



**MEMORANDUM OF MEETING**

**DATE:** February 11, 2003  
**MEETING DATE:** December 12, 2002  
**PLACE:** Leola Family Restaurant  
**TIME:** 6:30 pm

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

**SUBJECT:** PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee, Meeting No. 4  
KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

**ATTENDEES:**

- |                          |                            |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Fred Wissler, Member     | Stephen Gabriel, Alternate |
| John Bare, Member        | George Clair, Member       |
| Herman Bontrager, Member | Larry Knepper, Member      |
| William Brubaker, Member | Frank Ludwig, Member       |
| Bill Ebel, Member        | Karen Weibel, Alternate    |
| Bill Hoffman, Alternate  | Doug Maitland, Member      |
| Timothy Shay, Alternate  | Vincent Paparo, Alternate  |

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  
John Derr, P.E., Gannett Fleming

---

**The purpose of this meeting** was to review the outcome of the public meeting, to report on the recently held Study Group Meetings and the Agency Coordination Meeting, and to provide an engineering update on the preliminary alternatives.

**1. Welcome/Opening Remarks** - Mark Malhenzie (MM) welcomed everyone to the meeting. MM asked that the attendees introduce themselves. Lugene Keys (LK) 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 Steve Gabriel (for Mary Clinton), Tim Shay (for Henry Beiler), and Karen Weibel (for Frank Christoffel).

**2. Project Updates** - Deborah Scherkoske (DS) provided an overview on the outcome of the public meetings held in August 2002, the Study Group Meetings held in November, and the Agency Coordination Meeting held in December. DS explained that the public, the CAC, and the agencies are among the project's key stakeholders and the

project team has spent the past four months working very closely with these particular groups.

- **Public Meetings**

DS stated that two public meetings were held on August 27 and 28, 2002, and were attended by a total of 867 individuals. There were 200 in attendance at the Calvary Church location with the balance attending the public meeting held at the Garden Spot High School. A total of 568 surveys were returned, which is a return rate of 66 %. The findings from the public meeting indicated that the Transportation System Management (TSM)/Transit, Widening Option 1 and Widening Option 2 had between 13 % - 16% of the public say those alternatives were very effective or effective. The Bareville Connector and Railroad alternatives were rated very effective or effective by 19% to 21% of the respondents. The Southern Alternative received a 54% rating as very effective and 17% rating as effective. A question about possible interchange locations (at PA 772 and Diller Avenue) was also asked on the survey, and half of the people who responded thought those locations were effective. Only 14% felt the proposed interchange locations were not effective. DS noted that the recent project newsletter includes a summary of the public meeting results. Copies of the newsletter were distributed to the CAC membership in attendance (the CAC members are included on the newsletter mailing list).

DS noted that since over six hundred people attended the meeting at the Garden Spot High School, follow-up was necessary. Additional public meeting materials including the public meeting booklet and a copy of the survey were mailed out to those requesting them. Since individual copies of the alternatives mapping could not be made for all of those who requested them, copies were sent out to each of the municipalities and the County so that interested citizens could see them locally. Individuals also requested copies of the project video that was shown at the public meeting, so copies were made available to the local libraries for public use. DS stated that mapping of the alternatives and the before and after renderings are on the web site. Due to the survey, the project team found that some people do not have access to a computer, however many people found out about the web site for the first time at the public meeting and the site usage has increased significantly.

DS noted that the survey also asked open-ended questions that invited public comment regarding alternatives. The most common responses involved impacts to residents, farmlands and concerns with sprawl. Also mentioned was the time needed to complete the project and associated costs.

- **Study Groups**

DS asked how many of the CAC members attended the recently held study group meetings, and a few members indicated that they did. DS commented that the study group discussion was targeted to the specific areas of each study group's expertise. The Economic Vitality, Finance, and Transportation Alternatives study group meeting, held on November 6, 2002, reviewed the alternatives and discussed the access points. Comments were made regarding PA 772 and other suggestions were made to look at

Horseshoe Road and Ranck Avenue as possible access points to the Southern Alternative. Positive feedback was also received regarding the Diller Avenue connection. At the Historic and Archaeological Resources, Farmlands, and Natural Resources study group meeting held on November 13, 2002, the focus was on an update of the environmental impact studies. The farmland studies, including farmland interviews, were discussed. Another topic of discussion at the meeting was historic and archaeological studies. These studies are currently underway and include the evaluation of 5 historic districts and of the archaeological potential within the study area. Visioning Conference results and the ECLUS study were reviewed at the Land Use Growth Management and Government study group meeting held on November 20, 2002. There was also discussion on the land use implementation strategies.

- **Special Agency Coordination Meeting (SACM)**

DS indicated that the state and federal resource agencies were brought up to date during a Special Agency Coordination Meeting held December 3, 2002. The purpose of that meeting was to show the agencies the development progress on the PAA alternatives to date, and they were also updated on land use and environmental studies. A bus trip through the study area was held in the afternoon.

The next steps include the review of the input from the various stakeholders along with an evaluation of the alternatives in terms of their ability to meet the needs of the project. The project team will be making recommendations in early 2003 for the dismissal of some of those alternatives, and the alternatives that are to be moved forward will be studied in detail in the Environmental Impact Study (EIS). A second Visioning Conference is scheduled to be in the spring of 2003 with a public meeting to follow. At that point the reduced number of alternatives will be presented and input on possible land use scenarios will be sought for those alternatives.

**3. Engineering Update** – John Derr (JD) spoke about how the public comments received are being addressed and the stages of context sensitive solutions (CSS). He noted that context sensitive design will be completed in 3 stages, and that currently we are in the second stage for context sensitive design, which entails trying to minimize the footprint as best as possible according to the stakeholders' comments. The third stage deals with mitigation – minimizing impacts– noise walls, or other features. The third stage will occur after the next public meeting.

Public comment on stage two has led to an investigation of interchange locations. Currently, a diamond interchange was presented, at the previous public meeting, at PA 772 and Diller Avenue. Horseshoe Road was suggested as an alternative to PA 772. PENNDOT will evaluate the Horseshoe Road area for an interchange as part of the next Visioning Conference.

JD continued by stating that narrowing of the median is being considered, and meetings are being held with FHWA and PENNDOT to discuss applicable CSS criteria. All of the alternatives as currently designed meet PENNDOT's criteria. Also, width modification of the swale treatment on the outside of the roadway might be considered.

A CAC member expressed concern about how the public will be informed of local usage of a new roadway, once an alternative is chosen and interchanges are developed. JD replied by referring to the traffic model as an indicator of local usage with alternatives and interchanges. Half ramps were suggested for traffic going from New Holland to Lancaster.

JD added that at the public meeting the alternatives were presented as a 70 MPH roadway. He noted that the criteria could be potentially reduced to 60 MPH. JD noted that the existing designs meet PENNDOT's standards.

The focus on the Southern Alternative at the CAC meeting was questioned, and MM responded that it was used purely for demonstrative purposes. MM explained that at a public meeting, CSS strategies for all alternatives carried forward would be explained. Any alternatives that move forward will be examined for potential context sensitive solutions. A member questioned the wide median associated with the Southern Alternative and MM explained that the wide median was part of design criterion.

**4. Open Floor Discussion** – LK distributed correspondence that had been sent to the project team since the last CAC meeting and opened the floor for continuing discussion.

A CAC member remarked that the TSM alternative may not have been completely understood by the public. Another member cautioned that it is important to present a balanced picture of the alternatives, especially with respect to the renderings.

**5. Conclusion** - LK indicated that the meeting would conclude and the next meeting date would be included with the meeting summary, or announced in a 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