



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

DATE: March 7, 2002

MEETING DATE: February 26, 2002

PLACE: Bareville Fire Hall

TIME: 6:30 pm

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

**Mark Your Calendars –
the next CAC meeting is
March 26, 2002.**

ATTENDEES:

John Bare, Member
Frank Christoffel, Member
Bill Ebel, Member
Lisa Greaves, Member
Randolph Harris, Member
Neil Kinsey, Member
Larry Knepper, Member
Frank Ludwig, Member
Doug Maitland, Member
Clyde Martin, Alternate
Michael Middleton, Alternate
Russell Pugh, Alternate
Fred Wissler, Member

Colleen Brown, PENNDOT Bureau of Design
Lisa Brozey, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Deb Holland, McCormick, Taylor and Associates, Inc.
Stacey Hostetler, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Lugene Keys, KCI Technologies, Inc.
Mark Malhenzie, PENNDOT Engineering District 8-0
Dave Royer, Lancaster County Planning Commission
Scott Sternberger, KCI Technologies, Inc.

The purpose of this meeting was to kick off the PA 23 EIS project Community Advisory Committee and review the project history, introduce the project team, explain

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 2 of 5

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

February 26, 2002

the status of current activities and expected studies for the project, finalize operating/organizational principles and select additional CAC members.

1. Welcome/Opening Remarks – Mark Malhenzie, the PENNDOT Project Manager (MM) welcomed the attendees and introduced himself. MM then asked the participants to introduce themselves, state their role in the Community Advisory Committee and the interest they represent. All CAC members and alternates were invited to the meeting.
2. Project Overview – MM provided a brief overview of the project and project history. MM noted that this project is unique in that the transportation alternatives and land use studies will be integrated throughout the entire process.

A CAC member questioned what McCormick Taylor's role was in the process. MM explained that McCormick Taylor is PENNDOT's management consultant and they are continuing on from the initial Corridor (MIS) study.

A CAC member questioned how much "teeth" does the land use initiatives have with the municipalities. Lisa Brozey (LB), KCI Project Manager, explained that land use is something that is initiated and enforced by the municipalities. The county implemented this study to get all the townships involved in the process. PENNDOT, nor anyone else, can tell the municipalities what to do with their land. However, the county will be working with the municipalities on funding issues to help enforce the land use initiatives associated with this study.

MM indicated that the "teeth" is in the funding. MM explained the county initiated the ELCLUS study to help control land development and the county is not going to look favorably on municipalities that do not help the process.

Discussion continued between the Project Team and the CAC about land use. At the end of the discussion, LB noted that land use would be looked at with suggestions to the municipalities, however, there is an existing transportation problem on Route 23 that should be addressed. LB noted that there is a safety concern and a traffic concern on Route 23 today and that is why we (project team and CAC) are here.

A CAC member questioned why the project stopped at Blue Ball. The member indicated that looking ahead shouldn't we address the area beyond Blue Ball. LB reviewed the Corridor (MIS) study and the current project corridor. LB explained that of all the road studies during the MIS, Route 23 from US 30 to Route 322 was the only one with problems today. The purpose of the 23 EIS project is to address the existing transportation problem on Route 23 from Route 30 to Blue Ball and the ELCLUS would look at land use in the surrounding community to make recommendations to prevent or delay similar transportation problems with other areas within eastern Lancaster. LB explained that we fix the problem area here and

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 3 of 5

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

February 26, 2002

use the land use study results to put in appropriate land use measures to handle the other areas.

3. Where we are, Where we're going – LB referred the CAC to their 10-step handout. LB reviewed the 10-step process and the key steps. LB reviewed the difference between the Corridor (MIS) study and the current project. LB pointed out two key features to the CAC – the Land Use Study presented by the green circle and the Public Involvement line. LB asked for questions. No questions from the CAC at this time.
4. The CAC – its Role and Purpose – Lugene Keys asked if anyone participated on a CAC or CAC-type committee. Three CAC members indicated that they had participated on a CAC. LK explained the role of the CAC and their purpose.

LK asked if everyone received their packet of materials. The CAC indicated that they had received their packets.

5. CAC Organization and Operating Principles Review - LK reviewed each section of the CAC Organizational & Operating Principles with the CAC members and asked for comments on each section.

A CAC member questioned how the project team would be communicating with the Old Order Amish and Mennonites. LB explained that we have several options available to us to communicate with them including kitchen table meetings, meeting with the bishops and attending the auctions. LB emphasized that we will be reaching out to them in ways that are more comfortable for them and we intend to share the project information with them.

A CAC member questioned reaching consensus and indicated a problem with 51/49 being considered a consensus. The member also indicated that he didn't think some of the members and their alternates would vote the same way. Discussion around this topic continued. During the discussion, Deb Holland (DH) noted that the CAC would not be put in a position to cast the deciding vote on off-line versus on-line alternatives. LB indicated that Federal Highway Administration would make the final decision.

A CAC member questioned Tom Stouffer's membership. The member indicated that Tom Stouffer has since moved out of the project area and resigned from Lancaster Farmland Trust. LK indicated that we are working on replacing him and that we have been in contact with Lancaster Farmland Trust.

A CAC member questioned the section of keeping draft and preliminary information confidential but at the same time taking accurate project information back to the community. LK explained that this applies to specific data and that members would be made aware of what information is available to present to the community at large.

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 4 of 5

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

February 26, 2002

LB added that you can talk about the information, just note that it's tentative and will change until we have a finished product. MM gave an example to the group to further explain this issue.

A CAC member asked who was on the project team. The member indicated that our PA 23 EIS Process Flow Chart shows PENNDOT as being separate from the project team. LB indicated that MM represents PENNDOT on the project team but that others at PENNDOT will review and approve the alternatives. LK explained that PENNDOT is involved in two ways – on the project team and in the decision-making capacity.

Discussion continued around the reaching consensus topic with the CAC and project team. LK indicated this is why it is important that the members (or their alternates) attend meetings and participate. MM added that if we do not have consensus on an item – the CAC does not have to settle for 51/49 or 50/50. MM stated that the project team would revisit the issue and come back to the CAC for consensus.

LB asked if additional text was added - reflecting that if there is not a majority consensus, that we will revisit the issue before moving on – would this be satisfactory. LB added that in the event that there is not consensus, both sides of the issues will be documented. Most CAC member agreed with the additional text. One member indicated absolute disagreement, even with the additional text. LK stated that text would be added and brought back for final approval at the next CAC meeting.

LK asked if Tuesday nights were okay with the CAC for meetings. The CAC indicated that the last Tuesday of the month was the best day for meetings. LK asked about the location. The CAC indicated agreement with the location. LK asked about the start time. One member indicated that 6:30 pm is a little hard and the other members indicated that 6:30 was fine. LK indicated that at this point in time the CAC would continue to meet at 6:30.

6. Completion of CAC Membership – LK reviewed the current membership and their interests. LK then reviewed the volunteers and their interests. LK indicated that the CAC could add as many as six more people, and asked the CAC to discuss those who volunteered. LK pointed out that we do not have a representative for Emergency Services and that we only have one representative for Tourism.

A CAC member indicated that he could cover the EMS interest because of his involvement with the fire and ambulance companies. LK indicated that was good but we may want to have an additional person.

A discussion was held on the volunteers and their involvement. LK shared the CAC applications the volunteers filled out and submitted. A CAC member indicated that

MEMORANDUM OF MEETING

Page 5 of 5

KCI Job Order No. 18-01017

February 26, 2002

we might want to have someone from the County Agriculture Preservation Board on the CAC. LB indicated that we would contact them.

During the selection of additional members, LK reminded the group that the next meeting would be on **March 26 at the Bareville Fire Hall starting at 6:30 pm.**

Results from the selection process: (those names in bold are the new CAC Members.)

Herman Bontrager (12 votes)	Dale Gamber (1 vote)
Henry Beiler (11 votes)	Ephrata Chamber of Commerce (1 vote)
Katie Glick (6 votes)	Mildred McQueen (1 vote)
William Brubaker (5 votes)	Samuel Huber (1 vote)
George Clair (4 votes)	Sandra Tressler (1 vote)
Joe Shriver (4 votes)	Charles Bozym (1 vote)
Harold Landis (3 votes)	Eric Bachman (0 votes)
Stanton Nixon (2 votes)	John Long (0 votes)
Ronald Waltman (2 votes)	Donald Pauly (0 votes)
Robert Horst (2 votes)	Nannette Longnecker (0 votes)
Calvin Lapp (2 votes)	Elizabeth Ann Garman (0 votes)
Russell Pugh (2 votes)	Kenneth Etter (0 votes)
Donald Horning (1 vote)	

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

We believe that the above accurately reflects a summary of the key points of discussion that transpired at this meeting. However, input that reflects a difference in understanding, or further explanation pertinent 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 transcript.

CC: CAC Members
Project Team
Steering Committee