



MEMORANDUM OF MEETING



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

MEETING DATE: June 1, 2005
PLACE: Leola Restaurant
TIME: 6:30 pm – 8:00 pm
SUBJECT: PA 23 EIS Community Advisory Committee, Meeting No. 7

BOARDS ON DISPLAY: Where We Were; Where We Are; Where We're Going; Alternative Reevaluation Illustration – 2 Lane Southern Alternative; Anticipated Project Schedule; Transportation Needs/Goals, Conceptual Alternatives

HANDOUTS: May 2005 Membership Matrix

ATTENDEES:

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| John Bare, Member | Larry Knepper, Member |
| Henry Beiler, Member | Frank Ludwig, Member |
| Herman Bontrager, Member | Michael Middleton, Member |
| Frank Christoffel, Member | Kristine Newswanger representing |
| Mary Clinton, Member | The Lancaster Chamber on behalf of |
| William Ebel, Member | Tom Baldrige, Member |
| Michael Flanagan, Member | Russell Pugh, Alternate |
| Carol Hickey, Alternate | Karen Weibel, Alternate |
| | Adam Zimmerman, 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
Barry Schoch, P.E., McCormick Taylor, Inc.
Deb Hoover, McCormick Taylor, Inc.

The purpose of this meeting was to bring the CAC up to date on the re-initiation of the project following the initial stage of the reevaluation process and discuss membership issues.

1. Welcome/Opening Remarks – Mark Malhenzie (MM) welcomed everyone to the meeting. MM asked the attendees to introduce themselves and asked the alternates attending in place of absent members make mention of that as well. The alternates attending in place of absent members included: Adam Zimmerman for Joe Shriver.

Following the introductions, MM urged everyone, members and alternates, to ask questions as we moved through the agenda.

MM provided a brief overview of the project's status from the time of the last public meeting in 2003 through the reevaluation process in 2004, and impact of the statewide reevaluation on the PA 23 EIS project. MM stressed that the unavailability of funds to build all of the projects underway across the state was the impetus behind the reevaluation process.

2. CAC Membership - Lugene Keys (LK) passed out the May 2005 CAC Membership Matrix for the member's use during the membership discussions. LK explained that an attempt to contact Leah Zook, Katie Glick's alternate, was made to see if she wanted to fill Ms. Glick's seat on the CAC, but no response was received. In line with the CAC Organization and Operational Principles, LK asked the CAC if they were prepared to provide the names of other individuals the membership to consider. LK reiterated that the nominations did not have to come from the packet of volunteer CAC applications that were sent out with the meeting announcement letter. The nominations received from the members were: Calvin Lapp, Dale Gamber, Daniel Bawell and Harold Landis. These names were listed on a flip chart along with a comment that had been emailed to LK from a CAC member stating that whoever the nominee is, they should come from Earl or East Earl Township in light of PennDOT's revised concept of the project and the potential impacts in this area. The CAC members came to a consensus that Calvin Lapp would be the first choice to replace Ms. Glick. If he did not accept the invitation, an invitation should then be extended to Harold Landis. LK noted that she would contact Mr. Lapp.

LK also noted that based on the CAC principles, Mike Flanagan needs to identify an alternate. Mike said that he would do so and get back to LK with this information prior to the next CAC meeting. LK asked if there were other topics to be discussed, and there were none offered.

3. Reinitiation of PA 23: Where we were - MM and Deb Scherkoske (DS) provided an overview of the project's timeline starting with the August 2003 public meeting and continuing through the reevaluation process and activities to date. MM discussed Transportation Secretary Biehler's and Agriculture Secretary Wolff's meeting with PA 23 corridor stakeholders and their field view of the project in February 2004. He explained the project team's challenge to reduce project costs and impacts in conjunction with the statewide reevaluation process.

Where we are: MM explained that the statewide goal of the reevaluation process is to "right-size" projects in a balanced approach that reduces costs and environmental impacts while still satisfying the transportation needs to the best degree possible within available funding. MM went on to explain the right-sizing approach as illustrated by the 2-lane Southern Alternative. MM discussed the Department's commitment to team with the County and municipalities to strike the most effective balance possible with the proposed transportation solutions and land use planning. A lengthy discussion was held with the CAC membership relative to the significance of the County's comprehensive planning initiative and regional zoning ordinances, and the need for

PennDOT to strive to achieve a transportation solution(s) that are compatible with these plans. A CAC member suggested that on the local level, if the MPO is not satisfied that PennDOT's proposed solution would compliment the County or municipal land use plans, it will not endorse the solution. MM reiterated PennDOT's commitment to working closely with the County, municipalities, and the public to effectively marry transportation improvement and land use planning, and the possibility of this outcome possibly serving as a statewide model for other transportation projects in the future.

MM described the general design of a 2-lane Southern Alternative on a proposed 2-lane right of way (right of way necessary to accommodate the footprint of 2 travel lanes and shoulders, embankments if necessary, and other design features beyond the embankments such as areas for stormwater management and signing) as an illustration of the right-sizing approach. MM indicated that the alignment followed that of the 4-lane Southern Alternative but was sensitized further within the 4-lane footprint where impacts could be positively reduced. A CAC member asked about the possibilities of the extra area on the "Goat Path" since a 2-lane roadway would not require as much space. MM indicated that this area may likely be needed for storm water management, since design criteria has increased from when it was originally built. MM mentioned the possibility of other opportunities such as incorporating a separated bike or pedestrian path along the formerly graded Goat Path with a 2-lane design noting that this option was not as likely with a 4-lane design.

MM pointed out that the 2-lane Southern Alternative would continue to be proposed as a limited access facility, meaning access would be allowed only at the designated access points (no driveways) similar to an Interstate scenario. There would be a total of eight access points, six internal and one each at the ends at US 30 and US 322. MM noted that intent of the limited access concept was to not create another 1000-access point situation such as what has evolved over the years on existing PA 23 leading to many of its current problems. The limited access concept and other design concepts could assist the County and municipalities in managing land use. Meetings held with the municipalities to date have incorporated this approach. DS added that the project team has met with each municipality to discuss access points within each community, and some changes have been made based on their input.

A CAC member asked if the north-south routes would be cut off. MM indicated that there are approximately 12 to 14 north-south local roads in the area of the Southern Alternative, and that the severing of these routes was an early concern from the Plain Sect community. The team early on committed to keeping these routes by either bridging under or over them for about half of the north-south routes while the others would have the at-grade signalized design, in keeping with the concept of reducing areas of impact and improving the visual considerations as requested by the public. If it would be deemed necessary for any one route to be severed due to design issues, a reasonable mitigation alternative would be developed.

A CAC member asked if more truck traffic would be attracted to the townships. DS responded that traffic analysis has indicated that less than 10% of the trips in the PA 23 corridor are through trips, and that features such as at-grade intersections would reduce

traveling speeds through the corridor and therefore not induce traffic to leave the turnpike and US 222 to travel a Southern Alternative.

Where we are going – DS discussed the completion of the reevaluation process involving the reevaluation of the Bareville Connector Alternative and the Widening Alternative, noting that the team will continue looking at how costs and impacts can be effectively reduced. She also noted that the alternatives that had been dismissed would also be revisited as a part of this process to see if there would be comparable gains. DS also noted that the performance of all alternatives would be compared. Once this is completed, the results will be shared with the CAC, other stakeholders and at a winter public meeting. The team will then be able to focus on identifying what will be carried through to the DEIS. MM noted that all alternatives are still under consideration, including the 4-lane alternatives, that none have been dismissed at this time, and that this would likely not happen until after the public meeting as part of the process.

DS noted that the CAC meeting tonight was a part of the project team's effort to re-engage it's key stakeholders, agencies and the public. A meeting with the local and state legislators, and county and municipal officials was held in May to bring them up to speed with the project. MM indicated that all the study area Bishops were also invited. Our public outreach activities will continue through the summer with municipal meetings and we're planning on holding a public meeting in the winter of 2005/2006.

DS provided an overview of the anticipated project schedule which included County and municipal activities as well as PennDOT activities. DS noted that the schedule is the team's best guess in terms of time frames, but reflects the steps needed to complete the project. The County/municipal activities included in the schedule were the completion of the draft land use plan by fall 2006 and the final land use plan by fall 2007.

Open discussion - A question was asked about the EIS process – where does it go; does the CAC get to have input on what goes into the EIS, and how can input be provided if there is disagreement with what is in the EIS. DS and MM explained the draft and final EIS process including the approval process with FHWA. DS stated that the Draft EIS is released to the public for comment. Following the release of the Draft EIS, a public hearing will be held at which time the public can again offer input towards the project. The comments received from the Draft EIS and at the public hearing will then be addressed in the Final EIS.

Another question was asked regarding the EIS – does it have to be consistent with the County's growth management plan? DS responded that the EIS would include a disclosure as to whether or not it is consistent with the local and county planning efforts.

A question was asked regarding PennDOT's position on its plans being consistent with local and county plans. A CAC member responded that the Secretary of Transportation and Secretary of Agriculture were excited about Smart Growth, agricultural preservation, and were working hand in hand with the County and municipalities to make this project the best that it can be, and to make it a model for future projects. MM

thanked the member for their comments, and added that PennDOT will strive to deliver the best transportation solution possible.

Another member noted that it would be reassuring if the Transportation Secretary would insist on the strongest plans being enacted and supported. MM elaborated on the Department's efforts to launch a national best practice land use research, with the partnering intent of possibly offering for consideration additional or perhaps modification of existing tools under consideration by the County and Municipalities leading land use efforts that may have relevance and benefit to the corridor as a whole. He reiterated the importance of land use across the state and the Secretary's efforts to make sure the best transportation solution is balanced with land use on this project. Other CAC members spoke to the need of getting a new road, and keeping a balanced view of the importance of the need to address the traffic issues.

A question was asked about the possibility of pedestrian and bike trails, but no wide shoulders for buggies. Where would they be? DS responded that the bike and pedestrian trails could be developed on right-of-way areas separated from the roadway. MM noted that based on input received from the Plain Sect community, there doesn't appear to be a need for a buggy path along the Goat Path— they don't generally travel into Lancaster on that particular route. The input also indicated that if an alternative would reduce the traffic on the secondary roads, their primary network of use, their mobility would be improved and there would not be a need to be on a new facility. MM indicated that would also positively influence a team goal of minimizing the conflict of slow moving and faster moving vehicles, with improved safety in mind. DS also noted that Transportation Systems Management (TSM) improvements have been a part of the team's approach from the beginning and will be included with each of the alternatives. Wider shoulder along select side roads are an example of the types of TSM improvements to be considered.

4. Conclusion - LK asked if there were any other questions or comments. A member asked when we would meet again. DS noted that the next CAC meeting would probably be in the fall. LK thanked everyone for coming, and the CAC meeting concluded at 8:20 p.m.

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