while the project team was going to give the CAC an overview of what was going to be presented, the alternative displays that were set up for the CAC were about one-tenth of what was going to be displayed at the public meeting.

2. PA 23 EIS Public Meeting Overview – Deb Scherkoske (DS) explained that the focus of the upcoming public meeting is anticipated to be on the alternatives carried forward from the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis; therefore, that is what the project team will be presenting at tonight's meeting. Deb noted that the plans shown tonight are half the size of those to be on display at the public meeting on August 27th and 28th. DS also mentioned that there will be eight (8) stations available to illustrate all of the up to date preliminary information for the public. In addition to a sign-in station there would be an orientation station, a 15 minute project overview video, a Land Use station, an environmental resources station, an engineering station, a traffic station, and a CAC/Public Involvement station. DS stated that Lugene Keys (LK) would speak more about the CAC's involvement in the public meeting later tonight. DS asked if everyone would proceed to the first alternative board to spend a few minutes examining each of the alternatives. The following boards were on display:

- Composite map of all Build Alternatives
- Widening Alternative, Option 1 (No shoulders in Leola, New Holland, and Blue Ball)
- Widening Alternative, Option 2 (Continuous shoulders)
- Bareville Connector Alternative
- Southern Alternative
- Railroad Alternative, 5-Lane North and 5-Lane South Options
- Railroad Alternative, 2-Lane, One-Way Pair Option
- Transportation Systems Management/Transit Alternative

DS introduced John Derr (JD) and Matt Best (MB) from Gannett Fleming who would be leading the discussion of the alternatives. JD began by explaining that hybrids of

some of the six (6) alternatives have been developed. He also stated that in each of the alternative maps, Route 30 is on the left and Route 322 is on the right. JD led the examination of the first board, which was a composite map of all of the alternatives. MM stated that there was a summary of preliminary impacts displayed on a separate board at the bottom of each of the alternatives.

JD explained that board 2 illustrated the Widening Alternative, Option 1, which includes adding a center turn lane and would provide wider shoulders except in Leola, New Holland, and Blue Ball, where shoulders would be eliminated. Due to the concern of eliminating shoulders in these areas, a non-motorized bypass route to the north and south had been shown on the drawing. JD emphasized the photographic visuals on this board and their importance in giving the public a feel for what the alternatives would look like. JD also noted the all the boards present before/after renderings and typical sections to help the public understand the improvements/impacts of each alternative/option. A CAC member questioned if the non-motorized bypass was intended to restrict buggy traffic. JD replied by saying that it was intended to give them a safer alternative, not to restrict the traffic. Another CAC member questioned if there would be a route for the farmers to travel to the produce auction. Another comment was made concerning the changing Amish church districts. Also, a member commented that Route 23 is a busy road for Amish buggies. JD responded by stating that there was a meeting planned for tomorrow with Amish Safety Committee to discuss any changes that have been made concerning these topics in the last three (3) or four (4) years. MM added that the logic of these routes was based on a 1999 meeting with several members of the non-motorized community, where they indicated that they were frequently used. Another CAC member questioned whether shoulders were being considered on the alternative routes. MB responded that various side roads are being examined to see if placing shoulders on them would be justified.

JD moved the CAC's attention to Widening Alternative, Option 2. This alternative differed from Option 1 in that there would be continuous shoulders on Route 23, including in Leola, New Holland, and Blue Ball and the non-motorized bypasses are not shown as they are not needed under this option. MM explained that this alternative has the most impact on structures in the project area, but would provide a safe travel lane for non-motorized transportation modes on Route 23.

The Bareville Connector Alternative would use the goat path, and curve towards PA 23 and connect near Bareville. From there it would follow the Widening Alternative, Option 1 alternative, with no shoulders in New Holland and Blue Ball. As with Widening Alternative, Option 1, the non-motorized bypass routes are shown. The connection from US 30 to PA 23 would be 4 lanes and include a grass median and this section would be a limited access roadway. One CAC member inquired if there would be a severe impact to historic districts with this alternative. DS stated that if Widening Option 1 were used thirty (30) to forty (40) buildings would be taken, while, Widening Option 2 would impact approximately eighty (80) to ninety (90) buildings. The member asked if it would be feasible to move the buildings. MM responded that

moving buildings is very costly; however, the Department has done it on a few occasions in the past. Another member suggested that an east off-ramp and a west on-ramp at Horseshoe Road near the Conestoga Industrial Park could potentially gather much of the traffic from surrounding roads. JD replied that per design criteria, a 2-mile distance is needed between interchanges to provide operational efficiency and consideration of safety due to weaving vehicles and that these ramps would have to be built over railroad tracks. Another member seconded the east-on, west-off comment. JD indicated that these types of options were being considered and that the project team would be looking for additional input on interchange placement in this general area at the public meeting.

The Southern Alternative was described as a four-lane limited access highway running from US 30 to US 322. The design displayed maintains side road access through the use of overpasses or underpasses. The end of the alignment would go over Route 322. A CAC member inquired about the limitations of traffic on Route 23 and if more accesses would reduce traffic on Route 23 if they are taken the entire way through the project area. The Railroad Alternatives does show that type of concept with numerous access points. The access points would be at grade and would require signalization. On a limited access highway, it is access controlled through interchange spacing. JD stated that Route 23 currently functions as a collector roadway. MM indicated that the roadway was originally designed to be an arterial roadway, however after years of development (approximately one driveway every 70 feet throughout the corridor), it is functioning as a lower level roadway. JD also suggested that the Traffic Station at the public meeting be visited to answer many traffic-related questions so one could see the advantages and disadvantages of each. Another member was concerned with the amount of development that would be invited along with more interchanges. The member believed it was important to discourage development. It was noted that land use strategies would be part of each alternative. Another member stated that a super highway would be necessary to tie into Route 23 to be able to handle the traffic that would be filtering in each day. JD stated that PA 772 and other side roads need to be looked at for that reason, and that these roads will be evaluated further.

A CAC member inquired about changing the name of the "Southern" Alternative. The suggestion was made to call it "limited access" or a "four-lane thruway" to reflect the design. MM indicated that the names of the alternatives had been carried through the documentation process from the names assigned during the earlier PA 23 Corridor Study, and that it would be a confusing change to make at this time in the process with regard to the documentation.

The first Railroad Alternative board included the 5-Lane North and 5-Lane South options. These would include using the Bareville Connector alignment and then span over the railroad tracks and move eastward through New Holland using a five (5) lane roadway north of the tracks and running parallel to it or not spanning the tracks but instead running a five (5) lane roadway south of the tracks. Each option would consist of two (2) lanes in each direction and a center turn lane and would generally abut the Norfolk Southern variable right of way. MM stated that the team had conversations

with Norfolk-Southern Railroad about sharing the right-of-way early on and they did not consent. It was a profitable line to them and they had safety concerns. FHWA and the Department also had concerns. A CAC member asked what PP&L's response was about sharing their right-of-way. JD stated that if the project is run adjacent to the power lines it is possible to build between towers and it is also possible to move towers, but it is expensive. A CAC member asked if either the north or south were appreciatively better? MM responded that the north has more structure impacts, including impacting agriculture support businesses. The South option, would additionally impact Memorial Park. A CAC member asked if the location of sinkholes along the corridors were known at this time. JD stated that it is possible to perform an electromagnetic study to discover shift in alignments that could occur due to sinkholes; however, that is not typically a fatal flaw issue. MM stated that through approximately 70 farmland interviews, that the farmers in the project area generally would prefer not to be impacted, however if they must, it was preferred to design a roadway that might allow the borders of their farmland to be affected by the project, versus severing them. The team was sensitively designing to this notion, but could not completely avoid severing some properties, as the parcels are not laid out in a gridlike pattern where you could just run a straight line. Historic properties are also being given strong consideration as required by law. A CAC member wondered about the impact on businesses with the major interchanges of this alternative and the Southern Alternative. This impact had been evaluated, but the information was not available tonight. DS replied that the Southern Alternative has much less of an effect on businesses than any of the other alternatives.

A third Railroad Alternative was the 2-Lane, One-Way Pair Option. With this option, the existing Route 23 would become a 2-Lane, one-way road westbound, and 2 eastbound lanes would be constructed near the existing railroad line. A member asked if there was enough room to construct the road beside the railroad. JD responded that the alternative is as close to the railroad as possible, and the southern edge is against the railroad to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. MM also explained the history of sharing the Railroad right of way and that the project team originally looked into that, but the RR did not want to give up the right of way, it was a profitable operation and they had safety concerns with any sharing concept. The Railroad Alternatives do not impact as much farmland, but this alternative does impact a number of agricultural support businesses.

The final alternative examination was led by MB. This was the TSM/Transit (Transportation System Management) Alternative. This alternative consists mainly of spot safety improvements both on 23 and on some side roads. MB stated that there are proposals for shoulders and sidewalks along PA 23 from the Conestoga river to New Holland and along select side roads for this alternative. One example of a spot safety improvement was the realignment of 23 at 322 in Blue Ball. There was little discussion among the CAC members relative to this alternative.

3. CAC Participation at Public Meeting – LK announced that the CAC members and alternates were invited to participate in the public meeting by working the registration

table, talking with community members at the meeting about the project, and speaking about their role in the CAC. LK asked volunteers to contact her prior to the meeting to let her know which night they would be willing to assist at registration or the public involvement station. LK also asked for recommendations on contacts for traffic control, bicycle racks, and temporary hitching posts for other modes of transportation.

4. LK introduced the new alternates identified by CAC members since the last meeting. The alternates included Dan Sweigart who would be serving as the alternate for Tom Baldrige; Leah Zook who would be serving as alternate for Katie Glick, and Timothy Shay who would be serving as the alternate for Henry Beiler.

5. LK noted that at the last meeting the CAC agreed to wait on Transportation Secretary Mallory's response to Russell Pugh's correspondence regarding the operation of the CAC and the role of the alternates. This correspondence was sent out to all CAC membership prior to the meeting. LK asked if everyone received and had an opportunity to review this correspondence, to which the membership indicated they had. No comments were provided. LK asked if there were any additional comments on the most recent version of the Operating Principles. There were no additional comments from the CAC membership. LK announced that the Operating Principles would be finalized and would represent the CAC's adoption of a final version of the Organization and Operating Principles.

6. LK opened the floor for all the CAC members and alternates to discuss other relative topics of interest or anything about the presentation.

Topics discussed during this timeframe included a question and recommendation pertinent to the growing population of Amish in Lancaster County which also includes increases in non-motorized vehicular traffic and the potential for continued growth of cottage industries. There was also a comment on how land-use ordinances may need to be strengthened to help address the potential impacts of the cottage industries without hindering the growth of cottage industries. There was also discussion about the increased truck traffic on secondary roads in conjunction with cottage industries.

Other topics discussed included the impact that fuel supplies could have on the project and transportation in general.

7. LK concluded the meeting with the announcement that the date of the next CAC meeting would be provided as soon as possible either in the meeting summary or via separate mailing.

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

Steering Committee

ATT: Adopted PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee Organizational and
Operating Principles